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Glossary

Greece

Student Unions
EFEE: National Student Union of Greece, dissolved in 1967 & replaced by a new one
FEA: Student Committees of Struggle, unofficial committees of anti-regime students
FEAPTH: Student Society of Students of the University of Salonica

Official Organizations and Societies
EKOF: National Social Student Union, extreme-right wing student organization
EKin: Hellenic-European Youth Movement
EMEP: Society for the Study of Hellenic Problems

Clandestine Organizations
Anti-Dictatorship EFFE/KNE: Communist Student Union and Communist Youth
EDE: International Workers Union (Trotskyites)
EKKE/AASPE: Stalinist-Maoists (General/Student Section)
OSE: Organization Social Revolution (Leftists)
PPSP/OMLE: Marxist-Leninists (General/Student Section)
Rigas Feraios: Euro-Communist Student Group

Political Parties
Centre Union (liberals)
EDA: United Democratic Left (left-wing)
ERE: National Radical Union (conservatives)
KKE Interior: Communist Party of the Interior (post-1968)
KKE: Communist Party of Greece

Armed Resistance Organizations
DEA: Democratic Committees of Struggle (Trotskyite)
DA: Democratic Defence (liberals)
PAM: Pan-Hellenic Anti-Dictatorship Front (Communist-led)
PAK: Pan-Hellenic Resistance Movement (fusion between leftists and liberals)
Spain

Student Unions
APE: Professional Student Associations, introduced after the dissolution of SEU (1965)
FUDE: Spanish Democratic University Federation, unofficial, controlled by PCE
SDEU: Trade-Union of Democratic Students, unofficial, de facto replacing SEU
SEU: Official Francoist Student Union

Political Parties
PSOE: Socialist Party of Spain
PSUC: Communist Party of Catalonia
PCE: Communist Party of Spain

Clandestine Organizations
FLP: Popular Liberation Front, leftist-Catholic
LCR: Liga Comunista Revolucionaria, Trotskyite, fusion between FLP & ETA VI Assembly
MCE: Communist Movement of Spain, formed together with ETA Berri the Basque Communist Movement
MDM: Democratic Womens’ Movement
O.M.L.E.: Marxist Leninist Organization of Spain
PC(r): Reconstituted Communist Party of Spain, in-between the PCE and Maoism
PCI: International Communist Party, leftist, linked to French groups

Armed Resistance Organizations
ETA: Basque Fatherland and Freedom, separatist group
ETA Berri (New): runaway faction in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat, fused with MCE (1968)
ETA VI Assembly: non-violent faction of ETA (1973)
FRAP: Revolutionary Antifascist and Patriotic Front, military arm of PC (Marxist-Leninist)
GRAPO: Revolucionary Antifascist Groups First of October, military arm of PC(r)
MIL: Militant Catalan group
Introduction

A national ‘lieu de mémoire’

Crushed by the Colonels’ tanks, the student occupation of the Athens Polytechnic in November 1973 was the culmination of anti-dictatorship activities in Greece; in its wake it left behind numerous casualties. Ever since the democratic consolidation, the so-called ‘Polytechnic Generation’, named after this event, has been a standard point of reference in Greek society. According to the sociologist Lambiri-Dimaki, this ‘spontaneous socio-political definition’ took place right after the Junta’s fall and ‘functioned as a symbol of democracy, promoted by mass media and politicians’, ‘attributing authority and power to a portion of the post-dictatorship Greek student youth’. Accordingly, the establishment of 17 November as a day of national celebration was combined with the diffusion of a sort of ‘mass media memory’ in Greece, to use Namier’s term. The memorialisation of the Polytechnic was the major legitimizing incident of the Metapolitefsi process and this is to be seen in the fact that the first post-Junta elections were scheduled for 17 November 1974, thus appropriating and transforming the specific date into a national symbol. In her analysis of the memory of the Civil War during the Spanish transition to democracy, Paloma Aguilar has argued that the standard way for a society to overcome a traumatic period is through the homogenization of collective memory. In Greece, the hagiography of student resistance and its ‘epic’ conclusion was used *inter alia* in order to whitewash the lack of systematic dissent and the relative consensus that the Junta enjoyed among the Greek population during the six-plus-one years of its existence, a fact which has been obliterated as a result of *refoulement* and collective amnesia.

Accordingly, contrary to what happened in Italy concerning the ’68 movement and some people’s almost physical necessity ‘to forget about ’68’, as a supposedly

1 The exact number of people who were killed during the night of 16 to 17 November 1973 has never been ascertained. According to the official statement of the time the number of fatalities was twenty. Later evidence, however, showed that proven victims numbered about sixty. Unofficial sources still put forward a figure of more than a hundred, however.


huge collective error with disastrous consequences, including terrorism, in Greece the movement has been memorialised as the major act of resistance during the seven years of authoritarianism, serving one of the founding myths of the post-1974 Third Greek Republic. In fact, it remains imprinted in Greek collective memory that the students of the Polytechnic actually brought down the Junta. Despite the symbolic and actual impact that the Polytechnic had had in terms of discrediting the regime's 'democratic evolution' this conviction is inaccurate.

Much more outrageous, however, is its flipside, namely the conspiracy theory according to which the Polytechnic was either a staged event or one which incurred no losses and was void of apparent significance. This theory of an 'epic fraud' was promoted by regime leaders and their supporters ever since the fall of the Junta, as was clearly demonstrated during the so-called Polytechnic trials in the summer of 1975. According to this theory, still shared by the extreme Right in Greece, events did indeed take place on 17 November 1973, but since the policemen were very careful and protective of the students, none of the latter was harmed. If we add this to Premier Markezinis's (1973) stubborn denial of the fact that the Polytechnic had turned into a bloodbath, one can clearly see how this event and its significance was cast into doubt from the very beginning by a pro-regime faction that promoted its own counter-memory.

The Greek Left and Center-Left, in marked contrast to the above, have reified the Polytechnic and have equally attempted to appropriate its 'true meaning'. The main slogan of the Left remained for years: 'Let us follow the path marked out by November'. Moreover, as happened in France with May '68 and in Italy with the 'stagione dei movimenti', the media greatly contributed to the interpellation of the '73

---

7 See Giannis Katris, Η γέννηση του νεοφασισμού στην Ελλάδα [The birth of neofascism in Greece], Athens 1974, p. 405.
8 See Οι δίκες της Χούντας. Πλήρη πρακτικά. Η Δίκη του Πολυτεχνείου [The trials of the Junta. The Full Minutes. The Polytechnic trial], Athens, 1975.
9 It is interesting that already in December 1973 there was a conspiracy theory developed by people close to the regime, according to which the Polytechnic was a myth created by a handful of journalists who were reporting events in such a way as to present themselves as having committed acts of resistance, although they had not.
generation as the archetype of student resistance. In contrast to the Western countries, which had experienced ‘les années 68’, however, the Polytechnic became the national ‘lieu de mémoire’ par excellence in the years following the democratic consolidation. Symbolic commemoration has become standard practice ever since. However, the peaceful marches of the late 1970s gave way to violent clashes between extra-parliamentary leftists and the police in the 1980s and 1990s. As these clashes still occur on a regular basis in the actual premises of the Polytechnic alongside the regular commemorative performances, they constitute a peculiar re-enactment of the actual events. For many protesters the Polytechnic’s heroic messages and aims have been largely considered as unfulfilled, if not ‘betrayed’. A typical slogan, underlining the rejection of the ‘institutionalisation’ of this day declares: ‘The Polytechnic is not a feast, but an insurrection, a popular battle’. It is evident, not only from these elements, but also from the very label after which it is named, that this generation became connected to the actual location of the uprising, rather than the year in which it happened, as in the case of ’68 and other movements. The actual date of the event changed signifiers after it was appropriated by the terrorist organization EO17N, which operated from 1975 to 2002, and was named after it.

The either unidentified or over-specified group around the Polytechnic occupation came to haunt future generations, as it was looked upon as the ultimate archetype, a model of action and self-sacrifice. Every student mobilization since then, from the mass student movements of the late 1970s to those of the 1980s, even up until the massive school occupations of the early 1990s and the recent anti-globalization bloc, implicitly or explicitly evoked the Polytechnic as a model. Accordingly, the history of the student movement is often seen to be of paramount importance in terms of

---

10 A similar case is to be seen with the so-called ’68 movements and mainly the French May and its generational component. See Jean-Pierre Le Goff, Mai 68, l’héritage impossible, Paris 1998, p. 476. Similarly, as Emanuel Betta and Enrica Capussotti note, the student movements of the Sixties and Seventies in Italy are considered as being the passato prossimo of any present-day protest movement and as ‘the matrix and sole parameter for analyzing and judging every expression of political radicalism’. See Emmanuel Betta, Enrica Capussotti, ‘Il buono, il brutto, il cattivo’: l’epica dei movimenti tra storia e memoria’, in Genesis, III/1, 2004.

11 See for example the so-called ‘biographical index’ of the Polytechnic Generation, a sort of ‘Who’s Who’ that includes a network of 5000 names of ex militants, many of which are entirely irrelevant. Fyssas makes an interesting choice concerning his generational analysis: he sees the Polytechnic as the beginning of the Metapolitefsi era and therefore also includes in his dictionary the next generation, which, however, has little to do with the actual anti-dictatorship period. In Fyssas’s view the Polytechnic was a move towards the future and a break with the past, and therefore he does not include people in his index who participated in anti-dictatorship activities but belonged to a previous age group. Dimitiris Fyssas, Η γενιά του Πολυτεχνείου. 1973-1981. Ένα Βιογραφικό Λεξικό [The Polytechnic Generation. 1973-1981. A biographical dictionary], Athens 1993.
providing keys to understanding the contemporary crises in student consciousness. Mimis Androulakis, a student leader during the dictatorship period and a current politician, has recently argued that the Polytechnic Generation acts like a group of ‘vampires’. He argues that, through its deification, the Polytechnic Generation absorbs younger generations in its own past, rather than allowing them develop their own genuine rebellions. \(^{12}\)

A standard topos concerning this generation, however, is that it became conformist precisely when it came to power, not only having betrayed its ideals but also having ‘cashed-in’ its political militancy by acquiring in exchange important positions in Greek society. \(^{13}\) Since the Polytechnic was often likened to May ’68 and was described as a ‘late May’, this development too was juxtaposed with the ’68ers taking power in most Western countries. For every government minister, however, there were also dozens who after the flash of the moment fell into the void. Even so, there is no doubt about the fact that the so-called Polytechnic Generation still preserves a certain mythical aura for my generation, the first generation born after 1974. Apart from the aforementioned interpellations, this generation’s collective endeavours are often juxtaposed with the general absence of collectivities at present. Its permanent attraction was partly a trigger for the present research too, not only in terms of a desire for an in-depth analysis but also as a process of demystification. Contrary to this, the previous generation tended to be more obscure in public discourse and is definitely not as radiantly mediatic as the ’73ers, if one may use this term.

**Generation-Specific Memories**

More than ten years prior to the Polytechnic, Grigoris Lambrakis, an independent MP and member of the Greek branch of Bertrand Russell’s *Peace Movement*, was assassinated in Salonica in May 1963. His death acted as a generational unifying event for a group of youths who became known as the *Lambrakides*. After having played a major role in the intense period of the mid-1960s, this politicized student generation of the pre-dictatorship period did not manage to react to the advent of authoritarianism. Apart from the people previously identified as leftists and subsequently imprisoned as

---


13 The journalist Viky Charisopoulou, for instance, in her autobiographical account laments the fact that ‘the revolutionaries had their hair cut, gained ascendance, acquired political power’ (*Της μετασχηματισμής ηλικίας* [The lost generation of the Metapolitefsi], Athens 2001, pp.20-21). In Petros Markaris’s police novel with the telling title *Che Committed Suicide* (Athens 2003), fictional exponents of the ‘Polytechnic Generation’ are represented as corrupt and ruthless middle-aged yuppies.
subversives immediately upon the coup in 1967, many others joined the ranks of various resistance organizations in order to commit non-systematic acts of violence. Apart from sporadic actions, however, they managed neither to adapt to the extraordinary new political conditions nor organize popular and successful forms of protest/resistance. In part, this thesis addresses the discrepancy between the Lambrakides and the aforementioned Polytechnic Generation.

According to the Durkheimian tradition in the sociology of knowledge, generations are not normative periods but rather subjectively defined cohorts. Consequently, ‘a generation exists if and only if a number of birth cohorts share a historical experience that creates a community of perceptions of this tradition’. Following this theory, we can classify a first cohort of people who were born between 1944 and 1949, and a second, those born after 1949, that is to say at the end of the Civil War, up to 1954. These people, although part of the same biological generation, reacted to the stimuli created by the regime in an entirely different way and, likewise, tend to represent themselves differently in their current accounts. Apart from different models of action in the past, two diverse ways of collective remembering in the present characterise these ex-militants.

The generational units featured in my discussion were shaped around two different axes: the Civil War and post-Civil War experience, the latter of which provided formative elements in the imaginary and memory of many students. The first age-group, comprising people who were born, *grosso modo*, between 1944 and 1949, often portrays itself as one which ‘did not experience a youth’. People belonging to this generational unit tend to represent the Junta as the linear continuation of the Civil War and its obscurantism. The assassinated Lambrakis is a key-figure in their collective

---


15 This classification, however, does not imply that the generational criteria are biological. As Karl Mannheim has argued, a generation is rather a social phenomenon, entailing a common location in historical time and space, which creates a predisposition towards a particular mode of thinking, acting and experiencing. See Karl Mannheim, *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, London 1952, p. 291. Also see Claudine Attias-Donfiut, *Sociologie des générations. L’empreinte du temps*, Paris 1988.

16 I am using the term *imaginary*, as a concept that is not necessarily ‘real’ but contingent on the imagination of a particular social subject. The term, coined by Lacan (1936) in order to describe the dual relationship of the ego and the specular image, bears connotations of illusion, seduction and fascination but does not imply something inconsequential. It was famously used by Cornelius Castoriadis in his book *L’institution imaginaire de la société* (1975) in order to describe the memeplex of values, institutions, laws, and symbols common to a particular social group and the corresponding society.
representation, which underlines the climate of permanent fear and repression. In contrast to that, my second cohort distances itself, to a certain extent, from the Civil War, and does not seem to feel as if it was shaped by the experience of its aftermath. A typical statement from a female student born in 1951 reads:

I don’t have memories from the post-Civil War years, none, meaning that I didn’t experience that hideous anti-Communism, or I don’t remember it, namely I don’t have these images of the Communist with knives in the mouth etc. as personal images. (Alavanou)\(^{17}\)

Such students are referred to by contemporaries as ‘the new generation [that] is not very much influenced by events that it has not experienced itself’.\(^{18}\)

The second axis is the dictatorship itself. The imposition of the dictatorship marked the first generation’s student life, while those who were younger were still teenagers. It is those teenagers who opted for mass protest instead of individual clandestine action, who exploited the political opportunities offered by the regime in order to develop everyday creativity and ultimately the apogee of the student movement in 1973. By that time, people from the first cohort, those who experienced the toughest years of the Junta in terms of austerity and restrictions, with martial law and full-blown preventive censorship, who were more prone to clandestine networks and ‘armed resistance’, were already imprisoned or exiled.

Interestingly, until recently the ‘historical generation’ of the first students involved in anti-Junta activities was not particularly present in public memory, a fact that caused bitterness and resentment on the part of its members. Thanasis Athanasiou, a key figure of the clandestine organization *Rigas Feraios*, captured and imprisoned as early as 1968, expresses the contrast between the two as well as the above-mentioned regret both in moral terms and as a conscious decision:

None of the kids from that group of *Rigas* asked to buy off anything, we all stayed consciously in obscurity, we didn’t want to buy off our resistance activity, which would be easy for us after such action and so many years in prison etc and being among the ringleaders of the youth, [...].

---

\(^{17}\) My translation; this is also the case for extracts from interviews I have conducted, and for the titles of Greek sources in the text and footnotes. Passages in English cited from Greek, Spanish and other non-English sources are my own translations, unless otherwise indicated. Quotations accompanied by the interviewee’s name in brackets refer to interviews which I have conducted and will not be referenced by a footnote. The actual place and date of each interview can be found in the Appendix. Quotations which have been taken from published accounts will be footnoted, however.

contrast to subsequent generations of youth, from which one was becoming Minister just because he was once slapped. I'm saying this because at a certain point these things have to be said.

Antonis Liakos too retains in his *ego-histoire* the deep alienation that people from his age group felt when prison acted as an inhibitive factor in terms of keeping a high public profile and pursuing a political path:

Few of us in the resistance against the junta went on to pursue a political career. The new world which we faced coming out of the prison seemed strange to us.\(^{19}\)

Liakos's comrade, Darveris, a man who would end up committing suicide just before the end of the millennium, depicts vividly in his novel the gloomy mood of the post-Junta conditions, summarized as the end of collective endeavours and a return to individualism:

Each one decided to take one’s own way: a political career, a doctorate, a professional promotion. And these were dividing the old comrades more and more; in the post-electoral, rather than celebrating, atmosphere of the New Year’s Eve of '75 some people were already feeling lonely.\(^{20}\)

In later years, much as Portelli argues about the '68 generation in other countries,\(^{21}\) in Greece there is a great temporal and semantic distance between past and present, involving a period of dramatic socio-political transformations, which inevitably altered the way protagonists of the student movement think of themselves. The passage from authoritarianism to democracy, from minoritarian to mass politics, from socialism to yuppyism, and from the armed struggle to institutionalised positions in the power structure of the state all resulted in fragmented identities. For others, the passage from a bipolar to a multipolar world, the loss of a solid point of reference, such as the Soviet Union, and a marginalization of Communism was too direct a hit to remain without further personal ramifications, while the *retour à la normale* and the various failings of Utopia caused a whole class of malaises: depression, alienation, extreme radicalization, even marginalization. *Katerina*\(^{22}\) shows herself to be conscious
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21 Alessandro Portelli, ‘Intervistare il Movimento...’, op.cit.
22 Names preceded by an asterisk are pseudonyms, respecting the interviewee’s wish to remain anonymous.
of the distortions, not so much of memory than of the points of view that these changes inflicted:

If someone had asked me in '74 I would surely have said different things.

For Spyros Asdrachas, distance accounts for the narrative’s being a parade of shadows invoked, retrospectively, in order to represent the conditions of the present. On some occasions, one can discern this distance over time, not only in terms of the narration of events and their evaluation, but also in terms of the individual perceptions of memory. Chryssafis Iordanoglou, a Salonican student leader, wrote that

[the fact that these things are so incomprehensible in the present day constitutes an indication of how many centuries (fortunately) divide the present from the past.]

Dimitris Chatzisokratis, a member of the Polytechnic Committee of Occupation, appeared in 1983 convinced that one can deal with one’s own ego-histoire without being influenced by the present:

The attitude I always had - and I have tried to maintain it as time passes - is to not look at the past through the glasses of the present.

More than twenty years later, the same Chatzisokratis wrote a book on the Polytechnic, in which he expressed a different view. He argues, contrary to his earlier statements, that a constant dialogue between past and present took place during the writing process: between his twenty two-year old self and himself in his fifties, much more informed about past events. His narrative is interesting because it presupposes the prolonged existence inside his mind of the ‘spirit’ of that period:

In principle the fifty two-year old prevails and tries to control the twenty two-year old, whom he tries to limit in the descriptive and narrative part. Even more so since the fifty two-year old has in
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his possession so many references, notes of comrades, outstanding analyses and scientific approaches.  

Still, there is a paradoxical experience of ‘a distanced immediacy’, as the distance from the narrated past is balanced by a proximity to the subjective experience of those events. In interviews, the reading of past situations through a clearly political, cultural or generational perspective is also facilitated by the more recent itinerary of people which certainly provided the cues for certain images of the past. The fact that Katerina continued to be a militant with even more radical views is reflected in the way in which she represents how the political situation has affected both her self-perception and self-representation. Her point brings to mind Portelli’s view that in the ‘68 movements too, this distance between ‘myself narrated’ in the past and ‘I narrator’ in the present, was inflicted by History itself.

Today I am telling you these things having the knowledge of ’89 and mainly through the prism of the New Age, of new wars, the new world order, which forces you to see your real size within History. Without defeatism and whining, of course.

In terms of clandestine organizations and the recent arrests of alleged members of the terrorist groups EO 17 November and ELA in the summer of 2002, their supposed links were accentuated by a media-generated hysteria. The latter reinforced the public impression that there was a direct connection between the two, with terrorism being a regressive development of clandestine resistance, just as 1970s violence was linked to the ’68 movements. Consequently, for some time the so-called ‘armed resistance’ against the Junta was revisited in light of recent events and on the basis of questioning the legitimacy of violence under any circumstances. This created a climate of suspicion and silence in terms of the people who were involved in these organizations. Since the majority of my research was conducted precisely during this controversial period, it bears the side-effects of this issue, including exhaustive triangulations of information concerning my own agenda as well as investment in strategies of avoidance for fear of talking about ‘sensitive matters’.

26 Dimitris Chatzisokratis, Πολυτεχνείο ’73. Αναστοχασμός μιας πραγματικότητας [Polytechnic ’73, Rethinking about a reality], Athens 2004, p. 21.
27 S. Gourgouris, Dream Nation..., op.cit.
Apart from people who politely declined my requests to interview them, others often tried to ensure that anti-dictatorship acts not be confused with terrorist acts; as such, interviewees use a present analytical category for interpreting past events. The distance between the past and the present discourses on violence often reveals an actual—and indeed problematic—biographical rupture in the individual. Lumley aptly describes ruptures in self-images from the 1960s to the present, whereby the past often resembles a foreign country. Dionysis Savopoulos, the foremost songwriter of the late 60s and early 70s in Greece, offers an interesting autobiographical comment on this ‘schism’ between past and present, by likening the darkness and rage of his past persona to Koufodinas, the main gunner of the 17 November terrorist group:

The other day Kornilios, my older son, took me out and he put on a tape with the Black Sea from the Dirty Bread album. I listened to myself, with that darkest of voices in ‘72, singing alongside the distortions of the electric guitar ‘I do not have a sound, I do not have material’ and I thought I was listening to Koufodinas!  

Here I echo what Lumley describes in terms of the Italian case, namely the fact that in addition to changes in the discourse itself, the way of describing the same experiences has been transformed. Apart from societal changes, a crucial development was the fact that the dominant paradigm in public discourse ceased to be concerned with an alternative revolutionary politics. Moreover, there are individual factors which account for dramatic changes in both the narratives and the methods by which people find meaning in themselves and their lives. Josselson stresses that ‘events that loom large at one life stage may be underground at another, only to recur’, as narratives get ‘reshaped and rebalanced’. In this way, personal stories highlight the tensions between the historical past and the disrupted present.

**Research hypotheses**

As George Dertilis has argued, ‘we cannot cut history up into seven-year pieces’. So, although the conventional chronological framework I use in the title of the thesis covers
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30 Interview with Savopoulos, *Epsilon*, 27/10/2002, p.16. The person to whom Savopoulos refers is sentenced for life on the accusation of being one of the main operational organs of 17N.
32 George B. Dertilis, ‘Η Ιστορία που χάνεται’ [History that vanishes], *To Vima tis Kyriakis*, 23/11/1997, p. 35.
the years 1967-1974, namely the seven years of the dictatorship, it would be very difficult to limit the scope of my research to this period, without taking into account what happened before and after. The pre-Junta period is inextricably linked to the actual dictatorship years in terms of continuities and ruptures and, as such, is valuable especially in providing an understanding of the context and the evolution of social actors. Contrary to the Lambrakides who were largely conditioned by the pre-dictatorship past but also by an intransigent interpretation of ’68, from 1971 onwards a new generation of students chose to come to an open confrontation with the Colonels aided by the regime’s own opening up. My aim is both to reconstruct the developments in Greek society and university life, including the emergence of these two distinct generational groups, and to trace the continuities and ruptures in patterns and cultures of protest. Although the conscious focus of the study is on protagonists of contestation, this is not to suggest that by any means did the ‘Polytechnic Generation’ dominate student circles during these years. They were, rather, a ‘strict minority’, since the vast majority of students remained indifferent.

A further goal of my thesis is to catalogue the cultural and ideological features that the students had at their disposal in order to disrupt the relative consensus that was created after five years of dictatorial rule and to create new meaning. Their strategy relied on a legal platform regarding university issues, which exploited the political opportunities that were offered by the authoritarian regime’s partial liberalisation in the early 1970s. This was a major reason for the reinforcement of their mobilising structures and temporary autonomisation from political control that would soon be re-exercised by clandestine student organisations. The particular mass culture that was developed and appropriated by these students was reminiscent of a strong current of radical youth politics coming from abroad and coupled with the transformation of their everyday realities. This challenges a certain left-wing historiographical paradigm, which both stresses the stupefying effects of mass culture and looks at the exposure to Western ideas and ‘foreign imported models of life’ as ‘destructive’, paralysing and disorienting for Greek students. An illustrative example is offered by Giorgos Giannaris’s *Student Movements and Greek Education*:

In the first years of the dictatorship, youth interests were focused on football, lucky games, new songs - mainly Anglo-Saxon ones, dress (bell-bottoms and later on blue jeans, turtleneck sweaters, and, for the working classes, leather or plastic suits, most often black ones) - long hair and beards,
sexual activities, entertainment in general [...] In other words, the satisfaction of basic desires [...] Radio, cinema and in general paraphilology and the Press, newly arrived television, etc, led student consciousness to a foreign, that is imported and therefore unfamiliar way of life, carelessness, inertia, things that the Junta systematically promoted. These were the elements that aided the regime.33

Apart from repudiating this theory, my thesis argues that a certain re-appropriation of tradition became the linchpin in the collective student imaginary and practices against the regime’s own conceptualization and promotion of Hellenic-Christian civilization.

Finally, my thesis explores the relationship between international and local dimensions, while drawing parallels with other Western movements and student experiences. The distinct characteristics and ultimate demands of the Greek movement—a locally defined case—were determined not only by internal politics but also by a broader flux of information and semantic codes, such as dress, taste in music and literature, rhetoric and slogans. My main point here is that the student mentality, marked by both their domestic situation and an adversary as concrete as a military Junta, was nevertheless enhanced by an awareness of other contemporary student movements abroad. In an implicit comparison of the Polytechnic uprising with the '68 movements, my thesis sustains that this generation of Greek students was its own _avant-garde_, both in terms of self-perception and action repertoire. Apart from the various fundamental differences between Greek students in '67-'74 and the generation of '68 elsewhere, my hypothesis here is that in Greece the student movement came in on a wave of _cultural_ as well as political rebellion, a fact that likens it to the gestalt of '68.

By analysing the distinct characteristics of the 'Polytechnic Generation' and by discussing its relation to its predecessor in terms of similarities and differences as well as its often mimetic relationship to its European counterparts, this research interrogates connections between culture and politics, public and private, past and present. Since Greek students were representative of a social movement, following '68's ‘explosion of subjectivity’,34 it is crucial to investigate the role of individuals and their memory of the period in question. Accordingly, I trace the specific dynamics at work in the upsurge of
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33 Giorgos Giannaris, Φοιτητικά Κινήματα και Ελληνική Παιδεία. Vol 2 Από την ΕΠΟΝ στο Πολυτεχνείο [Student Movements and Greek Education. From EPON to the Polytechnic], Athens 1993, p. 337.
34 This concept was introduced by Luisa Passerini in ‘Le mouvement de 1968 comme prise de parole et comme explosion de la subjectivité: le cas de Turin’, pp. 39-74 in Le mouvement social, 143, April-June 1988.
student activity in Greece in the early 1970s, its present representation by protagonists and the interrelatedness between these different accounts. Thus, this study aims to reconcile the age-old division between structure and agency in an attempt to account both for structural conditions and individual perceptions. In addition, my focus on subjectivity exposes 'the mutual influences and tensions of the relationship between individuality and collectivity, experience and memory in the process of shaping the individual'.

Oral accounts have been combined with other evidence and conclusions have been drawn from their inter-relatedness. As Luisa Passerini argues, one should not only look at the facts; one must also explore the psychological and symbolic dimension, using categories such as the unconscious, the imaginary, projections, compensations and dismissals. An explanation based on solely political-institutional terms is less than satisfactory but it is important to employ a cultural analysis in order 'to situate the social processes of that period in an appropriate context for their nature and length.' In contrast to the binary perception at work in people's self-representation that tends to juxtapose the organised with the spontaneous, culture with politics, private with public, 'inside' with 'outside' Greece, right-wing background with left-wing influences, my project shows these features were to a large extent intermingled and interrelated. Finally, apart from the conventional chronology featured in the title, the complexity of the events renders it difficult to do justice to the subject matter without narrowing the research in geographical terms as well. As Athens, followed by Salonica, clearly played the vanguard position within the movement, the student revolts that occurred in the Universities of Patras and Ioannina have been left aside in the present study.

**Analytical categories**

Through parallel work with memory, oral history and archival material, this thesis attempts to promote a consistent dialogue between private micro-history and public events, as well as between oracy and public discourse. As such, effort is made to distinguish between past and present, as well as between historical processes and self-representation by means of exploring their interrelatedness. In this sense, the thesis seeks a balance between Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic History. It oscillates, in other
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words, between theory and data, events and interpretation, ‘hard facts’ and memory. The inevitable *histoire problème* of this approach is that attempts to reconstruct an epoch, respecting a certain chronology and socio-cultural structure, are undermined by the dialogue with the existing social reality through memory, which, to a certain extent, decomposes the syntagmatic genre. Ultimately, the paradigmatic approach takes over, since the drive to ‘emphasize the particular rather than the whole’ and ‘fluidity rather than normality’ weakens the fixed boundaries of historical monocularity.

In this context, I employ a widely interdisciplinary approach in order to break the traditional barrier between ‘agency’ and ‘structure’, individual and collective, private and public. Accordingly, my project investigates individual processes, subjectivity and meaning through a life-story approach and memory analysis. In terms of collectivities and movement dynamics, I apply theories of new social movements, whereas for analyzing the student frames, I often borrow tools from cultural studies. As far as analytical categories themselves are concerned, memory is mainly used in the light of Halbwachs’s classic analyses. In my view, individual memory helps to problematise collective stereotypes and the ways in which people wish to represent (or not represent) themselves, as individual narratives contain more ambiguous messages than the ones which are supposedly conveyed by collective memory. Often, however, in the text, there is a conflation between the two terms. In a similar way, subjectivity and identity are interrelated notions which are used interchangeably. Identity is usually preferred as an analytical tool in terms of collectivities, while subjectivity in terms of individuals, since it renders a more nuanced notion of personal dynamics.

I do not draw any clear-cut epistemological divisions between different factions of ‘youth’, usually a description of biological age, and ‘students’, a social category. The reason for that is that these categories are by and large intermingled and synonymous, especially if one looks at the particular context of the 1960s. Alongside the great changes that started to take place in European and American universities in the early ’60s, the student revolts all around the globe reinforced the image of students as a

---


powerful category, a solid group of their own; a particular sub-section of Chapter V elaborates on this. When reading period literature on youth culture, one cannot but think that this term encompassed the full spectrum of young people at the time. The predominant group and spearhead of those youths were students, a category which, at the time acquired a supranational character. After all, the processes of youth identity construction often coincided with the years in the university for those who happened to be the first to massively enter academic institutions.

Finally, as far as the term culture is concerned, my assumption is that student activities form part of a ‘wider set of social processes covered by the term ‘culture’ in the broader sense’, meaning not only in terms of aesthetics and intellectuality but also in sociological/anthropological terms, as norms of social behaviour. In this way, culture is also approached from an anthropological perspective as a ‘way of life’, which characterizes various forms of collective action and styles of social groups. In this sense, culture is indeed linked to politics, since by shaping subjectivity and offering life principles, it can express the need for resistance.

Last, but not least, when analysing the impact of ’68 in this thesis, the focus is on the French case, because at that time May ’68 was a point of reference for all. Apart from the Greek and Spanish contingent, Italian students of the 1960s also testify that they regarded the French May ’68 experience as a locomotive which spread the desire for social change and revolt to other countries. Accordingly, despite the fact that the Italian ‘autumn’ lasted more than a decade, the French movement was seen as a sort of condensed contestatory experience, a student revolt par excellence.

The polyphonic result of interviews

The past is myself, my own history, the seed of my present thoughts, the mould of my present disposition.

Robert Louis Stevenson

43 Richard Johnson, ‘The story so far: and further transformations?’ pp. 280-281, in D. Punter (ed.), *Introduction to Contemporary Cultural Studies*, London and New York, 1986. Johnson asserts that according to the existing circumstances a certain social group ends up either resisting or reproducing the existing mechanism of submission.
I have conducted in-depth interviews that lasted, on average, two hours each. Beginning with strategic informants and passing over to the snow-ball technique, I gathered fifty-two testimonies, covering a wide range of time-period, groupings, affiliations and roles within the movement, as well as the various Faculties. My subjects included both men and women who were students during the years 1967-74, and who played a pivotal or grassroots role in clandestine resistance organisations or the student movement itself. Interviews were also held with artists, journalists, publishers and bookshop-keepers, who were supposedly only peripheral actors in the movement but who in fact played a crucial role in terms of cultural diffusion.

In terms of analysis and interpretation, objections may be raised as to whether the sample of fifty-two interviews constitutes a sufficient empirical foundation upon which to build generalisations. Though this number is clearly not representative in a statistical sense, I nevertheless attempted to cover a wide range of organizations and to respect the ‘saturation effect’. The interviewees were identified by their recognisability in the movement, their role or simply because of the function of the snow-ball technique. I tried to gather testimonies from people belonging to both the first and the second cohort, even though the second prevailed numerically, because of its central role in the thesis. Although I tried to respect variables such as class, gender, origins and locality, I believe that statistical analyses are not sufficient to explain individual itineraries. As Ruthellen Josselson argues, people ‘cannot be objectively described as though as they are molecules’.44 I concur with her proposal for an epistemology that is ‘simultaneously empirical, intersubjective, and process-oriented’.45

The interviews’ content varied and often depended on the amount of visibility that the specific interviewee had acquired as, in some cases, protagonists of the movement who are very accustomed to talking in public about this period tend to reproduce a repetitive and almost codified narrative of the events.46 Naturally, the relationship constructed with the interviewees and the quality of their responses to my questions was affected by my own positionality, in terms of gender, class, age and

45 Ibid.
46 For an elaboration of this point see Riki Van Boeschoten, Ανάπτυξη Ξρόνια. Συλλεγμένη μνήμη και τροπολογία στο Ζώω Ερβενίου (1900-1950) [Troubled Years. Collective Memory and History in Ziakas of Grevena], Athens 1997, p. 218.
institutional background. Since during the course of an interview, a dialectic process between competing interpretative forms takes place, observation and interpretation are never value free. Furthermore, an interview is an encounter between two different subjectivities and two different social identities in a certain context which is culturally and historically specific. The meetings with my interviewees took place between 2001-2004, mostly in their homes in Athens or Salonica, and, on occasion, in work places or cafés.

A general comment at this point that can be applied to the vast majority of accounts is that since most of these people have been actively involved in politics, academia and journalism, they proved to be very eloquent speakers, accustomed to public discourse. Apart from being all too familiar with dialogues and interaction, most of them made use of a backdrop of sophisticated theoretical readings. This fact greatly differentiates these life stories from others made with people with a lower educational formation and professional evolution. Taking into account symbolic and psychological factors, I was often aware of biases and agendas, but also identified silences in the discourses. In general, they tried to render their narratives coherent even when things were fractured or fragmented. Still, the a posteriori rationalisation and the inevitable distortions are not necessarily of a conscious, disingenuous or deceitful kind.

Individual resistance is especially present when a past political militancy is at odds with the present and cannot be easily digested by the individual on a psychological level. Anxieties, obsessions, ambiguities and discontinuities were elements that were externalized alongside peoples' memories. More than the use of violence, great difficulties were discerned in cases where people were imprisoned and tortured, whereby the interviewees often found themselves in a state of malaise. This fact rendered memories ambivalent, exciting and painful all at the same time. Post-traumatic stress syndrome played a role as well, since many times interviewees, who had been through the experience of interrogation, remain very sensitive to the nature of any kind of questioning. However, testimonies were not always emotionally charged. Often the thoughts and feelings of the participants were detached, coated with an over-whelming sense of cynicism and self-irony, which marks a change in what Raymond Williams termed 'a structure of feeling'.

If a classification could be made, the interviews in general reinforced the gender stereotypes: women talked more easily about emotions, while men tended to focus on public life and political developments, thus resulting in a sort of private-public memory disparity. As in most interview cases, the most interesting personal confessions were narrated off the record. Xydi, for instance, noted that from 1974 onwards, each time the doorbell rang she was frightened, while Vervenioti remembered with emotion that shortly before being incarcerated she took a piece of basil with her for its odour to make her feel better. Kalimeris confessed that the only reason that he becomes so negative when talking about this period is because he loves it so dearly. One of the most intense moments was when after the end of the ‘official’ interview and during a conversation about entirely irrelevant things, Vanos revealed his having been tortured and the psychological effects thereof. Similarly, Karystiani remembered her need to escape when, after many years, she saw the most compassionate of her torturers on the bus. In these cases, my impression was that the interview acted simultaneously as a liberating and a deeply disturbing force for the interviewees.

An additional interesting feature was that both Lionarakis and Mandelou became increasingly friendly and open when their daughters, incidentally around my age, appeared and listened to our conversation, occasionally interrupting and asking things. Apparently, at this moment the inter-subjective relation changes along with the content of the exchange, as it is mediated by a more familiar relation. In that sense, the communicational impact is often reinforced, even though not always to the advantage of the interview, since silences and self-justification are often toughened. Equally interesting were the instances in which more than one person participated in an interview, often complementing but also contradicting each other. In one or two cases, the interviewees prevented me from taking notes, while in others they insisted on having a pseudonym. Most often the end of the interview left my interviewees in a charged emotional state, to the extent that one of them even lamented the fact that I made him remember all this. In other cases, they were eager to see whether my account would be in line with their group’s philosophy of action. After our meeting in Paris and while rushing to catch the train to the airport, Lionarakis found the time to ask me: ‘Rigas followed the correct line, right?’

Insofar as an interview is based on an inter-subjective rapport, it must be stressed that my interviewees affected me as well. In order to preserve my impressions of the interview process, apart from the actual recording, after each encounter I took note of
The most striking elements during the meeting. The fact that I was involved in both an interactive and implicated process/practice as well as in a hermeneutical one was a creative but complex experience. Very often, the illusion of familiarity with these people who continue to exercise considerable charm and authority was an element which had to be controlled when analyzing their narratives. Finally, a conscious decision in terms of the narrative construction of the thesis was to leave out the questions from the text; instead, they can be found in the form of a standardised questionnaire in the appendix. This fact, however, often creates the illusion of an autobiography, although replies were mostly triggered or extrapolated through precise questions or provocations. In my view, the elimination of the actual queries facilitates the reading and understanding of the testimonies, allowing for a more immediate impact of their content.

**Autobiographical writings**

Apart from the testimonies that I have collected myself, a vast corpus of interviews, autobiographical writings and biographies already existed (and of which I also made use) in order to gather thick data that could lead to a satisfactory qualitative analysis. There were few letters (Mavragani) and hardly any diaries or written accounts (Papachristos), due to the nature of the regime and the implications of such actions at the time. There also was a striking absence of pictures for similar reasons, apart from the ones which appeared in the press. If we try to classify the memoirs, one group comprises people who describe their personal experiences. Even though Asdrachas attacks the memoirs as ‘fundamentally differentiated from historical and chronicle writing in that it disregards the substantiation of its content and shuns completely any empirical evidence, being driven instead by ‘the passion for personal justification’, in reality, valuable interpretative cues can be deduced from those writings. Thus, historical time and the positionality of the authors are elements that must be considered when attempting to historicise these accounts (as well as silences and inevitable attempts at self-justification). A major example of that category is offered by a collective ‘autobiography’ written by leading members of the Athens movement, under the heading 19+1. As indicated by its title, this volume was published on the occasion
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of the twenty year anniversary of the Polytechnic, juxtaposing a confessional style of
drawing with chronicles and ideology-driven interpretations. At the opposite end of the
spectrum stands Stergios Katsaros’s *I the Provocateur, me the Terrorist* (Athens 1999),
which deals with the previous generation. Katsaros, who considered himself a
‘professional revolutionary’, offers a very rich overview of an individual itinerary
through action, imprisonment and disillusionment. A second group, is comprised by an
interesting genre, made out of novels with a strong autobiographical inspiration. In
Maro Douka’s *Fool’s Gold*, the author’s own experience of clandestinity is transformed
into a novel concerning the three days of the Polytechnic. Douka, like other female
authors writing about the same period, seeks to ‘highlight personal self-discovery rather
than political involvement’. As Tziovas puts it, she shifts the emphasis ‘away from
the historical reality toward the formation of personal identity.’ A similar process is
followed by Tasos Darveris’s *A Night’s Story* (Salonica, 1983, Athens 2002),
this time marking a male gaze on militancy. In these narratives, the
boundaries between past and present, history and fiction often remain blurred.

**Archival and Published Sources**

**Greece**

This study does not pretend to be complete. It overlooks various aspects but the paucity
of official documents and sources is an extra factor that contributes to this. In terms of
archives, Greek state archives were regrettably restricted due to the chronological
proximity. First and foremost the *Contemporary Social History Archives* (ASKI), but
also the Archives of the *Society for the Safeguarding of Historical Archives* (EDIA)
and the *Greek Literature and History Archive* (ELIA) in Athens provided me with
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Ibid.

Other accounts on Salónica include Christos Zafeiris’ *Eμείς, τον ’60 οι εκδοτές*, [We, the travelers of the 1960s], Salónica 2000, a chronicle about life in the city in the 1960s and Panos Theodordin’s* humorous autobiographical note *Το πόκ των Μακεδόνων* [Macedonian rock], Salónica, 1998.

For literary approaches to the Polytechnic, see Kostoula Mitropoulou’s, *To χρονικό των τριών ημέρων* [The Chronicle of the Three Days], Athens, 1982, Margarita Lyberaki, *To μυστήριο* [The mystery], Athens 1976, and the collective volume edited by Ilias Gris, *Το μελάνι των φωνάξει* Η 17η Νοέμβριος 1973 στη λογοτεχνία [The yelling ink. 17 November 1973 in Literature], Athens 2003. Alexandros Kotsias’s *Ναυταγώνες Άρχες* [Usurpation of Authority], Athens 1979, is an interesting attempt to approach the world of a *demi-monde* figure who is working for the regime during the days of the student unrest.
precious primary material, such as clandestine journals, leaflets and brochures. The clandestine press of the time was a major source, not so much of information as of the diverse discourse of the various organizations and of the messages they wanted to circulate. Other sources of information were the University of Athens Archives, with certain Faculty protocols and minutes from the proceedings of the professorial meetings, as well as the archives of the Greek State Channel (ERT), with a vast collection of newsreels of the period, which depict both the dictators' aesthetics and their concerns.

The newspapers of the period in question indeed proved to be an invaluable guide to generating a clear picture of the general climate in Greece, including the break and the changes inflicted by the arrival of the Junta on 21 April 1967. I examined the priorities and content of the every-day press, completely censored in the beginning, freer later on, including the reporting of '68 student unrests, the Arab-Israeli and Vietnam wars and, at a certain point, Greek university life and student actions. I covered the entire seven-year period in the papers *To Vima* (Athens) and *Thessaloniki* (Salonica), as well as several years from *Ta Nea*, *Makedonia* and *Eleftheros Kosmos*. I covered the entire run of the publication of the pro-regime student paper *O Foititis*. I mainly use this as a point of reference concerning pro-regime students, as I failed to locate the equivalent paper published in Athens, called *Foititikos Palmos* [Student Palm]. Finally, printed documentation served as a guide concerning the priorities of the various clandestine organisations.

**United States, UK, France**

I have consulted the National Archives in Washington, D.C., as well as PRO (Public Records Office) in London, which, at the time did not go further than 1973, leaving out the crucial Law School occupations and the Polytechnic uprising. The Simitis, Solaro and Pollis collections at Princeton University also helped in terms of pinpointing important documents and journals circulating in Europe and the United States concerning the political situation in Greece in general, and the student movement in particular. Of precious help was the *League for Democracy in Greece* Archive at King's College London. Its vast collection of primary material, such as letters from anti-regime Greek students to Greek professors in British universities in order to escape from Greece for postgraduate studies, and in reality also from arrest, coupled with an enormous collection of ephemera concerning the period are but two of the valuable
sources in this archive. The BDIC archives at Nanterre and the Archive of the Fondation Hellénique in Paris, which I organised as I consulted it, contained extremely useful documents for understanding how Greek students abroad perceived the '68 events in relation to their own domestic affairs. This includes published material used in order to circulate information, such as the journal Poreia.

**State of the Art**

Apart from several colloquia and recent research conducted on the political-diplomatic level, historiographical production on the post-Civil War period in Greece remains scarce. As for the existing bibliography on the Greek dictatorship, most treatises focus on the conditions that led to the democratic collapse. Early scholarship was written during and shortly after the dictatorship itself and stressed a centre-periphery theory, according to which Greece was placed within the scheme of foreign dependency and the so-called ‘foreign factor’ and its conflict with local ‘progressive forces’. Poulantzas, who saw the Junta as the peak in an internal fight between a ‘comprador’ and US-friendly bourgeoisie with an inside-looking but Europeanist one, offers an idiosyncratic, class-based analysis. Later analyses focus on the role of the
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army as the safeguard of the post-1949 state of affairs, viewing the dictatorship as either a response to the dynamics created by left-wing mobilization or a democratic transformation of Greek society. In terms of the dictatorship itself, some of the main points of reference at least in terms of a factual reconstruction belong to the dictatorship and early Metapolitefsi period. Only recently has there been a renewed interest in this period, resulting in some preliminary research on Meletis Meletopoulos's treatise on the regime. Although such work introduces fascinating material, it is seriously undermined by a number of grave methodological problems. Apart from that, recent research on the Junta's foreign policies, including policies on Eastern Europe and Cyprus as well as the published papers of the 1997 Political Science Symposium on different aspects of the seven-year period remain the most significant contribution so far. Still, insofar as events and processes were either only partially reconstructed or entirely overlooked, the writing of this thesis confronted great lacunae vis-à-vis extensive research of the dictatorship and pre-dictatorship periods, two significant conditions that in turn greatly affected the present study.

In general, the Polytechnic and anti-regime resistance are the two topics that have captured the interest of scholars and critics. Also important is the fact that the existing treatises on the anti-dictatorship student movement were written at very different moments in time, moments that greatly differ politically, economically, and historically. Ranging from mainly journalistic depositions executed in days immediately following the Junta's collapse in 1974 to present-day treatises, these texts often bear wildly different textures and nuanced meanings according to the historical moment of their respective productions. The literature on the student movement virtually exploded during the years immediately following the fall of the junta and into the following decade. Numerous analysts have tried to explain the course of events, in analyses that
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60 Dimitris Charalambis, Στρατός και πολιτική εξουσία. Η δομή της εξουσίας στη μετεμφυλιακή Ελλάδα [Army and political authority: the structure of political authority in post-civil war Greece], Athens 1985.
62 See the rich analyses in George Giannopoulos, Richard Clogg (eds), Greece Under Military Rule, London 1972 and the more journalistic approach of Solon Grigoriadis, Ιστορία της Δικτατορίας [History of the Dictatorship], Athens 1975.
64 See for instance the journal Anti, which featured a great number of articles and analyses from 1974 until the late 1980s.
were not only characterised by a politically biased and emotionally charged character but also made à chaud. In addition, the bulk of the bibliography on the student movement was generated by protagonists who produced their own theories, attempting to diffuse their personal experience through combinations of historical knowledge and analysis.

In most cases, these accounts simply echo the debates underway at the time of their conception along with their authors’ particular fixations. A notable exception is the study of Anna Mantoglou, who writes a socio-psychological analysis that regards the Polytechnic as the result of the action of a ‘strict minority’. Other analyses were either published or re-published on the occasion of anniversaries of key events. These accounts can be divided roughly into two categories: the more militant left-wing accounts produced up to the late 1980s, on the line that ‘the Polytechnic was a left-wing insurrection’, and the more ‘ecumenical’ views that have come out since the recent turn of the century. Since exponents of the so-called ‘Polytechnic Generation’ tend to be self-referential, they actually see themselves as the only eligible candidates for dealing with their own memory. As such, someone who ‘was not there’ is often criticized for the fact that s/he proposes interpretations and intellectualizations of things that only
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63 Stavros Lygeros, a member of the Committee of Occupation in the Polytechnic events of 1973, wrote a chronicle of the movement in 1978. This rich text, strongly marked by leftist tendencies, reflects the discourse and prerogatives of that particular section of students, that is: great animosity towards the ‘treacherous’ orthodox Communist Party and praise for the spontaneous nature of events. In the early 1980s, Minas Papazoglou, the main link between the Athens press and the movement, published a book which was the first full factual guide to the course of events. Less than a decade later, Olympics Dafermos, yet another protagonist, offered a well-documented account of the evolution of the student body from an uncoordinated entity to a well-functioning anti-regime pole. Here too, however, the author’s preoccupation is the relation between ‘organisation’ and ‘spontaneity’, an age-old dilemma among left-wing groups. Despite his ‘objective’ tone, Dafermos, an unaffiliated student at the time, almost obsessively seeks to prove that the political organizations did not play any significant role in the creation of the movement and that the fact that their late entry onto the scene did nothing but harm student unity. Marios Nikolinakos’s account, based on articles which appeared in the German press during the dictatorship period, mainly focuses on the resistance to the Colonels and bears the evident ideological traits of the time. See Stavros Lygeros, Φοιτητικό κίνημα και ταξική πάλη στην Ελλάδα. Από τις προσφυγές στα προπολεμικά στην εξέγερση του Πολυτεχνείου [Student movement and class struggle in Greece. From the appeal to the courts of first instance to the Polytechnic uprising], 2 vols, Athens 1978, Minas Papazoglou, Φοιτητικό Κίνημα και Δικτατορία [Student Movement and Dictatorship], Athens 1983, Olympics Dafermos, Φοιτητές και Δικτατορία. Το αντιδικτατορικό φοιτητικό κίνημα 1972-1973 [Students and Dictatorship. The anti-dictatorship Student Movement, 1972-73], Athens 1999. Marios Nikolinakos, Widerstand und Opposition in Griechenland, Frankfurt 1974, Greek edition, Athens 1975.

64 Anna Mantoglou, Η εξέγερση του Πολυτεχνείου. Η συγκρούσιμη σχέση ατόμων και κοινωνίας [The Polytechnic uprising. The conflictual relationship between the individual and the society], Athens 1995.

65 Representative of the first line is a collection of interviews under the Fallaci-like title Reportage with History (1983, 2003), while the second is evident in the collective volume edited by student leader Giorgos A. Vernikos, Οπότε θέλαμε να αλλάξουμε την Ελλάδα. Το αντιδικτατορικό φοιτητικό κίνημα: Η EKIN και οι καταλήψεις της Νομικής [When we wanted to change Greece. The anti-dictatorship student movement: EKIN and the Law School occupations], Athens 2003, p. 149 and Chadzisokratis’s above mentioned treatise (2004).
those who were there to experience can properly understand. Another typical criticism, one typically upheld by non-protagonists, is the one which places the antidictatorship student movement within an ongoing chain of student uprisings. This linear continuation from 1821 to the present, regards the rebelling student body as a constitutionally democratic and progressive element in Greek society.

A widespread attitude in the present literature is that one has to leave aside the ‘sentimental texts which might have a literary value, but not a historical one.’ In the introductory note to the history of the 1972-73 student movement in Salonica, Iordanoglou expresses his Thucydidean principles in terms of how a ‘chronicler’ should confront events that s/he has experienced:

The emotions of that time (anger, terror, pride, feeling of solidarity) cannot be reproduced or transmitted at present. Many people (well-intentioned, without any doubt), have tried to transmit the moral and emotional climate of that era by using expressions which were pitched as superlatives. This is a trap [that] leads straight to melodrama and does not convince anyone. The ones who have experienced events that cannot be narrated, do not need anyone to remind them of what they felt. The ones who have not lived through them, [however] cannot approach them emotionally. I think that the obligation of the chronicler, 25 years later, is to cite the facts in a dry way and with the maximum possible precision: what happened, how it happened and why. This is exactly what this chronicle is intending to do.

Despite Iordanoglou’s declared intention to be ‘distanced’, the whole text is characterised by a concealed but evident autobiographical timbre. In an article, Dimitris Psychogios begins from the same presupposition but finally admits the impossibility of the task:

I’m sorry, this text started in a different way and ended up differently. It sought to be an analysis but ended up being a fragmented personal testimony.
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68 See the introductory talks by exponents of the ‘Generation’ in the presentation of When we wanted to change Greece in February 2003 in Athens. One of the speakers said ‘we should write our own history, otherwise the next ones [generation] are going to come and write it as they please’(15/2/2003). For the fact that a similar attitude is to be discerned among ’68ers, see Capussotti, op.cit., p. 117 and Peter Braunstein, ‘Possessive Memory and the Sixties Generation’, Culturefront, summer 1997, pp. 66-69.


70 Vangelis Angelis, Olympios Dafermos (eds), Όνειρο ήταν... Το Αντιδικτατορικό Φοιτητικό Κίνημα και το Πολυτεχνείο με το βλέμμα των προτερητών [It was only a dream... The Antidictatorship Student Movement and the Polytechnic from the point of view of the protagonists], Athens, 2003, p.10.


72 Vassilis Pesmazoglou, ‘Η γοητεία του ανθρώπου’ [The charm of spontaneity], Ta Nea, 13/11/1999.

73 To Vima, 17/11/2002.
Finally, in terms of the *Metapolitefsi* period, little has been written. Apart from autobiographical notes, such as Charisopoulou’s account, an edition with the main headlines of 1974-75 and two volumes edited and written by political scientists Christos Lyrintzis and Giannis Voulgaris - the latter, being himself a member of the Polytechnic Generation, remain the most important contributions. International studies on regime transition, including Nikiforos Diamandouros’s articles and the classic studies of O’Donnel, Schmitter and Whitehead, have, to a certain extent, enriched analysis. These limitations often forced me, as a researcher, to rely on eye-witness accounts as scientific analyses.

As far as the ’68 movements are concerned, there has been a considerable production in the international bibliography on both oral histories and analyses of the movement’s dynamics. Apart from seminal works on oral history, such as Passerini’s influential ‘Autobiography of a Generation’ and Frazer’s collection of accounts on ’68 as an international phenomenon, there have been several recent works which employ tools and models drawn from research on social movements, including, first and
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foremost, Donatella della Porta’s juxtaposition of the German and Italian cases.\textsuperscript{78} The present study has greatly benefited from three particular studies of the ’68 movements: Gilcher Holtey on both France and Germany, Isabelle Sommier on the post-’68 environment in France and Italy, and Robert Lumley on Italy.\textsuperscript{79}

The present thesis departs significantly from the existing bibliography in a number of ways: through its systematic approach to the student experience by a non-participant, through its focus on oral history, combined with new theories of social movements, and through its in-depth examination of the cultural climate of the period. By looking at elements such as mass culture, subcultures, cultural appropriation and mimicry as positive registers in the evolution of the Greek student movement, this thesis positions itself against theories related to the destructive influence of the latter in Greek society. The thesis does not, however, align itself with the theory that there is necessary strict continuity in the student movements from the 1950s onwards due to ‘a cycle of protest’. In my view, although this cycle existed in the early 1960s, it was violently interrupted by the arrival of the Colonels, only to be succeeded by an entirely new cycle later on. In researching the student movement that evolved during the latter period, this thesis resists presenting the movement as a single, unified ensemble of progressive students and instead attempts to highlight its black spots as well as its coherent moments.

In addition, the contribution of the present thesis is that apart from tackling a complicated issue in a complex methodological way, it reaches beyond the Greek case and calls for a thick description of social phenomena as a possible way of confronting various histories of student revolts. To paraphrase Clifford Geertz, this thesis simultaneously argues for ‘an interpretive science in search of meaning’ and ‘an experimental science in search of laws’.\textsuperscript{80} Another novel aspect of the present study is its implicit or explicit juxtaposition with the European climate and ’68. In other words, this thesis attempts to carve a middle ground between a classification of the Polytechnic as a ‘Greek 68’, therefore arguing for a certain consistency with the greater European


\textsuperscript{80} Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, New York, 1973, p. 5.
experience, and an analysis that insists on the exceptional nature of the Greek case. Finally, the present study singles itself out with the added feature of comparing the Greek case to the Spanish movement, which despite its chronotopical distance, serves as a compelling alter ego to the Greek case. In this context, the thesis follows Passerini's rule of thumb according to which oral sources facilitate the exploration of memory under authoritarianism, and the variations of subjectivity in history, rather than making it difficult, as it is often assumed.81

Towards a Comparison

All dictatorships are unbearable, but some are more unbearable than others

George Orwell

According to the Spanish historian Santos Juliá, it is very difficult to compare the Spanish transition with cases of democratic consolidation elsewhere, including the collapse of Communism or the evolution of Italy, Germany and France after the Second World War. The reason given is that 'in Spain, the past, which was very present when the Transición started, was not just that of a dictatorship, but one that extended further back in time, i.e. to the Civil War of which the dictatorship was the consequence and extension'.82 As accurate as this is as a description of the problems involved in linking the Spanish or, for that matter, the Iberian experience to others, it glosses over an interesting parallel: the Greek case. It was the incomplete democracy of the 1950s and 1960s post-Civil War Greece which established the groundwork for the arrival of the Colonels in 1967. It was only after the collapse of the Colonels and the restoration of democracy in 1974 that the long lasting post-Civil War era came to a close, at least on an institutional level.83 The Greek Civil War had taken place ten years after the end of the Spanish (1946-49) but the defeated Communist Party remained outlawed for almost thirty years, thus mirroring almost exactly its Spanish

83 Constantine Tsoukalas argues that 'concerning its ideological and cultural consequences the Greek Civil War only ended in 1974', in State, society..., op.cit, p. 17. Antonis Liakos also stressed the fact that the post-Civil War regime of limited democratic rights and social expression in reality extended up to 1974, in Η εμφάνιση των νέων οργανώσεων. Το παράδειγμα της Θεσσαλονίκης [The appearance of youth organizations. The case of Salonica], Athens 1988, p. 76. For this period the novelist Alexandros Kotzias coined the term 'The Greek Thirty Year War', in Αντιποινήσεις Αρχής [Usurpation of Authority], Athens 1979.
counterpart. Thereafter, only after the disintegration of the dictatorship would Communism become de-criminalised and all the exiled and imprisoned left-wingers be freed. The full democratization of the country’s armed forces took place even later, with the coming to power of the socialist PASOK in 1981.

A major obstacle in comparing these two countries remains periodisation. Spain had already digested the triumph of Franco’s anti-Communist ‘crusade’ and was experiencing a second and probably more complex phase, when the Colonels took power in Greece. However, despite the fact that the two regimes had different durations, scopes and historical junctures, this comparison is meaningful in the context of how the extended post-Civil War periods in both countries were brought to an end through similarly slow processes of modernisation and rising demands for democratisation. According to several political scientists, the Greek case is comparable to those of Spain or Portugal, only if we take into account the fact that the dictatorship of 21 April 1967 was only the peak in a long-lasting series of political authoritarianisms ever since the inter-war period. Moreover, the fact that in both countries the dictatorships were not overthrown by popular reaction but instead through the inner workings of the regimes themselves makes it clear that there is yet another major similarity that should not go unnoticed. The chronological framework that I employ in terms of the Spanish case is that of the ‘Second’ or ‘Late’ Francoism, namely Spain of the later 1950s and up to the Caudillo’s death in 1975, which accelerated the disintegration of the Francoist regime.

In structural terms, one can speak of a common ground between the two countries as well, insofar as economic development and social backwardness are concerned. A common mode of small-scale commodity-type production, a dominant peasantry, a large petty bourgeoisie, an oligarchy of compradors coupled with a delayed industrialization under the aegis of foreign capital and a weak working-class constitute further shared elements. Several studies sustain that these common conditions of underdevelopment created a distinct Southern European political culture, based on similar structural conditions and leading to common patterns within Southern
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84 Communist Parties remained outlawed up to 1974 in the Greek and 1977 in the Spanish case.
85 In a similar situation to that of Spain, several thousand political prisoners also existed in Greece throughout these 25 years. As far as the Civil War political refugees are concerned, it is interesting that in both countries the first limited repatriation took place in the mid-1960s.
European social and political institutions. The post-war economic boom and its effects were to be fully experienced in those countries relatively late in comparison with the Western European countries. In the late 1950s, and despite US capital investments in exchange for military presence, the desperate need for jobs in the two countries led to a considerable export of labour, mainly to West Germany and Belgium.

Comparing the Greek and Spanish cases does not, however, justify disregarding the specific social and political conditions within each of the two countries. The major divergences stem from four main factors, all of which fall under one category: the inner transformations within the long lasting Spanish autocracy. Since one major factor in the evolution of Franco’s regime was the Francoist party, the Falange, the fact that several illustrious ex-Falangists believed that the regime had gradually betrayed its own goals triggered internal unrest and in fact generated the first critiques of Franco’s politics. No such equivalent can be found in Greece, where two decades of parliamentarism were interrupted by the Colonels, who remained in place for seven years despite never creating a political party. Moreover, in contrast with Spain and Portugal, the comparatively short-lived regime of the Colonels did not manage to maintain solid strongholds among the population. The second key differentiating factor is the role of religious institutions. The Catholic Church and, more significantly, organizations such as the Opus Dei and the Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas were major players in Spanish society as a whole, taking on a more significant role than that of the Orthodox Church and various other religious organisations in Greece. Apart from the liberal attitudes on the part of the hierarchy of Spanish clergy, the technocratisation of Opus in the 1960s transformed it into an unexpected critic of hard-core Francoist intransigence, since socio-political stability

---


89 The so-called Greek Cultural Movement (EPOK) was a short-lived attempt towards this direction. See United States National Archives [USNA], POL 13 Greece, American Consul Thessaloniki, ‘Alleged Local Organizer Comments on ‘Greek Cultural Movement (EPOK)’, 12 April 1973.
was regarded as a precondition for economic modernization. A third factor of difference lies in the emergence of a strong trade-union movement. At the time when trade-unionism in Greece was strictly corporative, in Spain workers' strikes became a standard feature of the 1960s and 70s and, in many cases, were an excuse for the expression of social discontent. Finally, a factor specific to Spain were the various dynamics of the repressed local nationalisms. The appearance of one of the most active organizations, the Basque ETA, in the 1960s was linked to this phenomenon and was responsible for carrying out a number of major anti-regime actions.

However, differences are also to be found in terms of the emergent Greek and Spanish student movements themselves, as they were asynchronic, apart from some common dates in which both the early anti-Franco student movement and the Greek anti-Right movement emerged and unfolded, as seen in the events of the late 1950s and the early '60s. However, while student unionism was allowed at that point in Greece, it was dispersed as soon as the dictatorship was imposed in 1967. As such, some time had to pass for the university newcomers to take on some initiatives. Thus, in Greece there was inertia at the very moment when Spanish students were reaching the peak of their activity (1968-70). Despite all these caveats, this chapter nonetheless attempts to link together these different experiences, arguing for similarities in perception, conception and imaginary, without suggesting uniformity. Far from being a structural juxtaposition, however, this analysis aims instead to examine how certain political opportunities created similar conditions for mobilization. Additionally, by looking at the relationship between socio-political processes and active subjects, including the latter’s self-representation, this comparison attempts to identify analogies, common patterns, parallel experiences but also to account for divergences. Among the most interesting features of this relation are the generational aspects and issues connected to the contact, real or imagined, between the youths and the respective Civil-War and immediate post-Civil War years. The common elements included oppression and isolation, in the period of ‘boom’ for social protest all over Europe, as the 1960s and '70s have been commonly characterised.

It should be stressed that although Greece and Spain are compared, the beliefs and actions ascribed to each country have obviously been shaped by the political and socio-cultural peculiarities of the respective countries and their individual histories and conditions. Still, by comparing the experiences and memories of students and by

---

measuring the results of their real or perceived contact with the international environment, this thesis argues for a mutual striking feature: even in these semi-peripheral, authoritarian countries new youth cultures emerged, which apart from being driven by local necessities, bore the strong imprint of the 1960s protest movements. The student movements played a key role in discrediting the regime’s attempt to liberalize from within, since the first concessions led to demands by anti-regime students for still greater freedom of information, political pluralism and democratization.

Evidently, the same methodological and theoretical issues outlined for the Greek chapters apply to the Spanish ones too. Geographically speaking, the focus of the Spanish case is on Madrid and Barcelona. Most research was conducted in the Archive of the Communist Party (PCE) and the Biblioteca Nacional’s department of periodicals, where I focused on the daily newspapers Madrid and ABC, as well as numerous ephemera. The Institut d’Estudis Catalans and the exhibition containing original pictures of the Caputxinada in Barcelona served as my main points of reference for that city. The PRO files on Spain that are housed in London proved to be valuable sources on student politics. The amount of information on clandestine activities that the British Embassy had at its disposition remains astounding.

I conducted a total of sixteen interviews with people in Madrid and Barcelona. Unfortunately, my results were disproportionate in terms of gender (women vs men, 2/14), a fact, however, that also reflects the scarce presence of female students in Iberian universities in the 1960s. An additional statistical observation is that the vast majority of the people with whom I have talked, including student protagonists in general, are currently working as university professors. Spain’s university system in the late 1960s was disproportionately small compared to its population and very elitist in its nature, so that it favoured a much more direct reproduction of the ruling classes than did the university system in Greece. This fact emerges in most interviews, as the discourses are uttered again and again in a strikingly structured way, with a learned vocabulary and excellent punctuation.

91 The use of the word ‘peripheral’ in this case does not imply the assumption that there is a stable and absolute ‘centre’, as opposed to the ‘peripheries’. It rather indicates the marginal role of those Mediterranean countries in the general political processes in Europe at the time, as well as their economic and social backwardness, compared to the main industrialised democracies that were shaken by the ‘68 movements. On this point the use of the term ‘semi-periphery’ could probably differentiate these two countries from the so-called ‘third world’ countries, which constituted the core of the ‘centre-periphery’ analyses of the 1960s.
Naturally, an important limitation in a foreigner’s approach is that, despite the relative advantage that distance conveys, one is not always capable of recognising and deciphering certain cultural codes. Nonetheless, Spanish interviewees were in general more willing to meet and discuss their experience than were many Greeks, probably because they were intrigued by the fact that I was a foreign researcher with a genuine interest in their past. In our intercultural exchange the apparent distance between self and ‘other’ was spectacularly balanced by an unexpected immediacy. I attribute this to the fact that the Spanish student movement has not been considered, either in terms of public perception or by present Spanish historiography, to be of crucial importance to the period known as ‘Second Francoism’ as a whole. Therefore, there has been no explosion of testimonies and media coverage as has happened with respect to the iconic moment of the Polytechnic in Greece. Hence, Spanish people are more eager to speak about their experiences that previously have fallen on deaf ears. Similar to their Greek counterparts, nevertheless, a number of Spanish activists of the time have written and even theorised their own political involvement and anti-regime militancy in recent years. Finally, on a bibliographical note, in contrast with the literature on the Greek dictatorship, several interesting accounts have been published on the period of the ‘Second Francoism’; these accounts cover a range of topics including purely political events, society, culture as well as education and the university revolts. That said, no systematic attempt has been made to deal with the memory of the period.  

Structure

The thesis is organised according to a structure that intertwines chronological and thematic aspects. Chapter One aims to reconstruct the conditions of the university and the country prior to the Junta. By looking at the period leading up to the dictatorship, it attempts to trace the identity of those students of the mid-1960s, some of whom were the first to experience the impact of authoritarianism in 1967. The pre-Junta period is inextricably linked to the actual dictatorship years in terms of continuities and ruptures and is crucial for providing an understanding of the context and the evolution of the social actors concerned. The chapter proceeds in analyzing some of the elements of the new regime, including its ideology and practices, as well as the institutional changes
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92 Two possible exceptions are Santos Juliá, Javier Pradera, Joaquín Prieto (eds), Memoria de la Transición, Madrid 1996, which however focuses on the period of the Transición, and Paloma Aguilar Fernández, Memoria y olvido de la guerra civil española, Madrid 1996 [English edition Memory and Amnesia. The Role of the Spanish Civil War in the Transition to Democracy, New York & Oxford 2002].
that it brought about in the universities. This chapter further aims at providing an overview of resistance organizations and groupings, their discourse and their relationships to one another. Apart from focusing on what was occurring in Greece, a central part of the chapter addresses Greek students abroad, mainly those living and studying in France and Italy.

Chapter Two begins with an overview of the various student cultures, briefly analyzing the priorities and standpoints of the ones who supported the regime. It proceeds in analyzing how family background (social and political) did not account for the creation of the movement, since coming from a left-wing tradition could not only be a contributing factor but also an obstacle. This chapter attempts to demonstrate the relationship between the levels of repression and the formation of the student movement. Further, the chapter concentrates on the mobilizing structures of the students, mainly the Euro-Hellenic Youth Movement, created by a circle of upper class students, and the so-called ‘regional societies’. It concludes with an overview of the various student organizations which reflected all different ideological currents and the relationships that grew up between them. The chapter further analyses the image of the ‘other’ within the student groups and the ‘hardening’ of subjectivity that the various rivalries brought about. Finally, insights into individual subjectivity are provided through a consideration of the processes of conservation and innovation of identities, attitudes and behaviours along with the narrative analysis of patterns, which, however, always connect to a group identity.

Chapter Three engages with the dialectical relationship between culture and politics, which remains one of the core points of this study. As ideological reasons, alone, do not account for the creation of the student movement, it is necessary to explain the roots of its cultural background, as well as to examine the ways in which this in turn reinforced student combativeness. I examine new trends in cinema, theatre, music, aesthetics and everyday life in an attempt to explain how new cultural identities were shaped. This chapter turns to alternative forms of culture which were created in juxtaposition to the Junta with an interest in how several counter-cultural elements acquired political significance over time. This section also addresses the role of female students in both the student body in general and in the movement in particular, in an attempt to account for continuities and ruptures with the past. Lastly, references are made to the contested issue of a belated ‘sexual revolution’ and the various affiliational privates going public.
Chapter Four chronicles the events that led to the clash between the students and the regime, reconstructing the ten-month countdown to the climax of the student movement and its ultimate suppression. Further, this chapter explores the processes put in motion at the peak of the Junta's 'liberalisation experiment' and the main public expressions of the student revolt: the November 1973 Polytechnic occupations in both Athens and Salonica and their forerunners, the Athens Law School occupations in February and March of the same year. Despite the violence employed by the regime - a subchapter explores this aspect also on a personal level - these 'liberated spaces' became a territory for dissidence and dissonance. In terms of the Polytechnic occupation, the role of the radio station, the bullied anarchists, the ideological struggle between different occupation strategies and the first popular response, for the first and last time during the Colonels' rule, are surveyed. Alongside this, I analyse the memories of the protagonists of the movement; these moments are presented as pure 'transcendence', whereby the individual was entirely absorbed by a collective, overwhelming fear. The chapter closes with the bloody conclusion of the Polytechnic and its aftermath.

Chapter Five continues to explore the role of leading figures and 'charismatic' personages. As such, the chapter briefly confronts the abrupt passage to the post-dictatorship period in the summer of 1974, the so-called Metapolitefsi, the so-called change in political rule. It traces the continuation of the movement and the radicalisation of students, this time under democratic conditions. I argue that this period of fragmentation, disillusionment, alienation, and lack of vision, led to the gradual disintegration of what had come to be the student movement in previous years. This chapter, moreover, talks about the linkage, whether direct or indirect, to the international '68. The chapter asks: in what ways can the student uprising be seen as a local case of a wider international movement and how did the general wave of '68 infiltrate Greece? On the other hand, it asks in what ways Greece departs from this model?

Finally, Chapter Six introduces a similar case in the European semi-periphery, namely that of Spain. Analysis of the evolution of the Spanish student movement of the 1960s and '70s series aims not only to expose both the similarities and differences between the two movements but also to link student experiences and subjectivity across time and space. These categories of inquiry include new cultural dynamics, the politicization of youth culture and the similarities in the mobilisational tactics of anti-
regime students. Apart from the affinities in the political opportunities offered by the Spanish *apertura* (opening up) and the Greek 'controlled liberalisation', further analogies are acknowledged in terms of the students’ self-representation. The generational aspect and the link, whether real or imagined, with the Civil Wars and immediate Post-Civil War years as well as with May '68, are among the most striking features of this dimension. Although numerous inconsistencies revealed themselves throughout the comparison generated by this thesis, it is precisely these incongruencies that motivate further questioning and interrogation of the historical, political, and social circumstances that inform these specific events.
Chapter One

The ‘long Sixties’: Greece before and after the Coup

Greek University: in between progression and regression

What was the situation in the Greek universities in the Sixties and Seventies? By 1967, Greek universities had witnessed an unprecedented increase in student numbers, starting in the early 1960s. As was also the case in other European countries at the time, this was mainly due to the demographic boom of the post-war years. This was combined with the growing demand for specialised technocratic personnel, corresponding to the rising production needs that dictated the need for more graduates, who would be prepared for qualified career positions in the rapidly expanding public sector. The student population almost tripled: from 28,302 in 1960-61 to 80,041 in 1973. In order to cope with these changes more student places were created, including a higher institution in Ioannina, initially a branch of the University of Salónica, and later on in Patras.

The greatest increase in student numbers occurred in the years 1963-1965, when the student population rose from 35,000 in 1962-63 to 53,300 in 1964-65. This had been facilitated by the so-called ‘Educational Reform’, a reform of the educational system, carried out by the liberal Centre government which came to power in 1963.

---

93 I would like to thank Professor Isabelle Sommier for her useful comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

94 The term ‘Long Sixties’ was coined by Arthur Marwick in his seminal work The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and The United States, C. 1958-C. 1974, Oxford 1998. Marwick postulates this term, copying Hobsbawm’s ‘short twentieth century’, by arguing that this extended period starts in 1958 and goes on up to 1973-74, that is, until the international oil crisis. The term was taken up successfully by a number of studies, including Axel Schildt, Detlef Siegfried, Karl Christian Lammers (eds), Dynamische Zeiten: Die 60er Jahre in den beiden deutschen Gesellschaften, Hamburg 2000, on Germany.

95 See Antonis Liakos’s excellent synopsis of the theoretical and empirical coordinates that a study on the student movement requires in ‘Σκέψεις πάνω στην Ιστορία του Φοιτητικού Κινήματος’ [Thoughts on the History of the Student Movement] pp. 327-333 in Πανεπιστήμιο: Ιδεολογία και Παιδεία. Ιστορική Διάσταση και Προοπτικές [University: Ideology and Education. Historical Dimension and Perspectives], vol. 1, Athens 1989, p. 330 and Giorgos Mavris, ‘Κρίση του Πανεπιστημίου και φοιτητές’ [University crisis and students], pp. 31-41 in Κριτική, 9/10, Athens 1985


97 In Salónica and Athens, besides the two old universities and the Polytechnic in the latter, there were another six independent institutions of higher education. These were the School of Arts, the Geoponiki, the Commerce School (ASOE), Panteion School (Political Sciences), all of them in Athens, and two Industrial Schools in each of the two cities.

with Evangelos Papanoutsos as its intellectual guru. The reform removed several social obstacles to entering higher education, the most important of which was the abolition of tuition fees. It also included the initiation of the so-called *Ethnikon Apolytirion*, which was a way of examining the students by blind-peer reviews, thus bypassing personal relations and favouritism, and making it possible for gifted students from the countryside to study for a degree.

The Reform had been a feature desired by all that was constantly proclaimed but never realized, a 'malaise' ever since the creation of the Greek State. For a comprehensive study see Alexis Dimaras (ed.), *Η Μεταρρύθμιση που δεν έγινε. Α' 1821-1894, Β' 1895-1967* [The Reform that Never Was], Athens 1974.

However, the reform established the 'Academic Apolyterion' and a process of entry to the Higher Institutions which was based on a complex system of grading co-efficients which greatly hindered the entry of students to the faculty of their choice. This favoured the already mounting student migration. The standard strategy became to go abroad and pursue a transfer. For a personal account see Giorgos Vavizos, *Εστι δενώσαν ... η καρποφορία. Μαρτυρίες ενός αριστεριστή για την αντιχονιστική δράση των Ελλήνων φοιτητών στη Νότια Ιταλία* [This is How the ... Carbonara was Made. Testimonies on the Anti-Junta Action of Greek Students in Southern Italy], Athens, 2002, p. 191.
The same reform had a very innovative character and gave a progressive push to Greek educational affairs for the first time since the end of the Civil War, in 1949. It significantly reduced ideological propaganda in school curricula and favoured the use of the vernacular Greek (*dimotiki*) in schools, instead of the artificial, purified version (*katharevousa*). More importantly, the Center Union Government abolished the so-called ‘certificate of social beliefs’, namely a paper issued by the police authorities, which stigmatised left-wingers and excluded them from all public institutions. This certificate had been a university entrance requirement ever since the end of the Civil War. In his humorous autobiographical account Panos Theodoridis, an architecture student in Salonica in the mid-1960s, stresses the fact that even students who considered themselves as ‘progressive’ had to sign these papers in order to enter University:

> At the end of the day, I am conscious of the fact that before I entered university, just like all other progressive fellow-students I had signed some papers, some certificates of loyalty. We did not just sign [them as a formality] - the gendarmes had come to our homes, they realized that we were good kids and only then gave them to us.101

To grasp the environment of the university it would be useful to examine the numbers and the social composition of students. By 1968/69 71,259 students were enrolled in the higher institutions, 48,758 of whom were men and 22,501 women.102 It has to be noted here that this was a massive change in the numbers of women, who started entering the university in relatively large numbers after the early 1960s, as a result of more flexible family strategies and the enhanced possibility of entering the job market on favourable terms as a graduate.103 Approximately one third of all students came from the two large urban centres (25,460 from Athens and 6,944 from Salonica), while the rest were from the provinces.104 Naturally, students from the countryside had more freedom of action compared to those living with their parents. In their recollections, these students stress the differences which emerged between them and the city kids:

---

102 Department of National Statistics (ESIE), op. cit, p. 5.
103 Antonis Liakos, *Η εμφάνιση των νεανικών οργανώσεων. Το παράδειγμα της Θεσσαλονίκης* [The appearance of youth organizations. The case of Salonica], Athens 1988, p. 66.
104 ESIE, op. cit., p. 29.
The political contrasts [in the city] were intense. And there were also pupils who were politically organized, whereas in the province this was a very distant possibility. The contrast between village and city was even greater and more intense, because of the cultural differences and barriers, from the way they used to dress, the music the kids of the city used to listen to ... The rest [of us] were village kids. (Vourekas)

I used to be, you know, the kid from the provinces and I felt like a bit of a bumpkin. Naturally, it took me a while to de-mythologise some of my fellow-students who were very nicely dressed, who were from Athens and had a different attitude [...]. And I had to remember Alice in Wonderland, I remembered her many times, the point when she says 'Oh, you are just playing cards'. And among other kids I was... I was also very small, I remember coming back from the gym with a thin coat, miserable... These were beautiful chicks and all that. Things like that, which again have nothing to do with politics. (Mavragani)

These reforms also contributed to the change in the social composition of the university population. For the first time, young people of petit-bourgeois and working-class origins entered the universities in large numbers. In the decade 1960-70 the percentage of students from merchant families, shopkeepers and so forth rose from 10% in 1959-60 to 13.2% by 1969-70. Students from a working-class background had, by 1969-70, reached 14.6%, whereas in 1959-60 they had not been more than 8.3%. Myrsini Zorba, a humanities student, emphasizes the fact that without the Reform she would have been excluded from higher studies for both financial and political reasons:

I come from a left-wing working class family and, if it hadn't been for Papanoutsos' reform, I would not have managed to go to university. ‘Certificates of Social Beliefs’ plus fees would have been entirely prohibitive. So, I was, say, socially destined to be a saleswoman. (Zorba)

Students from farming families also increased from 24.5 to 27%. So, by 1969-70 the categories according to the father's occupation of workers, employees, merchant-sellers formed nearly half, 41.5%, of the student population, having increased from 27.6% in 1959-60.¹⁰⁵ A major factor that contributed to this was the fact that by the 1960s growing prosperity and a booming economy had also led to something of a baby-boom in Greece. Moreover, an additional factor was the urbanization that followed the 1940s,
which had led to changes in the urban landscape with the concentration in the big cities of vast numbers of people.

As the number of new student places was not sufficient to cope with the 'overpopulation' of Greek universities, the governments of the day - including the Colonels - took various measures in order to curtail the numbers of students who could enter. Therefore, there was a growing friction between the number of the students who applied to enter the university and the students who actually did enter. In 1964-65 of 32,069 applicants, 23,000, or 71.5% entered; in 1970-71 of 53,724 only 13,882, representing 25.8%, succeeded; and in 1971-72 out of 48,816 only 11,000 (22.8%), matriculated, despite the decrease in the number of applicants compared to the previous year. 106

Rebels with a cause: Students107

The political consequence of the increase in student numbers was that the students gradually turned into a political issue, as they acquired social force. University life had been a source of friction for a long time prior to the dictatorship and complaints about governmental policies on educational issues were a standard feature throughout the post-war era, as various governments neglected the growing needs of university life in terms of funding and personnel, as well as of modernisation and liberalisation in general. So, while in the 1950s the university had been the battleground for the nationalist issue around the 'unification' of Cyprus with Greece, in the 1960s it became the terrain *par excellence* in terms of exercising pressure on the state for democratisation and a fairer distribution of funds. The fact was, in any case, that a 'cycle of protest' had begun that would last up to the 1967 coup.108

---


107 The choice of this subchapter's title directly refers to the film 'Rebel without a cause' (1955), which launched James Dean as the archetype of the juvenile rebel. In this respect, the title and the students' treatise, suggest an entity that identified itself but was also viewed by third parties as a justified rebel. This corresponds to a significant change in the ways youth actions were viewed, and also represented a move from a psychopathological or a generational interpretation of juvenile rebelliousness to a political one. For a typical exponent of the first one see Lewis Feuer, *The Conflict of Generations. The Character and Significance of Student Movements*, New York and London, 1969.

108 For the notion of 'cycle of protest' see Sid Tarrow, *Democracy and Disorder: Protest and Politics in Italy*, 1965-75, Oxford 1989. In his quantitative approach, Tarrow identifies a cycle of protest and social conflict in Italy from 1968 to 1973, ending with the disintegration of the main social movement organisations.
As was the case in Spain, those born during the Second World War or the Civil War proper were also the ones who caused the first great disturbances in university campuses. The Greek Civil War had come to an end by 1949, but its legacy lived on for decades, despite periodic attempts for political and social reforms. Greece in the 1950s and 1960s was a ‘sickly’ \(^{109}\) or ‘repressive’ \(^{110}\) democracy, a ‘disciplined parliamentarism’ \(^{111}\), as the pluralist system was restrained by right-wing regimes of enforced consent, patronized by the United States and sustained by the Crown, the Army and the Orthodox Church. Still, margins of political action had remained open, even if semi-legal or conditioned by extra-constitutional factors such as the ‘parastate’. \(^{112}\) A major formation was the United Democratic Left (EDA), a political party that gathered the heritage of the Resistance and reincarnated the instances of democratisation in Greek society and state after the Civil War. \(^{113}\) The spectacular rise of these so-called ‘crypto-Communists’ reinforced the fear and prejudice against them and everything they represented, such as ties with the Soviet Union and the outlawed KKE, which was allegedly preparing for a ‘fourth round’. \(^{114}\) Extreme Communistophobia has to be seen in context - not only in terms of the legacy of the Greek Civil War, but also in the general setting of the Cold War which was reaching its climax.

The 1960s were marked by political disturbances and growing unrest. The 1961 electoral results produced by ‘violence and fraud’, engineered by segments of ERE, the right-wing party in power, fuelled the so-called ‘unyielding struggle’ of the recently


\(^{110}\) I am borrowing this term from Arthur Marwick’s book The Sixties, Oxford 1998, where it is used in order to define the political situation in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. See in particular p. 358.

\(^{111}\) Term used by Nikos Alizizatos in the historical television series ‘History: Speech and Image’ in ET1, 19/7/2005.

\(^{112}\) The period 1950-67 is described by Constantine Tsoukalas as one of a ‘limited democracy’ (Κράτος, Κοινωνία. Εργασία στη μεταπολεμική Ελλάδα [State, Society, Labour in Post-War Greece], Athens 1987), while Dimitris Charalambis argues that parliamentarism was just formal, since the political system of the post-civil war period was a hybrid between a military dictatorship and parliamentary democracy. (‘Από το μετεμφιλιακό κράτος στο κράτος της μεταπολεμικής. Εκσυγχρονισμός κοινωνικής συναίσθησης και διαχειριστικής στρατηγικής’ [From the post-civil war state to the state of the metapolitefshi. Modernisation, social consent and administrative practices], Synchrona Themata, 1988, 9, 56-70).

\(^{113}\) In the 1952 political elections EDA received 10.6% of the votes, without gaining a seat in the parliament because of the majority electoral system introduced with US pressure. The new electoral law allowed the right-wing parties to stay in power for eleven years (1952-1963), despite the significant rise of the Centre-Left in 1956. The 1958 elections left the Liberals with the third strongest position in parliament, with EDA emerging as the main opposition party with 24% of the votes. See, R. Clogg, Parties and Elections in Greece. The Search for Legitimacy, London, 1987, pp. 17-55.

\(^{114}\) According to the right-wing analysis of the time Greek Communists had made three attempts to gain power by force, including the period of the German occupation, the 1944 events and the 1946-49 Civil War proper.
created coalition of several liberal parties of the Centre (CU). From this time onwards, the student movement dropped strictly educational issues and became the linchpin of a political struggle aimed at breaking the monopoly of right-wing governments, which, as mentioned, was a natural consequence of the dynamics of the civil strife. Prompted by the police's arbitrary use of their powers, including the frequent invasion of university campuses, the movement gained momentum by placing the question of democracy on the political level of university administration, as well as on the level of knowledge. This was the so-called '114 Movement', referring to the article of the 1952 Constitution according to which the implementation of the constitution was guaranteed by the citizens themselves. That was interpreted as giving citizens the right to act in situations in which a government was not respectful of the Constitution. As 114 was the second-last article of the latter, this was considered as an indication that it summarised in a generic way the spirit of the whole document. In this way, students reappropriated the vague formulation of the article in order to vindicate their right to resist and to launch themselves as the spearhead of the movement for more democratic rights.

This was coupled with the demand some years later to increase governmental funding for education.\(^\text{115}\) The main slogan promoted by the students was '15%', namely a demand that the government provide this amount of the budget towards educational expenses.\(^\text{116}\) The fifteen percent was also known as the 'dowry to education', as on the occasion of Princess Sofia's marriage to the Spanish prince Juan Carlos de Borbon in 1962, a special tax was imposed to pay her dowry. Students took this opportunity to juxtapose the luxurious dowry with the poor state of education. Other attempts to organise student action were channelled by the 'Bertrand Russell Youth Committee for Nuclear Disarmament', which from 1963 onwards organised meetings, peace marches and talks.\(^\text{117}\) The Committee became very popular, demonstrating the fact that a politically militant mass of young people was looking for new spaces and means of expression beyond the restrictions of the existing political parties. Student combativeness and coherence were largely defined by these actions, while student identity was determined by the dynamism of street activism. Especially active in such

\(^{115}\) With only 6.8% of the budget dedicated to education, Greece had a negative record in Europe, in stark contrast to its lavish military expenditures.

\(^{116}\) Linardatos, op. cit, Katerina Saint Martin, Λαμπρακίδης. Ιστορία μιας γεννήσις [Lambrikides. History of a Generation], Athens 1984, p. 45

\(^{117}\) This had been an already established trend in many European countries, especially in Britain with the London Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and in Italy with the Partigiani della Pace and Aldo Capitini's famous peace marches.
initiatives was the left-wing composer Mikis Theodorakis, who in 1962 proposed a manifesto (‘The Athens Manifesto’) for the creation of a wide cultural body, in order to oppose the ‘fascist’ danger, revealed by the 1961 electoral fraud. The manifesto was signed by many left-wing artists around Theodorakis, who proposed himself as a leading figure, capable of co-coordinating student activists.

**Teds and vé-vés**

During this time, various elements of international youth culture had also penetrated the repertoire of Greek youth and style. Already in the late 1950s a sort of ‘teddy boy’ subculture existed in Greece, including fringes, frills, Brylcreem and cinema.\(^{118}\) These small bands of male, not necessarily working-class, adolescents loved stealing cars and achieved considerable notoriety for throwing ‘yogurt bombs’ at their teachers and elderly women. This phenomenon of ‘societal provocation’, as it was characterised by the press of the period, was coupled with the appearance of the first rock n’roll groups.\(^{119}\) In order to cope with the teds, the infamous ‘Law 4000’ was introduced, according to which young rebels were immediately arrested, had their hair shaved off and were marched into the streets carrying humiliating placards, in what constituted a survival of a rural or wartime practice in the urban post-war context.

Next to the male rebellious, though not politically dissident, teenage gangs, a sort of sexual openness is to be found for the first time in that period with some female adolescents. This trend, often expressed in forms of sexual exhibitionism, such as performing strip-tease at parties, is a standard feature in films made during this period.\(^{120}\) Later on, the mini-skirt, a symbolic step towards female aesthetical and ultimately sexual emancipation, became fashionable in Greece as elsewhere. Soon, ‘Beatle mania’ became widely diffused and films such as Richard Lester’s ‘A Hard Day’s Night’ (1964) featuring the Beatles became big hits. Youths who followed this trend were habitually referred to as ‘yé-yés’, following the French term.\(^{121}\) The journal

---


\(^{119}\) This followed the screening in 1956 of the film ‘Blackboard Jungle’, featuring Bill Halley’s mythical hit ‘Rock Around the Clock’ (1955), which was welcomed with particular enthusiasm.

\(^{120}\) These films often deal with youth delinquency, while the female need for sexual emancipation is often presented as immoral or fatal. See Maria Paradeisi, ‘Η παρουσίαση της νεολαίας στα κοινωνικά δράματα της δεκαετίας τους εξήντα’ [The depiction of youth in the social dramas of the 1960s], *Ta Istorika*, 22, June 1995, pp. 205-218.

\(^{121}\) This was taken up by French journalists from the Beatles’ song, ‘She loves you’, whose refrain read ‘yeah-yeah-yeah’. The term soon became synonymous with the young people who dressed, talked and behaved in a pop fashion. In Greece it soon acquired negative connotations.
Modern Rhythms, highly influenced by the French radio station Salut les Copains, reported that the first concert by the rock group Forminx in May 1964 in Salonica was met with 'seismic enthusiasm' by the youth. Apparently, this was a clear-cut case of mimicking what was happening abroad with the Fab Four and Johnny Hallyday. Accordingly, the 'yé-yé' fashion contributed to the fact that by the mid-1960s teen life was as explosive as elsewhere and was therefore often considered by the authorities as inappropriate.

The subtext to all this was partly the US imported consumer culture, which translated into greater comforts. Greece in this period was changing rapidly, moving towards relative modernisation. Several items such as modern electronic devices and cars, luxuries back in the 1950s, had become normal commodities by the early 1960s. While large segments of the urban population joined the expanding public sector work-force, welfare ('ευημερία') became an expressed aim of Karamanlis's and Papandreou's governments. Even though welfare was never set at a higher level, its anticipation increased the expectations of a better future, while the introduction of more goods in everyday life was a means of relativizing the 'weight' of politics. Prosperity and mass consumption, however, two of the main features in post-war Western Europe, were not consolidated prior to the period of the dictatorship. Television, a major mass culture producer, was about to be introduced in later years too. In contrast to its counterparts abroad, Greek youths of the 1960s spent their teen years without TV, as this medium was purchased en masse only in the following decade.

Still, the fact that the post-war economic hardship already seemed a distant and unpleasant memory to growing sections of the urban population was a key element behind the introduction of commodities such as stereos and a standard pocket money, two of the preconditions for the emergence of a youth culture. Although, in contrast

---


123 See Dimitris Papanikolaou, Σχηματιζόμενα τη Νεολαία: Ο Θεοδωράκης, ο Σαββέπουλος και του '60 οι εκδόμες' [Shaping the Youth: Theodorakis, Sannopoulos and the '60s'], unpublished article, p.6, and Dinos Dimatatis, Get that Beat: Ελληνικό ροκ 60ς και 70ς [Greek rock 60s and 70s], Salonica, 1998, σ. 39.


125 An experimental television station was established in 1966, but it only started to operate on a full-time basis and with two channels after 1969, that is during the period of the dictatorship. In fact, TED, the second channel was a military one [Armed Forces Channel]. See Maria Komninou, Από την ηχοσκόπηση στο θέαμα. Μελέτη για τη συγκρότηση της δημόσιας σφαίρας και του κινηματογράφου στη σύγχρονη Ελλάδα, 1950-2000 [From the Market to the Spectacle. Study on the construction of the public sphere and cinema in contemporary Greece, 1950-2000], Athens 2002, pp. 136-137.
with Italy or France, this was not translated into more private space for the young within the traditional Greek house, the latter became, for the first time, regular consumers. This fitted well with the post-war capitalist trend of boosting consumerism and the continuous renewal of models. Subcultures were gradually becoming sources of inspiration and the material of an extended financial activity. Antonis Liakos notes that as the consent of the bourgeois classes after the war was guaranteed through the ideology of ‘affluent society’, the contestation expressed itself not in the sphere of production, but in that of consumption. ‘Not at the time of work but during leisure. Not as a break with parental working culture but as a solution of its contradiction on an imaginary level’, thus a symbolic one. In a standard filmic representation of this generation, the young hero concludes that the priorities for his generation are a new flat with modern furniture and electrical equipment, a car and plenty of night-life.

By establishing a new way of dressing and behaving, with musical and even speech preferences as forms of expression and rebelliousness, provocation ultimately became assimilated by the dominant culture, even if all this started off by several specific strata and their problems. By the mid-1960s a distinct youth culture was already shaped in Greece, including pocket books and a life put into rhythm by music. Leonidas Kallivretakis rejects the commonly expressed view that ‘rock n’ roll did not exist before the 1980s in Greece’ by arguing that in the ’60s everyone bought rock n’ roll records and was eager to listen to the few specialised radio programs on this music. Myrsini Zorba, a secondary school student at the time, recalls, however, that she did not possess a stereo at home. In the mid-1960s, a stereo still acted as a means of turning private space to a communal one in order to listen to music. This comes into stark contrast to the above assertion and delineates the differences between the

---

126 Antonis Liakos, Η εμφάνιση των νεανικών οργανώσεων. Το παράδειγμα της Θεσσαλονίκης [The appearance of youth organizations. The case of Salonica], Athens 1988, p. 72.
127 Ibid, p. 71. Liakos stresses that the new tradition was characterized by an inversion of values, that is, instead of seriousness and ambition there was comfort and hedonism. The rejection of power and the search for strong emotions, including violence as a means of individual or collective justification were basic characteristics of this trend.
129 Antonis Liakos, The appearance ..., op. cit., p. 72.
130 Leonidas F. Kallivretakis, Προβλήματα ιστορικοποίησης του Rock φαινομένου. Εμπειρίες και στοχοχομία [Problems of historicizing the Rock phenomenon. Experiences and thoughts], pp. 157-174, in Ta Istorika, 20, June 1994, p. 170. Alongside Petridis’s famous radio programme and some pirate stations, the most popular radio station transmitting rock music was AFRS, that is the station of the US military base outside Athens. In a way, US military presence went hand in hand with cultural transmission.
commodification acquired by her generation and the following one, to which Kallivretakis actually belongs. In fact, parties played a major role in the creation of new collective feeling. For Zorba socialization was also reinforced by live concerts:

I remember the last concert of Savvopoulos which was organised by EFEE in the ‘Kentriko’, no one from the tuition centre was coming along so I went on my own. First time in a concert, on my own, and it was such a magical thing, it was like entering a different world, like it was in the boîtes some time later. Because we didn’t have the chance to listen to live music, I didn’t even have a stereo at home, let’s say. And this music, which signalled a whole mythology, was a good ambience.

At the same time, movies such as Godard’s *Masculin-Feminin* and Antonioni’s *Blow-Up* (1966) made the people more familiar with the consumerist trends and pop culture as well as with the blasé attitude of Paris and ‘swinging’ London youths. Another favourite film of the time was *The Graduate* (1967) with its visual depictions of sexual experimentation and the very popular ballads of Simon and Garfunkel. In general, the great Greek rock groups of this period sang in English and copied the foreign model by leaving out its social dimension. Often, however, young people combined these features. A typical ambivalent message was circulated by the poète-chansonnier Dionysis Savvopoulos, in his song ‘Vietnam yé-yé’, in which the French ‘yé-yé’ was married with a political subject matter *par excellence*. Still, as far as conservative circles were concerned, the a-political youths, who were the most faithful followers of these trends, were supposed to be less ‘dangerous’ than the politicized ones. In contrast to that, the official Left often rejected these ‘US imported’ cultural models as corrosive and destructive of the youth and disliked the fact that this youthful potential was expressed through ‘collective hysteria’ and useless unbending instead of being channelled into political action.

**Generation ‘Z’**

1963 is a key year. The assassination of the independent left-wing MP and member of the Greek branch of Bertrand Russell’s *Peace Movement*, Grigoris Lambrakis, in Salonica in May marked the peak in the years of post-Civil War repression and the beginning of the end of Karamanlis’ days in power, precipitated by his conflict with the

---

Crown. The assassination came as the result of the emergence of a massive parastate mechanism, based on the practices of violence and intimidation of left-wingers and acted as a generational unifying event. The ‘five days of May’\textsuperscript{132} started with the attack on Lambrakis, continued until his death and climaxed with his overcrowded funeral service in Athens. This sequence of events played a major role in politicising yet another student generation. With politicisation being the result of the specific historical juncture and the spontaneous popular response, Lambrakis soon became the symbol of a pioneering movement that was named after him: the ‘Democratic Youth Movement Grigoris Lambrakis’, otherwise called ‘Lambrakides’\textsuperscript{133}. The slogan among the youths of the time was that Lambrakis was still alive, ‘o Lambrakis Zei’. The letter Z, initial of the word ‘lives on’ [ζει] in Greek, became a constant graffiti on the walls and a symbol of the newly created Lambrakis Youth. According to the composer Mikis Theodorakis, the leader of Lambrakis Youth, this symbolized both Life (Zoi) but also due to its shape the thunder that castigates the enemies of the people.\textsuperscript{134} Zogia Chronaki remembers these moments as a flusbulb memory:

[Theodorakis] came together with Ritsos, with Lambrakis being essentially dead at ACHEPA and we were gathered and he went to the stairs of the Old School of Philosophy here, I can almost see it now, together with Ritsos, we were shouting slogans and he was trying to calm us down.

As the dead Lambrakis became the crucial figure in the collective representation of left-wing youths, this generation of students could be described as Generation ‘Z’. Katerina Saint Martin argues that ‘Lambrakis became the hero of a generation, which […] was searching for another message from that of hatred and blood that was unleashed by the Civil War’\textsuperscript{135}.

\textsuperscript{132} Eternalised as The 100 hours of May in Dimos Theos and Fotos Lambrinos’s documentary film of the time that conveys in a powerful way the tension that preceded and the explosion that followed Lambrakis’ death. The images of the funeral show young men singing and women throwing flowers to the passers by in a gesture of reconciliation.

\textsuperscript{133} As Antonis Liakos noted in a speech at the Commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the creation of the Lambrakis Youth [‘The ephemeral spring’, Conference organised by ASKI and EMIAN, 5-6/2/05, Athens], that event was a formative experience. For people of his generation, this event became a pivotal moment, a point of no return. Liakos concluded: ‘I was there too’. Similarly Zioga Chronaki: ‘When Lambrakis’s assassination took place I was present’.

\textsuperscript{134} Forward to Andreas Lendakis’s Οι νεοφασιστικές οργανώσεις στη Νεολαία [The neo-fascist organizations within the youth], Athens 1963. This graffiti also inspired Vassilis Vassilikos’s book ‘Z’ (1966), which became the basis for the screenplay of Costa Gavras’s renowned political film ‘Z’, on the same case (1969).

\textsuperscript{135} Saint Martin, op.cit., p. 56.
Still, this generation was shaped by the Civil War and post-Civil War experience, as mentioned earlier on. The left-wing composer Mikis Theodorakis argued already in the early 1960s that the generation which was born during the occupation, remained a hostage of the Civil War:

[This Generation] grew up within the flames of the Civil War. It became mature within Karamanlis’s Middle Ages. What have the governors responsible for our country offered it up to now? What possibilities to educate itself, fulfil itself or create? Quite the opposite, they put it within a ‘free prison’, without democratic rights and liberties, and with the only right to remain blind-jobless and desperate.136

Triantafyllos Mitafidis, born in Salonica in 1947, has very strong memories of these years and recounts how ‘the main feature of our childhood was being terrified’. Mitafidis seems to have visualised the actual strife - indeed, he presents it as if he had experienced it in person, although he was a new-born at the time. What is more, his perception is that of a prolonged civil conflict up to the ’60s, a long-drawn out period of repression:

I was born during the Civil War. It was the generation that was born towards the end of the occupation and at the same time inside the Civil War, and was brought up with those images of the fratricidal struggle. [...] There was no interval for this generation. (Mitafidis)

Anestis Evangelou’s poem entitled Generation of the ’60s is often quoted as very representative of this climate:

Between the poison of the adder
And the wolf’s tooth
Within the mist and the fear
With panic
And under the gaze of the stool pigeons
We came to know the world

For this reason our words are poor
Without exaltations, with no music

136 Mikis Theodorakis, To Μανιφέστο των Λαμπράκιδων. Ποιοι είμαστε. Τι θέλουμε. Γιατί μας πολεμούν [The Lambrakides’ Manifesto. Who we are. What we want. Why they are fighting us], Athens 2003, p. 50.
And our verses are usually bleeding

Christina Vervenioti argues that things were not ideal before the Junta, a statement which comes into stark contrast with the common enthusiasm about the ‘liberating’ years of the mid-1960s:

there was a demonstration every day, a protest every day. They were beating us up, demonstrations, every day... So, even before the Junta came, things were not free in the universities to make a gathering or a demonstration. [...] We were already having a hard time.

Similarly Thanasis Athanasiou, a Commercial School student, attributes a sort of heroic status to political activism prior to '67:

In that period if I did not spend one night in jail it would be an exception. I've visited all the jails of Attica. [...] So, to be organized in the Lambrakides during this epoch was indeed something heroic. Because you were in direct danger. It was no joke... Surveillance and arrests were everyday phenomena. (Athanasiou)

The youth’s repertoire of action included extensive riots and rallies, open discussions and peace walks, focusing mostly on educational and cultural issues. The goal set forth was the creation of not just a political but of a cultural mass movement. Groups and nuclei of the Lambrakis Youth created two hundred ‘cultural societies’ throughout the country. The organization numbered about ‘200,000 people, who planted flowers and trees in mountains after a fire, donated blood to the Red Cross, formed cultural centres, libraries, discotheques of classical music’. This movement brought about crucial innovations in terms of traditional Left-wing politics in Greece. It was an organisation open to everyone and with a declared independence, despite its clearly defined political engagement. Its original organisational structure moved beyond the rigid political tropes of the time. Crucially, for the first time since the end of the war, female participation reached high levels, in a period in which marriage and marital strategies were supposed to be the main preoccupations of an average Greek woman in her twenties, as dowry was still an almost institutionalised practice. According to Nikolaidou, ‘on the basis of the Civil Code of 1946 and its new editions of 1963,

---

137 Quoted by Christos Zafeiris, Εμείς τον '60 οι εκδρομείς [Us, the travelers of the ’60s], Athens 2000, p. 9.
including the old family law, women in Greece were treated as second class citizens and were not supposed to study or work, while men were still considered superior and were the actual breadwinners of the households. This was the background against which the Lambrakisses acted and to which they reacted, even though their activity was never translated into any significant separate women’s organisations or radical feminist demands. However, Vervenioti’s point that the female numbers equalled those of men could not be taken at face value, as both the numbers of women in the universities, and the photographic material of the period tell a different story:

In '65 and '66, when the people were marching in the streets we had everyday problems, back then. There were just as many female students, they all came along. I don’t think that they were fewer. (Vervenioti)

It is significant, however, that the Sixties signal a phase of incubation of the feminist movement as the Pan-Hellenic Women's Organization and the Union of Greek Women Lawyers were created by left-wing oriented professional women. Eventually, left-wing students co-existed in large gatherings, such as the pre-electoral campaigns of 1963-64, with the Youths of the Centre Union and occasionally with that of the tiny but idiosyncratic Progressive Party. The Youth of the conservative party in power, EREN, was rather uninspiring, leaving a large space to EKOF an extreme right-wing, all-male student organization with a solid pedigree of violence and aggression, which included the bullying of students that it considered as not ‘nationally minded’ enough.

The turning point for the Lambrakides and the ‘progressive’ movement of the 1960s was the so-called July events, signalling an ‘organic crisis’ marked by the ‘massive withdrawal of support for the structures of representation, and an abrupt increase in political demands’. This was when the unconstitutional sacking of Prime Minister Papandreou by King Constantine in late June 1965 triggered a general upheaval, in which the participation of the youth was crucial. There was a huge wave of protests, strikes and riots over the following seventy days, during which there was a

---

140 Ibid, p. 21.
141 This tactic was known as ‘anti-demonstration’. For a full account of EKOF’s history and actions see Andreas Lendakis, Το παραστάτε και η 21η Απριλίου [The parastate and the 21st of April], Salonica, 2000, first edn. Athens 1975.
142 Here I am borrowing this Gramscian term from Robert Lumley’s thorough analysis of the Italian case in the 1960s and 1970s, see Lumley, 1990, op. cit., p. 9.
strikingly harmonious collaboration between students and workers. The libertarian attitude of the demonstrators and the largely anarchic means of protest, including the fact that half of Athens was set on fire, made future analysts describe those events as an ‘early ’68’. Although it is a fact that this was the first time after the end of the Civil War that the people rose up in such a massive manner and political mobilization provided a challenge to the type of social order that had prevailed since the ’40s, the methods used to mobilize the crowds and to express their grievances were conventional. Nancy Bermeo stresses that

strikes and demonstrations became increasingly common in the early 1960s, but there were very few, if any, bombings, property occupations, kidnappings, or acts of revolutionary violence. Demonstrations increased and several fires were set after George Papandreou left office, but Panayiotis Kanellopoulos himself (the civilian who led the Greek government before the coup) asserted that the period of high mobilization had ended long before the military intervention occurred. He believed that ‘the main battlefield’ at the time of the coup was no longer in the streets but ‘in the Parliament’.

Even if, several activists at the time framed it as a clear-cut ‘revolutionary situation’, a term taken over by later researchers using Marxist analytical categories, the protesters’ action repertoire remained highly predictable. According to that line of thinking, July ’65 provided the ‘objective conditions’ for a Revolution, namely an uprising of the masses against the repressive state. However, the ‘reformist’ Communist leaders of the time, namely EDA and the exiled KKE, did not grasp this and missed a great opportunity for channelling popular dynamism towards a direct confrontation with the bourgeois establishment and the ‘right-wing State’. The ‘absence’ of the official Left and its lack of initiative was attributed to the old left-wingers’ defeatism and their
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143 Around 400 open demonstrations took place. Two of them, one on the occasion of Papandreou’s sacking and one during Petroulas’s funeral numbered several hundred thousand people. See Lendakis, op.cit, p. 123 and Giannis Katris, op.cit. p. 228.

144 Christoforos Vernardakis, Giannis Mavris, Κόμματα και κοινωνικές συμμαχίες στην προδiktατορική Ελλάδα. Οι προϋποθέσεις της μεταπολεμικής [Parties and social coalitions in pre-dictatorship Greece. The preconditions of the metapolitefsi], Athens 1991, pp. 239-267. Petros Efthymiou, 'Ή ρώ της Ελλάδας' [The echo in Greece] in May '68, 30 Years After, special section in To Vima, 10/5/1998. In his brief review, Efthymiou argues that the demos were characterized by a 'subversive' and 'playful' character, that could be seen as a common element with the '60s movements abroad of later years.


146 See Nikos Psyroukis, Ιστορία της Σύγχρονης Ελλάδος (1940-74) [History of Contemporary Greece], Athens 1983, Dimitris Livieratos, Giorgos Karambellas, Ιστορικά ’65, η έκρηξη των αντιθέτων [July events ’65, the explosion of contradictions], Athens 1985.
obsession with being victimised. This missed ‘revolution’, triggered inside some people, such as Katsaros, the need to go radical:

After the July events a quite solid Guevarist team was formed within the EDA Youth, 50-60 people, who made a systematic propaganda of these views through leaflets. We had the violent rupture in our minds. And we were preparing by pinpointing the places from which we could take up arms from, e.g. police stations.¹⁴⁷

A crucial incident that reinforced people’s rage was the murder of Sotiris Petroulas, a student leader flirting with tiersmondisme, who was killed during a demonstration on 12 July 1965, and instantly became a generational symbol. He was ‘the first victim of our generation’, Stergios Katsaros, a student at the time, recalls in his autobiographical writings.¹⁴⁸ Mikis Theodorakis’s ‘Song for Petroulas’, a hymn written in the second person ‘was sung by the crowds during Petroulas’s funeral’.¹⁴⁹ The song, written under the emotional impact of the event, linked the dead student directly to Lambrakis (‘Lambrakis has taken you over with him’), concluding:

Sotiri Petroula
Lead your People,
Lead us to the fore.

The flipside of Petroulas’ tragic death and an interesting aspect of the popular uprising of ’65 was its anarchical attitude and humour.¹⁵⁰ Apart from the various slogans against the King and the influential Queen Mother Federica (‘The people do not want you, get your mother and walk off’), those concerning the so-called ‘apostates’, namely the break-away fraction of the CU that tried to form a majority with the support of the Right, were also daring compared to the rigid discourse and ethics of the time.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷ Stergios Katsaros, ‘Εμείς οι γιακαριστές’ [We, the Guevarists], quoted in IosPress, 30 years Che. Tribute to Che Guevara, no. 4, Eleftherotypia, 9/10/1997.
¹⁴⁸ Stergios Katsaros, Εγώ ο προβοκάτορας, ο τρομοκράτης [I the provocateur, me the terrorist], Athens 1999, p. 40.
¹⁵⁰ One of the main slogans (‘Lala to Lalaki’) brought out a personage that was a convicted pimp, who supposedly knew about the military conspiracy of the younger Papandreou. See Giannis Dimaras, op.cit., p. 32.
¹⁵¹ Novas, a failed candidate for the premiership was greeted by a play on words that was offensive and hilarious at the same time. ['Νόβα, (πού στη) πίζεσα;'] Ibid.
The ‘Lost Spring’: continuities and discontinuities in oppositional politics

This period is marked by the appearance of a whole new intellectual current including cinema, music, theatre, the fine arts, writing and literary criticism, all of which were connected to left-wing ideas concerning innovation, creation and humanism. The intellectuals who backed the Lambrakides were among the first to articulate a critique of the Communist Party Orthodoxy. The journal Pali [Again] adopted new aesthetic paradigms in literature, attacked literary orthodoxies and published texts focusing on such taboo issues as homosexuality. Still, social criticism and the progressive currents in creative writing were in reality accessible only to restricted intellectual circles. Equally innovative was the avant-garde intellectual journal Epitheorisi Technis, which was supervised but not controlled by the EDA. However, as Aris Marangopoulos observes, this small elitist circle concerned with liberating itself from party discipline and discovering Ernst Fischer, Lükacs, Brecht, Goldman, Gramsci, the Frankfurt School, J.-P. Sartre and Rosé Garaudí, was not able to touch on issues concerning every-day life, which, in the end did not become a collective left-wing demand. As far as student writings are concerned, the journal Panspoudastiki was a step forward in terms of increased radicalism and a certain political autonomisation, as it promoted the creation of a left-wing student body, free from strict party control.

Overall, Greece was experiencing a sort of cultural renaissance and for the first time the possibility to link ‘elite’ with ‘popular’ culture was regarded as a tangible project. Theodorakis is an illustrative example of this tendency, with his attempt to popularise the poetry of Seferis, Ritsos and Elytis, by setting it to music. Similar ideas were expressed in terms of painting (Tsarouchis), theatre (Koun’s Art Theatre, Katrakis’s Theatre of the Neighborhoods) and cinema (Koundouros). All this fitted neatly with the Lambrakides’ idea of an everyday street culture, open and easily accessible to all. In fact, they were the first generation of activists after the Civil War to link culture to politics. In addition, they were very much in favour of peaceful ways of protest and placed themselves within Bertrand Russell’s tradition, as well as sharing

152 Petros Efthymiou, ‘Η ηχος στην Ελλάδα’ [The echo in Greece] in May ’68, 30 Years After, special section in To Vima, 10/5/1998.
similarities with the Civil Rights Movement which was very active in the United States at the time.\footnote{Papanikolaou, Singing Poets..., op. cit., p. 171.}

Students stemming from within the Lambrakis Youth's ranks were also pioneering in creating a break with the official Communist party line. Crucially the first Maoist groups were formed during these years around the journal \textit{Anagennisi} [Renaissance], 'an organization for the renaissance of the Communist movement in Greece' (Tsaras), which, interestingly, worshiped the notorious former General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party, Nikos Zachariadis. Alongside this, a Third World Movement grew out of the political awareness that was caused by the Vietnam War and the guerrilla struggles in Latin America. Ho Chi Min and Che Guevara had made their way to Greece as well, in the form of groupings that defined themselves without reservation as 'anti-monarchist', 'anti-capitalist' and 'anti-imperialist', while accusing EDA of being 'legalist' and 'defeatist'.\footnote{Giorgos Giannakopoulos, 'Η κρίση των νεολαίων κοριτσιών της κλασικής περιόδου 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την Ελλάδα την \textit{Papagiotis Kanellopoulos, 'Η κρίση των νεολαίων κοριτσιών της κλασικής περιόδου 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρων διαιρουργικοί στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 1965-1967. Οι άρω...'}

...
contrast to the liberal ideas of the movement at large. Accordingly, a Lambrakis had to be ‘honest, hard-working and virtuous’. This generation tried but did not manage to break social conservatism and make an overall rupture in terms of the values system. The development of sexual relations between men and women within the organisation was considered as a step that would, of necessity, lead towards marriage, even though this line of thought was habitually disregarded. A Salonicean Lambrakissa, Zogia Chronaki, recalls with terror at present the social conservatism that possessed her and her friends. In a telling story about the morals of the period, Chronaki recalls how she, together with a friend, boycotted a scheduled excursion to the countryside, because they found out in the train station that they would be the only women:

And we took the decision, the morons, and we went and said ‘we are not coming’. Having had this sort of upbringing then you were functioning this way too.

Moreover, the pictures of the demonstrations manifest a clean-cut, buttoned-down outfit of the primarily male protesters, with an invariable use of ties and suits that hardly distinguished them from previous generations. Puritanism dictated the rejection of long hair for the boys and the wearing of trousers or smoking for the girls, in the name of the struggle against the American life-style.

Moreover, the pioneering aspects of the Lambrakis Youth movement were crucially curtailed by the fact that the organisation did not manage to retain its autonomy for long. This was not least because of the eventual control by the Communist Party and its decision to merge it with the youth organisation of EDA. From that point on students were continuously subjected to political manipulation. It is important to note also that the first attempts to break party monopoly and to acquire an independent voice (Panspoudastiki journal, EFEE) were short-lived. By 1966, students were acting within political organisations rather than within their own structures.

The movement which started up in '63 and continued all the way to '67 is regarded as ‘organically’ connected to the anti-dictatorship student movement. Even the assumption of the students during the dictatorship years (1967-74), who viewed themselves as a group who had the right and duty to speak out on political issues grew from the previous student political involvement and the fact that for over ten years they

158 Ibid, p. 185.
159 Ibid.
had played a crucial role in street politics. An effect of the students’ growing participation in street politics was also the transformation of the popular imaginary concerning them. The students, a privileged category - mainly due to their abundant free time - soon became a point of reference concerning the struggle for a different future.

In my neighbourhood I did not know any students, can you grasp this? And I was dreaming of the notion of student not with romanticism, but with anything that you can put with your mind on what this thing meant. The elusive dream. (Zorba)

A certain imaginary of youth action in Greek society was promoted, an image which was going to be reinforced and changed during the years of the coup and acquire a more universal character. It is not a coincidence that those of the later generations looked on these people with awe.

I wanted to go the university and have such action. (Damofli)

Still, more or less, I had in mind that I would study and that I would definitely enter the University or the Polytechnic. In the same way that I had in mind since when I was little, that when I would become a student I would participate in the student movement, which I took for granted that (laughter), that it would go on, namely it was then that it had started a little bit, because during the Junta the student movement climaxed. But I considered it as de facto that I would ... Maybe I had associated it that the students always have to deal with a movement. And therefore when I would be at the University, one of my fields would be science and studies and the other one would be a matter of the Left, you know, and the social movement... (Papageorgiou)

The Lambrakides were praised and feared, to the point that they were suspected by George Papandreou and others of being about to stage a revolt, something that became a sort of urban myth and was later used in the Colonels’ own line of argument. In spring 1965 George Papandreou, who apart from being Premier was also Minister of Education, sent out a circular to all schools with warnings about the Lambrakis Youth’s alleged attempts to win over the pupils and initiate them into Communism and with instructions to punish such incidents with great harshness. In fact, Decree 1010 about ‘ politicised students’ gave schoolmasters the right to expel students involved in
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160 I owe this insight to a discussion of the nature of student movements in the Introduction of Jeffrey Wasserstrom’s Student Protest in Twentieth Century China. The View From Shanghai, Stanford 1991, p. 21.
161 The circular was sent in 16 March 1965.
'political activities' but, for good measure, Papandreou was flirting with the idea of banning the organization altogether. The politicization of this generation had reached such heights that the right-wing publisher Helen Vlachou argued that the Greek Parliament should be shut down in order to 'send all the 114 rats back to the basements to play flippers'. The fact that a conservative intellectual figure of such high calibre made a public statement, arguing that entertainment was a better alternative to political participation, was an unprecedented phenomenon which shows the extent to which the dynamism of this new generation alarmed certain circles. Vlachou went as far as to fantasize a left-wing coup with the Lambrakides hailing the dictators.

This was a generation aware of its original character. It is not a coincidence that the main student paper of the Lambrakis Youth bore the illustrative title Our Generation. Giorgos Karambelias (Patras 1946, Medical School 1965) juxtaposes the setbacks and defeatist tendency of older generations to this one's fresh approach and will for confrontation.

There was a new generation coming out, which did not carry the fear of the old people. Oh, the old ones had been in exile, in prison, all those who instructed us, there was a situation in which they obeyed the logic of how to get beaten up less, that was the logic of the Old Left. There was a new generation coming out which wanted to be more aggressive. [...] We felt that we could go on the offensive, this which in reality was only about to happen after the fall of the dictatorship.

Talking about switching to the offence in the 1960s is probably an overstatement. However, it is accurate that this generation rejected the 'victimisation', which had been characteristic of left-wing culture in Greece ever since the 1940s. Karambelias expresses all the regret of his generation, which regards the coming of the Junta as putting an end to its growing political and social emancipation. Fondas Ladis, another exponent of this generation, wrote shortly after the coup
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162 Quoted in Mikis Theodorakis, Το Μανιφέστο των Λαμπράκιδες. Ποιοι είμαστε. Τι θέλουμε. Γιατί μας παλεύουμε [The Lambrakides' Manifesto. Who we are. What we want. Why they are fighting us], Athens 2003, p. 26
163 According to Vlachou's unfulfilled prophecy a possible victory of the Centre Union in the 1967 elections, EDA's 'revolutionary mechanisms', which would be put into motion, would stage a coup and the dissolution of the Republic. The Army would be unwilling to shoot against a people's demonstration, incited by EDA itself, and the 'people's government' would be sworn in the presence of the Lambrakides. [The entire passage has been taken from an editorial written by Vlachou and published in her own daily Kathimerini. Quoted in Οι δίκες της Χούντας. Πλήρη πρακτικά. Δική Προσπάθεια 21ος Απριλίου 1967 [The trials of the Junta. Full records. The trial of the main responsible for the 21st April 1967], Athens, 1975, p. 489.
A whole people camped on the streets. This is where we ate, where we fell in love - we rarely slept. We all together became a lion, we wanted to eat governments, kings and much more. With the dictatorship the streets fell empty. It looks as if all these things that filled up our eyes were nothing more than a giant newspaper that was suddenly taken over by the wind.\(^{165}\)

This was, in general, regarded by the Left as a rebirth after years of stagnation, a ‘spring’, to quote Tsirkas’s term, which was violently interrupted by the dictatorship in 1967.\(^{166}\) The well-known translator and writer Kostas Tachtsis expresses a different opinion, waxing indignant at this cultural and political ‘renaissance’ and stressing, instead, the backward aspects of Greece’s avant-gardes of the mid-1960s compared to the western ones:

In the West, to the sound of the music of the Beatles, and under the influence of psychedelic drugs that were at the time sold without restrictions, various liberation movements had erupted: youth movements, feminist, homosexual, black movements; the flower generation was also about to appear, rock would turn into pop, and I had experienced all that, partly participating - albeit in my own way - partly as a mere observer.

What did I find upon my return to Greece? The same provincial hell, parochial ideas, and unsolved contradictions that I had left behind some years earlier. Young workmen and students were on the streets demonstrating to the sound of Theodorakis’s hymns, to the slogans ‘114’, ‘bread-education-freedom’; in the tavernas the first generation of the ‘kamakia’ [predatory Greeks courting tourists] were dancing the syrtaki self-absorbed, unself-conscious with the tourists looking on. They called this ‘a spring’, they called this a ‘renaissance’.\(^{167}\)


\(^{166}\) Η Αφήνη Ανοίξη [The Lost Spring], Athens, 1976, is a semi-autobiographical novel published by the Cairo-born Communist writer Stratis Tsirkas. The love affairs of a Communist repatriate from Eastern Europe during the years of the Centre Union break are set against the explosive background of the July events in 1965. The title and the content of the novel hint that this was the beginning of the end of the gradual recovery of more individual liberties for left-wingers and of the cultural uplift that was taking place after 1963. The fact that Tsirkas wrote this novel during the years of the dictatorship is one reason why he does not shy away from presenting this time of crisis as a series of causal events leading to an inevitable democratic collapse. Left-wing people who witnessed this period eagerly subscribe to this analysis, while the title of the novel has become a favourite way ever since of describing the two-year period 1963-65. See, for instance, Viktor Netas’s article ‘Όταν τα τούνια συνέτριψαν την Ανοίξη’ [When the Spring got crushed by the tanks], Eleftherotypia 22/4/2005.

\(^{167}\) Kostas Tachtsis, Το φοβηρό βήμα [The Terrible Step], Athens, 1989, p. 371. I owe the reference to Dimitris Papanikolaou and I am using his translation.
Shortly before the coup, the universities were once again the theatre of protest and violence. As the policemen stormed into Salonica University, the press unwittingly forecast a long chain of violations that were about to take place from that point onwards, not only in university premises, but across the whole country:

The university asylum was violated yesterday in its entirety. For the first time in the history of the Aristotelian University, policemen entered in full outfit in its historical building, in order to violently chase the students out of it […] with the blessings of the Rectorate. […] The University of Salonica’s reputation as the most liberal higher educational institution of the country has been sacrificed. Greece, and all the more so, Greece of intellect and science, is ridiculed on an international level from the unacceptable tactics of some of its representatives and the crude use of material violence against the student youth. The worst has come to the worst.168

An interesting analogy is provided by the Rolling Stones concert in Athens’ Olympic Stadium on 17 April 1967, just four days prior to the coup. When at a certain point Mick Jagger, the group’s singer, threw a bouquet of red roses to the audience, the Communist-phobic police interrupted the concert. The event ended up in complete chaos and both the band members and their fans were beaten black and blue. Although the centre-left opposition newspapers criticised the savage beatings of demonstrators during political events, they seemed to have been of the opinion that these ‘yé-yés’ deserved the beatings.169 The long-haired boys were not only unsuspected of being politicised, but on the contrary were accused by a part of the press of being ‘passive’, of ‘never shaving’ and of ‘sleeping in caves’.170 Accordingly, an interesting distinction was made between a-political yé-yés and politicised youth. In other words, this pop warbling was considered to be offensively inoffensive.

This split in the pre-1967 generation, in a very schematic way, continued after the coup took place. One part of those two broad categories of students/youth, those who were politicised, inevitably got involved in serious resistance activities and became ‘bombers’, while the other part mostly remained a-political as before, despite the fact that it often retained its counter-culture style. This division would be practically cancelled some years after the imposition of the Junta, when in the early 1970s a new

---

168 ‘Το αστυνομικόν κράτος απέβαλε το προσωπελευ’ [The police state took off its mask], Makedonia, 12 April 1967. At the same time a report is made on the violent suppression of a demonstration of building workers in Athens: ‘Αιμοκόλλησε το οικοδόμος τη κυβέρνηση’ [The government caused a bloodshed among the building workers], Makedonia, 13 April 1967.
170 Ibid. These were the terms used by Dimitris Psathas, a well-known writer and playwright, in his column in the liberal newspaper Ta Nea.
The nation-saving ‘Revolution’

Greek People,

For a long time we have been witnessing a crime which has been committed against our nation.

The ruthless and squalid party exchange, the recklessness of a great part of the press, the systematic attack against all these institutions, their corrosion, the humiliation of parliamentary life, the defamation of everything, the paralysis of the state machinery, the absolute lack of understanding in as far as the problems of the youth are concerned, the mistreatment of our students and pupils, the moral decline, the confusion and bleakness, the secret or open collaboration with the subversives and finally the continuous inflammatory preaching by unscrupulous demagogues, have destroyed the peace of this country, have created a climate of anarchy and chaos, have cultivated conditions of hatred and division and have conducted us to the eve of national disaster.

There was no other way left for salvation than the intervention of the Army.

*The proclamation made by the Colonels upon their seizure of power on 21 April 171*

The seizure of power by the Colonels in April 1967 was the peak in a series of political irregularities that had characterised Greek public life, at least since 1961. The turbulent and chaotic state of affairs and the high probability that George Papandreou’s liberal CU would win the forthcoming elections, scheduled for May 28, with its left wing increasingly radicalised, both alarmed and made it easier for certain middle-ranking circles in the Armed Forces to declare a state of emergency. The Übergang of Papandreou Junior, Andreas, from bourgeois liberal positions to neo-Marxist ones, including New Left views on centre-periphery and maximalist suggestions on dealing with foreign dependency, 172 had greatly alarmed the Crown, the Right, the Armed

172 Stelios Kouloglou, *Στα έξη του τρίτου δρόμου* [Tracing the Third Way], Athens 1986, p. 15.
Forces and the US Embassy. The reform currents which were brought by the CU and the changing dynamics in the country and its policies, both domestic and foreign, had made Papandreou, father and son, two unwanted figures for the main bastions of post-Civil War Greece. The 1965 crisis and the long way to the scheduled elections for May 1967, aggravated by allegations of a left-wing conspiracy within the Armed Forces, deepened the crisis. It is in this crisis of the legitimization of the post-Civil War power structure that the 1967 coup d'état matured.

The Army, in particular, underwent a hard politicization, while closed circles within its ranks, such as IDEA, had demonstrated their willingness to directly intervene in politics already from the early 1950s. Segments of the same group, mostly low-ranking officers, were the ones who orchestrated the 21 April coup. These ‘acted for their own interests to save the position of the army in the power structure of the country, endangered as they saw it by the balance shift that had occurred in Greek politics from the early 1960s onwards by the rise of political and social forces that questioned the post-Civil War status quo.’ In fact, for a long time preceding the coup, various left-wing politicians and the press had been constantly referring to an imminent intervention by the Army and the danger of a dictatorship, as if in an attempt to exorcise this possibility. Despite these warnings, when the ‘Revolution’ took place, it became

---

173 Apart from the official formulation about an imminent Communist insurgency, the so-called ‘4th round’, the US Embassy constantly commented on Andreas’s arrogance, irresponsibility, populism and demagogue tendency, as the greatest future threat to Greece’s political system. See Alexis Papachelas, *O βιωσός της ελληνικής δημοκρατίας. Ο αμερικανικός παράγον. 1947-67* [The Rape of Greek Democracy. The US Factor. 1947-67], Athens 1997, and in particular the comments made by Robert Anschetz, a senior diplomat close to the US Ambassador.


175 The 1951 abortive coup, masterminded by the military organization IDEA, in favour of Marshal Papagos, was not the only interference of the Army in the country’s political affairs in the 20th century. From 1909 onwards, various exponents of the Armed Forces had intervened, either through pronunciamenti or with the establishment of dictatorial regimes. For a contemporary comparison of the Colonels’ regime of 21 April 1967 and General Metaxas’s regime of 4 August 1936 see Stratis Someritis, ‘Die Diktatur vom 4. August und die Diktatur vom 21. April 1967’, pp. 119-140, in Marios Nikolakos, Kostas Nikolaou (eds), *Die verhinderte Demokratie: Modell Griechenland*, Frankfurt am Main, 1969.

176 This took by surprise the so-called ‘Great Junta’ of the Generals which was preparing itself for a drastic intervention in the political affairs of the country in case of a landslide victory of the CU. The latter was probably about to be headed by the King himself.


178 The ‘nation-saving’ Revolution was the way Junta labelled itself. The term Revolution was probably inspired by Nasser’s movement, of whom Papadopoulos was a great admirer, but also referred to the ‘Revolution of 1821’, namely the War of Independence against the Ottomans, suggesting a sort of continuity with the national heroic figures of the past.
evident that the political parties had made no preparation whatsoever for such an eventuality. Most prominently EDA, the only body with solid organizational structures due to the conditions of partial clandestinity within which it had to operate, acting as the front of the exiled Communists, proved entirely unprepared to respond in any way to the task of coordinating a coherent resistance.

The coup took place after the country was declared in a ‘state of siege’, putting into action the NATO-inspired military plan ‘Prometheus’, that was drawn-up in order to prevent a possible Communist attack from the North. Parliamentarism was abolished altogether, martial law was declared and preventive censorship was imposed on the press to the extent that newspapers could only print what they were given from the government news agency, resulting in identical copy across different titles. All the decrees of the 1952 Constitution were suspended as far as the freedom of thought and expression and the freedom of the Press were concerned. The state machinery was soon drastically weeded out and controlled by the Colonels who organized a systematic means of coercion and repression. All mail, external and internal, was censored and telephones were indiscriminately tapped.

Being an authoritarian movement, the Junta immediately implemented a near ubiquitous system of oppression, inhibition and exclusion in order to ensure ‘law and order’. The main articles of the martial law announced by the new chief of the Army General Angelis on 27 April 1967 forbid open-air meetings of more than five people, gatherings in halls other than cinemas and theatres, anti-national propaganda, meaning publication or dissemination of news likely to disturb public order, possession of arms or explosives of any sort - all arms had to be handed over to the police within 48 hours and all hunting licenses were annulled. Equally forbidden was the temporary harbouring of all persons not normally resident in the area (unless their presence was

179 In a ‘state of siege’, according to the law that was passed in 1912, the government had the right ‘to prohibit the announcement of publication of information in any way, and through the Press and to proceed to confiscation of newspapers and other periodicals, either before or after their publication, up to the closing down of newspapers for a certain period.’ [Nikos Alivizatos, 1983, op.cit.] The 1912 martial law was amended in the 1968 constitution with the crucial provisions that in case of emergency the military authorities take all action to ensure the defence and security of ‘the State, the regime, the social system, public order and peace’, instead of the vague ‘country’, in order to make sure that the Anti-Espionage Law 1947/509 was applicable. According to the British Embassy in Athens a crucial amendment was that in the ‘state of siege’ the military authorities had the right to ‘remove from his place of residence any person who [was] suspected of disturbing the security of the state, public order and peace’, whereas under 1912 law, only convicted persons could be transferred in that way. [Public Records Office [PRO], FC09, Confidential, A.M.Goodenough, to British Embassy Athens to A.E.Palmer, Southern European Department, Foreign Office and Commonwealth Office, London, 4 August 1970].
declared to the police), possession of amateur radio transmitters or other means of communication, hoarding of food and other essentials.\textsuperscript{180}

The Junta’s mechanisms of detention and coercion violently interrupted any political process and were extended to the wider policing of civilian social life, demonstrating particular harshness. About 3,000 Left-wingers, stigmatised as ‘non-patriotic’, were put in prison and more than 8,000 were sent to concentration camps in remote islands, a practice which had never really been abandoned since the end of the Civil War.\textsuperscript{181} Pattakos’s ludicrous comment in June 1967 that ‘the deportees [we]re, on the whole, enjoying a very pleasant time, swimming in the sea and sun-bathing, and being well-fed’\textsuperscript{182} were coupled with his remark that ‘political prisoners are not men - only beasts’, only a couple of weeks later.\textsuperscript{183} At the same time, the use of systematic torture became standard practice and was mainly exercised by the notorious Military Police (ESA).

Apart from wide networks of surveillance and the mechanisms of suppression, the Colonels counted on the incapacity of civil society to react and on the long-time democratic deficit. In many ways, the Junta was not a break but the ideological continuation and the coherent reproduction of the political dominance of the repressive mechanisms, which had served the upper classes up to that point. Even though the vast bulk of the regime figures were of peasant or lower class origins, a fact that often fuelled a rhetorical hostility for hard-core capitalists, upper class circles and their endeavours and habits, no particular measures were ever taken to reduce their advantages or influence. Still, as Nancy Bermeo justly claims, the coup was not the result of a military-capitalist-bourgeois coalition and had not emerged in order to oppose redistribution of funds and GDP fall, resulting in an economic crisis.\textsuperscript{184}

Therefore, she maintains, the Colonels’ dictatorship should not be placed under the typology of ‘bureaucratic authoritarian’ regimes, such as the Latin American ones, following Guillermo O’Donnell’s typology.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{180} University of Warwick Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Greece, Dictatorship in Greece, a preliminary report, , 1967, (4), p. 3 in the League of Democracy in Greece Archive, INFO VI.
\textsuperscript{181} Later on they became 13,000.
\textsuperscript{182} Le Monde, 2 June, cited in ‘Dictatorship in Greece’, a preliminary report University of Warwick Committee for the Restoration of Democracy in Greece, 1967, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{183} Sunday Telegraph, John Warrack, ‘Greeks and the Arts’, 1.8.67, MGA/CUT 43.
The Junta was commonly characterized as a ‘fascist’ regime, which in popular discourse was the appropriate description. However, the regime could not be classified as fascist,\(^{186}\) as it did not rely on organised corporatist institutions or a bloc of economic interests, a link between the regime and people or any movement or party to offer support and votes.\(^{187}\) Rather, it was an authoritarian regime, close to the Turkish pattern of the Army as the ‘Saviour of the Nation’, \(^{188}\) but characterised by large incogruencies in its discourse and action. The dictatorship, which could also be defined as ‘a veto regime’, was later on ‘degraded to the level of a one group regime’.\(^{189}\) However, Veremis’s argument that the dictatorship did not evolve to a clientelistic authoritarian regime, as it ‘did not dispose of either a military unity or political clientele, elements \textit{sine qua non} for its transformation’,\(^{190}\) is arguable, since the Colonels were quick and efficient in constructing a wide clientelistic network right from the very outset.

As far as the Colonels’ ideology was concerned, it was an extreme version, a \textit{reductio ad absurdum}, of the post-Civil War ideological superstructure of the Greek State, which was based on fierce anti-Communism and the glorification of the ‘Greek Spirit’ and the ‘Hellenic Christian Civilization’.\(^{191}\) This time, more than ever before, the Nation was exalted as morally, culturally and socially superior to any other in the western world. This was peppered with the rejection of the corrupt \textit{ancien regime} and the Junta’s preached ideal and panacea against corruption and decadence through the reinforcement of the age-old triptych ‘Family-Country-Religion’. The moral code

\(^{186}\) Despite obvious divergences from Fascism, some researchers insist on this line, mainly arguing for an ideological affinity. See in particular Giorgos Veloudis, ‘To ‘Πιστωτή’ της 21\(^{\text{st}}\) Απριλίου: Ιδεολογία, πολιτική, οικονομία’ [21\(^{\text{st}}\) of April’s ‘Credo’: Ideology, politics, economy], \textit{Eleftherotypia}, 22/4/2005.

\(^{187}\) Ioannis Tzortzis, op.cit. Only in 1973 did the Junta try to promote its accomplishments and attract some sort of genuine popular support, through the \textit{Ellinistiko Politistiko Kinima} (Hellenistic Cultural Movement), which was guided by higher officials in the Colonels’ governments, without, however, any spectacular results.


\(^{189}\) Veremis uses in this respect the classic typology by Clapham and Philip [C. Clapham, and G. Philip, (eds), \textit{The Political Dilemma of Military Regimes}. London 1985]. Still, he notes, there are some diversions from a typical ‘veto regime’, such as the low degree of military unity, since ‘the Colonels were cut off from the higher officers and the rest of the armed forces’. Thanos Veremis, \textit{Ο Στρατός στην ελληνική πολιτική} [The Military in Greek Politics], Athens 1997, pp. 268-269. I owe this reference to Ioannis Tzortzis, whose translation I am using here. \textit{Ibid}, p. 2.

\(^{190}\) \textit{Ibid}.

imposed on Education was guided by these principles too, coupled with iron discipline in terms of behaviour and outlook. Boys had to maintain a 'decent appearance', be clean and well-mannered and have short hair. As for women, they were forbidden to wear mini-skirts and had to dress 'correctly' and avoid undesirable places.\(^{192}\)

**Passive vs. Active**

Colonel Papadopoulos meets Chairman Mao and asks him with how many political dissidents he has to deal with in China:
- About ten million, says Mao
- ‘Oh, just like me!’, answers Papadopoulos.

*Joke circulated at the time of the dictatorship*\(^ {193}\)

The imposition of the coup was followed by stagnation, whereby no political actor managed to retain a character or a structure and react. King Constantine, responsible for the legitimization of the dictators in the first and crucial hours of the coup, staged an aborted counter-coup on 13 December 1967 and after its failure went into self-imposed exile in Rome. Political elites, which soon came to be called the ‘old political world’, a sort of redundant *ancien regime*, remained on cold terms with each other throughout the dictatorship years. ‘The pre-dictatorial divisions were not easy to overcome in a climate of mutual doubt and divergence on how to deal with the regime, and what to do about a future democracy that was not near’.\(^ {194}\) The party leaders, George Papandreou, leader of the Centre Union, and Panagiotis Kanellopoulos, leader of the right-wing ERE, actually the acting Prime Minister at the time of the coup, decided to condemn the regime shortly after their release from house arrest. As Bermeo points out, the fact that

\(^{192}\) In addition, the new Minister of Education issued a circular stressing that ‘the school has to watch the students’ behavior outside school. Circulation of students late at night, their stay in coffee shops and other suspicious centres and in various clubs which are corruptive for the souls of youth, are unacceptable. The cultivation of the nationalistic and Christian conscience of students is the first and greatest aim of all school work. Teachers and school work should have a strong nationalistic pattern and be governed by faith in the values and the fate of the nation.’ (Sunday Times, 11 June) Sunday school has been made compulsory for all children; regular attendance at church has also been decreed. A more sinister development is the proposed revision of school text-books to bring them into line with the Junta’s view of recent history and future aims (*Le Monde*, 27 April 1967).


\(^{194}\) I. Tzortzis, *The Metapolitefsi that...*, op.cit., p. 4.
Kanellopoulos, the leader of the largest conservative and highly pro-capitalist party in the country was unambiguously opposed to the coup, had serious implications for regime legitimacy. After Papandreou's death in autumn 1968, his heir apparent, Georgios Mavros, followed the same position of sheer rejection. Soon Mavros and Kanellopoulos were to take on the role of defending the accused in the trials of Junta's arrested opponents. At the same time, Evangelos Averoff, ERE's ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, followed an idiosyncratic line, trying to 'build bridges' with the regime. The founder of ERE and for eight consecutive years Premier, Constantine Karamanlis, continued to live in Paris, in a sort of splendid isolation, waiting for the right moment for his return to the country's political affairs. Finally, Ilias Iliou and Leonidas Kyrkos, EDA's main leaders, were immediately imprisoned and did not manage to co-ordinate any serious action.

What did ordinary people do? To many the coup came as an unexpected traumatic event. Left-wingers, for instance, had been constantly told by the Party leadership that there was nothing to worry about. Chronaki underlines this point:

Then out of a sudden a dictatorship took place. Out of a sudden for the Left too, since Avgi came out a day before with the seven reasons why a dictatorship would not occur. (Chronaki)

However, the fact that Avgi, EDA's main newspaper, discussed whether a coup was possible or not demonstrates that there was a growing uneasiness about this eventuality, even if this was not considered to be imminent. In fact, the issue had been raised many months prior to April 1967, by prominent politicians, including George Papandreou himself, the octogenarian leader of the Centre Union. His son, Andreas Papandreou, and composer Mikis Theodorakis, however, were both expressing their faith that in case of a coup d'état the Greek people would risk their lives and resist. Actually, Andreas's over-evaluation of the people's mythical audacity was about to become a major ingredient of his resistance grouping's rhetoric as well. However, the

195 Nancy Bermeo, 'Classification and Consolidation... ', op.cit., p. 441. As Bermeo points out, pro-capitalist parties in classic bureaucratic authoritarian regimes, like the Latin America ones, took an anti-democratic stance when the dictatorships were imposed, ousting left-wing governments that seemed unable to change the downward trend in the GDP growth rates.
196 Papandreou declared in a maximalist manner, characterised by wishful thinking, that 'the proud working classes of our country, our unenslaved people, will oppose its democratic resistance against obscurantism and fascist measures, will defuse all violence through anti-violence, will protect their sacred and indefeasible rights, in order to govern the country that belongs to them. In Greece people will be sovereign', Makedonia, 14/4/1967.
197 S. Kouloglou, Tracing the Third Way..., op.cit., p. 16.
commonly repeated statement ‘Resistance began in the very first day’ does not accurately describe the marginality of these attempts. A significant number of people were indeed rejecting the regime, but did not know how to act. Initially, there was a shared belief that the dictatorship would not last long. The gradual realisation that the regime was more resilient than expected instigated a fatalist attitude. This feeling is intensely expressed by the writer Evgenia Fakinou. Franco’s regime as a negative point of reference is a recurrent theme that indicates the terms in which people tried to foresee the regime’s endurance:

No one knew how long the dictatorship would last. What would happen if it were as resistant as that of Franco in Spain? We would spend all our life like that. This gave us a sense of vanity. Many thought about leaving the country and some made it as well. But the majority of people remained here.

Marios Chakkas’s short story *The fish bowl*, about a left-winger who fluctuates between going underground and staying at home, superbly captures the reigning indecision between action and passivity that tormented many left-wingers.

Unconsciously he started cutting slices from the corner of the bread while at the same time optimistic thoughts came to his head: ‘Bah, this situation won’t last long. Soon they’ll fall.’ […] ‘How are they going to fall’, he heard a voice inside him [ask], ‘on their own like ripe fruit or by shaking the tree hard?’ ‘People will oust them’, he corrected a bit embittered, because it was a given that he considered himself as one of these people and so he did not leave himself out of it.

After much going back and forth, the symbolic end to Chakkas’s story has its protagonist deciding to return home to feed his little fish in its bowl, alluding to

---

198 See for example L.Alexiou, N.Antonopoulos, M.Papazoglou, K.Papazochnou, ‘Έτσι ο λαός πολέμησε τη χώρα’ [This is how the people fought the junta], *Ta Nea*, 11/12/1975 or the forward of the novelist Stratis Tsirkaas to the publications close to the KKE int, where he reproduces the common ‘[our people] resisted with indomitable spirit’, in Άρχειο Παράνομου Αντιπαπασιακού Εντύπου, ΚΚΕ Εσωτερικό, ΕΛΑ, ΠΑΜ, Ρήγας Φεραίος [Archive of Clandestine Resistance Journals. KKE Interio, EDA, PAM, Rigas Ferraio], Athens 1974.


people’s reluctance to give up the routine of their everyday lives in order to resist the regime.\textsuperscript{201}

Desistance was such that in 1968, a year after the imposition of the dictatorship, the actress Melina Merkouri said in an interview in London that ‘if I had a bell I would ring it to wake up the whole country’,\textsuperscript{202} clearly pointing to the need for consciousness-raising among the Greeks. Still, most Greeks remained frightened and, with the exception of some organized circles, passive. An explanation put forward, accounting for the lack of reaction, is that the resistance organizations that were created ‘fail[ed] to provide a convincing alternative proposition and valid ways of action’.\textsuperscript{203} At the same time, pre-dictatorship political forces had lost their credibility precisely because the coup took place without them preventing it.\textsuperscript{204} Another deterrent factor seems to have been ‘the consequences but also the memories of the Civil War’ and people’s fear of a replication.\textsuperscript{205} However, all these explanations seem to adopt a line of argument, according to which resistance is a natural reaction in times of crisis and oppression and therefore something must have gone wrong. The fact is that ordinary family men and women do not easily override fear or put their lives at risk for a problem that they do not even believe that they can redress. Michalis Sabatakakis, a high-school student at the time the coup took place, recalls this climate and stresses the paralysing effect of fear. Interestingly, his narrative strategy employs a typical interpretative model, based on the ‘in those days - now’ opposition:\textsuperscript{206}

What the ones who haven’t experienced this cannot feel, namely those of a certain age downwards, is the brutal political climate of the Dictatorship. That is, there are no parties, there is no Parliament. It is the feeling of a heavy policing of every single thing. It is the fear. The basic thing is fear. Because the man, you know, who with great easiness up to ‘67 was going out to the streets in order to demonstrate during the July events, is scared. And it is normal to be scared. He

\textsuperscript{202} John Gale, ‘Melina: What those colonels told me’, Observer, 14.4.68.
\textsuperscript{203} Olympios Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., pp. 26-27.
\textsuperscript{204} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{205} Ibid. Similarly, several British diplomats are documented as raising this issue. The British Embassy in Athens, however, is reported as disagreeing on possible resemblances: ‘It would seem to me that the comparisons which I hear occasionally with the situation at the time of the civil war overlook the fact that the latter began with considerable communist fighting cadres already in being, with considerable quantities of arms already stored in caches in the mountains, and with free access routes across the frontiers to the north. None of these conditions prevails today and we are moreover in the era of the military helicopter.’ PRO, FOCE 1/22, British Embassy Athens ‘Greek Resistance Movements’, T.E.Bridges to J.E.C.Macrae, Central Department, Foreign Office, 8 June 1969.
does not have an unreal fear, he has a real fear. He is scared of finding himself with twenty years
of prison.

Rather than searching how to lead a clandestine existence, the majority of people who
were against the regime exercised a sort of ‘passive resistance’, as was the favourite
motto at the time. This was not exercised through some form of civil disobedience,
despite abortive attempts to boycott or isolate the regime, referring mainly to the
circulation of a series of caustic jokes about the Colonels. These jokes, castigated the
absurdity of the appearance and discourses made by Papadopoulos and Pattakos, two of
the regime’s major figures, but also tended to overstate popular opposition to the Junta.
As Dimaras notes, ‘jokes were the hidden weapons of subjugated people from ’67 to
’74’. Consequently, people spreading jokes or any other ‘anti-regime propaganda’
were dubbed by Papadopoulos as ‘whisperers’. However, the emotional conclusion that
when ‘the ‘whisperers’ plunged their arrows in the poison of satire the tanks started to
tremble’ conveys an *ex post facto* attempt to magnify the former’s impact. In later
days, and in particular in the wake of the Polytechnic uprising, Mikis Theodorakis, a
symbolic figure of anti-regime activity, seemed very pleased with the fact that ‘the
bitter days of passive resistance are over for good’.

For a large part of the population, this passive stance ‘was never transformed to a
consensus and even less so to active support’. Nancy Bermeo argues that the regime
did not find legitimization, partly because of the Greek political institutions and
political culture. The Army was not a united whole and politicians belonging to rival
parties agreed to co-operate, a trait that Bermeo attributes to the country’s long
parliamentary tradition. This democratic political culture, including liberal 19th
century constitutions and an early universal male suffrage, ensured a rejection of
authoritarianism.

Evidence suggests, however, that for several old sections and new subgroups of
Greek society the passive stance was also due to the fact that they were, if not
supportive, at least tolerant of the Colonels’ regime. Social isolation was not as total as
is often described, and apart from the definite support of the ruling classes, one could

---

207 Giannis Dimaras, *Εμπρός στον έτσι που χάραζε ο τίτοιος* [Let’s continue the x that z has started],
208 Ibid
209 Canada, 27.11.73. Quoted from a bulletin of the Historical Archive of the Fondation Hellenique.
210 O. Dafermos, *Student and Dictatorship...*, op.cit., p. 27.
211 Nancy Bermeo, ‘Classification and consolidation...’, op.cit., pp. 435-452.
212 Ibid.
speculate that also the lower classes’ apathy was not just the outcome of fear. Apart from the military regime’s use of raw violence as a deterrent, analysts maintain that another reason that accounts for people’s passivity was rising welfare. The regime benefited from a relatively good economic performance at least up to 1972, despite inflation and foreign indebtedness. In addition, to farmers and civil servants the Junta meant the cancellation of debts and higher salaries, to building constructors more permits, while to the average petit bourgeois Greek it brought allowances and loans. What is more, the Colonels achieved considerable levels of support in the rural areas, not least because of their efforts to build infrastructures, including roads and the introduction of electricity. Apart from that, the regime’s close co-operation, even if under unfavourable terms, with foreign multi-national companies, including Esso Papas and Onassis’s enterprises seemed to many a step towards modernisation. Tourism was yet another privileged sector privileged by the Colonels, boosting the national GDP and profiting from the reigning ‘peace and quiet’, despite the persistent attempts of anti-regime organisations in Greece and abroad to boycott it. In fact, the country’s

---

212 See Dimitris Charalambis, *Army and political...*, op. cit., p. 272. See also Solon Grigoriadis, *History of...*, op.cit., 1st volume, p. 261, 2nd volume, p. 276. The analyses put forward by these authors often present the dictatorship in terms of a dichotomy between the reactionary regime and the progressive people, with the latter being defeated because of the extreme violence employed by the regime or/and the devastating impact of the so-called ‘foreign factor’.

214 As Tzortzis points out ‘the economic politics of the Junta boosted growth in industry, construction, and small and medium enterprises’. The average rhythm of growth during the first five years of the dictatorship was more than 10% per year, the average unemployment was about 5% and the average inflation during the same period was less than 2.3% (Numbers taken from tables of the National Statistical Service of Greece, quoted by I. Tzortzis, *The Metapolitefsi...*, op.cit., p. 3). Also Panos Kazakos notes that by 1969 the country had achieved the highest growth rate of the entire decade 1965-1975, namely 11,6%, with inflation rates around 2,5% and per capita income around $1135. See Panos Kazakos, *Ανώμαλα σε Κράτος και Αγορά. Οικονομία και οικονομική πολιτική στη μεταπολεμική Ελλάδα, 1944-2000* [Inbetween the State and the Market. Economy and fiscal policies in post-war Greece, 1944-2001], Athens 2001, p. 267. However, the economic boom lasted until 1972. By that time inflation had risen, imports had increased and the taxation due to the lower-crisis that was becoming overburdening. See Yangos Pesmazoglou, *Η ελληνική οικονομία μετά το 1967* [Greek economy since 1967] in Richard Clogg, George Yannopoulos, *Η Ελλάδα κάτω από στρατιωτικό ζυγό* [Greece under military rule], Athens 1976, pp. 136-191.

215 O. Dafermos, *Students and Dictatorship...*, op.cit., pp. 26-27. Mantoglu’s rejection of this theory on the grounds that people started demonstrating during the ‘unyielding struggle’ and the ‘114’ movements despite the rising welfare of the early 1960s (cit. 157), seems to be a weak point, since the parliamentary governments of that time never reached the level of the Colonels’ populism. The vast amount of loans and benefits introduced by the latter effectively checked symptoms of discontent.

216 In the period 1967-1973 tourism received six times more funding than in previous years. See Panos Kazakos, *Inbetween the State...*, op.cit., p. 277. Also see Cendric Thomberry ‘Greek Left warns tourists’, *The Guardian*, 18/5/68: ‘The two major Greek underground resistance groups, Democratic Defence and the Patriotic Front, have issued a joint statement in Athens saying that all tourists who visit Greece will be considered as sympathisers of the dictatorship. No responsibility for their safety is accepted. [...] ‘First, all collaborators of the dictatorship will be hit ruthlessly. Secondly, all foreign tourists who visit Greece will be considered as sympathisers who contribute, directly or indirectly, to the perpetuation of the dictatorship. Consequently, the resistance groups in Greece do not accept any
tourism took off during the precise years of the dictatorship. Whereas in 1960 Greece received 394,000 tourists, in 1972 the number of tourists entering the country totalled 2.5 million.\footnote{217}

The lack of credibility that the democracy suffered in the years following 1965, as the country was experiencing a serious crisis of parliamentarianism, is yet another reason accounting for consensus. The permanent crisis, the disintegration of the political system, the continuous alteration of short-lived governments and the tension and fanaticism were factors that culminated in the rhetorical invocation by a large part of the population of an extra-constitutional solution as welcome.\footnote{218} In the end, to many it seemed that credibility and public order had replaced political fanfare and popular unrest, while for the traditional voters of the Right the difference initially did not seem that great. For the right-wing publisher Helen Vlachou, one of the few publishers to suspend publishing activity altogether throughout the dictatorship, the indifference shown by the majority of people was owed to the fact that they were profoundly unhappy with the pre-1967 state of affairs and therefore willing to give the new regime a chance:

People in the streets showed no interest and no concern about the outcome of things. In reality this stoic acceptance of a situation was no one's victory but a defeat of all politicians of all colours, since the previous one seems to not have satisfied most of them. 'Let them try' was the slogan that reigned.\footnote{219}

According to the right-wing economist George Pesmazoglou, 'the greater part of the people initially tolerated the coup. And this because it was afraid that communism or anarchy would prevail'.\footnote{220} Doumanis argues that far from proving a fascist inclination in Greek national character, this was rather an indication that people wanted a strong government which could affirm its proper public responsibility by mediating a real responsibility for the safety of foreign tourists in Greece.' However, British diplomats were concluding that '[a]part form statements of a propaganda nature (e.g. the warning to tourists by Democratic Defence and the Patriotic Front that they could not hold themselves responsible for the safety of any tourist in Greece this summer) there is, as yet, no sign of any active organised opposition to the Regime.'\footnote{PRO, FC09, CE 1/22 Confidential, Foreign Office to Athens, J.E.C.Macrae, Central Department to The Hon. T. E. Bridges, 28 May 1968.}

\footnote{\textit{On this issue see Nikos Mouzelis, \textit{Facets of Underdevelopment}, p. 50. Also see The Economist's excellent analysis, 'Swallows winging south', 31/7/1971. Despite this significant increase, however, these numbers were still well below the Spanish or Italian standards.}}

\footnote{\textit{A common expression at the time was that 'a sergeant should come to bring some order'.}}

\footnote{\textit{Helen Vlachou, \textit{House Arrest}, London 1970, p. 34}}

\footnote{\textit{Meletis Meletopoulos, op. cit., p. 110.}}
capacity of implementing its decisions. For the American anthropologist Michael Herzfeld, however, it was 'extremely embarrassing to hear from Greeks [...] that they need a strong government and that they deserve the Junta. Such comments were part of the dominant ideology in the period of the Colonels.' A military officer at the time replied to one person's affirmation that the Junta did not enjoy any form of support from the Greek people as follows:

I don't agree. If the Greek people had spit on us we would have been drawn within their saliva. They don't do it, though.

So, it could be said that apart from generating genuine discontent, the regime also enjoyed a solid block of consensus, by people who saw authoritarianism's firm grip as the political response to the endemic problems of the country's social structures.

As far as systematic attempts to resist are concerned, after the initial shock, efforts were made by the few non-captured left-wing ringleaders still at large to create clandestine nuclei of action. Over thirty official groupings started operating, each with a small number of participants, thus keeping the anti-regime activities largely fragmented. Resistance, in fact, never gained much momentum. The groups' numbers remained relatively small, following the model of pro-dictatorial action and did not manage to establish a link with the people. In short, they were not the products of the new dynamics created by the establishment of the Junta, but rather 'the continuation of the past, and thus they obeyed its logic'. Most of these organisations' actions aimed at underlining their presence rather than overthrowing the Junta. Accordingly, resistance in the form of minor clandestine actions had no strategic aim other than that of demonstrating that there was a reaction against the regime.

The three major operating organisations were Democratic Defence (DA), the Panhellenic Anti-dictatorship Front (PAM), and the Pan-Hellenic Resistance Movement (PAK). PAM, a direct derivation of EDA and the Communist Party, was the quickest in printing brochures and a journal (Machitis) containing information on

---

221 Nicolas Doumanis, Una faccia, una razza. Le colonie italiane nell'Egeo, Bologna 2003, p.165.
223 Quoted by Anna Mantoglou, The Polytechnic..., op. cit p. 158.
resistance activities. There were ongoing moral debates on the ethics of violence and whether it should turn to more radical and ‘visible’ acts of resistance. Such tactics were resorted to on a limited level, but were abandoned after Brillakis, its leader, was personally accused of the death of a passer-by in Athens, killed by an exploding bomb during the first months of the Junta. DA, on the other hand, was clearly oriented towards ‘dynamic’ action, even though the social profile of its members might have suggested otherwise. It was, in fact, an organization mainly comprised of middle-aged professors, doctors and lawyers and without a clear cut left-wing orientation. Its repertoire was confined to the placing of bombs, where again great attention was given to the necessity of avoiding victims.²²⁵

Lastly, PAK, founded in March 1968 by the recently released Andreas Papandreou, professed revolutionary action, hinting at a struggle not only against the Junta but for general social change, including liberation of the Greek nation from US imperialism.²²⁶ His son, Nikos Papandreou, points out that ‘it was natural that Andreas Papandreou would place his attempt […] within the general context of this period’, namely ‘the paradigm of the liberation movements from Cuba to the Congo and the resistance of the people of Vietnam against the huge power of the United States’, a fact which explains the use of the word ‘liberation’.²²⁷ In other words, PAK’s rhetoric was influenced by Third World, and particularly Latin American, revolutionism and city guerilla theories.²²⁸

Apart from occasional, aborted attempts at co-operation, the much-desired, but always contested, platform of unity of resistance never came into being. The constant attempts to create a unified or at least a co-ordinated body of resistance out of the three organizations failed miserably despite the fact that the appeals for the ‘need of unity among the anti-dictatorial forces’ were monotonously repeated throughout the first years of the coup. Soon, the very nature of the resistance methods came to further

²²⁵ See the thorough account of one of its leading members, the Sociology Professor Vassilis Filias, Τα αξέχαστα και τα λησμονημένα [The unforgettable and the forgotten ones], Athens 1997. A very interesting personal account is to be found in the prison diaries of the prominent Salonician intellectual Pavlos A. Zannas, Η μεταλήψη της Φωλιάς [Prison Notebooks], Athens 2000. Peter Murtagh provides an analysis of the international network around DA, which provided it with logistical support, in The rape of Greece. The King, the Colonels and the Resistance, London, 1994.
²²⁶ ‘Ο Αγώνας είναι εθνικοπολεμικός’ [The Struggle is one of national liberation], in Agonas, 22/9/73.
²²⁸ For a thorough discussion of these resistance organizations see Marios Nikolinakos, Αντίσταση και Αντικολώτες. 1967-74 [Resistance and Opposition], Athens 1975.
divide and fragment the organizations. In later years, as will be shown later, a whole range of negotiation strategies and an interplay with the regime started to take place instead, making the initial division between 'active' and 'passive' redundant. What is more, the politicisation of everyday practices and the emergence of new collectivities with a contestatory repertoire based on allusions and indirect challenges created spaces of political agility that eventually surpassed the dichotomy between hard-core resistance and passive acceptance.

'Tidying up' the University

On 30 April 1967 the major pro-regime newspaper with the almost ironic title Eleftheros Kosmos [Free World], published the news that the regime was dismantling EDA, the Lambrakis Youth, as well as EREN and EDIN, namely ERE's and the Centre Union's Youths. A week later, the same paper quoted the Chief of the General Staff, Vice-General Odysseas Angelis as ordering the dismantling of 279 more societies and clubs, constituting a strong blow against the right of building societies and preserving networks and spaces of sociability. These included the Lambrakis Youth, the Bertrand Russell Greek Committee for the Détente and Peace, the Pan-Hellenic Union of Women, the Democratic Trade-Unionist Movement, the Coordinating Committee of Working Youth of Greece, the Society of Working Students, the Democratic Resistance of Students, the Federation of Local Student Societies of Greece, EFEE and the Pedagogical Institute. The new regime was quick to dismantle the whole structure of student representation and participation at higher institutions and all party youth organisations were abolished, including the ones of FIDIK, the Progressives, the Liberals, the Liberal Democratic Union and the Socialist Party. Student elections were banned, the archives of the old student unions were confiscated and new student councils were directly appointed by the government, with their constitutional charters modified, in order to ensure compliance with the new order. Konstantinos Kalambokias, Junta’s first Education Minister, explained:
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229 On a biased but interesting view of how Andreas Papandreou's behavior undermined the unity of anti-regime organisations see Peter Murtagh, The Rape..., op.cit., pp. 207, 225.
228 Quoted in Andreas Lendakis, Το Παρακράτος και η 21η Απριλίου, [The parastate and the 21th April], Athens 2000, p. 334.
230 A total of 280 student societies, associations and organisations were banned and their properties were destroyed or confiscated. See Christos Lazos, Greek Student..., op.cit., pp. 354-355.
Instead of devoting themselves to education, students have become tools of the parties through their youth organizations. The Junta has banned all party youth groups and is giving thought to the formation of a national youth organization.\(^{232}\)

Georgios Georgalas, Junta’s main ideologist and a former avowed Communist, described the ‘detoxification’ of the new generation, which had previously been exploited by Communism and party politics, as one of the coup’s main aims.\(^{233}\) According to a newsreel of the time ‘young people, restless and directionless, were led to chaos’.\(^{234}\) In an attempt to cure this malady, all pre-1967 student ring-leaders were either imprisoned or exiled. Up to 1970, a hundred and forty students were tried by martial courts and expelled from University.\(^{235}\) In fact, Chronaki remembers this as a very bleak period:

\[
\text{[There was] a shutting up. Half of my friends were underground and the other half imprisoned. It was a very bad situation. (Chronaki)}
\]

The remaining and the new students were faced with immersing themselves in an entirely claustrophobic environment. Extensive surveillance, inside and outside University, was guaranteed by a widespread informer system of undercover ‘student’ agents.\(^{236}\) Inevitably, suspicion among students grew vastly, in a context in which any sort of approach was considered to be a trap. In order to control the universities and the acting teaching body more effectively, the authorities established mechanisms of persecution, repression and reward. Nothing escaped unrecorded, unregistered or unpunished. A British journalist reported at the time:

\[
\text{I heard this week of a young student [...] who was sentenced to two years for ‘insulting the police’. His crime consisted of asking a girl, privately, why she hung around with informers.}\(^{237}\)
\]

In due course, the Junta issued several decrees defining the ‘rights and obligations’ of students, the most serious of which was to be 93/1969 which excluded any right of free

\(^{234}\) News Archive, Greek State Channel (ERT).
\(^{235}\) Minas Papazoglou, \textit{Φοιτητικό Κίνημα και Δικτατορία} [Student Movement and Dictatorship], Athens 1983, pp. 14-16.
\(^{236}\) The police had a specialised ‘student section’ (\textit{Spoudastikon}) ever since the 1930s.
expression. On top of that, higher institutions lost their independent character altogether.\textsuperscript{238} The Junta appointed retired generals as ‘governmental commissioners’ in the universities, in higher positions in the central administration of the Ministry of Education and in educational institutions, putting them in charge of their ‘appropriate functioning’.\textsuperscript{239}

Moreover, Universities soon became heralds and propagators of the dominant ideology as the Junta created a legal arsenal in order to terrorise professors.\textsuperscript{240} The organisation of political control within the universities included dramatic modifications of the composition of the academic staff.\textsuperscript{241} Dimitris Fatouros, a Professor of Architecture at the University of Salónica at the time, dubbed by US reports a ‘liberal who favours avant-garde teaching’,\textsuperscript{242} wrote later on that

Professors were not allowed to leave the country, their offices were bugged, their meetings observed, the whole administrative system was modified, in order to allow the military authorities to choose and decide for the dean and all university authorities. It arbitrarily change[d] the schedules of lessons and the lessons themselves. It impose[d] appointments of assistants, it appoint[ed] relatives of the personnel of the secret security agencies. The decision of each School, each university, about the most minor of topics depend[ed] on the central administration of the Ministry of Education in Athens.\textsuperscript{243}

\textsuperscript{238} M. Papazoglou, \textit{Student Movement...}, op. cit., p. 14.
\textsuperscript{239} Giorgos Giannaris, \textit{Φοιτητικά Κινήματα και Ελληνική Παιδεία. Βολά 2 Από την ΕΠΟΝ στο Πολυτεχνείο} [Student Movements and Greek Education. From EPON to the Polytechnic], Athens 1993, p.325. See also Κ. Κονοφάγος, \textit{Η εξέγερση του Πολυτεχνείου} [The Polytechnic uprising], Athens 1982, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{240} ‘Greece’s military Junta has assumed power to suspend university professors for six months if their ideas did not conform with the ‘national ideal’. A constituent Act providing for this and published yesterday in the official gazette, said such suspensions can be extended a further six months. [...] It said reasons for action against university professors would be activities which could be construed as incompatible with the status or moral qualities of a university professor. The Act also empowers the Prime Minister to dismiss a university professor if his election in the past was made against the opinion of the council of professors of the relevant university, even if a law provided for such a procedure. The Prime Minister could also suspend from their duties professors whose activities were against the ‘social status’ of Greece and held ideas not in conformity with the ‘national ideal’. Quoted from ‘Greek regime moves against universities’, \textit{Morning Star}, 23/6/67.
\textsuperscript{241} Altogether fifty-six professors were sacked when the Junta took power, while nine were suspended. By 1968 the regime had got rid of one hundred and sixty seven professors. However, according to the British Embassy in Athens, the regime had moved ‘with considerable circumspections, presumably to avoid either massive resignation from among the teaching staff or student demonstrations on their behalf.’ In addition, ‘the Rector of Athens University, Professor Rammos, is rumoured to have reached a compromise with the Government by which several names originally on the list were removed’. PRO, FCO9/196, Restricted, British Embassy Athens to the Foreign Office, B. Hitch to J.E.C. Macrae, ‘University Dismissals’, 2 February 1968.
\textsuperscript{242} USNA, XR POL 13-2 Greece, Amconsul Thessaloniki to Department of State, subject: ‘Follow Up on Rightist Student Demonstration, University of Thessaloniki, December 8, 1970’, 14 January 1971.
\textsuperscript{243} Dimitris A. Fatouros, \textit{Αλλαγή και Πραγματικότητα στο Πανεπιστήμιο} [Change and Reality in the University], Athens 1975, pp. 101-102.
However, the majority of the remaining professors did not oppose the implementation of illiberal and unconstitutional laws, and in fact a good number of them also took their own measures to curtail potential student initiatives. An example which encapsulates the regime’s philosophy and discourse in terms of higher education is to be found in the speech of Colonel Papadopoulos, the ‘primus inter pares’ of the regime, at the University in Salonica. The Professors were urged by the Dictator to oblige their students to behave on the following threat:

The Greek students have to think that to have a letter sent by the Principal to their village to be read by the priest from the pulpit would be a much graver penalty for them than to be expelled from University.

The professors, as would also be the case in later, more dramatic occasions, enthusiastically applauded Papadopoulos’s oratory delirium. Although, undoubtedly, many of them did so out of fear rather than out of conviction, Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s questioning ‘what sort of an education can you get from a professor who’s scared stiff of losing his job?’ seems closer to the mark.

It is noteworthy, that the Colonels abolished the Educational Reform and its main mouthpiece, the Educational Institute, and re-introduced a ludicrous hyper-arcaic katharevousa as the official language of State and University. They also re-introduced the ‘certificate of social beliefs’, not as a prerequisite for entering University but as a definite condition for receiving a scholarship. In this case the Minister of Public Order had to guarantee to the University Authorities that the student was inspired by ‘national ideals’. In most cases, a major reason for not issuing the certificate was the parents’ political stance. One report reads that a certain student ‘is influenced ideologically by the Communist beliefs of his father’.
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244 The valedictory orations of Professors Mangakis in Athens and Maronitis and Manesis in Salonica that became occasions of student unrest were an exception.
245 'Ομιλών εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην ο Πρόεδρος της Εθνικής Κυβερνήσεως κ. Γεώργιος Παπαδόπουλος εν Τέχνες: Το Πανεπιστήμιο πρέπει να γίνει η εκκλησία πνευματικής αναπτύξεως του Ελληνικού έθνους' [Speaking from Salonica the President of the National Government stressed that the University has to become the Church of the Intellectual Development of the Greek Nation], To Vima, 6/1/68, p. 1.
247 'Μεταβάλλεται ρήματα το σύστημα εξέτασης δι' Ανωτάτας Σχολές. Δεν θα απαιτείται πλέον πιστοποιητικόν φροντισµάτων', Ta Nea, 1/4/68.
248 Ministry of Public Order to the National Granting Institution (IKY), Confidential, subject: ‘Balabasis Evangelos, son of Georgios and Despoina’, 27/3/70. Private archive of Minas Kokkinos. Other documents sent by the Ministry to the Granting Authorities argue about a male student who was heard praising Russia [‘Certificate of Girgkoudis Anastasios, son of Mavroudis’, 28/7/70] and a female one who was seen harbouring a suspected Communist [‘Tavouktsoglou Diamandoula, daughter of Krystallis
spectrum, 10% of Greek students entered university, having been proposed by the Army\(^\text{249}\) and a certain number entered without exams, on the grounds of their ‘nation loving character’ and ‘moral education’.\(^\text{250}\)

The strategy that the Greek dictators implemented in the University is characteristic of the populist character of the regime as a whole. Alongside an increase in wages, the reduction in taxes and the cancelling of debts, the number of teaching positions were increased, provided that the professors were filled with ‘healthy social values’, while student grants were doubled.\(^\text{251}\) The old system of buying study books from the professors was rejected as sheer commerce, and instead books began to be offered at no cost.\(^\text{252}\) In this spirit, one can read the propagandistic message in the newspapers of the time:

Youths, thanks to the 21\(^{\text{st}}\) April you are now privileged because you have limitless opportunities to study.\(^\text{253}\)

In addition, the inauguration of the University of Patras, the construction of the Athens campus and the project for a new university in Crete were equally placed in the context of the regime’s efforts to build up the necessary infrastructures for education.

What was the student reaction to all this? The shock that followed the abrupt change in the country and university life left many shattered, but most students indifferent. Even those who were most politically conscious were left with a void in terms of how to react. The majority of students with or without left-wing family credentials felt disoriented. The feelings of fear, confusion and displacement, both in temporal and spatial terms, are rendered powerfully by Maria Theologidou, a Humanities student in Salonica:

\[^{249}\text{Decrees 45/1967 of the 25th and 26th August 1967.}\]
\[^{250}\text{Quoted from the journal Antistasi \text{68}, March 1968.}\]
\[^{251}\text{Students with an average mark of 7/10 annually received a grant for the whole period of their studies. See Kostas Krimbas, \text{'Ανώτατη Εκπαιδευ\piον κωφό της Χούντας' [Higher Education at the time of the Junta], pp. 135-152 in Gianna Athanasatou, Alakis Rigos, Serafeim Seferiadis (eds.), \text{The Dictatorship...}, op.cit., p. 141.}\]
\[^{252}\text{Ibid, p. 141. It was concerning these kind of supplies that Professor Pesmazoglou argued that ‘material rewards do not cover nor heal deviations from principles of moral or intellectual importance.’ See his article \text{"Ακαδημαϊκή Ελευθερία" [Academic Freedom], in Synecheia, March 1973, p. 3}\]
\[^{253}\text{To Vima, 5/5/68.}\]
The picture that I see within the Humanities Faculty, which is supposedly better off in terms of education than the Maths and Physics etc, the picture I see is... we have realized nothing, that is we don’t know where we are, in which epoch, in which country. Kids from the countryside mainly, but also the kids from Salonica, are either a small category of bourgeois families, rich and maybe right-wing, and a very small minority of kids who come from left-wing families and watch, are scared; the families are scared, everybody is scared.

Another female student in Salonica admits that ‘we were bowing down our heads’, trying to remember the state of mind that led her to this point:

I don’t know how we were... We were not indifferent, but scared. We were worn down. I don’t know how we were, what we were thinking of... (*Georgia)

In *Youths of Sidon*, the left-wing poet Manolis Anagnostakis points the finger at the young and their passive stance. Anagnostakis evokes in his title the decadent youths of Cavafy’s universe (‘The youths of Sidon, 400 A.D.’). Just like Cavafy, he accuses the younger generation of historical amnesia and vane radicalism and he indirectly hints that dictatorship means nothing to them. Finally, the poem’s conclusion is a bitter acceptance that the older generation was out of age and energy: invalidated by the circumstances and unable to be a source of inspiration for the younger ones, who supposedly looked at them with a hidden contempt.254

Fresh young girls - stoutly built lads
All passion and love for life and action.
And your songs too, good, with meaning and substance
So very human, so moving,
About infants that die in other continents
About heroes killed in former times,
About revolutionaries, Black, Green and Yellow ones,
About Man’s grief in his overall suffering.
It’s especially to your credit that you involve yourselves
In the issues and struggles of our age
You directly and actively make your presence felt - in view of which

254 Anagnostakis also makes a bitter remark on the internationalism of this generation, ironically commenting on their solidarity songs. This poem demonstrates to a large extent a condescending attitude and a lack of understanding of the younger generations. His poem also expresses a sort of metaphysical anxiety of the old intellectuals concerning the newcomers. See also Pavlos A. Zannas’s prison notebooks, in which this cine-critic and translator of Marcel Proust into Greek, expresses the same fear: ‘Is there going to be left something for us?’, Ημερολόγια Φυλακής [Prison Notebooks], Athens 2000, p. 158.
I think you more than deserve
In twos, in threes, to play, to fall in love,
And unwind, for sure, after such exertion.
(They’ve aged us prematurely Giorgos, do you realise?)  

Here, Anagnostakis, a prominent exponent of the so-called ‘40s generation and himself a combatant in the civil strife, uses passivity as a rhetorical feature, in contrast to the epic and heroic model of the Resistance, the Civil War and even the Lambrakides. ‘Passivity’ in this sense became a discursive element and a rhetorical canon of supporters of the Left in order to describe their feeling of defeat. Giorgos Karambelias, a member of the proto-Maoist group PPSP, stresses the feeling of frustration deriving from the fact that none of the pre-dictatorship political entities managed to undertake any initiatives:

The tragic thing was that there was no other organization, since ‘Anagennisi’ collapsed, PPSP didn’t do a thing, EDA absolutely nothing, as Rigas and PAM started being created after the winter of ’67 to ’68. In the beginning everything collapsed, everyone got caught etc, few people managed to survive.

Even so, and with mobility in the universities being excluded, a small number of students embarked on desperate and non-systematic attempts to get involved in clandestine actions on the side of the few resistance organizations and other small groups. However, for students without a political background there was little chance of making contact with these organizations, since any sort of approach was ruled out as extremely dangerous. An Athenian student of the time argues that ‘I wanted to do something but didn’t know who to turn to’. As was the case in Spain at the time, in Greece these comparatively privileged channels of contact with politics also reinforced the peculiarity of radical students and their isolation within the general student population.

A few militant students attempted to operate in small, tight nuclei called Dimokratikes Epitropes Antistasis (DEA), the main core of which was Trotskyite, part
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255 Manolis Anagnostakis, ‘Νέοι της Σίδονος’ [Young People of Sidon] from the group of poems ‘Ο Στόχος’ [The Target], originally in the Ακαδημαϊκά Κέιματα [Eighteen Texts], Athens 1970, p. 128. Translated by David Conolly (http://www.lsa.umich.edu/modGREEK) [last visited June 2005].
256 José María Maravall, Dictatorship and Political Dissent. Workers and Students in Franco’s Spain, Cambridge 1978, p. 105.
of the 4th International. According to one of their manifestos the DEA were created as a reaction to the helplessness of parties and all organized entities and were committed to having no leaders and the 'great advantage' that its members should not know more than necessary so that the organization would be protected in case of interrogation. Christina Vervenioti and her sister were two of the students who became part of this resistance group:

We were working day and night, we were working, printing, distributing, printing, distributing, this was one part of the organization that was under our control, we were printing the paper and the leaflets and all that. There was another part which probably had, as it was probably proved, some connection with bombs, to plant bombs and these things. We were doing this until we got caught. They arrested us very quickly. They took us in on 3 September 1967; we had worked in April, May, June, as little as that. (Vervenioti)

Vervenioti’s final phrase ('as little as that') expresses the regret about the fact that she, as with the majority of people who were immediately involved in clandestine action, did not manage to stay under cover for long. The trajectory of those people was mainly a few weeks of action, followed by many years of prison. Moreover, the careful formulation concerning the use of violence reflects the divisions of the time but also the cautiousness of ex-militants when they talk about their experiences in the present day, even if this deals with a 'legitimate' cause.

In February 1968, little less than a year after the coup occurred and during the 12th Plenary Session of the exiled Greek Communist Party in Budapest, the moderates who expressed criticism of the official line were expelled from the Central Committee. They, in turn, created the so-called ‘Interior’ faction, which supposedly had closer ties and connections to the actual situation in Greece. This move came as a shock. Not only did the Communist leadership not manage to put forward a precise project of resistance, but it suffered a dramatic official division at a time when unity was vital for keeping a left-wing front against the regime alive. Uncertainty was reinforced by the lack of good information in Greece about how and why this happened. On top of that,

257 Stergios Katsaros, I the provocateur..., op. cit., p. 102.
258 'To κλειστή της δημοκρατίας. Εφημερίδα στην υπηρεσία των δημοκρατικών επιτροπών αντιστάσεως' [The key of democracy. Journal in the service of the democratic committees of resistance], nr 7, Leaflet Archive, Anti-dictatorship Organisations, Contemporary Social History Archives, Athens (ASKI).
259 For a full documentation of this issue see, as seen from the point of view of the so-called 'revisionists', see Panos Dimitriou (ed.), Η διάσπαση του ΚΚΕ. Μέσα από τα κείμενα της περιόδου 1950-1975 [The split within the KKE. See from within the documents of the period 1950-1975], vols 1 & 2, Athens 1975.
the disoriented Communists felt after a while compelled to choose between the two lines. Athanasiou recalls that ‘this was a shocking moment for us’. Vervenioti reveals that she took a clear cut position from the very beginning, opting for the ‘orthodox’ part, mostly because she felt that she had to take a stance:

It had an impact on me. We didn’t know many things over here. [...] When I heard it at that time we were in the house of friends and we heard it and we talked about it, many Left-wingers together. I was of the opinion that it shouldn’t ... Without wanting it, I don’t know why, those years had an effect on me so that I said, without knowing anything about the so-called Interior and Exterior etc, that I was for the Exterior without being, without anything... It was just that at this point of the discussion I took this position. (Vervenioti)

‘68 as a point of reference

The social agitation in Greece, including the students’ and workers’ movement, up to 1967, had been synchronic with the 1960s protests in industrialized countries, including the USA (1964 Free Speech), BDR, France (1964 university criticism, 1966 Strasbourg), with fewer, but constant, references to the Vietnam War. However, the fact that Western countries were starting to experience a crisis of parliamentarism, at the same time that Greece’s ‘limb’ had already been placed in a ‘plaster cast’, as the dictators’ favoured medical metaphor was.²⁶⁰ This was a factor that aggravated their disparities. In the same period that ‘the world was burning’, with the great uprisings in Western Europe, the Prague Spring and the US anti-war movement at their height, Greek trade-unionism on all levels was forcefully silenced by the violent presence of the Greek Junta which was reintroducing basic conservative values, such as ‘patria, religion, family’.

Still, the news on what was happening abroad arrived in Greece too, sometimes in an over-exaggerated and sometimes in an underplayed manner. There was often an attempt to threaten the public with unsettling images coming from abroad and when an editorialist smuggled a comment or two on the incidents. In general, there was much reporting of the events and an often distorted image created by frequent references to them, as the regime chose to demonstrate in this way the peace and quiet reigning in Greece. Another pole of antithesis to the existing cultural order was counterculture. At

²⁶⁰ Dictator George Papadopoulos adored medical metaphors. The major one was that Greece was sick and that the Revolution’s task was to cure it, by getting rid of the sources of infection. In his speeches Papadopoulos used a tortured Greek, full of ‘scientific’ paradigms of the sort, stringent in tone and often incomprehensible to many of his listeners.
the same time that the ‘summer of love’ and the Monterey Pop Festival were marking
the apogee of the international hippy scene, the directives of the Colonels’ Ministry of
the Interior instructed that ‘Beatles and beatniks, the products of ‘teddy-boyism’, have
no place in Greece’.261 According to the notorious Secretary General of the Ministry of
Public Order Ioannis Ladas, these tendencies were just ‘pretend[ing] to have a social
content’:

The unwashed long-haired hippies gave a refuge to the useless and the lazy. Especially on this
issue, because I have dealt with it in practical terms, allow me to tell you that when I used to arrest
them and shaved their heads, I didn’t do it in order just to cut their hair, but in order to stop this
mentality which was destructive for themselves and for the Motherland. […] Look at the rotten
foreign youth, which sank in the mud of drugs, of pansexualism, decadence and degeneration,
wander around in the streets of the big cities without dreams, without ideals, without hopes,
without a future.262

In spring 1968 the Principal of the University of Salónica, in his address to the
ensemble of the students, juxtaposed the international student unrest with the
tranquillity reigning in Greek institutions:

The European youth is suffering, nowadays, from a moral and mental disease, which has grown so
much, as to tear down values, traditions and habits. (...) Fortunately, these signs have not come to
our country. Our youth is healthy (...) Of course there are some students who are miserably trying
to imitate foreign models, disregarding the breadth of splendid ideals of the Hellenic civilisation.
Even so, they are not outrageous ‘yé-yés’, like those abroad who talk nonsense and keep shouting,
who put metal sticks in their boots, razorblades in their clothes, take drugs and carry out robberies.

And he added

you must have been informed by the newspapers about the wave of violence and the turbulence
that took place recently in several European Universities, including the burning of institutional
buildings and other anti-academic activities which were committed by your colleagues abroad.
Those students have been ‘used’ by others, in whose interest it is to create unrest. (…) You, on the

contrary, should be grateful because thanks to the national government and the prevailing order you can focus on your studies without being distracted by anything. 263

As is often the case, this grotesque use of the foreign patterns of youthful delinquency and the almost obsessive use of '68 as a negative point of reference often backfired, as the message that was coming along was that there was something happening abroad that was worth mentioning and that was contrary to the value system established by the Junta itself. In one interesting example the paper *Ta Nea*, of centrist leanings but highly distorted by its contact with censorship, made an extensive report in which it compared pictures taken from the French May and the ones from the events of July '65 in Greece. The report argued for an extraordinary similar anarchist attack that ravaged the cities and put the existing social order in grave danger. According to the commentary

The events repeat themselves. The goals are the same. The means are identical. It is difficult to discern which photos depict the deeds of the Greek communists and which ones those of the French. It is, however, easy to establish that Greece, on the one hand, was definitively freed after the 21st of April from the same danger that has reigned today in France. These parallel pictures demonstrate two parallel mortal dangers. One of them has been avoided. We wish that the other one be prevented too. France deserves to be saved as a nation and as a people as well. These pictures are dedicated to all those French political and journalist circles, which until few days ago dared to spell doubts on the beneficial intervention for Greece by the Revolution of the 21st of April, and were smearing the Revolution of the 21st of April, as it allegedly restricted the liberties of non-free and anarchical organs of international communism. Greece is not happy for the dramatic trial that France is going through. On the contrary, it wishes wholeheartedly that the great and amicable nation find the restitution of order and quiet. 264

The abundance of information that one can find in some liberal journals of the time such as *To Vima* and *Thessaloniki* was also coupled with that of the foreign press which circulated without restrictions in the urban centres and were therefore available to those who had a command of foreign languages. Therefore, when Agis Tsaras, an

---

263 Ο χαιρετισμός του Πρωτάνακα κου Γκανάτς προς τους φοιτητές του Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης: [The greeting of the Rector, Mr Ganiatsas, to the students of the University of Salónica], *Makedonia*, 15/5/68.
264 Παράξενοι έναγμα—παράξενης εικόνες [Parallel lives, parallel pictures], *Ta Nea*, 29/5/68. There follow pictures from the 'July events' with fires, ravaged street signs, barricades, buses with broken windows. At the same time, the French May events are presented from the streets as an ensemble of overthrown cars and ruined pavements. By this time the paper's journalists came to know Daniel Cohn Bendit's full name, as in the first days they used to ironically misspell his name as Daniel Bad.
Engineering student and a Maoist argues that nothing was written in the papers he rather reproduces a common topos about this issue:

We learned about May from listening to people who had been there, from the radio or... Nothing was ever published by the newspapers. I'm telling you, try to think about this, the poverty of information.

The fact that Tsaras’s mistake concerning this matter is a recurrent one in most testimonies, has to do, as Portelli notes, with the meaning it derived from the actors’ state of mind at the time, ‘from its relation to subsequent historical developments and from the activity of memory and imagination.’265 The meaning conveyed is that media manipulation was total and that, as would be natural, news on an insurrection abroad would be silenced. Still, Panos Theodoridis describes a different picture, by adopting a causal sequence involving the messages of '68 and a change in every-day life. It is, however, an interesting account in terms of aesthetic changes by someone who was caught in the transition:

What had happened to us towards late '67, early '68, was a transformation. In the meantime all the messages from the people of Czechoslovakia were coming to us, from the riots, the Prague Spring, all the stories about what was going on in Germany with Rudie Dutschke, what was going on with May '68 in France, and certainly by watching pictures, because, I remind you, there was no television, there were only some magazines from where we gathered some information. Oh, and some letters from friends who were already abroad. And at this point we started to throw away our jackets, to throw away our suits, we started avoiding the clubs [...] and we reached the point that we put on a greatcoat, hobnailed boots, we remembered that we had to have shower once a month [...] and to start growing our hair as long as it gets.266

In a way, however, the '68 rebellions called many of the Greek students' primary objectives into question: for them consumerism, material goods, the myth of the affluent lifestyle and the guarantee of a technocratic professional career were more desired than contested. As a militant Greek Trotskyite student of this generation points out,

266 P. Theodoridis, Macedonian..., op.cit., p. 240.
Mitafidis, the president of the Humanities student committee in Salonica in 1966 and currently a teacher and trade-unionist, makes a double reference: apart from John Galbraith's bestseller of the time, *The Affluent Society*, he refers to a key phrase taken from Jean Luc Godard's film ‘Masculin Feminin’ (1966). The original phrase, which appeared as an intertitle in the movie went: ‘This film could have been called ‘The Children of Marx and Coca Cola’. This maxim is a recurrent theme in people’s self-representation, in a sort of negative identification. For instance the novelist Aris Marangopoulos:

> This phrase corresponded to the French May but to us over here it seemed out of place, unfamiliar, even insulting. [...] Even if some of us were Marx’s children, we definitely did not understand the allusion about this ‘unholy’ marriage with the American brand.

Contrary to that, Antonis Liakos maintains that his generation ‘eagerly identified [itself] as the ‘Children of Marx and Coca Cola’’. In all cases, even though it is true that in Greece there was no real love affair with America and capitalist culture, there was an indirect flirtation with many of its by-products, such as music, clothing and cinema. In fact, most Greek students at the time had no revulsion for materialism. In point of fact, Coca-Cola as a product arrived in Greece as late as in 1969 and Theodoridis gives an interesting account of the exaltation that he and his friends felt when they first came in contact with these products in London: ‘In 1965, to photograph yourself with a Coca Cola bottle was a quite big thing [...] because these little products, Coca Cola, or a pair of white fabric shoes meant for us something more than a cult item, they were for us part of a uniform, which we ‘digged’ very much’.

Also, Tasos Darveris, a student militant who was arrested for underground activities and

---

267 The film recorded the uneasiness of a new generation in France, against the background of the recently completed Algerian War and the ongoing one in Vietnam. US exported pop culture, consumerism, violence and political apathy versus revolutionary politics are some of the topics that are tackled. Two different, but complementary, youth worlds are portrayed through the encounter of a woman and a man, the consumerist and the idealist respectively. After May ’68 the film was often quoted as prophetic.


269 Tasos Darveris, *A Night’s...*, op.cit., p. 22.

imprisoned in the early years of the Junta, makes in his writings an interesting, albeit ironic, association between freedom and consumerism. In his description about a transfer from one jail to the other he reports as the most striking features a woman and a Coca-Cola advertisement:

A young woman was coming down a moody earth-road [...] the most beautiful image of their life! And on the pound the advertisement of Coca Cola, ‘Coca Cola: Lust for life, LUST FOR LIFE!’

However, the sort of pop politics that appeared in Western Europe did not make their way through to Greece, not least because of the political situation. Accordingly, the students of this generation did not have the chance to accumulate the paradigm offered by international events, such as the protest movements and their countercultural features.

Of course the movements of the '60s and so on, Che Guevara etc, we missed them all, this is very important. [...] We grew up in such conditions that we were deprived of all this. (Mitafidis)

In a similar tone the music critic Giorgos Notaras notes that ‘from '67 to '69 there was hullabaloo out there. With Woodstock, May '68, long hair, peace movements, we missed these things’. Although, these statements do not seem to convey the complete picture, at least concerning rock music and, to a lesser extent, new modes of behaviour, they express a genuine regret for missing the evolution of their counterparts abroad. This is something which is also to be found in the following generation which grew up under the Junta, albeit to a much lesser extent as alongside mimicking foreign models it also produced its own cultural icons and aesthetics.

In contrast to them, the previous generation of students were the ones to experience the toughest years of the Junta (1967-1971), in terms of austerity and restrictions, with martial law and preventive censorship in full operation. A large number of them, already ‘filed’ by the police as politicized, were tried on the basis of the Anti-Espionage Law 509 of 1947 and imprisoned immediately upon the coup. Therefore, those belonging to this generational unit tend to represent the Junta’s

272 Giorgos Notaras, ‘Τους Έλληνες δεν τους ένδιαφέρει η αυθητική, τους ενδιαφέρει η ζωή’ [Greeks did not care about self-criticism, they cared about life], pp. 127-146 in Rena Aggouridou, Είκοσι Πρόσωπα Ζητούν την Ελλάδα. Απόσπασμα μιας ελληνικής αυτοβιογραφίας [Twenty Persons Seek for Greece. An Attempt to a Greek Autobiography], Athens 1999, p. 136 [my emphasis]
subjective chronology as the linear protraction of the Civil War and its obscurantism. Overall, student organizations mirrored the disarray of the political parties themselves. According to Papatheodorou, the dictatorship burdened this generation with the calling off of its revolutionary youth. Its imposition clearly marked a massive traumatic moment, which acted as a ‘generational’ or ‘unifying event’. Those who were already students when the coup took place or entered university in the first few years were inevitably conditioned by the past, as most of them had already participated in the events of the early 1960s, and thus were marked by continuity in discourse and action. In fact, it could be said that it was hard for those students to adapt to the new situation created by the Junta and switch to popular and successful forms of struggle, as they had already exhausted their creativity in previous years. The Lambrakides were dispersed and did not manage to leave any considerable organizational legacies, despite their excellent networks.

However, a good number of students went abroad immediately after the coup took place. As a result, in connection with the ones who were already residing outside the country, a significant part of the anti-dictatorial movement built its headquarters overseas. This included some of the most radical organizations, and it was often from there that activities in Greece were coordinated. In fact, the Hellenic Student Societies in France, Italy or Germany considered themselves as an integral part of the Greek student movement. Most of these students were both inspired and perplexed by the contact with the '68 revolts.

Importing Revolution

Greek students in Paris

The place *par excellence* for revolutionary initiatives was Paris, the so-called ‘Mecca of the Revolution’. Tasos Darveris’s description in his roman de clef *A Night’s Story* reflects the Marx and Coca Cola generation as he describes the city as an ‘ideological supermarket’. Accordingly, one could ‘buy’

---

274 This description echoes Karl Marx’s own labelling of Paris as the ‘Babel of Revolution’. See Triantafyllos Mitafidis, ‘Ενα άγνωστο ντοκουμέντο από τον αντιδικτατορικό αγώνα’ [An unknown document from the antidictatorship struggle], in Nikos Theodosiou (ed.), *Μάης του '68. Οι προκηρύξεις* [May ’68. The leaflets], in *Makedonia*, special section *Epiloge*, May 1998.
theories for all tastes and measures, solutions for all problems of the revolutionary movement, people who are ready to pick out of their pockets this or that type of revolution, wrapped up in the ideological paper of your choice.

Darveris’s account further presents Paris as the major place for the formation of radical intellectual elites, who embraced radicalism as a political *habitus* alongside their higher studies.

Student Cafés, where one thinks that Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Che are walking around, next to Toumamaros, Vietcong and Palestinian commandos. If someone were to judge just from the Latin Quarter, one would conclude that all those haunted, hungry and barefoot revolutionaries had at least one doctorate from the Sorbonne.²⁷⁵

Paris had long been established as a common target for Greek students wanting to pursue postgraduate studies. In late 1945, on the eve of the outbreak of the Civil War, thanks to a series of scholarships provided by the French Ministry of Education in connection with the *Institut Français* of Athens, a ship called *Mataroa* brought some of the most promising young intellectuals and artists out of Greece, and set sail for Paris. This arrival signalled the creation of a predominantly left-wing Greek émigré intellectual elite.²⁷⁶ The *Association des Etudiants Hellènes à Paris* (EPES), which had coordinated various political and cultural initiatives ever since the 1930s, had as its headquarters the Greek Pavilion of the *Cité Universitaire*. Soon, inner political...
divisions, predominantly between Trotskyites and Stalinists, had split this small Greek Parisian community. Greek émigrés, however, for a moment rediscovered a sense of unity because of the coup itself. One of the vehicles for coordinating common activities within the Greek community was the aforementioned student union, which quickly took a series of initiatives, including the raising of funds, the publishing of a journal (Poreia) and the organization of ventures, such as open discussions, film screenings and street marches to the Embassy.

The year of 1968 was to be crucial for the shaping of diverse militant identities among Greek students. A major factor for this was the dramatic rift inside the Greek Communist Party during the winter, with the creation of two factions, one expressing a neo-Stalinist and one a mildly Euro-communist tendency.277 As could be expected, when the événements of the French May started invading the scene, the orthodox Communists, just like the PCF, regarded them as the result of the irresponsibility of 'politically inexperienced student masses', which in any case, could not be the avant-garde of a popular uprising.278 For them May’s discourses and actions constituted a deviation from the official revolutionary process and were therefore regarded as sheer opportunism.

In general, the students’ stance was not a clear cut one. Not only were there very few who took part in the events, but for a large part of them the libertarian attitude of protests seemed an incomprehensible luxury at the time that in Greece things were serious. As Greek students abroad regarded themselves by and large as crusaders in the mission of liberating Greece, they often tended to be rejecting of 68’s libertarianism and lack of direction. As the President of EPES, Nikos Chatzinikolaou, remembers ‘we felt somewhat awkwardly inside this party’.279 The word that he uses, πανηγύρι, is a

277 After the 12th Plenary Session of the Communist Party in Budapest, the moderates who expressed criticism of the official line were expelled from the Central Committee and they, in turn, created the so-called ‘Interior’ faction, which had closer ties and connections to the actual situation in Greece. This break took place at a time when a unity of all ‘democratic’ forces was needed more than anything else.

278 In an article published at KKE’s journal Neos Kosmos [New World], leading Communist cadre Farakos accuses the students of being inexperienced, opportunist and often overtly anti-Communist. He also rejects the rival faction of KKE Interior which by and large endorsed the ’68 uprisings through the journal Ενοτίτα which decalred Sorbonne to be a ‘new Smolny’. Farakos equally criticises Marcuse, who he mistakenly calls Marcise, for his theories which are characterised by a mixture of opportunism and leftist terminology and undermine the ‘revolutionary capacities of the working classes’. He concludes that Marcuse’s attempt to ‘reconcile’ Marx with Freud is an unscientific venture which aims at incorporating revolutionary theories within bourgeois ideology. Grigoris Farakos, ‘Διεθνή Πλατφόρμα της ιδεολογικής πολιτικής πάλης του κόμματος μας. Μερικές Πληροφορίες’ [The International Context of the ideological struggle of our party. Some Aspects], in Neos Kosmos, 10, October 1968, pp. 15-31.

279 ‘Ομολογούμενος αιτιολόγησαν λόγο παράξενο σ’ αυτό το πανηγύρι: Nikos Chatzinikolaou quoted by Ino Afentouli, Μάης ’68. 20 χρόνια μετά [May ’68. 20 years later], Athens, 1988, p. 197.
frequent theme in students’ recollections when talking about this period. Kostas Vergopoulos remembers that most Greek students were rather hesitant to join the movement, as they grew suspicious of what was happening:

For the ones who expressed the party lines, from KKE to KKE Int. up to the Maoists and the Marxists-Leninists, the May movement was a provocation: it was Jewish-American meddling which mobilised the rich kids in order to get rid of General De Gaulle. At a certain point a comrade from KKE stood up and said: ‘Colleagues, we say yes to the red banner, but at the right moment and in the right place’.

Another common statement is that the reason for having a superficial, if any, relation to the ongoing French movement, was that Greek students were concentrated on what was going on in Greece. In the end, even a partial participation in it was interpreted as a way of contributing to the ‘cause’ at home, through the circulation of placards, leaflets and journals in a sort of campaign to promote the case of resistance.

We were considering the events of May from our own point of view. We were wondering in what ways all these things that were happening could contribute to our cause in Greece. This was the only thing that mattered to us.

Still, May ’68 was to become a catalyst for Greek students of that period in Paris. According to the film-director Koundouros:

We were carrying with us the shame for our defeat without resisting; we were envious of the French who were carrying out their revolution against an autocratic but lawful and democratic government. So, we stood there, on the pavements of Paris, witnesses of foreign affairs and we were staring with a lump in our throat at the way in which the enraged French were going down the streets like human waves, floating from everywhere like a rough river, seizing the pavements, the squares, the universities, the schools, the factories.

The May events acted as an excuse for triggering what was to become their most visible act of protest: on 22 May, one hundred and twenty Greek students, alongside thirty

---

280 Interview with *Dafni, Athens, 20/7/2001.
Spaniards, occupied the Greek Pavilion inside the *Cité Universitaire*, clearly capitalizing on the subversive climate of those days and in many ways mimicking the French forms of protest, which were based on a series of occupations. According to a Greek student of the time ‘we were jealous of the French. We felt ashamed of our country and our lack of resistance’. In this way, the *maison hellénique* was declared as ‘the first square meters of liberated Greek soil’.\(^\text{284}\) Greek students regarded this act both as a resistance against the Colonels but also as their way of participating in the May events. According to the manifesto issued by the *comité d’action* which took responsibility for the occupation:

\[
\text{L’occupation est autant un acte de résistance au fascisme grec qu’un acte de participation au mouvement populaire français.}\(^\text{285}\)
\]

In fact, a banner outside the gate of the Pavilion announced that ‘here the imagination has taken over power’ (Karkagianni). They also stressed the interconnection between different parts of the world and the unity in oppression and revolt. According to their communiqué:

\[
\text{The struggle of French youth is at the same time the struggle of all people. If the establishment of fascism in Greece is a threat for Europe, the battles in the streets of Paris are hope for the whole world. […] We will try to use the experience of this struggle, its problematisation, its enthusiasm, its inspirations, for our popular resistance against the Junta.}\(^\text{286}\)
\]

Apart from some situationist acts, however, like the imposition on the Director of the House to circulate in the building in his pyjamas, some remember that this occasion soon degenerated into quarrels among the various political sections and endless discussions:

\[
\text{Only some miles away from the Sorbonne and the uprising of the French students, the street-battles which continued in the central boulevards seemed too far away. The whole climate at the Greek Pavilion was one of theory and introversion. I had the feeling that my compatriots, with all}
\]

\(^{284}\) Interestingly, the censored Greek press reported that ‘this action by the Greek students confirms their full alignment with the international anarchist movement, which at this moment is disturbing the whole of Europe’ [‘Καὶ Ἑλληνες ἀναρχικοί!’ (Greek anarchists too!) in *To Vima*, 23/5/68.\(^{285}\) *EPÉS*, Occupation of the Hellenic Residence of the Cité of Paris, 22/5/68. Contemporary Social History Archives (ASKI).\(^{286}\) *Ibid.* My translation.
the personal micro-political lines which they were eager to impose, promote and defend, were consuming themselves in things which were far away from real action.\(^{287}\)

This, however, was not always the case. May '68 and the occupation of the Greek Pavilion acted as a springboard for the creation of several Paris-based clandestine organizations with the aim of pursuing 'dynamic resistance' in Greece. Greek students showed signs of increasing radicalism, partly due to their physical distance from the events in Greece but mainly because of constant mobilization and their contact with international militantism. A whole new sect of 'ultras' was bred in this period, including the reinforcement of the Trotskyites and the spectacular rise of Maoists. The latter were about to be designated from now on with the more or less derogatory term 'leftists' - a direct translation of *gauchistes* - and to be treated as a separate category.

The anti-authoritarian messages of the time were among the inspirations for the creation of two Paris-based organizations, which did not, however, come into contact with any *tiersmondiste* or other organization in France. These were the 20 of October Movement, as well as the 29 of May Movement (*K29M*, later switched to *LEA*). Like Cohn Bendit's 22 of March Movement, Greek organizations took their names from the day on which they were formed, following the model of Fidel Castro's 26th of July Movement. Next to that, *K29M* was also a powerful reference to the 'national' past (the day of the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans), which reflected this organization's mingling of left-wing symbolism with romantic nationalism, typical among Greeks at the time. What is more, in the epic-heroic code, as it was conceived by these militants, to conceive a date as the starting point of the whole enterprise signalled the beginning of a long process, destined to bring revolution or at least a radical change.

The 20th of October, whose main cadres used to be followers of the Centre Union Party before becoming radicalised, made some extraordinary bomb attacks, one of which destroyed US President Truman's statue in November 1970. The grouping also distributed the clandestine journal *Synergasia* (Cooperation), hinting at the need for closer co-operation between anti-dictatorial forces. Members of the organization were arrested in the autumn of 1971. As an American report of the time sarcastically pointed out, '[their arrests] fittingly perhaps, took place on October 20'.\(^{288}\) The 29 of May

\(^{287}\) Teos Romvos, 'Η Φωνή της Αλήθειας' [The Voice of Truth], in Nikos Theodosiou (ed.), Μάης του '68. Οι προκηρύξεις [May '68. The leaflets], in *Makedonia*, special section *Epiloges*, May 1998.

\(^{288}\) USNA, DS, POL 21, 5765 Confidential, American Embassy Athens to Secretary of State, 22 October 1971.
of Maoists in Berlin - the ‘Berliners’. It followed a stricter path of revolutionary politics, with its cadres being trained for city and mountain guerrilla warfare in Cuba. Inner divisions led to a separation of its German component in 1969, which later became the Revolutionary Communist Party of Greece (EKKE), and to the organization’s transformation into a different entity called Popular Revolutionary Resistance (LEA). The latter, committed one of the most contested acts of resistance in Greece’s recent public history: the placing of a bomb inside the US Embassy in 1972.

Those organizations, formed solely on the basis of pursuing dynamic forms of action, were mainly inspired by Che Guevara’s foco theory and the Toupamaros’ actions and, later on and to a lesser extent, by the anti-authoritarian messages of the French May. Both organizations managed to gain the moral and financial support of prominent European intellectuals, such as Jean-Paul Sartre, and ‘professional revolutionaries’, such as Pablo. An important feature that distinguished these groups originating abroad from the ones based in Greece was the fact that their rhetoric was becoming increasingly radical, hinting not only at the downfall of the dictatorship but also professing social change. According to a K29M member, Victor Anagnostopoulos, the constant discussion among the organizations’ militants was concentrated on issues which were not of that time, such as how one imagined socialism, what peoples’ power would be like. Everything should be ready from the outset, as if we were the ones who would make the revolution.

The 20th of October talked about an ‘anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist, anti-bureaucratic socialist democracy of workers’, while the 29th of May and later on LEA foresaw that the ‘tough and long armed struggle of our people’ was the only way to obtain ‘real national independence’ and ‘popular sovereignty’. In short, the dictatorship provided the context and the opportunity for a revolutionary uprising, which would be brought about by constant militant action that, in turn, would gradually enlighten and guide the

---

292 Extract taken from the speeches of members of the organization in court, published in a leaflet in 7 October 1972.
293 Common leaflet of LEA and Makriyiannis, a small clandestine organization, which was united with it in October 1971.
people. For this purpose, the organizations were ‘determined to use the experience of the revolutionary struggles of other people, taking into account the special conditions of Greece’.  

The Castroist notion of ‘action prior to consciousness’ was a sort of guiding principle for these organizations.

**The Greek ‘Carbonari’**

The Greek student community was formed in Italy from the late 1950s onwards and rose spectacularly during the Junta years. To the students who traditionally considered Italy as a favourite study destination, were added those who were guided by a ‘repulsive cause’ and were searching for better conditions of life and more liberty. Most Greeks idolized Italy as a paradise of individual freedom, including political expression, but also limitless consumption. These elements are striking in the following phrase of a Greek student taken from an anonymous interview, collected and presented in a collection of testimonies in the early 1980s:

My brother, who was in Italy, comes and tells me. There was still the dictatorship: ‘In Italy life is beautiful, comfortable. You can have what you want, a car, entertainment, and on top of that you are free, something that in Greece you can forget about.’

Dionysis Mavrogenis, a later day Maoist leader of the Greek student movement spent some time as a Pharmacy student in Bologna in 1971, and experienced the Italian national celebration of 25 April, which contrasted with the black anniversary of the
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294 See K29M’s organ *To Κίνημα. Για τη λαϊκή εξουσία στην Ελλάδα* [The Movement. For people’s power in Greece], Paris, 4–5 June ’68, p. 56.
295 This phrase was reproduced by Alberto Moravia (12/10/1968) and criticized by Pasolini in the Italian context, see Pasolini, op. cit., p. 213.
297 For the tendency to migrate to Italy for studies see Konstantinos Kornetis, ‘Una diaspora adriatica. La migrazione degli studenti universitari greci in Italia’, in Gerardo Minardi, Emilio Cocco (eds), *Immaginare l’Adriatico*, Milan, in process. Nikos Kleitsikas’s [The Greek Student Movement and the Anti-dictatorial Struggle in Italy], Athens 2000, provides a detailed account of Greek student actions in Italy during this period. See also Kostas Papoutsis, *To μεγάλο ‘Ναι* [The Great ‘Yes’], Athens, 1996, and the collection of interviews *O Ματρικόλας* [The Fresher], Athens 1992, which is very useful but which does not specify the gender and other characteristics of the anonymous interviewees. For a more personal viewpoint see Giorgos Vavizos, *Έτσι δενόταν ... η καρπονάρα. Μαρτυρίες ενός αριστεριστή για την αντιχουντική δράση των Ελλήνων φοιτητών στη Νότια Ιταλία* [This is How the ... Carbonara was Made. Testimonies on the Anti-Junta Action of Greek Students in Southern Italy], Athens, 2002.
Greek 21 April. He recalls that this was the first time in his life that he saw ‘a red flag waving’. The ecstatic feeling of watching for the first time Communist or anti-authority symbols being overtly and proudly exposed en masse is manifest in most testimonies of students who happened to travel or study for a limited period in Italy. Vera Damofli recalls how Italy evoked for her memories of pre-dictatorship Greece and the continuous political struggles:

I remember I went to Venice, I was still a student, and I saw slogans written on the walls, you know, I had missed that so much. To watch slogans written on the walls, it was so nice...

Xydi emphasises the freedom of expression to such an extent that she focuses her recollection on the commercialisation of the symbols of transgression:

I went to Padova for a year [...] I came back with the symbol of anarchy. There they were selling them in the supermarkets. (Angeliki Xydi)

Parallel to this, various committees were formed, organising demonstrations and exhibitions and denouncing the use of torture in Greek prisons. Journals such as ‘Grecia Libera’ contributed to a campaign of information dissemination on the violation of human rights in Greece. Efforts were made in the direction of consciousness raising; a telling example is a leaflet that circulated at the time reading ‘What did you do against the dictatorship in Greece?’

In 1971, at the Piazza Matteotti in Genova the young student Kostas Georgakis set himself ablaze in protest against the Colonels, copying the Czech Jan Palach who had done the same three years earlier, after the Soviet troops entered Prague. Alkis Rigos, a Panteion student, recalls how he suffered when Georgakis died, being both inspired by his action, appalled by his own indecisiveness and thrilled by the general excitement of those times:

I had written poems for Georgakis, for Palac, I stayed awake overnight. It was partly out of jealousy, that I didn’t do it, that I didn’t get as far, these are vivid things, they are a ... You live in

---

For a detailed reconstruction of this dramatic action see K. G. Papoutsis, 1996, cit. A very interesting comment upon the suicide of Palach was written by Pasolini, who among other things pointed out that this frantically idealistic sacrifice employed ‘a religious technique’. See ‘Praga: una atroce libertá’, in P.P.Pasolini, cit., p. 104.
The protest movement against the Colonels’ regime was boosted by a series of intellectual circles and their public interventions. Exponents of the world of the arts, such as Bernardo Bertolucci, supported publicly the groups which were involved in the armed struggle against the Junta. On the occasion of an event organized in favour of the 20th October, for example, a number of first rank Italian intellectuals participated with great enthusiasm, boosting but also legitimizing its cause and practices. In late 1968, Pier Paolo Pasolini wondered in his column of the journal Tempo and on the eve of the imminent execution of Panagoulis whether Italian students, ‘who by shouting are spreading the panic’, would demonstrate in favour of Panagoulis as well. ‘Their mysterious shouting [...] does it include a protest for this assassination?’, wrote Pasolini. Andreas Papandreou’s PAK enjoyed financial support by the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) and Italian politicians of the calibre of Pietro Nenni and Sandro Pertini supported that organization with articles in Italian newspapers.

Theories on the armed struggle found fertile ground among Greek students, who were becoming increasingly radicalised due to their extensive contact with the Italian New Left. It is an interesting fact that many Italians participated in the various attempts to transfer arms to Greece. The commonest practice was the arms transfer through ‘cruises’ in the Aegean. In another famous case, in November 1968, an airplane was redirected to France by Umberto Giovine, a young Italian journalist and a member of the ‘International Commandos for Greece’, asking for democratic concessions in Greece. Adrianio Sofi, the then leader of the extra-parliamentary group ‘Lotta Continua’, claims that this experience was for many Italians the immediate precedent to the armed struggle in Italy in the following years:

---

300 Giagkos Andreadis, H αντίσταση της μνήμης [The Resistance by the Memory], Athens 2004.
301 ‘Diario per un condannato a morte’, 7/12/1968, reprinted in Pier Paolo Pasolini, Il caos, Gian Carlo Ferretti (ed.), Rome 1999, p. 77. It is noteworthy that some years later Pasolini wrote the forward to the Italian edition of poems that Panagoulis had written in prison.
303 Vassilis Filias, Ta αφέχαστα και τα λημονημέα [The unforgettable and the forgotten ones], Athens 1997.
This common militancy makes you better understand the drama of our comrades who were involved in the so-called Italian terrorism (some are dead), after having played an important role in the movement of a concrete solidarity to the Greek resistance. I remember, in particular, one lady, Maria Elena Angeloni, who was distributing arms and explosives and ended up exploding in front of the American Embassy in Athens. In the backyard of our house we thought that these dear friends were not just justified, but in fact emboldened by the fact that they took up arms against a fascist regime, which was violent and a product of a coup d' état.\textsuperscript{305}

In this context, the Greek students who were committed to the resistance against the dictatorship were seen as blessed with the heroic aura of the political exiles, a fact that also influenced their self-representation. On an institutional level, the Italian state endowed them with a series of benefits and privileges, including the extension of university scholarships offered by the Ministry of Public Instruction. Often, the Greeks in Italy could count on the tolerance of the police, in addition to the solidarity of university teachers,\textsuperscript{306} a fact that also applies to the militants residing in France.\textsuperscript{307}

At this point cross-national diffusion of protest material was made through personal contacts. A common trend of the time was the import of ‘subversive’ music from abroad, mainly via students who studied in Italy and France. The ones who managed to dwell without major problems\textsuperscript{308} brought with them banned music, above all Theodorakis records, Marxist books, leaflets and sometimes explosives too. Lionarakis recalls with admiration Paki Kyriopoulou, a woman student organized in Italy:

\textsuperscript{306} See A. Cammelli, op.cit., p. 37. The university teachers often conceded Greeks the so-called ‘political vote’ in order to pass an exam. See K. Papoutsis, 1992, op. cit., p. 46. In order to understand this wave of sympathy one has to bear in mind the fact that a right-wing coup was thought to be imminent in Italy as well. As also happened later on with Chile, the Italian Left saw these cases as precedents in a type of domino-effect regarding authoritarianism that could affect their own country too.
\textsuperscript{307} The pro-Junta Greek students in Italy were organised in the \textit{National Society of Hellenic Students of Italy} (ESESI), which was collaborating with the Italian neo-Fascist organization \textit{Ordine Nuovo}. Between 1967 and 1974 episodes of political violence and clashes between left-wing and right-wing Greek students in Italian campuses were a frequent phenomenon. They often involved Italian activists and at times had a tragic outcome, like on one occasion when in the university of Pisa Cesare Pardini, a young Italian student lost his life. The two national experiences were synthesised in the fascist cry ‘Yesterday Greece, Today Italy’, used by Italian neo-fascists who aspired to Italy’s also adopting a dictatorial turn. Interestingly, Italian paramilitary elements were working closely with the Greek Junta for this scope. See Nikos Kleitsikas, \textit{The Greek Student Movement...}, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{308} Being involved in anti-regime protest activities was not without dangers. Many Greek students were spotted by informers and reported to the Consulates, Embassies and the representatives of the Orthodox Church. The typical retaliatory move was the blocking of money transfers from the Bank of Greece. In other cases, the deferral of the military service of male Greek students was cancelled.
Paki was one of the most heroic figures, in Rigas in Italy, she was going in and out of the country, very brave woman, very much so, with leaflets, with duplicators, with machines, some little bombs at a certain point...

What people brought along with them were also the ideas and the spirit of the Italian '68. Maria Mavragani remembers vividly an Italian anti-fascist song and points out the almost metaphysical capacity of Greek students to sense the content of the album without understanding the words.

We were singing Italian songs, from the Bella Ciao cycle, I remember the vinyl, I miss it now, they brought me from Italy those songs from Bella Ciao in vinyl, yes of course, we were singing lots of things. The cops could not understand what we were singing. For example the famous one [...] (she sings) 'Bandiera nera la vogliamo? NO!', altogether. Without knowing Italian ... but we knew what we were saying. (Mavragani)

There was a specific image of what being abroad meant and those students were looked upon as a window on the world. Damofli remembers regarding them as carrying along the aura of '68:

They were bringing with them a sort of fresh air. They were coming back to Greece in the summers and they were describing their experiences to us, you know, after '68, and we were jealous. (Damofli)

As one would expect, for those in Greece, '68 came to symbolise the all-desired insurrection, while at the same time their counterparts abroad acquired in their eyes a legendary status. This view came into contrast with many Greek émigrés who regarded many features of the '68 movements as something bizarre and grotesque and definitively less militant and devoted to a serious cause than they longed for. Later on, the seriousness of the Greek 'revolutionaries' in France and Italy made them suspicious of any sort of mass form of protest, as they envisaged instead the armed struggle, a fact that epitomizes this awkward 'in' and 'out' relationship. In his autobiographical book on émigré students in Italy, Giorgos Vavizos notes with evident self-irony concerning the prevailing over-revolutionism and the fact that the majority was in favour of the use of radical tactics in Greece:
We all thought that the creation of a guerrilla war in Greece was necessary, in order to overthrow the Junta. Our major concern was whether the armed struggle should start from the mountains, so that the guerrilla army would later on occupy the cities, or whether the cities should rise up first, so that from there the guerrilla warfare would be spread to the mountains.\(^{309}\)

Despite the short or long-term goals of each organization, the legitimacy or not of the use of violence as a means of resistance was one of the main points of friction among them. The traditional Left-wing leadership not only opposed ‘dynamic action’ but also tended to stigmatise those who deployed it as ‘agents provocateurs’ of the Junta, an accusation which had been a favourite condemnation of the Left from the 1930s onwards. It is no coincidence that when Alexandros Panagoulis attempted to assassinate dictator Papadopoulos in summer 1968 the reaction of most left-wing leaders was one of distrust.

If he doesn’t belong to our organization, if one cannot check who he is, we don’t trust him. In addition, you should not forget, that this is the period in which still whoever signs a statement [of repentance] is a ‘traitor’. So, the Communist Party is really hard. (Zorba)

The violent groupings, on the other hand, regarded this attitude as ‘reformist’ and rejected it as a lack of revolutionary commitment.\(^{310}\)

As a result of that, a number of students who were both members of the Communist Party and of some clandestine circle were expelled from the former due to their ‘one-dimensional insistence on the armed struggle’ which was attributed to an alleged flirting with *gauchisme*.\(^{311}\) For the adherents of this line the Communist Party, contrary to its legendary past during the Resistance and the 1946 armed insurrection against the ‘oppressive bourgeois state’, had lost its revolutionary spirit and had become a ‘reformist’ entity, remaining passive and unprepared vis-à-vis the Colonels’ dictatorship. The only way to challenge the latter was through organized nuclei of city guerrillas. According to a declaration of the 29\(^{th}\) of May:

\(^{309}\) Giorgos Vavizos, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

\(^{310}\) Papachelas & Telloglou record an incident in which Chatzinikolaou, the President of *EPES*, declared in a student meeting a month after the coup took place that ‘the Junta came by force and should be ousted by force’. The reaction of Thodoros Pangalos, the Communist Students’ Union General Secretary at the time, was one of immediate condemnation, as Chatzinikolaou had overstepped the party line, in *The 17 November...*, op.cit., pp. 17-18.

\(^{311}\) *Ibid*, p. 21.
If you deal with an opponent who is basically relying on the use of force, there can be no other reply by the people fighting against it than force. The armed struggle is the basic form of our political battle.\footnote{To Kinima, p. 55.}

However, the belief in the appropriateness and the pre-determined and messianic benevolence of the use of force as a carrier of social change was not always shared by the organizations which were not programmatically against it. One of them was headed by Giorgos Karambelias, who recalls arguing with Giotopoulos, K29M's controversial leader, during the student meetings in Paris:

The argument we had with the K29M and Giotopoulos - I remember quarrelling with him - was that they were of the opinion that city guerrilla could be the main feature [of resistance]. We were saying that there were no conditions for urban guerrilla; the whole thing was just symbolic armed acts, which we supported.

Since symbolic acts of violence were directed against 'US imperialism, oppression, and the financial supports of the system',\footnote{A. Papachelas & T. Telloglou, The 17 November..., op. cit.} the most frequent targets were government buildings\footnote{Among which the buildings of the state controlled Television (EIRT), Electricity (DEI) and Railways (EIS).} banks and enterprises (Andreadis/Essu Pappas), and, quite frequently, US buildings and sites. The US and NATO were largely conceived by left-wing popular mind as the dictators' major sponsors and supporters, which fitted perfectly with the anti-imperialistic and tiermondiste discourse of the time, thus placing the Greek example alongside the Vietnamese one. In addition, although bombs were often put in streets, squares, parks, cars and state buildings, in fact even the most violent groupings were conceiving of this as a means of essentially bloodless protest rather than envisaging any actual physical losses:

The armed struggle in that period was a common topos for all of us. When we had tanks facing us and a dictatorship which was supported by a huge power, and you know it, the power of the US, it was not possible to think about anything else than the armed struggle. But this was on a symbolic level. We never put a human target, not even in our imagination, saying it's this person, that person. This dimension didn't exist. (Karkagianni)
In her plea during the recent trial of the alleged members of the terrorist organization *EO17N*, Vassia Karkagianni hinted at a symbolic and imaginary means of conceptualizing resistance in terms of a violent *levée en masse* against the tyrants, which reverberates in the violent discourse of the time and the need to deal with the perennial problem of how to translate theory into concrete action. Her image is a contradictory one: imagining, envisaging, exalting violence as the only means of resistance whereas no clear-cut targets were described.

I, myself, designed posters up to the Polytechnic uprising and after, which had this iconography on them, people with guns. Despite the fact that none of us had ever touched a piece of wood in his hands. This was on the symbolic level, that given that the dictatorship was continuing in Greece all the people should take up arms. But there were no targets, this was entirely in the imaginary and symbolic level, but this was our decision then, to fight with all means.315

**Home-grown revolutionaries**

- ‘We are soldiers in the service of the Revolution.’
- ‘We are terrorists.’
- ‘If that’s terrorism, then three cheers to terrorism!’316

Another grouping which was propagating the necessity of armed resistance as part of a wider international class struggle, this time operating in Greece, was the Trotskyite organization *Laiki Pali* (Popular Struggle) in Salonica. According to a leaflet which it circulated in spring 1968

the ‘democratic’ fronts beyond parties from above and the parliamentary pressures are unable to overthrow the dictatorships. Young workers and students move on like brothers. The only right way is the way of class struggle.317

Numbering about ten persons as its leading nucleus and not more than fifty *in toto*, this grouping saw the need to resist the Junta as fitting neatly with its ideological prerogatives. Triantafyllos Mitafidis, one of the group’s leading members, recalls:

---

317 ‘Η διεθνής εξαναπαύση γεωλογία καλεί στον αγώνα’ [International revolutionary youth calls for a struggle], leaflet issued together with the *International Workers’ Union*. 
dictatorship, of the regime, all of that. Of course we translated that to bombs, with that logic. Others did that as well even without having the same principles.

Tasos Darveris, another leading member of the organization, recreates in his novel a discussion among its members, in which they quarrel about whether violence could act as the catalyst of History’s revolutionary process. At a certain point one of the characters wonders:

In other words you want us to put our finger in History’s asshole.\textsuperscript{317}

Here, Revolution, the ‘asshole’ of History and violence’s ‘finger’ form a brilliantly ironic description of the precarious expectation of historical recourse in a Bakhtinian inversion and ridiculisation of the whole process.

The action of \textit{Laiki Pali}, which had started off with the circulation of leaflets and the unfolding of large anti-Junta banners from the top of central buildings, was indeed turned to the planting of explosives in key areas. Clandestine life is presented by its members as two-fold, since these actions were combined with a gloss of legality, including the regular attendance at classes. The organization was arrested after one and a half years of underground action and just before an ambitious organized attempt of planting a bomb in the military pavilion of Salonica’s International Fair in autumn ’69, during Papadopoulos’ speech. Its members were court-martialed and received severe sentences, including life imprisonment.\textsuperscript{318} Interestingly, in their pleas, both leading members of the organization rejected dynamic actions. Liakos declared that ‘our credo, is that the mobilizing force of History is the class struggle and we don’t believe in dynamites and terrorism’, while Mitafidis stated bluntly that as Greece was not Latin America, therefore the armed struggle had no chances of succeeding.\textsuperscript{319} The leading members of \textit{LP} demonstrate in this point a stark differentiation from the beliefs of the Paris based organizations, which, however come contrast with Darveris’s own literary depiction.

In protagonists’ recollections, the often inherent contradictions between putting people’s lives at risk and aiding the cause is recorded as a traumatic dilemma. Mitafidis

\textsuperscript{317} T. Darveris, \textit{A Night’s...}, op. cit., p. 177.
\textsuperscript{318} G. Yiannopoulos, ‘Resistance Forces...’, op. cit., p. 283.
\textsuperscript{319} ‘Η δίκη των εννεά’ [The trial of the nine], \textit{Thessaloniki}, 4/2/1970.
recalls the risks of being involved in this sort of action and stresses the major biographical rupture between past and present.\(^{320}\)

And of course the great danger was to get killed. But not only to get killed but also to get the people of the whole building block blown up with the dynamite. [...] Those were great risks, but we had different minds back then. (Mitafidis)

This is the moment in which the constant agony of whether people read the brochures or not was replaced by the euphoria of finally being active and efficient. As Giannis Papatheodorou argues, this was a breaking point in which it seemed that ‘it is the bombs and not the leaflets that break the inertia of the society under surveillance’.\(^{321}\)

At the other end of the spectrum, Klearchos Tsaousidis remained a member of Laiki Pali up to the point that the organization decided to take up arms. Looking at his past choices now he wonders about the defining factor for taking his distance from the organization, placing it somewhere in between individual consciousness and the instinct of self-preservation.

When the moment of the more aggressive tactics arrived, at that point I distanced myself, probably because of fear. That is, one has to look oneself very carefully in the mirror in order to realize whether it is because one doubts the necessity of wasting human lives or is it because one is scared. Or both?

In his retrospective analysis, Tsaousidis presents his disillusionment with the organization as mainly owing to a rejection and condemnation of violence, as he anachronistically attributes a human side to the policemen of the time:

No matter what you do, no matter how many precautions you take, with the explosives there is always the danger of making the innocent pay the price. Now that I think about it I say, isn’t the average gendarme, the one whose mind is filled with crap about the mean Communists and the enemies of the nation and religion innocent?

\(^{320}\) As contemporary circumstances provide cues for certain images of the past, my research which was conducted during the controversial period of the wiping out of the terrorist group EO 17 November, supposedly linked to the Junta period, had to also contend with this problem. Therefore, an interesting point in this chapter is that violence which was used as a medium during this period (1967-72), would come close to being labeled as ‘terrorist’ in present conditions. In some cases, there was an obvious attempt to make sure that anti-dictatorship acts should not be confused with terrorism, which made my interviewees use a present analytical category for interpreting past events.

\(^{321}\) Giannis Papatheodorou’s Intro to T. Darveris, A Night’s..., op. cit., p. 21.
The fear factor is also evoked by Mitafidis but this time it is presented as a constant source of adrenaline, a feverish aspect of clandestine identity. For him, fear reinforced the determination to continue the struggle, despite the awareness of being trapped in a no-win situation:

When an organization got hit, you felt a shivering in your neck. How can I put it now? It was a situation in which you were living under suspension. [...] We were facing great dangers. There was no way that they would take pity on us... (Mitafidis)

The ways of imagining action owed much to cinematographic images. The idea of resorting to violence was already based on re-enacting cinematic prototypes: seeing one's self from a distance as an action hero; copying, for example Lindsay Anderson's emblematic movie 'If' (1969) on the rebel British students who take up arms against the oppressive establishment and execute the whole teaching staff of their reactionary college, a film which was briefly screened in Greece, after an initial ban. In this case real life imitated cinema and not the other way round. Staikos, a K29M member, comments on the necessary training of the members of the organization by saying that 'it has remained in my mind as a very cinematographic experience'. Moreover, cinematic images and titles are evoked in self-representations in what Liakos calls 'cinema as a way of conceptualization and comparison with lived experience'. Comparison, however, often reveals a great distance from the idealized images. Mitafidis’s already mentioned assertion ‘we were not the children of Marx and Coca-Cola’ falls into this category. Even more so, at a key point in Darveris' novel, one of his imprisoned heroes comments on the failure of one of the members of Laiki Pali to escape, although he had the chance to do so, in contrast to cinematic role models. A traumatic gap emerges between fiction and reality, as the latter is viewed as a script that was not well-written:

‘This is something that would never take place in cinema’, Labros said. ‘In cinema everybody escapes.’

---

322 Antonis Liakos’s Preface to T. Darveris, A Night’s..., op. cit., p. 23.
324 T. Darveris, A Night’s..., op.cit., p. 204. Also p. 318: ‘He once again thought how different cinema was from reality’.
In other cases, there is a striking similarity between fictional narrative and lived experience, at least as it represented at present. Liakos’s own conceptualization of clandestine struggle included *L’Armata Brancaleone* (1966), Monicelli’s satirical hit on the Middle Ages. Projective identification with a counter-hero of a Don Quixotesque nature, like Vittorio Gasman/Brancaleone, also indicates a considerable amount of self-irony in the conceptualization and the imaginary of militantism, which is probably reinforced in present recollections. Liakos stresses the fact that this is not an ex-post invention but an actual occurrence, as, in fact, the film itself functioned as a driving force in terms of militancy.

This film belonged in some way to the micro-mythology of our resistance group. Those of us who founded this group had our first discussion after we had seen this film in a Thessaloniki cinema in the summer of 1967. Often sarcastic towards ourselves and our activities, we likened ourselves to the comic heroes of Brancaleone. Great words, poor results. An ineffectiveness, somehow comic and ironic at the same time.\(^\text{325}\)

A tragicomic element and a bouleversement of registers is equally used by Liakos’s comrade, Darveris, in his description of how the four leading members of the organization burst out laughing after the announcement of the verdict of the military court which was almost ludicrous in its sentence of life imprisonment.

Contrary to counter-heroes, however, Resistance icons were very present in the imaginary of most young people involved in underground activities. These included Aris Velouchiotis, the most famous Communist guerrilla leader during the German occupation, a Guevarist figure *avant la lettre*,\(^\text{326}\) and of course Che Guevara himself. Aris, the supremo of the partisan army ELAS, had decided to carry on the armed struggle after liberation, contrary to the party’s wishes. This decision and his early death led to his canonization by Party dissidents as a figure of uncompromising and relentless struggle.\(^\text{327}\)

---


\(^{326}\) S. Gourgouris, *Dream Nation...,* op. cit., p. 181.

An average of twenty seven bombs were planted every year during the seven years of the dictatorship, reaching a peak in 1969. A large number of bombs were discovered without having exploded, while in most cases the bombs did not cause any physical damage at all, a fact which, according to Nikos Serdedakis, is due to the organizations’ lack of experience and know-how. It is not a coincidence that the overwhelming majority of the students involved in activities including explosives were either Centrists or members of the Lambrakis Youth in the early 1960s. The resort to ‘dynamic actions’ was a dramatic volte face from their quintessentially peaceful methods of protest prior to the Junta. This could be seen as the ‘revival of the suppressed’, to use Stuart Hall’s term, that is, a way of fighting against the passive, defeatist, painful past. It was the choice to finally ‘do something’ and do it radically. However, as Tasos Darveris’s alter ego argues in his autobiographical but highly illuminating novel A Night’s Story, ‘no one was convinced that the Lambrakides were transformed from peaceful legalists into city guerrillas in just three months, no matter how much they got involved in explosions at that time’. Katsaros’s confession is equally telling and comes into stark contrast with the fact that he was an arduous supporter of political violence, fascinated by Che’s ‘voluntarism’ and trained in Cuba. Although his organization decided to shoot stool-pigeons, who were ‘easy targets’ in his words, it did not accomplish this aim in the end as ‘our hands were still trembling’:

In order that the revolutionary shoots a person he himself is bound to have lost one part of his humanity. But back then there was no continuity. From lawful citizens of a parliamentary - even if conservative- democracy we were called from one moment to the next to be transformed to executioners.

What was the actual effect and reception of the ‘dynamic’ acts and how effective was this sort of ‘armed propaganda’? There is no doubt that for many people this was a proof of the fact that there was actual resistance going on. In an article called ‘Witness in Athens’, a British journalist quoted a man saying that under conditions of an

---

329 Ibid.
330 Stuart Hall, ‘Επανενακλήση της Ιδεολογίας: Η Επάνοδος του απωθημένου’ [Rediscovering Ideology: The Revival of the Suppressed], pp. 139-144 in Maria Komninou, Christos Lyrintzis (eds), Κοινωνία, Εξουσία και ΜΜΕ [Society, Power and the Media], Athens 1988.
331 Stergios Katsaros, ‘Εμείς οι γκεβαριστές’ [We, the Guevarists], quoted by IosPress, 30 years Che. Tribute to Che Guevara, no. 4, Eleftherotypia, 9/10/1997.
impotent and bitter silence ‘the general reaction to the wave of bombings by the resistance in 1969 was enthusiastic’.\(^3\) In another account published in Britain, the diplomat and writer Rodis Roufos Kanakaris, under the nickname the ‘Athenian’, wrote:

People, greatly encouraged, went to sleep and woke up with the hope of hearing of further attempts; their morale shot upwards.\(^4\)

Petros Efthymiou, a student leader at the University of Ioannina at the time and an Education Minister in a centre-left government about twenty years later, shares this view. He wrote referring to Dimitris Psychoyios, a leading figure of 20 October, and the bomb that he placed in May 1972 inside the General Confederation of Greek Workers, which was controlled by the regime:

I will never forget the wild joy that I owe him when on a night in May 1970 the explosion of a bomb that Dimitris had planted in GSEE came to encircle me, while I was mixing in a pot the ‘materials’ for the production of home-made TNT, just like a little magician.\(^5\)

The emotional way in which Efthymiou recalls this incident captures the moral weight that acts of resistance acquired in the general stalemate and passivity that reigned inside the Colonels’ Greece. Interestingly, he uses humour -‘like a little magician’- in order to de-dramatize the fact that he too was involved in the preparation of explosives. This narrative choice partly demonstrates the difficulties in dealing with a past that includes the preparation and planting of bombs, regardless of how ‘just’ the cause was. However, Efthymiou goes as far as to praise the value of bombs by comparing them to a sort of heavenly music, thus referring to the relativity of moral statements regarding violence and creating a contrast with the present attitude towards it:

if at present bombs are associated with crime and the blood of innocent people, back then they were the most beautiful music, the most spontaneous song of freedom against oppression.\(^6\)

\(^5\) Petros Efthymiou, *Για όσους κάλυψε η λήθη και σκέπασε η σιωπή* [For all those covered up by oblivion and drowned by silence], pp. 53-60, in Dimitris Papachristos (ed.), *Εκ των ουτέρων 19+1* [Ex post], Athens 1993, p. 57.
\(^6\) Idid. The distance between the past and the present discourse on violence is very interesting and is often to be seen in testimonies of the movement’s protagonists. Often it creates a real biographical rupture, which can be difficult to deal with. Efthymiou’s recollection took place ten years before the
Evidence suggests, however, that for most people those acts remained isolated events, as, at least until the beginning of the great trials, but also later on, it was difficult to relate the shadowy members of those organizations with real people. Anna Mantoglou's point that a general silent approval was demonstrated by the fact that those acts were not condemned by Greek people as terrorism, lacks any further substantiation. On the contrary, it seems that several people did indeed consider these as the acts of extremists. As a foreign correspondent commented at the time, most Greeks regarded bombs as threatening since 'very few of them can bear to contemplate the fear of another Civil War'.

What is true, however, is that these acts as well as the members of resistance groups received a great deal of publicity from the regime's papers, in order to demonstrate that violent elements were still lurking inside Greek society, while at the same time they were demonstrating the regime's efficiency. Accordingly, there is a significant asymmetry in terms of the mini-organizations and the few acts that they managed to inflict before getting caught, and the amount of notoriety that they acquired through the media. Usually on the front page of the papers, the anti-regime 'criminals', 'lunatics' or 'terrorists', as they were routinely described, were becoming a sort of popular myth for one part of the population and the Left. By inversing Liakos's description of his 'Brancaleonic' resistance failure to match great words with grand deeds, the regime was lending the latter far too much importance and media hype in comparison with their pragmatic value in terms of resistance. From 1970 onwards, this would be coupled with the anti-regime press which would use the same strategy for opposite ends, taking advantage of the relaxation of the legislation and the possibility to publish the defendants' defence pleas. High recognisability was one result of this, while indirect anti-regime propaganda was another. Consequently, these defendants, who had no possibility of appeal against the verdict, started to act as a sort of model for younger students.

capture of the 17N organization. It is very likely that in present circumstances he would have been much more cautious in his wording.

337 Anna Mantoglou, The Polytechnic..., op. cit., 56.
338 David Holden 'The revolution of Supergreek', The Guardian, 15/2/70.
339 Antonis Liakos, 'History Writing...', op. cit., p. 53.
340 For an analysis of the social representation of the trials, as seen through the press coverage of the period see Elli Chatzikonstanti, Η κοινωνική αναπαράσταση της δυτικότητας (1967-74) μέσα από τον τίτλο και ειδικότητα μέσα από τα δημοσιεύματα των πρακτικών των δικών δικτύων αντιπολιτευτικών οργανώσεων σε 3 αθηναϊκές εφημερίδες [The social representation of the dictatorship (1967-74) through
What played a major role in my politicisation were the things that were published then by newspapers about the tortures. In the trials, the charges that the accused made about tortures. The trials of Rigas Feraios, the first trials, that is, that became public. These influenced me politically, in some way. (Kouloglou)

The mediatised image that was constructed was a larger-than-life version of the real deeds, which often hit the target of the younger people's imagination. In theatrical terms, the resistance organizations' performance exercised a disproportionate impact on the audience. In this sense, there was a double amplification, which apart from the media included the readers' own fantasy.

**The terrible solitude of Rigas Feraios**

‘The living [...] invoke with agony the spirits of the past as being in their service, by borrowing their names, their war slogans, their uniforms’

Karl Marx, *Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte* (1852) 341

As Rigas Feraios was probably the most prominent intellectual figure behind the 1821 Greek War of Independence against the Ottomans, the choice of name reveals the fact that this was an organisation which appealed to the iconography of the national ‘revolutionary’ past.342 Thanasis Athanasiou, one of the organization’s founders, stresses that ‘of course the name Rigas Feraios was not incidental [...] since it compressed this sense of struggle, democracy, unity.’ Rigas was used as a powerful reference to the relentless struggle against tyranny and the organization’s founding manifesto concludes with his famous ‘oath’: ‘as long as I live, my only aim shall be to eliminate [the tyrants].’ As Gourgouris notes ‘the invocation of the ghost of [Rigas], given especially his image as a revolutionary and a man of the people, simultaneously sanctifies his figure and declares ownership of his logos’.343

---

341 I owe this reference to Antonis Liakos’s 'Η διάθλαση των επαναστατικών ιδεών στον ελληνικό χώρο, 1830-1850' [The refraction of revolutionary ideas within Greek territory, 1830-1850], pp. 121-144, in *Ta Istorika*, 1, September 1983, p. 124.
342 The War of Independence of 1821 is traditionally referred to as a Revolution. The more radical group Makriyiannis was a similar reference to one of the leading figures of this war.
So, it is important to note that the 1821 fighters, despite their systematic use and abuse by the regime’s propaganda, still constituted a depository of references for young people, symbolizing pure, patriotic fighting, as was also the case for the Generation of the Resistance. This is what Isabelle Sommier calls the ‘resurgence of the revolutionary myth in order to give meaning to one’s engagement’, an apparently timeless strategy, as Marx’s above mentioned dictum indicates.

Any open student activity within the grounds of the university was ruled out as unrealistic and too dangerous. Therefore Rigas mainly focused on actions of attrition and of underlining its presence, with a repertoire ranging from the distribution of leaflets to the writing of anti-Junta slogans on the walls, despite Brigadier Pattakos’s warning that political graffiti-makers would be shot, and including non-systematic acts of limited violence. Michalis Spiridakis, one of the organization’s historical members in Salonica, remembers ‘the brush, the paint, the leaflet from hand to hand.’ The leaflets tried to urge people to join the battle:

Colleagues, all of you should join the struggle against the fascist dictatorship, let us never become slaves of the tyrants, long live proud Greek Youth.

Colleague, your fellow-students are in exile or prisons, being tortured ruthlessly. It is the duty of all of us to fight for their liberation.

Damofli remembers that one day as she walked with her mother she noticed leaflets on the ground:

I remember taking them with care, like a sort of a wounded bird. Then we took them home, but didn’t really know what to do with them (laughter).

In any case, the utterance of Darveris’ persona in A Night’s Story, that people were mostly scared to read those leaflets and that even if they did they resulted to be an unsuccessful means of instigation, is valid. One of his protagonists says in agony

---

344 I. Sommier, Le ‘68..., op. cit., p. 35.
346 Pamphlet 1 and pamphlet 2, 7.1.43, Society for the Safeguarding of Historical Archives (EDIA), Dafermos EDIA Archive.
347 In Stelios Kouloglou’s television programme The story of the real 17N, 17/11/02.
There can be no work done with the masses without a minimum of liberty. How can you work with the masses when people are afraid to talk to each other?[^48]

In an anti-Junta journal published abroad in March 1968 a Rigas member is quoted as saying that ‘the organization’s aim is the resistance against fascism with every means until the final overthrow of the Junta’. When the journal’s collaborator asked if ‘every means’ included armed action the answer was:

It must be the final form of the movement’s struggle. It is a fact, if we want to be realistic, that one has to work very hard and all possibilities must be exhausted before that. Greek youth does not seek to cause bloodshed in the country. But if all other forms of struggle are excluded, what else remains? People want to live freely and peacefully. But if war is imposed on them they fight it and they win it.[^49]

Despite the student’s answer, reflecting the fear of being accused of causing civil strife, Rigas was indeed involved in non-systematic actions of limited violence. Alongside this it published clandestinely the journal Thourios, a bulletin of information on resistance activities. However, this organization was helplessly alone in trying to mobilize the students:

There was no one else [in the University]. It was us. No one else. We were the only ones who got mobilised. (Spiridakis)

Action, clearly from the position of clandestinity, in order to demonstrate that some people were resisting. (Athanasiou)

By 18 September 1968 a large number of its main cadres had been arrested and on 29 October its historical leadership was put on trial and given severe sentences, ranging from five to twenty-one years. In their defence, the students declared to be proud that they have been members of the Lambrakis Youth.[^350] In fact, all of Rigas’s founding members had been leading figures in it and therefore experienced and stressed the

[^48]: Darveris, op.cit., p. 175.
[^49]: Achilleas Kapageridis, 'Ελληνική Πανεπιστημιακή Αντιφασιστική Οργάνωση ΡΗΓΑΣ ΦΕΡΑΙΟΣ' [Greek All-Student Antifascist Organization Rigas Feraios], Antistasi ‘68, March 1968.
[^350]: Nicole Dreyfus provides a picture of their trials, from the point of view of an observer in Les étudiants grecs accusent. Dossier du Procès d’ Athènes, Paris 1969.
‘continuity’ from the pre-'67 Lambrakides to student action under the Junta, despite the fact that none of their patterns were carried over into the dictatorship era.

The Greek students have not forgotten for a moment the ideals which led to the great student struggles for the democratisation of the Education and National Independence. [...] We don’t recognise any EFEE other than that in whose name all those great struggles took place for the Renaissance of Education and 114. As followers of this struggle we announce the rising against the dictatorship.351

In its founding manifesto, Thourios used a discourse with mixed references to the ‘heroic traditions of Greek Youth and the student movement’ and the destructive ‘foreign manipulation’. Analogies were drawn between the Colonels and Metaxas, Mussolini and Hitler, with the latter being quoted as Papadopoulos ‘teachers’. The manifesto deliberately used a vocabulary which resembles EAM’s discourse during the German occupation, aiming at evoking the spirit of resistance: ‘no student should become a quisling, collaborator of the tyrants’.

Since the majority of the people who participated in the Resistance under the Communist-led EAM/ELAS were defeated and demonised after the Civil War (1946-49), there could not be a reaction against this ‘heroic generation’, as, for example, in the case of Italian students in the late 1960s and their saturation with the Resistenza. In Greece, this generation still held a mythical statute and was very influential in terms of left-wing political imagination. In fact, there was no reaction against this ‘heroic past’ but on the contrary its appropriation. Accordingly, one of Rigas’ leaflets reads:

The fighters of Rigas Feraios struggle using every means, following the democratic tradition of the generation of the ‘40s.

An interesting side to that is the fact that many Rigas members had parents who participated in the Resistance. In his book, Skroumbelos makes many references to the heroic fathers,352 who acted as models in the minds of their children, as did Athanasiou’s father for example. This is a direct and painful evocation of the Civil War model, in which the strife acts as a ‘skin-felt experience’ and not as a vague and

351 Thourios, October 1968; Similarly, a later issue (December 1968) declares that ‘from the very beginning in the Rigas lines, students are present who fought for the ideals which have been forged in older struggles.’
352 Thanasis Skroumbelos, Οι κόκκινοι φίλοι μου. Μια ιστορία της οργάνωσης Ρήγας Φεραίως [My red friends, a History of the Rigas Feraios organization], Athens 2004.
abstract evocation. At the time of her trial, Maria Kallergi, a student and RF member, gave a report to foreign correspondents in which she described the conditions of her arrest. In between talking about the eighteen days of her being continuously tortured before being transferred to Averoff prison, Kallergi referred to the painful visit of her father, a man who had participated in the Resistance, by saying:

My father started crying. My father is a courageous man, he is an old freedom-fighter. He was arrested by the Germans in Crete, while he was working for an English commando. He knows what it means to believe in an idea. I have always been proud of him.  

Rigas manifesto also proposes a continuum of vanguard student action in all national struggles:

We shall continue the great traditions of students who fought in order to bring down Otto’s monarchy, who alongside Makriyiannis fought for the consolidation of the Constitution.  

Workers were also cited as part of a tradition of ‘heroic struggles […] of the pioneering workers’ movement’, and were described as ‘a volcano which boils quietly’ in a struggle parallel/common to that of the students. Lastly, in Rigas’ founding manifesto the Junta was accused of ‘obeying foreign bosses’ (ξενόδουλη), meaning the imperialistic plans of the US. In the same spirit a later issue of Thourios reads that ‘the country is further sold to foreign interests, thus cementing our dependence on foreign capital’, echoing this well-known topos of the Greek Left throughout the post-war period:

333 Quoted in Nerio Minuzzo, Quando arrivano i Colonnelli. Rapporto dalla Grecia, Milan 1970, p. 108. Relations with the generation of the ’40s were not, however, always rosy. A generation gap is strongly expressed by Anagnostakis in a poem with the telling title Στο Περίπτερο ’68-’69 [At the margin] (1979), where he talks about how his old comrades were mistreated by their children. ‘Upon K.L.’s return to Ikaria he found his son, a man at that point, in a cinema school, with his studies unfinished.[…] On the fifth night, during a quarrel in the house, the young lad raised his fist and pulled it to his face, swearing at him and calling him a loser and a cuckold’. At the same time Anagnostakis reports that symbolic gestures had changed signifiers in a tragic way since the wartime period; this was the case, for example, with Tina ‘who was shaved by the Chites in ’45’ but whose daughter was ‘dancing yesterday in the club with her hair cut off very-very short in the trendy a-la-garçon way’.  

334 The Rigas Feraios Album, Athens 1974, pp. 52-53. A similar line of argument is to be found in the defences of some of the founding members of Rigas during their trials. So, for example, Nikos Kiaos: ‘Rigas is continuing the struggles of students who fought in the front lines of the people’s struggle in the past. During the struggles for the country’s Constitution, the 1909 revolution, [during] the Resistance against the occupiers, [for] independence and self-determination for Cyprus, Democracy and 15%.’ in Thourios [Battle-Song], December 1968.  

335 Thourios, April 1969.  

[The people] understood well by now who is hidden behind [the dictatorship]: American imperialism, NATO, the monopolies.[...][The Resistance] guarantees the continuation of the struggle until the substantial victory, the breaking of the bonds with the foreign dependency which is directly responsible for the tragedy of the people.357

After the 1968 split within the exiled Communist Party, Rigas was gradually identified with the ‘moderate’ part, the so-called KKE of the Interior. However, its attempt to be less dogmatic was more often than not interpreted as reformism and lack of revolutionary fervour. Accordingly, and in contrast to the ‘negative’ Party line, in its December issue of 1968, Thourios refers to the growing importance of the role of students in social struggles, quoting the student unrests worldwide.

[The Greek student youth] believes that the student struggles in other countries are part of the same struggle for the overthrow of the forces of reaction on an international level. It observes with great interest those struggles and is reinforced and strengthens itself in its own anti-dictatorship, anti-fascist struggle.358

In this spirit, Thourios introduced a column in order to follow the international student scene and its struggles and to inform Greek students, believing that this constituted an important contribution to the Greek struggle against the dictatorship and fascism. So, while the first issues of the journal express quite old-fashioned appeals to the students’ patriotism, by 1970 its tone had changed significantly, acquiring a more open and internationalist approach with a clear anti-capitalist/anti-imperialist character. Accordingly, in 1970 we read

the struggles of the youth of Vietnam are leading us, the struggles of the youth of America and of Europe are moving our souls. We talk the same language. We fight against a common enemy.359

In terms of organizational structures Rigas’s contribution from mid-1969 onwards was an appeal for the creation of student committees, that is small and flexible groups for a more dynamic and inter-active participation.360 Parallel to that, the leadership of KKE Int. was hesitantly trying to organize a military/operational section in order to

357 Ibid, April 1969.
358 Thourios, op.cit.
359 Ibid.
360 Thourios, April 1969.
start limited armed action. The whole affair resulted in a great fiasco mainly because of the famous ‘hundred and eighth’ bomb, which was the one that killed Tsikouris and Angeloni outside the US Embassy in September 1970.\(^{362}\) This incident was crucial because it caused a number of significant arrests. By 1971 Rigas’ ‘first generation’ had been detected and dispersed, while from late 1969 to 1971 only three issues of *Thourios* were printed.

However, the incident in the American Embassy also caused a radicalization of some of Rigas’ members who were involved in the operation and who distanced themselves from the Party, by seeking new ways of armed struggle.\(^{363}\) The result was the creation of *Aris-Rigas Feraios* [ARF], which was both a bellicose reference to the God of War but also to Aris Velouchiotis, the northern star of left-wing resistance, as mentioned before. *ARF* was led by the student Kostas Agapiou who travelled around Europe in order to gather money and arms. At some point *ARF* started collaborating with the Parisian *LEA*. In a common leaflet which they distributed after the explosion of five bombs during the night of 8 July 1971 in different parts of Athens and Piraeus, the two groupings declared their determination to ‘combine the right theory with the right action’, accused the US as the cause of all evils in Greece and concluded with the common aim to give ‘power to the people’.\(^{364}\) Accordingly, a branch of the moderate group *Rigas* was won over by the more radical organizations, which, by 1972 were either discredited or dispersed.

**The ‘historical’ generation’s pension**

Members of this ‘historical’ generation of the student movement were the first to go to prison and thus acquire a sort of symbolic status. Vervenioti was married as soon as she left prison and she recalls this moment with an evident sense of pride:

\(^{362}\) Tsikouris and Angeloni were widely cited as heroes of the Greek resistance during the entire period of the Junta. It is noteworthy that the incident, rejected by US officials as sheer terrorism, was hailed by Andreas Papandreou with particular enthusiasm. Papandreou referred to the two bombers as ‘heroes’, a fact that earned him the title of a terrorist. On 29 August 1972 LEA placed a bomb in the basement of the US Embassy in order to honour the memory of Tsikouris and Angeloni: ‘Our anti-imperialist action today is dedicated to the memory of the fighters Tsikouri and Angeloni who lost their lives two years ago at the same place during a similar action’. USNA POL 23-0, American Embassy Athens, ‘Popular Revolutionary Resistance’ Claims Responsibility for Explosion in Embassy August 29’, 8 September 1972.

\(^{363}\) The 17 November..., p. 36. According to the authors the smaller ‘dynamic groups’ profited from the fact that the large ones (PAM and DA) were wiped out in 1960 and 1970, but the great importance that they attributed to clandestinity rules make them suspect of being ‘non-political’.

\(^{364}\) Ibid, p. 37.
In the church it was not just the whole Panteios, my School, that was present, there was everyone.[...] This marriage was a sort of a rally. Everyone had come to honour me. (Vervenioti)

Accordingly, in terms of prototypes, these students sparked off a sense of admiration in the younger ones. Mitafidis and his comrades came out of jail briefly with an amnesty that was granted in ’73, whereupon they were immediately sent to the army. He remembers that, as they had been in prison for five years, when they came out it was striking that they were also looked physically older than the younger ones, who in the meantime had also invented new codes of communication.

When we came out of prison we had a small problem of communication with the new generation. [...] We went [to a meeting] bald, with white hair [...] But the new generation saw in us the people who could teach them. They did not have the usual rejecting stance. That generation was eager to learn. And it had of course us as its models. (Mitafidis)

When he walked out of prison, Darveris’s surrogate, Lambros, is stunned by the extent of the changes which had occurred during those four years.

Deportations had ceased years ago, censorship had been abolished; the bookshops were full of Marxist books and Theodorakis’ songs were often heard at the boîtes. In the taverns which were frequented by circles of students the political songs were dominant, as were the jackets, blue jeans and beards.564

The recollections of younger students vary from stressing the fact that the so-called ‘grandfathers’ of the movement provided them with a know-how and an intergenerational transfer of ideas, to lamenting the often patronising stance that those older students adopted towards them:

First of all, the ones who got an amnesty were some members of the previous student movement, who had been expelled from the universities in ’67 and they got back to the Schools. One of them was a very important person, Thomas Vassiliadis in Salonica, he made a massive organization out of Rigas Feraios, KKE of the Interior... He was a very intense personality, right? And others came from the extra parliamentary Left.[...] So, there are chains which transmit an experience.(Vourekas)

564 Darveris, A Night’s Story..., op.cit., p. 253.
In contrast to them, Xydi remembers that her group, A-EFEE, did not benefit at all from the experience of the earlier generations, a fact that she deeply regrets as it seems that people could have profited from the mistakes of the previous ones:

It plays a role too that many of these people were in jail, in exile, but I really felt, you know, this gap that exists between the first anti-dictatorship people and the student movement, I believe it had a negative effect on us because no struggle experiences were transmitted to us, but also on the level of political experience, because we had to find out about many things by ourselves and this took us some time and marked us and our lives, which under different circumstances might have been a bit different, or even very different. (Xydi)

In contrast to that picture, however, comes Darveris' emphatic view that 'there was no intention on the part of the elderly to 'educate' the younger ones with the aim of maintaining the movement'. His heretical point of view is that the dictatorship gave to this older generation, which in the early 60s had enthusiastically dedicated itself to non-stop political activism, the chance to take a rest and 'live its life'.\(^{365}\) This idea was echoed by the singer-songwriter Savvopoulos in a 1969 song as 'the best of the kids' who 'got tired and went back home'. Contrary to this, in another song by Savvopoulos from the same period, reference was made to the 'kids who were lost in the magic forests', a part of this same generation which had been consumed by drugs, a taboo issue for most people to talk about even today. This verse, however, could also be applied to those who got involved in political action which ended up in an impasse.\(^ {366}\)

For the majority of students involved in clandestine activities, activism during the Junta years ended there, but they were marked, affected, altered by the events. The political goal of their battle was not fulfilled and they spent years in jail during their early twenties. Fighters belonging to this generation were in fact released in the summer of 1973 with Papadopoulos's amnesty, as will be shown later. This was to be a source of melancholy for most of them as they could hardly relate to the new generation and the exigencies of life after and under entirely new, at least for a brief moment, political conditions such as the Markezinis'government. The anti-dictatorship student

\(^{365}\) *Ibid*: 155

\(^{366}\) Interview of Savvopoulos with the author, 8/1/04, Salonica.
movement's passage to mass action was seen by most of them with suspicion. ‘The
return from the lonely exaltation of violence and clandestinity to the everyday-life of
mass struggles is an unbearable normality’, Zoumboulakis argues. Katsaros claims
that the fact that Papadopoulos’s general amnesty included the bombers was a very
clever move as it stripped them off psychologically, by demonstrating that the regime
had nothing to fear. As in that period an Athenian theatre was staging a play with the
comic title *Manolakis, the bomber*, Katsaros bitterly concludes that:

>This is what Papadopoulos succeeded in doing. To transform the city guerrillas into picturesque
Manolakis.*

Interestingly, Katsaros makes a generic division along Marcusean lines of his own
generation, being Promethean and systematic in its self-suppression, and the second as
Orphean and Narcissistic, that is liberated and rather oriented towards a Dionysian
experience.

‘One of the paradoxes of historical procedure is that there is no necessary
connection between the motives for an action and its outcome’. Surely, the
Lambrakides had thought that by involving themselves in clandestine protest actions
they would eventually raise people’s consciousness and lead to a massive resistance.
The fact is, nevertheless, that a whole cycle of clandestine and violent action
repertoires, connected to people from this age group, eventually proved fruitless.
Moreover, according to the famous definition by Neidhardt and Rucht, a social
movement is ‘an organized and sustained effort of a collectivity of inter-related
individuals, groups and organisations to promote or resist social change with the use of

---

367 Stavros Zoumboulakis, ‘Από νύχτα σε νύχτα’ [From one night to another], bookreview of Darveris’s
368 ‘Μανολάκης ο βομβιστής’, *Eleftheros Kosmos*, 11/5/73.
369 Stergios Katsaros, *Εμείς οι γκεβαριτές* [We, the Guevarists], quoted in *IoPress*, 30 years Che.
370 Stergios Katsaros, *I the provocateur...,*, pp. 212-214. According to Katsaros the subsequent
generation’s dislike for clandestine action and violence was due to the fact that it had interiorised
Marcuse’s critique of Prometheus, namely the laborious, self-disciplined and self-sacrificing figure, and
his preference for Orpheus and Narcissus, who personify liberation and hedonism: ‘If we take into
account that the tactics of armed actions means planning, method, conspiracy and strict discipline it is
very easy to understand the feelings of this insurrected and half-anarchist youth’ (:213). Katsaros
concludes that the Polytechnic uprising was carried away, by a new generation which was mocking any
kind of planning and organization ‘as if they were going to a Dionysian feast’ (:214). However, as will
be shown later, this conclusion is rather exaggerated.
371 Heinz Bude, ‘The German Kriegskinder: origins and impact of the generation of 1968’ in Mark
Roseman (ed.), *Generations in Conflict. Youth Revolt and Generation Formation in Germany 1770-
public protest activities.\textsuperscript{372} Therefore, as clandestine resistance did not manage to mobilize any significant sector of society, the student body included, it did not go public and therefore it did not evolve into a movement. Still, by quoting Sartre’s famous saying that the Second World War marked the most liberating years of his life, Darveris defends, and retrospectively justifies, his life choice as an action dictated by a drive to live. In his half-fictional cathartic novel, he represents Resistance as the definite \textit{raison d’être} of his generation.

Chapter Two

Mobilizing the Students

Competing youth cultures

- We need time, we have to wait for probably three to four more years until the twenty-year old Lambrakides becomes thirty, get a job, marry and have children and take responsibilities. Then it will be safe to proceed [to democracy].
- What do you think about the next wave of youths?, I asked.
- Oh, those are perfectly trained for becoming good citizens and believe me, he said, they are 'a-political'.

High-ranking official of the Ministry of Public Order and Greek-American Professor, May 1972

In May 1972 the American Embassy of Athens made a useful classification of the state of affairs among Greek students. They identified four groups within the student population of Greek universities. The first and largest category that was identified was comprised of apparently apolitical and non-activist students. As the American report pointed out ‘this group, for various reasons, [was] uninterested or unwilling to take risks of involvement in student activities which might threaten continuation of their education. Family and economic pressures, for instance to obtain a university degree had been deterrents to involvement in organized student activities.’ Those were students who remained passive vis-à-vis the political situation, as they were concerned most of all with their studies. As Antonis Liakos points out, some good students always choose to focus on how to graduate rather than being involved in political dilemmas.

However, Angeliki Xydi points out that her generation used to study a lot:

I think that all this was a daily situation, namely you were running to the university, doing your combative things, your unionist things, you went, well, to the library - we studied very hard and

---

374 Angelos Dodos interviewed by Professor Kouloumbis, 4/5/72, cited in Theodoros A. Kouloumbis, ... 71 ... 74: Σημειώσεις ενός πανεπιστημιακού [71...74. Notes of an academic], Athens 2002, p. 220.
375 USNA, POL, American Embassy in Athens to Department of State, ‘Student Discontent: An Analysis’, 6 May 1972
most of these people were very good students, and the proof is that many of them have become very good scientists too.

Most interviewees shared this view and argued that they were brilliant, echoing a later day slogan of the Greek Communist Party according to which the students should be first in their studies and first in the struggle. In stark contrast to that comes Fyssas who in his book on the Generation of the Polytechnic bluntly argues that this was not the case, as there was no time or mood for that. Sabatakakis also argues that there was a disproportionate relationship between anti-regime students and the achievement-oriented ones and their method of work. In fact, the combination of university and political action also led to an extended duration of studies, a lasting phenomenon in Greek auditoria. Additional factors making study difficult were the fact that the courses were highly rigidified using a very archaic katharevousa, that examinations were based on the reproduction of facts, and the percentage of liberal-minded professors who were prepared to allow space for ‘contradictions’ and free discussion was minimal.

A foreign correspondent in Athens commented on the university situation up to 1970:

Three years ago, a group of students told a visitor that, while campuses elsewhere in the world were alive with agitation, Greek students were in no position to act. They talked of the desire to get their diplomas, of the fear of the police and the army, of their inability to find more than a few dozen colleagues interested in open defiance.

Similarly, the Principal of the Athens Polytechnic notes that after April 1967 he looked at the students who ‘remained passive in regard of what was happening in our country’. And he adds ‘it was natural for me to be surprised [...] about the apathy of our youth, our students’.

---

376 Dimitris Fyssas, op.cit., pp. 18-19.
378 Alvin Shuster, ‘Greek Students, Long Passive, Now Challenge Regime’, New York Times, 28/2/73. In a collective volume by Greek and foreign scholars on the nature and characteristics of the by then five-year old dictatorship (London 1972) the Education expert Alexis Dimaras commented anonymously that ‘about the student movement one can say too little as there is a gap since 1967, whereas there used to be a very active movement prior to 1967’. In Alexis Dimaras, Προσήλωση στην παράδοση και αντίθεση στην ελληνική εκπαίδευση [Concentrating on tradition and being reactionary in Greek education], pp. 208-231, in G.N.Giannopoulos, R. Clogg (eds), Greece under..., op.cit., p. 225.
In addition, the Junta offered a series of incentives for entertainment, such as excursions to the countryside, music festivals and above all football. When in early 1971 *Protoporia*, a student journal with anti-regime leanings carried out a survey on student conditions in Athens University, most students complained about the fact that there was no coherence in the student community and drew a very bleak picture of student life. Among the answers that were given were 'We are definitely not united. There is no student community'. In addition, a group of female students complained that most guys' interests at the University were quite one-sided, as all they talked about was sex and sport: 'It is awful. All they talk about is football'. More significantly even, a student attacked the appointed student societies as non-existent, adding that

the students in their majority are rather bored with the student condition. They start out being bored and they end up being even more bored.380

In an interesting diary account of a Greek-American academic visiting Greece at the time we read that 'most of the students seemed to be older in age and bored'.381 Similarly, an article in the *New York Times* concluded that 'Greek university students [are] for years the most passive in the West'.382 So, apart from the tiny minority of radicals who took part in clandestine actions, the vast majority of students remained passive vis-à-vis the authoritarianism imposed on the country and the university

---

380 *Protoporia*, monthly youth journal, 2, January 1972. The journal’s introductory editorial contains some very interesting features. It refers to the discontent of the young with the misled ‘leading Generation’ and all political lines. It further accuses the old society of being hypocritical, since it tolerates the production of weapons, but gets shocked by sexuality and drugs. It goes on to stress that education depends on the good will of people who control the means of production and communication and to proclaim that ‘everything around you leads you to the sign “specialised moron”’. This is a striking point in relation to Greek standards concerning the production of specialized technocratic experts, and it takes a clear distance from the previous generation which saw this as a desirable outcome. The following are also striking: the direct references to the world protest movement, which includes the still inexistent Greek one, and to the May slogan itself: 'power to the imagination'. 'Everywhere, in the whole World, we young people ‘shout’. [...] We are searching for beauty my friend.' And: 'If you have the power to shout 'The Future belongs to the Imagination', then ... you too enter the PROTOPORIA.' The journal only published two issues before being banned in early 1972, with a tirage amounting to 5,000 copies, which was a record at the time. See the article by its director Thodoris Kaloudis, "Πώς φτάσαμε στην κατάληψη της Νομικής" [How did we get to the Law School occupation], pp. 104-109, in G.A.Vernikos, op. cit.

381 Kouloumbis went to a talk given by Dimitrios Tsakonas, a Sociology Professor and Minister of the Junta, at Panteion University. His description of the academics with expressionless faces, the bored students, the dull discourse and the out of tune national anthem played at the end of the talk is an excellent condensed description of the decadent conditions in Greek academic life at the time. 'I felt pity for the Greek students', Kouloumbis concluded in his diary (spring 1972). See Th.A.KouIoumbis, ...71...74..., op.cit., p. 157.

system, and went on with their lectures, in a highly policed university. Accordingly, their generation was characterized as passive and uninterested in politics.

The second group, according to the American report, was comprised of students who were pro-regime in orientation, mainly because they had benefited from the regime’s actions. This was a small group around the leaders of the student organizations appointed by the Junta in April 1967, after the dissolution of the previous groups. These students, apart from spreading propaganda in favour of the regime, often bullied those whom they considered as its adversaries, even if they were professors, thus enjoying a sort of impunity. A telling incident was when a group of these students, belonging to the appointed Rightist student organization FEAP (Student Union of the Aristotelian University), entered Professor Fatouros’s class of Interior Decoration at the School of Architecture in Salonica (December 1970) and disrupted the lecture, threatening him and his students, smashing things and writing slogans on the blackboard. Despite the fact that Fatouros, enraged as he was by the incident, made a formal request for the severest possible punishment of the students responsible, not only were these not punished, but the University authorities considered taking some action against Fatouros himself, for his ‘liberal’ teaching methods.

These were the same students who cheered the dictator Papadopoulos on every occasion. In an illustrating newsreel of the same year on Papadopoulos’s address to the students of the University of Salonica, one can see a large number of students in exaltation rhythmically shouting the dictator’s name and ‘long live the Revolution’. When the dictator addressed them with warmth by saying ‘the light in your eyes shows your solidarity with our work’ they chanted in chorus frenetically ‘Long live Greece’. Despite the obvious propaganda purpose of this newsreel, the enthusiasm of a mass of students in participating in the staged cheering of the dictator is but one indication of
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384 The presence of the university section of the police (‘Intellectual Surveillance’) was constant and obvious so as to intimidate the students. The individual dossiers for students with all personal details and the details of their academic progress were at all times at the disposal of the Security Police. In addition, some two hundred pro-regime students were responsible for spying on their fellow-students in lecture-halls secretariats, reading rooms and buffets.

385 USNA, XR POL 13-2 Greece, American Consul Thessaloniki to Department of State, subject: ‘Follow Up on Rightist Student Demonstration, University of Thessaloniki, December 8, 1970’, 14 January 1971. The US report concludes, providing an insight into the logic of such actions, that ‘since they were ostensibly demonstrating against the anti-Regime behavior of Professor Fatouras [sic], the University is understandably loath to punish them in the face of assumed Government disapproval of Fatouras. Even if no direct action is taken against Fatouras, he may decide that his position is untenable and that he can no longer continue teaching at the University if no demonstrations against him and interruptions of his class are to be condoned by the authorities.’
the fact that the regime enjoyed a number of genuine supporters among the youth.\textsuperscript{385}
The most radical exponents of this category were the continuation of \textit{EKOF}. One part of these students were those who were appointed by the regime as heads and members of student organizations. Skyrianos recalls being approached in order to participate in their activities:

That year a fellow-student of mine from school happened to enter the same faculty. One whose family we knew, we knew well what sort of people they were; they had embraced the Junta. So, within the first week that I went to Athens he came, he welcomed me, telling me 'how nice, we entered together, we're gonna do this and that'. And within a week he suggested to me that we go and become members and participate and help the Student Society, the appointed one of course. The Junta's Society. And there was the truth bare naked, I realised very well what was going on and I turned tail and I never got involved in the official students organization. (Skyrianos)

The societies' task was to organise talks, open discussions on student issues, excursions to the countryside, entertaining events, celebrations of national anniversaries, as well as the 'Day of the Student', which was established by the Junta, alongside the 'Day of the Peasant' and the 'Day of the Worker'. The inner statutes of the societies were modified to ensure the effective control of their functioning and non-university and non-national issues were constitutionally banned from their meetings.\textsuperscript{386}

Apart from the university, the dictators organised a Boy Scout and Girl Guide movement, the \textit{Alkimoi}. Starting off with 1,000 members they ended up having 20,000 in 1972. These youths also assisted in the celebrations of Greek 'military virtue', which the regime habitually organised in the Panathenean Stadium and which were characterised by a delirium of kitsch nationalism.\textsuperscript{387}\textsuperscript{388}

However, in a letter sent by the regime's appointed 'Youth Directory' to Papadopoulos in 1970 there is admission of the fact that there was 'full inertia of the student societies, non-existent contact between societies and the mass of students and

\textsuperscript{385} Greek State Television (ERT) Newsreel Archive.
\textsuperscript{386} Minas Papazoglou, op.cit., p. 26.
\textsuperscript{387} See Gonda Van Steen, 'Gazing at the Nation: Bread and Circuses of the Greek Military Dictatorship', unpublished paper.
\textsuperscript{388} As most often entire schools were brought to watch the spectacle, on one such celebration the dictator Papadopoulos was prevented from speaking by the cheering pupils in what constituted an effective but probably unintended act of protest. According to Kevin Andrews the pro-regime students started shouting 'Pa-pa-dópoulou', while the ones opposing him exploited the fact that his was also the name of a popular brand of cookies and shouted 'A-la-ti-ni', that is, the name of its main competing brand. See Kevin Andrews, \textit{Greece in the Dark, 1967-1974}, Amsterdam 1980, p. 23. Quoted by K. Van Dyck, \textit{Cassandra...}, op.cit., p. 20.
lots of university problems of the students', despite the 'innovations' that were imported by the regime.\textsuperscript{399} Despite the fact that the regime envisaged the use of these societies for the 'enlightenment' and the guidance of other students, they never managed to gain considerable momentum among students, not least because of the outdated and deeply reactionary character of their activities. For freshers, for example, the programme included 'general mass attending, screenings of films with a moral content, musical breakfasts',\textsuperscript{390} activities aimed at boosting the youths' Hellenic-Christian credo.

A constant feature were the excursions abroad, in which already 'stigmatised' students could not participate, and the free tickets for football matches, the 'magic little pieces of paper' as Nikos Bistis calls them.\textsuperscript{391} Football, in this period came to be identified with the regime, as the latter systematically promoted sporting activities as part of the national revival. In particular, \textit{Panathinaikos} so-called 'epic course' to Wembley, playing in the final of the European Cup, became one of the highlights of 1970. According to a foreign report

The extraordinary demonstrations throughout the country when the team beat Red Star of Belgrade were an entirely new phenomenon for Greece. In part it was a chance to let off bottled-up steam, and at first the security forces were worried as hundreds of thousands poured into the cities' streets. But they were sharp enough to tie the football victory to the regime by infiltrating the crowds with men shouting 'Long live the revolution!' In the soldiers' view it is healthier to have people shouting in the streets about football than about politics.\textsuperscript{392}

Gradually, those who were interested in football were pinpointed and excluded as pro-regime. Giannis Kourmoulakis is an example of a non-politicised student, who, up to a certain point, co-existed with the 'appointed' ones, enjoying the benefits of this. Kourmoulakis is an exceptional case, as he argues that often the needs and worries of those students were similar to those of the students who were, in terms of their politics,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{399} Andreas Lendakis, 'Επιτελείο για τη φαινοτητοποίηση της νεολαίας' [Directory for the fascistization of the youth], \textit{Anti}, 18, cited by O. Dafermos, \textit{Students and Dictatorship}..., op.cit., op.cit., p. 45.
\item \textsuperscript{390} \textit{Ibid.} p. 46.
\item \textsuperscript{391} Nikos Bistis, 'Από το υπόγειο της Γίωνη Σταθά στην τωράτος της Νομικής' [From the basement of Giannis Stathas' Street to the Law School terrace], pp. 96-98, in Giorgos A. Vernikos (ed), \textit{Εικόνες Φαινοτητοποίησης: Η ΕΚΙΝ και οι καταλήψεις της Νομικής} [When we Wanted to Change Greece. The Anti-Dictatorship Student Movement: EKIN and the Law School’s occupations], Athens 2003, p. 98.
\item \textsuperscript{392} 'Football yes, politics no', \textit{The Economist}, 31/7/71. The myth of Wembley was promoted by the regime as a national victory and Papadopoulos reminded the players that they were 'playing for the soul of Greece'. Similarly, a popular song of the time to the tune of \textit{Ob-la-di-ob-la-da} goes 'only Greece can bear such daring young lads like you' [Σαν κι εσάς διαλεξτά πολιτικά μόνον η Ελλάδα γεννά].
\end{itemize}
covered with fleas, thus de-demonising the ‘appointed’ students, who are usually looked upon with distaste:

On top of that, I am an Olympiakos fan. In that period I used to have friends with whom I went to the matches, the Junta had formed some student societies in the Faculties. They were giving us tickets, the teams were giving tickets, the societies went to the teams and took tickets and distributed them to us. We used to pay 10 drachmas then. There were some people who were pinpointed and placed as administrative councils, without elections, they were appointed. I used to have contact with those kids, we talked, we had an opinion about what was happening etc, and with those kids we talked about what could be done, ‘we should do something in order to improve the situation and those kids had the same agonies, the same problems about what should be done, that the things did not go well, why not get better books etc. Up to the point in which the signatures start being collected in order to have elections in the societies. [...] At that point you have to take a position. To go either this way or the other...

Those students, the ‘appointed ones’, soon to be seen as the absolute ‘other’ by the student movement, are sketched by Kourmoulakis here in human lines. Ignorance is a factor he evokes for being pro-regime:

It was a bit like a trench war, where, however, the differences were informal ones, namely not even the kids themselves, I imagine, that were on the other side knew why they were there.

From 1971 onwards there was indeed an attempt to change tactics and win over students with an ‘alternative’ taste, by organising rock concerts - famously with yé-yé icons Johnny Hallyday and Silvio Vartan and later on Demis Rousos\(^\text{393}\) - and publishing a couple of student journals: *Foititikos Palmos* (Student Palm) in Athens and *O Foititis* (The Student) in Salonica. These journals, despite their enthusiastic editorials on the Greek dictators, also tried to tackle issues such as the student condition, sexuality and youth culture, without, however, abandoning a moralist discourse and constant attempts at ideological indoctrination. In any case, it is interesting to note that the cultural dynamics are not clear-cut at this point, as also non-politicised students also shared much of the enthusiasm about political cinema, *rembetiko* music and subversive TV-

\(^{393}\) However, the rock n’ roll tastes, which included a yé-yé element and an alternative and collective way of unwinding did not necessarily have a political resonance. They did, however, have a behavioral one. In any case, if one looks at the night-clubs of the time, places which from one point onwards would not attract the politicized students, they very often bear names which evoke the foreign counter-cultural scene.
programmes, such as *Ekeinos ki Ekeinos*, without attributing to them the symbolism and the meaning that the politicised ones did.

Last, but not least, it would be a mistake not to mention the existence of a hard-core of politically thinking pro-regime students participating in the so-called *National Movement of Greek Scientists* (EKNE, 1969). Numbering 500 members, all young technocrats, EKNE had *Ethnokratia* as its main motto, namely ‘the political regime whose every action results from the spirit of a bonding between generations and which will have as a prerogative the interests of the nation.’\(^{394}\) Interesting highlights from the first Congress of EKNE included its President arguing that their leadership would ‘teach manliness to the leaders of the Western world’ and others suggesting that ‘Hellenic-Christian’ civilization was a sort of panacea that would cure the ‘ill societies of the West’. A female student accused the older generation of being responsible for the decadence and dissoluteness of the new generation and a female lawyer rejected feminism as ‘a woman has to recognize the fact that she is a woman in order to remain such’.\(^{395}\)

**Production of a rebelling subjectivity**

By the end of 1971, two other groups made their appearance. A third group, which consisted of students who were exasperated with the ‘unsatisfactory conditions in the universities, including extreme conservatism of the university administration and faculty, lack of student-professor contact, extremely over-crowded classes and others’. This group appeared willing to organize and participate in a process of free elections of the representatives of various student organizations. Finally, the fourth group, roughly described as political activists of the centre but with primarily left-wing convictions, was anti-regime and sought to ‘embarrass the government over academic issues and ‘radicalize’ the main body of their colleagues’. At a point in which the ‘historical generation’ of the movement was out of action, this new age group emerged. A new group of students, willing to tear down this world, in order to obtain from the sick air around them deep, convulsive breaths of oxygen.\(^{396}\)

\(^{394}\) EKNE Α’ Συνέδριον Εθνικού Κοινότητος Νέων Επιστημόνων [First Congress of Young Greek Intellectuals], Athens 1972.

\(^{395}\) Ibid, pp. 98-99. These young jurists tried to combine all this with a modernizing view of the country, a fact that reveals ideological confusion. Meletopoulos expresses his astonishment about the fact that the thirty-year old members of EKNE adopted the conservative mottos of the time with such ease.

\(^{396}\) Dimitris Karambelas, *Διονύσιος Σαββόπουλος* [Dionysis Savopoulos], Athens 2003, p. 170. Jim Morisson’s demand ‘We want the World and We want it Now!’, was a cry of despair if translated into
The dictatorship deprived me of those social and personal possibilities, the air, my oxygen, that is. (Zorba)

After years of introversion, this new category emerged shouting and claiming its right to live/experience freedom without boundaries.

And somehow you said 'I want to go to university, where things are freer and at the same time there is a space for action'. I went to the university determined that I would do something against the Junta. And then I was waiting for the right moment. (Kouloglou)

When the time came to enter university, I didn't seek out all that really interested me and no one helped me in that, whereas I would have liked to study literature abroad somewhere, all my hominess was to go to university, to come to Athens and enter an organization fighting against the dictatorship. That was all. Nothing else interested me. (Karystiani)

It is noteworthy that Karystiani uses a word with strong sexual connotations in order to describe her drive to enter university and resistance - almost a sexual need, a physical necessity, something that was bound to bring her pleasure. However, as will be shown later on, the majority of those students did not have a political pedigree and, in contrast to the previous ones, did not experience the war and the Civil War and their associated deprivations, either directly or indirectly. It was rather likely for them instead, 'to count the dictatorship as their formative experience'. The writer Rhea Galanaki sums up this generation's attitude to the past: 'I am not speaking about the pre-dictatorship situation which I do not know'. In many ways, this attitude reflects a certain need on the part of the students to 'kill' their precedents and affirm their dynamic presence as a self-sustained entity, which was not the clone of the Civil or Post-Civil War period and their demands. The scarce references in the student documents to the earlier generations is in accordance with their self-representation, and renders the impression that the movement itself diffuses an idea about a generational distinction and refusal of all pre-existing channels of demand transmission.


*Ibid.* The literary exponents of this generation were summarized as the so-called 'generation of the 70s'.
A number of them felt pressurised already since the school years, with obligations including a hair cut, more teaching of the ancient Greek heritage, more religious education and with Modern Greek being banned from the curriculum. This came as a violent rift with the last years of democracy, and the reform program of the progressive Centre Union, whose short period in government (1963-65) under the octogenarian George Papandreou is considered as a defining factor in their development. A period of liberal instruction had been introduced by the so-called Educational Reform, which was, however, violently interrupted by the dictatorship. This benevolent caesura is strongly imprinted in the minds of those who experienced it as school students:

And then came old-Papandreou and brought new books, new language, we could read whatever we wanted. (Damofli)

We grew up, in our teenage years, with Papanoutsos's reform, which changed the situation completely after '61. Things were turned upside down. For us the difference was much greater than for others. (Iordanoglou)

In contrast, the schooling of the Junta was 'a continuous bombardment of naiveties, inaccuracies and dangerous chauvinism'. However, it is important to add here that most benefits of the Educational Reform for schools were short-lived even prior to the coup. The governments that followed Papandreou between the summer of '65 and the spring of '67 were quite reactionary, although nominally they were supposed to be of centrist inclinations, and nullified parts of the reform; this was often done with the backing of considerable parts of the academic establishment. The Educational Institute was attacked, the budget was reduced and the curricula, imprinted in people's memories as the most striking feature of educational democratisation, were altered, banned or simply pulped. So this is probably a leap that people make in their
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400 Especially a history book, Kostas Kalokairinos's 'Roman and Byzantine History' was labelled Communist propaganda and was pulped. For a detailed account of this incident see Andreas Lendakis, op. cit., p. 125. Also see Rena Stavridi Patrikiou, 'Ο φόβος της Ιστορίας' [The fear of History], pp. 67-77, in Α.Ι. 1949-1967. Το εξωτικό ..., op. cit., p. 76.
memories from '65 straight to '67, disregarding two years of regression, which were crucial for creating the condition for the coup itself.\textsuperscript{401}

How did people’s memories register the impact of the authoritarian regime upon their everyday lives? Recollections tend to describe life under the Junta in gloomy terms and colours. According to Vera Damofli, the dictatorship was a period full of darkness: ‘I think that it was always cloudy’.\textsuperscript{402} Indeed, for her the whole political climate was a sort of a tombstone, as there was no space left to breathe, the latter being a very common way of describing frustration:

> What were all these people, you had to stand them every day, with their yelling, with their dressing habits, with their horror. Every day... You had this thing, don’t you think that they were... It was something which, we were young, man, it was a burden. A tombstone. Very bad thing. And you were saying, ‘man, I have to make rifts over there, make some in order to breathe’. This was very powerful. It is a very heavy thing to live in a dictatorship.

According to Gavriil, those were years of exclusion and obscurity, in which one was obliged to feel a continuous sense of guilt, even for falling in love. A usual reference concerning the Junta, regards the vulgarity of its taste, including its ludicrous symbol, a phoenix emerging from its ashes, which could be found in all sizes and places. *Katerina, later an Architecture student in Athens, is firm in her assertion that the preposterous aspects of the Junta were more deeply felt by her generation than anything else:

> We felt much more the ridicule of the dictatorship than its violence.

Dictator Papadopoulos’ almost paranoid appearance and manner of talking is also referred to as a major reason for disgust:

> That voice of Papadopoulos, how should I tell you, sounded like a pneumatic drill inside my nerves. (Damofli)\textsuperscript{403}

\textsuperscript{401} It is also adopted by analyses of the educational processes. See for example Kostas Krimbas: ‘All discussions on the modernisation of the education were disrupted by the establishment of the dictatorship’. In K. Krimbas, ‘Η συνώνυμη παιδεία των κυρών της χώρας’ [Higher Education in the times of the Junta] pp. 135-152 in G. Athanasatou et al (eds), The Dictatorship 1967-74..., op. cit.

\textsuperscript{402} Tasos Darveris recalls in his autobiographic novel that the winter of '67-'68, that is the first year of dictatorship, was the coldest of the last decade’, Darveris, op. cit., p. 129.

\textsuperscript{403} Vera Damofli, ‘Οι συνελεύσεις’ [The assemblies], pp. 197-201, in Gatos, op. cit., p. 199.
I was feeling very suppressed by their stupidity. People in power were inferior. They were completely uncultivated. (*Sofia)

Upon entering university, a privileged site of freedom of action and interaction under normal conditions, all they encountered was complete inertia. Condensed tension fed a tendency to tear down the old world, in order to escape from its sick atmosphere: ‘Something rotten in the Kingdom of Denmark’s’ we used to say’. This conceptualisation of the situation in literary terms is also echoed in Savvopoulos’s popular song of the time (1972) ‘Something’s making me sick in this town’, which again subversively reappropriated Papadopoulos’ favourite medical metaphor: Greece was a sick patient which was put in a plaster- cast and had to be operated on. Saratsi, a Humanities student, describes how her imaginary of freedom depicted on the packet of her favourite cigarettes, Hellas Special, involved a romanticised element that came into conflict with her Marxist credo:

For some reason, Acropolis with the lunar black colour of the packet signified for me the nights of freedom that were awaiting us, my eyes were filling and I was saying to myself as an authentic Marxist, albeit a revisionist one: ‘For Christ’s sake, no lyricism now, whatever lyrical you got put it into action’. As an active EKIN member concludes, students’ everyday mantra was that ‘something has to be done’. Some of these ‘teenagers’ saw no other solution than to shout, thus claiming their right to experience freedom with no boundaries, against a collar which was tightening more and more, threatening to deprive them of the possibility of dreaming and living as they longed to.

The archetypical teenager ontology that includes a rift with society did not function as a psychological necessity but incarnated a collective demand, which was already blowing in the western world: the dream of the radical overthrow of hypocritical bourgeois values. The coming of the Junta was quite dramatic for these young people who were just coming into contact with the international protest
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404 Dimitris Marangopoulos, ‘Όι άγνωστοι στρατιώτες’ [The unknown soldiers], pp. 51-56, in Giorgos Vernikos, op. cit., p. 51.
405 Savvopoulos’s songs act as resonators, within which one can clearly hear the stressed heartbeats of those youths who were coming face to face with paralysing dangers, and one can hear their quest for dignity. See D. Karambelas, Dionysis..., op. cit., p. 17.
406 Titika Saratsi, ‘Για τη φιλη και συναγονοίτρια μου Έπι, που καμίαθες ναρις’ [For my friend and comrade Epi, who passed away too soon], in G.A.Vernikos, op.cit., p. 101.
movement that struggled 'for a new way of living rather than for a new politics', as Marangopoulos notes.\footnote{Ibid.} There was an alternative way, summarized by Damofli as follows:

Either you became part of the golden youth of this period with Mastorakis, the clubs and the quick degree, or you were looking for something else.\footnote{Vera Damofli, 'Oi ouvslrikyeK; [The assemblies], pp. 197-201 in Giorgos Gatos (ed), \textit{Πολυτεχνικό 73 Πεπορτάζ με την Ιστορία [Polytechnic '73. Reportage with History]}, Athens 2003, p. 199.}

In addition, some students started to be sensitized by reports on the trials, the torture and the exile of resistance fighters. Nikitas Lionarakis, a student of a solid right-wing background, claims that he was entirely unaware of the regime's cruelty until the point at which he happened to attend a trial. Soon thereafter, Lionarakis, as a young intellectual, began to have a general moral stance regarding politics:

During the first year in Salonica the great trials of PAM and Rigas took place, with Chalkidis, Spyridakis, Papalexis and the rest. The trial took place right across from my house, within the International Fair [...] As a Law student I decided to go [...] And there I had a great shock because for the first time I heard about torture. There was a lady called Parthena Kerameida, I have no idea what happened to her since, and a certain Aristeidis Baras, who stated that they had been tortured etc. I went mad, these were unheard of things for me, that they could take place. So, I followed the trial and started, on a rational level now, to realize that this was a regime that was a bit authoritarian.\footnote{O. Dafermos, \textit{Students and Dictatorship...}, op.cit., p. 53.}

Like him, several students tended to analyse the situation with a certain openness, due to the fact that they were not conditioned by a past experience, and lacked the political cautiousness which would imprison them within pre-defined political schemes.\footnote{Ibid.}

The students who have entered university from the Dictatorship onwards did not generally have an organized contact to politics, did not consist therefore of members of groups and mainly of the \textit{Democratic Lambrakis Youth}, as did the previous ones. So, they almost started from scratch, their relationship to politics starts from scratch. (Sabatakakis)

According to a testimony, those sensitized students, few as they initially were, immediately formed strong bonds and constituted a sort of commune, based on a common understanding regarding the rejection of the Junta. Despite the absolute tone
of this affirmation, it seems that, in general, the students were indeed divided on a first level on whether one was with or against the state of affairs.

The students did not have a life outside that of a common experience in this period. Namely, their personal life, the professional quests, the mentalities, the discussions, everything was turning around the issue of the Junta... The main issue was how to overthrow the Junta. And this defined their behaviour... Their sentimental relations were more stable, meaning that they did not search to find if they were in tune with a person or not, given that they were already communicating on a first level, being companions was enough.411

Sabatakakis recreates the everyday contact between those students in gatherings, which signalled the creation of the first solid and extended circles of socialization. Typically, he draws a distinction between this and the previous generation in this regard:

My circle of friends, and not only mine, proceeded in an organized way to discussions in homes, of a philosophical nature, something that most probably did not happen in previous periods, it did not happen prior to '67, and does not happen after '74, that is, organized groups that are systematically discussing, that is in an organized manner. That two times a week, for years, they gather in a place in order to discuss philosophically, or who in an organized manner have a contact to cinema. (Sabatakakis)

A decisive change brought about by those students was the decision to go openly and defy the risks that this entailed. However, being involved in a large scale protest was often accidental and had to do with one's intuition rather than with political criteria and judgments. Maria Tzortzopoulou, a Panteios student, tended to avoid the campus as an unpleasant place. Although she confesses that she was not one of the most politically sophisticated students, she nevertheless knew what was going on:

I didn’t want to enter this sort of environment nor did I wish to attend courses. Even I understood what was going on. Anyway. Somebody approached me, it was Marinos, and he tells me ‘we collect signatures for a paper’. Now, why did this guy tell it to me, what attracted him to me, I had nothing to do with these things, ‘we collect signatures in order to improve the condition in the student domain etc. Are you going to sign?’ ‘I’ll sign’, I told him. [...] Now, why did he trust me and why did I trust him, I don’t know. (Tzortzopoulou)

Intuition is also seen by Kourmoulakis as a defining factor for making choices of the sort. Given that he was a politically non-affiliated student, he differentiates himself from his ‘organised’ colleagues, who once in a group were guided by a collective body that took most decisions. In this respect, he presents himself as a loner, someone who was guided only by his ‘instinct’.

We knew why we were here, but we didn’t have, that is me personally - some other kids who were organised might have had it - an instruction or anything like that. I got instructed by my instinct. (Kourmoulakis)

Still, these students remained a small number, a ‘strict minority’ to use Roszak’s term, as their distance from the rest remained quite large.

**Heirs and defectors: The constituency of anti-regime students**

There is a national danger nowadays: to put the communist label on all students.

*Sofoklis Tzanetis,* ex-Minister of Public Order, in court, defending his nephew, accused of misconduct (February 1973)\(^{413}\)

There was an interesting shift in that first category of students, whose background, according to the US classification, did not ‘permit’ them to take part in any activity. It was the very existence of the oppressive and ludicrous dictators that transformed them into a more politicized entity, reinforcing their need to ‘do something’ and, gradually, to become associated with the Left.

We were not politicized up to that point. We hadn’t read anything. They made us through the beatings, through their stance, they turned us and made us, say, Communists. We hadn’t read a thing, we weren’t Communists, I was just a 22-year old lad, I was against the Junta because, say, they were repressing us. There was no consciousness, most kids, the majority of the kids were like that in that period. You cannot say that all the kids were left-wing, no one had read then, where


\(^{413}\) ‘Σήμερα η απόφαση για τους φοιτητές. Οι προτάσεις του επιστημονικού. Ένοχοι για περιπλοκή - Αθωοί για τον Καζαντζή.’ [Today the decision on the students. The proposals of the persecutor. Guilty for insulting the authorities - Innocent for ‘teddyboyism’], *Thessaloniki,* 19/2/73.
could you find those readings then, it was only later that those things started to circulate.

(Kourmoulakis)

Similarly, Nikos Alivizatos, a Law student of a solid bourgeois background, writes that one did not need to be left-wing in order to rebel:

You became left-wing through the indignation that a barbarous regime caused you, which condensed the most reactionary features of post-war Greek society: cheap patriotism, Greek Orthodox hypocrisy and servility vis-à-vis the foreign ‘protectors’. [...] So you became left-wing by being anti-regime in the first place. Readings, political thinking and ideological consciousness did not precede, they followed. In this sense - at least as far as I am concerned - freedom, democracy and human rights were the first issue, the fundamental right of political belonging. Revolution followed.414

In his index of the members of the ‘Polytechnic Generation’, also Dimitris Fyssas argues that it was the arbitrariness and vulgarity of the Colonels that gave a twist to kids of all backgrounds to embrace the left-wing paradigm and shape their oppositional tactics around its theoretical frame:

We were the suppressed kids of the dictatorship, brought up with Papadopoulos’s kalamatlanos dances and Pattakos’s trowel, being fed up with the military marches and the ‘birds’ of the regime of 21 April, enraged that they didn’t let us listen to and read whatever we wanted, oriented, of course, towards the outlawed and being sympathetic to the haunted ones: that is the Left and the left-wingers. The Junta made us left-wing without knowing it. That’s why we come from all social classes, that’s why we are children of right-wing and pro-Junta families as well.415

However, Fyssas disregards the fact that there was an international protest movement cycle of ’68 and that the intellectual and political trends would have entered the country and would have radicalised the students, even without the Junta. Still, the very characteristics of this generation of rebels were defined by the Junta’s vulgarity and its anti-modernization stance.

All the same, a recurrent theme in student recollections, both of this and of the previous generation, is a reference to a certain political family tradition, mostly Left-wing. Luisa Passerini’s observation about a quasi-biological predestination of being left-wing. Luisa Passerini’s observation about a quasi-biological predestination of being

414 Nikos Alivizatos, Μήπως το ταξίδι συνεχίζεται; [Does the journey go on?] pp. 9-47, Preface to Alex Adler, Ο Κομμουνισμός [Communism], Athens 2004, p. 11.
socialist or communist is particularly valid. Passerini argues that there are key-points in self-representations, in which 'personal and collective memory meet and the individual mythology becomes a tradition shared by a family, a circle of friends, a political group.'

Yes, it came as a natural continuation, [my father] was continuously talking to us, there was no way that in the evenings at dinner, on Sunday afternoons say, he would not talk to us about Lenin, Marx, Engels. Those people were part of our lives... (Vervenioti)

Of course it was clear that I would be oriented, as Resistance had a mythical dimension inside me, resistance to the Germans, the Left after the Civil War, namely that I would participate in this against the Junta. It was all too clear, that is. (Zorba)

I consider that I was a Communist straight away, that is from back then (laughter), since I was very little, immediately when I started to understand the world. (Papageorgiou)

The claim of continuity in the politics of the family is usually associated with the place of origin, as in some cases Asia Minor:

We were naturally Left-wing, as we were refugees. (Damofli)

We grew up within the atmosphere of poverty and suppression, of the, how can I put it now, of refugee-life, we had the consciousness of the refugee. And of course the fact that we were the very history of multiethnic Salonica, all this had a, how can I put it, I found it very natural. Namely, I didn't have any inhibitions in getting involved in a movement with internationalist characteristics. (Mitafidis)

Giannis Kourmoulakis, acknowledges the fact that a certain political pedigree naturally endowed certain people with a greater political awareness, in contrast to those with a more politically neutral home environment:

From one point of view we were quite ignorant, me and some other people. Others were smart, the ones who had a family background with some history, some past, an uncle who had experienced some deportation. Those knew some things about what to do.

---

In contrast, people from left-wing family traditions (and therefore on the side of the defeated in the Civil War-), indicate that this experience often led to greater caution on the part of parents. Continuous persecutions in the post-war years and the interiorisation of a constant fear of being purged created the imperative that the kids should not get involved in politics:

What was coming out was [...] the urge to be very careful. They didn’t want us to get more clues. Things were still very recent. My father had been persecuted up to ’53, I was already born. (Vourekas)

Our parents, even the left-wing ones, rarely talked about their past. There was indeed an atmosphere of violence and repression. (Kalimeris)

As youths tend to internalise collective values, some chose to reinforce the bond with their families, whereas others opted to break. Family traditions often acted as boomerangs in terms of political choices, as they generated a sort of generational clash, while an extreme indoctrination on the part of the parents often led to undesired results.417 A strong ‘orthodox’ Communist tradition on the part of parents, for example, often produced as a response a more ‘radical’ choice. This is the case for both Kleopatra Papageorgiou and Anna Mandelou, a Maoist and a Trotskyite respectively. Mandelou explains her more critical stance towards Party Orthodoxy as a logical outcome of the fact that she came from a Communist family:

Indeed I met kids, for instance the son of a General [...] who of course would look at the Left-wingers with awe, since they had been persecuted for all those years. They were all like that, the kids of middle-bourgeois families did all have an awe [...]. I couldn’t have such stance because I knew the Civil War better, meaning the History of the Left in Greece. I had experienced it deep inside me. So I had a more critical stance. And I was not the only one...

On the other hand, Christina Vervenioti reacted against her socialist father’s rejection of the Communist party’s dogmatism by embracing the KKE. For that reason she evokes with distress her father’s endless repetition of a particular personal misfortune of his, aiming to reinforce his argument, which in the end had the opposite effect:

417 In Darveris’s novel, during the trial of Lambros’s organization, Andreas, the unofficial leader of the group, stresses in his plea the repressive effect of the values promoted by one’s own family and hinted at a sort of inner ‘obligation’ to reject them: ‘Your Honour, my father was a gendarme. And I say this so that you realise in what kind of environment I was brought up and why I hated the triptych ‘country, family, religion’, in A Night’s Story..., op.cit.
In general my father was telling me not to get involved with the KKE ... And this of course made me at some point enter it with all my force (laughter). Because, yes, because my father was telling me about all those mistakes committed by the Party, about Zachariadis, about this, about that, he told me that once they had a gathering at my aunt’s place and my father disagreed on certain issues and when he left from there someone hit them, because my father was with someone else, and they had a disagreement concerning that particular line, and on their way out they fired at them. And he kept on telling me this over and over again.

In general the class origins of the students who became politically involved varied and therefore material conditions do not account for anti-regime activity. Moreover, in contrast to the previous generation, in which most of the politically involved students were descendants of left-wing families, this generation’s political instructor became the Junta itself. Middle and upper-middle class students, and those of a solid right-wing family background, started to become radicalised and turned against their background. They embraced the dominant Left-wing paradigm of the time, despite the fact that, or often because, it came in stark contrast to their family’s political tradition or social status. This was a common trend in the '68 movements in the rest of Europe in which ‘the phenomenon of ‘defection’ by the sons and daughters of the wealthy and influential [had taken] on scandalous proportions’. Dafermos argues convincingly that in that epoch the class aspect could be a major deterrent to activism, as university was a high stake for people coming from lower social backgrounds to take risks:

When someone entered whichever Faculty in the University coming from a rural, petit-bourgeois, working class, one changed class, one could change class [...] One guaranteed a decent life, changes were radical, this was an impediment to action against the regime, because one was playing with one’s degree. But the ones coming from higher strata in terms of income, what did they have to lose?

Papachristos notes on this phenomenon:

---

418 The surprise and resentment of the well-to-do families towards youngsters’ follies is vividly expressed in a famous satirical song of the early ’70s, even though this was supposedly criticising a petit bourgeois attitude. The song is called ‘Shame on us for that kid of ours!’ and goes ‘We did not want any trouble in our family, but now we ended up having a rebel in our house’. LP Τα Μικροσκοπίκα [Petty Bourgeois Songs], by Lukianos Kilaidonis (music) and Giannis Negropontis (lyrics), 1973.

I dare say that it was no one's hereditary right to enter the struggle or the student movement because s/he was from a left-wing family background or like that, a priori. The processes themselves were such that they put into the game kids and students who were going against the family background of their parents or their political history. And we have many examples like that. From Nikos Meggreli, who in the end killed himself during the Metapolitefsi, it didn't matter if his father was right-wing and a Minister under Karamanlis, in fact of Education, and out of the blue Nikos is in the Law School Committee, he was by then a protesting left-winger. (Papachristos)

Thanasis Skamnakis, a Law student belonging to the Young Communists League (KNE), adds that this heterodoxy confused the authorities who could no longer classify their opponents according to their family status:

It was of course a conflict with the parents as well, meaning that half of the kids of Varvakeios, which used to be a model school and an experimental one, were in the Communist Youth [...] Beyond any suspicion...

Thodoros Vourekas sustains that these people, often offspring of conservative ministers in the cabinets prior to 1967 and of 'well to do families' were bringing 'a culture of their own to the movement'. Furthermore, he sustains, the Left was seen as winning over people from other political parts, thus becoming 'a gigantic force'. A female student who requested to remain anonymous argues convincingly that a bourgeois family background could contribute considerably to the shaping of one's consciousness. That was the case with the major figures in her School, Architecture, which was traditionally one of the most politically active:

The kids that were ... we could use the word 'avant-garde' in inverted commas, the kids who dedicated their time to the anti-dictatorship struggle were not peasants. They were city kids and they were kids who had some political and intellectual stimuli, from their houses in other words. They were not from the poorest, more suppressed, more tormented strata. These were few. They existed, but they were, I believe, the exception. I cannot talk with percentages but... as I saw them, they were kids who had the luxury, if not to make a trip abroad, at least to buy books, to read books, speak a foreign language or two and eventually to have a contact with what was going on abroad. For example, in the School of Architecture there were many kids who had graduated from expensive private schools, the [American] College, the German School and that stuff, and they participated in the movement. (*Katerina)
In addition, the students who inspired and participated at first in the *Hellenic European Youth Movement* (EKIN), one of the main cultural platforms created in late 1970 in an attempt to exploit the limits of legality, were all of well known bourgeois Athenian families. Nikitas Lionarakis, one of EKIN’s leading members, stresses the fact that they were sons and daughters of army generals and ship-owners, who first socialized with each other at parties and soirées organized by the Rotary club, ‘in order to reproduce the bourgeois establishment in Greece’. Similarly, Kaiti Saketa, the owner of the left-wing book-shop in Salonica, argues that her EKKE student friends were all bourgeois, a fact that accounted, in her opinion, for their sophistication. Saketa argues that this was a well-known reality:

The EKKE kids first and foremost, as we all know, came from bourgeois families. All EKKE kids, we knew them... The most intellectual, the most well-read of all.

Theodoridis writes that his way of thinking at the time concerning people of a conservative background, was that youth was a defining factor that rendered continuous political ‘progress’ inevitable:

We believed that progress was a rather mechanistic thing, namely it was enough to be young in order to be oriented towards progression and as the years go by you become even more progressive, this is why when we were students we had among our cadres, in those small left-wing groupuscules, we had sons of Right-wingers, whatever you can imagine, we believed that there was no way that the change that these youths, these colleagues of ours, were feeling was not organic, was not internal.420

At this point, we can also detect the element of ‘revolt against the family’, an intergenerational conflict, whereby the young articulate their distinct political and social views, often in contrast to the conservative family values.421 An interesting example of a defector is provided by the daughter of Efesios, Minister of Defence

---

421 According to Anderson’s useful, albeit outdated, behavioristic analysis, almost 50% of the students stayed with their parents and relatives, while only 3.3% lived in halls of residence and 28.5% with fellow-students and 17.2% on their own. Anderson shows that 63.1% from his sample (3,000 students) in 1972 considered themselves as upper-middle class (37). Only 14% of all students were of peasant families, even though the peasantry made up 56% of the Greek population. See Lynn R.Anderson, *Προσωπικότητα και στάσεις των φοιτητών των ελληνικών Ανωτάτων Εκπαιδευτικών Ιδρυμάτων [Personality and stance of students in Greek Institutions of Higher Education],* Athens 1980, p. 36 and B.G.Valaoras, ‘Βιο-κοινωνική ύπατη Ελλήνων φοιτητών’ [Bio-social texture of Greek students], *Medical Society of Athens, Bulletin of Minutes,* 1970, volume 1, pp. 37-81.
during the 1973 events, who as a member of Rigas was inside the Polytechnic shouting ‘Freedom’ and ‘Democracy’, while the tanks were crushing the gate. Lacking, however, in these testimonies of past and present are angry references to parents as ‘compromised’ and ‘conformist’. Accordingly, this verbal element of violent generational clashes, one typical trace of ’68, cannot be discerned. In contrast to this, many children of right-wing parents, military men and in general of people who were least tolerant of the coup, including Lionarakis and Xydi, tend to express a tender view at present.

My father used to help the people, because he had a good reputation, that one, that he was an honest right-winger etc, but he was a worker and he happened to rush sometimes to the Police in order to help somebody, to get him out. (Xydi)

On top of that, they claim that their parents were surprised by this mistreatment and irrevocably opposed to the Junta after a while.

Tale of two Cities
During the first period of the dictatorship, with martial law in force in Athens and Salonica, open-air rallies and demonstrations were banned and offenders risked court martial. That is the so-called ‘clandestinity’ period, in which power was not the subject of open contestation and public space was devoid of exchange. This changed when, in successive years, the student movement achieved high visibility by going into the public. In a period of four years (1967-71), however, the only recorded incidents of open protest were on the occasions of the public funerals of two prominent figures: the liberal politician George Papandreou (1968) and the Nobel-prize winner, poet George Seferis (1971). These moments were used as an opportunity to stage massive demonstrations against the regime.

Papandreou’s funeral was attended by an estimated 250,000 demonstrators, who found themselves the object of particularly harsh police repression (brutal beatings, 100 arrests, 36 people tried by special court-martials). Slogans included ‘democracy’, ‘this is our referendum’, ‘you are our father’, ‘elections’, ‘down with the army’, ‘the army to the barracks’, ‘114’ and ‘hail to the heroes’, the latter referring to Panagoulis’ group,

---

422 Spyros Karatsaferis, _Η σφαγή του Πολυτεχνείου. Η Δίκη_ [The Polytechnic slaughter. The Trial], with a preface by P. Kanellopoulos, Athens 1975, p. 321.
which some months earlier had attempted to assassinate dictator Papadopoulos. These were interspersed with the singing of the National Anthem, which is a Hymn to Freedom, and songs associated with the Resistance. Interestingly, the US Ambassador Talbot reported that

One remarkable aspect of the demonstration was that party youth groups, which were disbanded after the April 21 takeover, appear to have retained cohesiveness and organization, for they appeared to be out in force, well led and disciplined and with a prepared action plan.\(^{425}\)

However, his comment seems out of place given the fact that massive attendance was largely spontaneous and all that remained of the party youths were rudimentary groupings.

Seferis’s funeral, on the other hand, was the culmination of his role as a sort of symbolic leader of the resistance. According to Van Dyck, it resembled the funeral of Palamas, another ‘national’ poet, who died in 1943 under German occupation. His funeral was ‘attended by thousands who came to protest and mourn the death of a country as well as that of a man who had fought for its survival’.\(^{426}\) This funeral gave the 10,000 people who reportedly attended, the opportunity to sing banned songs of the self-exiled Communist composer Theodorakis,\(^{427}\) a good number of which featured in the words of Seferis’s poems.

Symbolic moments were transformed into notable opportunities for large gatherings and into opportunities for the expression of dissatisfaction. To paraphrase McAdam, by framing the march as an act of public mourning, people appropriated long-standing cultural symbols in the service of protest.\(^{428}\) ‘The cultural legitimacy that attached to the march encouraged participation while constraining official efforts at social control.’\(^{429}\) In this context Clifford Geertz’s observation that symbolic

---

\(^{425}\) USNA, POL 6 Greece, Confidential, Department of State Telegram, 7658 Athens, ‘Papandreou funeral turned into first political demonstration in eighteen months’, 4 November 1968.


\(^{427}\) USNA, POL 6 Greece, Confidential, Department of State, Telegram, Athens 5050, ‘Seferis Funeral’ Singing Theodorakis songs could draw charges of ‘carrying out propaganda against the established social order’, 23 September 1971.


\(^{429}\) *Ibid.* McAdam refers to the funeral of Chinese Premier Yu Yaobang in 1989 that stimulated the march and the movement in Beijing in 1989. His conclusion is nevertheless fairly valid concerning the Greek case.
performances can be understood as 'social dramas' is particularly valid. Katerina Detsika, who was present at both funerals recalls:

I think that we also wanted that. We expected, how can I tell you, what I’m saying is macabre, someone of such stature to die in order to express ourselves, to express this blatant anti-Junta feeling. So, we were given those two opportunities which were unique.

Thus, when the people were denied a private space, since any in-doors assembly of three or more people was prohibited, public spaces such as squares and avenues inevitably became a territory of open confrontation, even if prompted by funerals. To the theatricality of power was opposed the theatre of the streets, ‘whose young actors and directors invent[ed] scenes and texts by drawing on a global repertoire.’ Later on ‘liberated spaces’, in the occupation of various Schools, became a ‘territory for dissidence.’

The main student activities were co-ordinated in Athens and Salonica. The youth of Athens clearly played the dominant role and had a vanguard position in terms of student action, not least because of its numeric superiority. In the academic year 1968/69 the higher institutions of Athens numbered 44,880 students (30,516 male, 14,364 female) and those of Salonica (Aristotelian University of Salonica, Industrial School) 25,838 students (17,758 male, 8,080 female). In the summer of 1971, The Economist commented on the shifting view of the above urban centres:

Athens, Salonica and now Piraeus are sophisticated cities. The best hotels are as good as any in Europe and their service is probably better; boutiques and supermarkets have arrived; the traditional, exclusively male coffee-houses have given way to smart cafés to cater, not just for the tourists, but for the rapidly changing pattern of Greek life.

Nevertheless, clear differences can be seen in the two cities. They can be differentiated in terms of student activities, philosophies and action, due to different backgrounds, tradition, spaces and experiences, in other words a social immersion within two entirely

---

430 Ibid, p. 64
431 University of Athens, ‘Panteion’ School of Political Science, Polytechnic, School of Commerce, Industrial School of Piraeus, Agronomy School, Fine Arts.
different urban contexts. As the meaning of the self is determined by the encounter between subjectivity and environment, the experiences, and thus the formation of subjectivity were totally different, according to the physical space of instruction. As Jeffrey Wasserstrom has argued, there is ‘a distinct rhythm and style of the youth movement provided by the city’s size, cosmopolitan character [and] unique political structure’, in other words the city’s distinct features.

In addition, the nature of the university buildings is important in terms of human relations and social and cultural reactions, including the symbolic power of places. This includes the ‘routes’ in the city and its dwelling places, such as residential and leisure zones, student neighbourhoods, cafés, taverns and student flats. These spaces and their logics were redefined during the dictatorship years. Rigos tries to draw parallels, on an imaginary level, with prototypes of guerrilla warfare, evoking the native Indians and a famous phrase borrowed from a Mao dictum:

> It looked a bit like city guerrilla warfare, or like the Indians in the war, as the Americans used to say, namely with a basic characteristic of city guerrilla warfare which is that the guerrilla has to feel inside the city like a fish in water. (Rigos)

In terms of urban territoriality and the university’s location vis-à-vis the city, the University of Salonica was located in the very centre of the city. It also had a campus, which created a particular resonance and a different relationship between city and university and provided a springboard for the creation of networks and a coherent terrain of action. In contrast, the University of Athens was decentralized and did not constitute a focal point of the city. Accordingly, in Salonica the areas with student flats were usually next to the university, while in Athens the layout was much more spread out. This reveals a great deal in terms of different student experiences of university life, of their relation to university instruction, their itineraries in the city and their actions.

Athens, even in my time, was chaotic. Meaning that the kids would get together during the hours in which they were together in the lectures, in the university spaces [...] and then they would lose

---

each other. My wife was here, that is my future wife, was a student in Athens and I know from her recollections how it was. (Vourekas)

All this is a reflection of the spatial relationships of everyday life in the two cities. Athens' chaotic character and huge distances contrast with Salonica's limited size and confinement of the major activities in the narrow space of the centre. As Manadu Diuf points out, 'the morphology of a city, its representation and production, effectively signify the trajectories of the individual and collective lives that unfold there'. Thodoris Vourekas, a Physics student whose individual itinerary included Parga, Athens and Salonica, points out:

[In Salonica] there were all-student neighbourhoods, the whole university, with much better infrastructure, a new Physics-Maths School, very large, with auditoria [...] There the main element was Melenikou Street, the 40 Churches neighbourhood or a part from the Toumba are, it was an entire chain around the university with student neighbourhoods. There were taverns up in the Castles and we were together during the whole day, we met, there was a community and communication on a daily basis. That was a great thing, there was not the alienation of Athens. [...] And its neighbourhoods, even those with the building blocks, man, they were not characterless, so there was some warmth in people and a better sort of contact. You felt differently. I don't know. The Northern Greeks were nicer people. They were real Macedonians.

Accordingly, in Salonica, the space of social immersion was narrower and people tended to be more conservative and easily recognizable, as they were fewer. This was balanced by the fact that most students there came from other cities and therefore were less easily spotted by the locals. Still, a female student from Athens who came to Salonica for her studies notes that 'in Athens they stared at the way I was dressed much less than here'. It is illuminating that Athenian students studying in Salonica complain about the city's dense and almost claustrophobic communication network. For Andrianos Vanos, an Architecture student from Athens Salonica first and foremost meant the departure from a social and cultural life that existed in Athens:

I entered the University of Salonica, I came here, I had to leave behind all this beautiful and youthful atmosphere that had been created in Athens, where there were already some models like,

437 M. Diuf, 'Urban Youth...', op. cit., p. 60.
438 In contrast to Salonica, Anderson notices that compared to 1964, there were not so many students from outside Athens in 1972, probably also due to the functioning of the universities of Patras and Ioannina. Lynn R. Anderson, Personality and stance..., op. cit., p. 86.
439 Discussion with *Sofia, Salonica, 15/1/01.
say, Savvopoulos or the places we used to go [...] and I came here [to Salonica] that everything was dead, from this point of view.

On top of that, Vanos emphasizes the fact that in Salonica violence and suppression was an everyday reality as it was visible:

Since Salonica is a small city everything takes place in the centre. You could see from your house, watching from the balcony, the police chasing or arresting people.

Carl E. Schorske argued that cities are ‘symbolic condenser[s] of socio-cultural values.’ These are reflected in Salonica’s stark post-Civil War social alienation and its ‘tradition’ of underground networks of extreme right-wingers, the so-called ‘parastatals’. The latter earned the city the title ‘mother of all bullies’. As the modern city is the classic locus of collective memory, residues from earlier times are strongly imprinted in peoples’ memories and they rank high in their recollections.

The Lambrakis case... the more intense parastate.... Nikiforidis, who was killed because he was gathering signatures for peace. Yes, there was a tougher political climate in Salonica. This is also proven by the later suppression through terrorising bullying student groups. (Vourekas)

Here in Salonica there was a very strong politicisation because two very intense political events that had taken place. One was the assassination of Lambrakis and the other one was that the farmers had entered Salonica. And in relation to all the political climate the youth of that period had been very strongly politicised. (Vanos)

Another striking feature was the powerful presence of EKOF, the ‘National Social Organization of Students’. In fact, in the episodes that took place in campus a month prior to the coup, as already mentioned, its members became involved in violent clashes with left-wing students, leaving many of them seriously wounded. Theologidou clearly draws a dividing line between the two cities in terms of this episode:

---

There are some beatings during this last month in Salonica. In Athens this does not exist, it exists in Salonica. (Theologidou)

So, it is interesting to note that post-Civil War terrorization of defeated left-wingers is much more quoted and stressed by students from Salonica than by those from Athens. Comments often tend to characterise Salonica’s limited space as an ideal ground for the ‘hide-and-seek’ between police and students:

The police had an experience, the student branch of the police had organised very well this network of repression in Salonica. It could do it because the space was, as I said, limited. This was good for us, but it was also good for the police, they could intervene everywhere. (Vourekas)

Stergios Katsaros in his autobiographical novel recalls his decision to join the underground organization _Laiki Pali_ and go to Salonica as the expert in bombs, as the biggest folly of his life:

As soon as I set foot in Salonica I felt the handcuffs around my hands.  

Kaplanis, a Dentistry student and member of the clandestine mechanism of KNE in Salonica, argues similarly. His assertion, however, that Athenian Professors were more supportive of anti-regime action lacks further substantiation and rather looks to be an idealized version of reality in the capital:

Salonica, don't forget, was a very tough city for those in clandestinity, first of all the geographical way the city is structured, you cannot hide in too many places, it's not like Athens. [...] There were many parastatals, it was like this, the people were not that positive. Right? We shouldn't forget this thing. It wasn't like Athens where the University Professors or the intellectuals opened their door...

In spite of Dimitris Fatouros’ view that ‘the university is the city itself and vice versa’, Salonica and Athens do not seem to follow this rule. Salonica’s reactionary character was supposed to be balanced by the liberal character of its university. Traditionally the city’s university was known for its progressive positions, mainly in the so-called ‘language question’. It is telling that the number of professors sacked from

---

443 Stergios Katsaros, _I the Provocateur_, op.cit., p.158.
444 Dimitris Fatouros, _Change and Reality..., _op. cit., p. 75.
Salonica is twice as many as those dismissed from other institutions. The exact opposite is true for Athens, as its university’s reactionary reputation and perceived old-fashioned character stood in stark contrast to the non-conservative tendencies of vast segments of its population. Anderson notes that these perceptions concerning the nature of the universities were shared by students in the early 1970s: “the ‘image’ students have of the University of Salónica is more ‘modern’ or liberal than the ‘image’ they have of the University of Athens”. Indeed, the most liberal students opted to study in Salónica for that reason. Even so, Greek students, as happened elsewhere, ‘thought in national rather than in strictly academic or local terms’.

**Political Opportunities**

By this time Greek campuses were so quiet that in February ’72 in an article which appeared in the *Observer*, Colonel Woodhouse, a renowned, albeit biased, connoisseur of Greek realities since the time of the German occupation stated that ‘hard as it is […] to detect a spark of revolt among older Greeks, it is harder still among the young.’

Some weeks later the student movement would take off with a series of organized actions aimed at winning free elections. This absence of comment about potential student revolts bears striking similarities to the famous *Le Monde* article which concluded that France was feeling ‘bored’, a week prior to May ’68.

But what were the underlying dynamics that allowed the creation of the student movement? A major contributing factor was the new phase in the Colonels’ politics that started in 1971, the period of the so-called ‘controlled liberalization’. This attempt at normalization aimed at winning public support for the regime, silencing criticism abroad and ensuring a long-lasting authoritarianism with a democratic façade. Part of this policy was to remove martial law in most parts of the country, soften
censorship and allow for more social interaction. Later, a general amnesty would be granted to all political prisoners and parliamentary elections would be scheduled. By autumn 1971 the infamous ‘Certificates of Social Belief’ were abolished. At the same time, the verdicts of the martial courts were becoming less ferocious.

Papadopoulos’ manoeuvres and his decision, regardless of whether or not they were sincere, to civilianize the regime and proceed to a gradual normalization of political life, opened a space for reaction on the side of counter-elites and civil society in general. This included the students, with their mobilization potential being gradually reinforced. The ‘liberalisation’ offered a clear structure for opportunity, namely room for manoeuvring, which helped the student body ‘carve up public space’ and develop into a more robust entity. The repertoire of student protest changed significantly between 1967 and 1971-72, as conditions changed and concepts of mass struggle replaced clandestinity, and the ‘closed’ nature of the clandestine groups became

452 With the ‘Law about the Press’ of November 1969, preventive censorship was ceased and the responsibility for censorship passed over to the publishers.
453 Several major constitutional rights were restored such as the right of association and cooperation, the inviolability of the home and the right to personal safety, with decrees issued by the ‘National Revolutionary Government’ in November 1968, April 1969 and April 1970. See Alivizatos, The political institutions..., op.cit, p. 286. See also To Vima, 29/5/72, «Επαναφέρονται τα δικαιώματα των Ελλήνων» [The articles 10 and 11 of the Constitution are back to force. The right of assembling and of association].
455 For a theory on the importance of the structure of political opportunity for the successful outcome of a social movement see in particular P.K.Eisinger, ‘The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities’ pp. 11-28 in American Political Science Review, 67, 1973, Charles Tilly, From Mobilization to Revolution, Reading 1978, Herbert P. Kitschelt, ‘Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest’, British Journal of Political Science, 16, pp. 57-85, Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions, New York 1989, S. Tarrow, Power in the Movement. Social Movements, Collective Action, and Mass Politics in the Modern State, New York 1994. According to this theory, movements are ‘less a product of meso level mobilization efforts that they are the beneficiaries of the increasing political vulnerability or of the political and economic system as a whole’. McAdam, 1994, cit, p. 39. However, to look at the role of political opportunities, not in terms of their eventual potential but as the only and absolute drive behind social movements often leads to a so-called ‘structural’ or ‘objectivist’ bias. McAdam’s observation that it is impossible to ‘separate these objective shifts in political opportunities from the subjective processes of social construction and collective attribution that render them meaningful’ (Ibid), gives more balance to the approach and is also a key element in my own understanding of mobilisational dynamics. After all, ‘mediating between opportunity and action are people and the subjective meanings they attach to their situation.’ (Doug McAdam, Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, Chicago 1982, p. 48)
456 For an elaboration of this notion see Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison, Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach, Cambridge 1991, p. 104
redundant.\textsuperscript{457} This represented ‘a transition of the anti-dictatorship struggle from a personal individual stance to collective action’.\textsuperscript{458}

This development reflects McAdam, McCarthy and Zald’s point, that a movement only emerges out of the combination between political opportunities and mobilizing structures, which afford groups a certain structural potential for action. Still, in order to mobilize, people need not only to be aggrieved but also optimistic that by acting collectively they can redress a problem, that is through a framing process.\textsuperscript{459} The opening up of the regime, including a less policed public sphere and more opportunities for the diffusion of ‘subversive’ material, offered the student body the cohesion and optimism it lacked. However, resource mobilisation theory, which holds that the emergence of a social movement depends on the available resources that the oppressed have at their disposal, fails to account for this case.\textsuperscript{460}

\section*{Mobilizational structures}

Theda Skocpol in her classic treatise on social revolutions argues that people cannot engage in political action unless they are ‘part of at least minimally organised groups with access to some resources’.\textsuperscript{461} Two initiatives which would comply with this rule and which, as places of dissent, would prove instrumental in enhancing the organizational capacities of students were the re-opened ‘regional societies’ and \textit{EKIN}. The regional societies, a decadent institution up to that point, used the legitimate façade of a cultural club in order to act as headquarters for ‘theoretical reflections and discussions during the day or up to the morning light’ (Karystiani), and these discussions included the delineation of student strategies. Regional Societies, legal corporations following the regime’s decision to restitute the right of association, had their own offices, so providing a means of avoiding direct control or harassment by the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{457} G. Notaras, \textit{Dictatorship and Organised Resistance...}, op. cit., p. 197.
\item\textsuperscript{458} Alkis Rigos, ‘Φοιτητικά Κίνημα και Δικτατορία’ [Student Movement and Dictatorship], \textit{Anti}, Vol. 344, 17-23/4/87, pp. 54-55.
\item\textsuperscript{459} See Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, Mayer N. Zald, ‘Introduction: Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes - toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements’ (henceforth ‘Introduction’) pp. 1-20 in Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, Mayer N. Zald (eds.), \textit{Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings} (henceforth \textit{Comparative}), New York, 1996, p. 5.
\item\textsuperscript{461} Theda Skocpol, \textit{States and Social Revolutions. A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China}, Cambridge, 1979, p. 10
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Katerina, who came from Patra, was a student in the Athens Polytechnic and adds that apart from anything else these societies acted as a first point of reference for newcomers:

A kid who was coming from the countryside and did not know anyone, mainly in the big faculties, the massive ones, could find someone there. If not people with the same ideology, some people who were on the same wavelength.

The Cretan society of Athens was one of the most solid and active, having among its ranks some of the would-be most prominent members of the movement. By conducting its first elections in late March 1972, the Cretan Society was the first one to elect its own council and to demand for all other societies to be allowed to do the same. The president elect of the society was Ioanna Karystiani, a law student known for her charisma in inspiring student crowds. This was a breakthrough without precedent, in terms of gender politics also, as a woman, Karystiani, took over leadership of an entity which had been representative of a traditionally male-dominated and macho Cretan microcosm. For a time, the society’s journal Xasteria (Clear Skies) was another common point of reference. Societies also tried to organize discussions and concerts, which, however, did not always take place due to continuous police interference. Even so, a concert organized by the Cretans in May '72 ended in a demonstration of 3,000 persons, the first of such proportions during the Junta period.

In any case, societies, referring to the local and the folkloric aspect, were an interesting attempt at reversing and employing two of the regime’s main propagandistic materials: tradition and folklore. In this way, as will be shown later (Chapter 3), folk culture was promoted as a form of resistance, in a way following the US model which included Dylan’s return to folk. In addition, students assimilated elements of traditional dress, such as kerchiefs, hand-woven bags and knitted skullcaps in their dressing habits. Theodoridis describes this retro fashion:

---

462 This, however, was not always the case. Especially in Salonica the offices of the Cretan and other local societies were broken into several times and damaged by students who were sympathetic to the regime, including EKOF members and 4th August hooligans.

463 G. A. Vernikos, op.cit., p. 20.

464 It was nevertheless attacked by Maoists for too much academic tone and too little class feeling and combativeness. See Manolis Pimblis, Το φοιτητικό κίνημα και η πόλη του Α.Δ.Μ.Ε. [The student movement and the struggle of L.D.M.E.], Salonica, 1974, p. 165.

465 O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op. cit., p. 61.
We suddenly wanted to decorate our student rooms and we suddenly went to antiquarian shops, we discovered barbers’ chairs, old mirrors, *Good Morning Sir*; then *sarakatsanika* clothes appeared: whatever was folk culture began to attract us.\(^{466}\)

Kleopatra Papageorgiou describes the ‘folkloric’ localism displayed by members of the Cretan society, with a somewhat critical tone:

> These kids also had an intense localist, not nationalist, feeling. In a good sense of course, because maybe through this localism, and through cultivating it, [they got] the chance to express themselves against the Junta. Namely, imagine, some of them didn’t miss the chance to even wear the kerchief on their heads, the one that Cretans wear (laughter). Or boots, or they were showing off their Cretan accent. They showed that they were Cretans, though they could also speak without an accent. They did it on purpose.

From a certain point onwards, the local societies took the lead in terms of protest, especially against ‘conscription’ (see Chapter 4). Local societies promoted active subversion, using the local and traditional as innovative, and at the same time as a means of protest always referring to the pure, folkloric, popular, demotic psyche.\(^{467}\) Not surprisingly, this revolutionary and unsubdued spirit was often connected to the archetype of the 1821 War against the Ottomans.

Another initiative that broke through the suppression of political activity and revealed an area in which potential action could be undertaken for the creation of student cohesion was *EKIN*. This, as mentioned previously, started off as the initiative of individuals who were the children of wealthy, conservative, well-respected families. It is no coincidence, that some of its most illustrious members were young members of

---

\(^{466}\) P. Theodoridis, *Macedonian..., op. cit.*, p. 323.

\(^{467}\) This was also part of a general *problématique* which goes back to the so-called ‘Generation of the ’30s’, dealing with the necessity of retaining the ‘living’ parts of tradition. The following is an interesting point of reference combining this preoccupation, which was always present in intellectual writings up to the time of the Junta with youth rebelliousness and the generational conflicts that this provoked. It is provided in an essay written by the sociologist I.N.Xiotiris in 1972 where he reconstructs the dialogue between a youngster of the time and his father: ‘My father replied: ’You stared at the world, my boy, and you found it incomplete. You want to create a better world. You have my blessings, but your beautiful world has to be somewhat improved too. I don’t like your cynical discourse, its loud and frantic music and its vulgar literature. I recognise the contradictions in its life and I don’t have anything to respond, but I prefer uncertainties to your absolute truths. Are you all so certain about your responses? Have you got direct solutions for all your problems? I do not challenge your right to innovate or revolt. This is the mission of youth. My mission is to defend tradition, creative tradition, of course. Take every good and living bit that lies in tradition and engrain fittingly the new body to the old.’” (*Τι πρέπει να γνωρίζει η άριστη γενιά για την στάση της ανάγκης των νέων* [Things that the adult generation should know about its stance towards the youth], in Thessaloniki’s column ‘Timely Issues’, May 1972).
the Rotary Club and in general of well-to-do and ‘respectable’ circles, and therefore with a ‘clean’ record.

EKIN’s choice of name was important in terms of symbolism: linking Greece with Europe, extending its hand to the outside world, stressing their similarities. One of the society’s founding members, a law school student called Vemikos, was a ship owner’s son and a non-affiliated student throughout the dictatorship. Vemikos, himself a businessman at the present moment, argues in recent writings that the name was chosen ‘because in that period the European Union [sic] opposed the Junta and forced it to leave the Council of Europe. We also thought that the European Union presented the only hope in terms of opposing the arrogance of the United States and overthrowing the dictatorship.’ In addition, Giataganas notes that this act, alongside the EEC’s suspension of the ‘Treaty of Association’ with Greece, endowed the institutions communautaires with a ‘dimension of resistance’. The fact was, however, that the European Economic Community, apart from member states such as Holland, was not actively involved in Greece’s expulsion from the Council of Europe in 1969 – instead this was promoted mainly by the Scandinavian countries.

Little by little the Society started becoming a public area for discussion and exchange of ideas. It focused on culture as the key for acquiring political consciousness and became involved in publishing activities, including the publication of basic texts on education by Greek intellectuals and classical texts examining questions of knowledge, such as Plato’s ‘Sophist’. The first article of the Society’s bulletin pointed out that despite the fact that ‘youth all over the world has become one of the privileged fields of reflection and protest’, Greek higher institutions had turned ‘from spaces of intellectual restlessness and conflict of ideas’ to ‘places of relaxation or, in the best of cases, of coffee-time small talk’.

In a communiqué issued on the occasion of the Free Theatre’s staging of John Gay’s Beggar’s Opera in 1971, EKIN talked harshly about the ‘guilty silence’ of the majority of youths and declared itself to be conscious of young people’s enthusiasm and romantic combativeness. It concluded that its members

468 Giorgos A. Vernikos, ‘Personal Testimony’..., op. cit., p. 144.
469 Xenofon Giataganas, ‘Δυναμικές ενέργειες ή μαζική δράση; Παρανομία ή νομιμότητα’ [Dynamic acts or mass action? Clandestinity or legality?], pp. 60-62 in G. A. Vernikos, cit., p. 61.
470 For a detailed review of Greece’s expulsion from the Council of Europe see Dimitri Constas, Η ‘Ελληνική Υπόθεση’ στο Συμβολό της Ευρώπης 1967-69 [The ‘Greek Case’ in the Council of Europe], Athens 1976.
471 For example Alexandros Delmouzos’s Dimotikismos kai Paideia, Giorgos Koumandos’s Anotati Paideia and others.
472 ‘1ο ενημερωτικό δελτίο’ [First Bulletin], in Vernikos, cit., p. 226.
were determined to struggle in order to win all they could through 'truth and honesty' against the awful and inexpressible things happening to the country. Interestingly, on this occasion, EKIN, based on a hard core of non-affiliated, non-Communist individuals, launched an appeal for the unity of all youth reforming tendencies, thus clearly appealing to the Communist faction. An interesting feature within the numerous proposals made by the Society's members was once again a proposal concerning the 'development of folk culture', which was considered as a pre-condition for any progress while it 'suffered under the co-ordinated attack of the technocratic pseudo-civilization of Athens'. Anti-technocratic rage and folk revival are two constant and recurrent features in student documents of the time.

Alongside EKIN, EMEP (Society for the Study of Greek Problems), was a parallel organisation with the same sort of function and aims. It was founded and run by the 'old guard' of democratic politicians, headed by a former Governor of the Bank of Greece, a diplomat and writer, a Centre Union Minister and a liberal female politician. Despite professing respect for their action, Lionarakis confesses with self-irony that for the younger ones EMEP's outlook seemed too conservative. In order to ridicule their lack of revolutionary zeal EKIN's members called them names, for example, paraphrasing the name of the wartime Communist Youth (EPON), and mixing it with the surname of one of EMEP's leading members:

We used to make jokes about them because we were very revolutionary. We used to call them PEPON, from Peponis. (Lionarakis)

Nevertheless, many regarded these two groups as the most effective of any of the Greek resistance organizations. Escaping the political party ban though performing an active political function, the two societies invited scholars to talk. The most successful events were the heavily-attended public meetings addressed by the British economist Joan Robinson and the West German writer Guenther Grass. 'Treading with the utmost 473

---

473 'Συμμετοχή στο Διάλογο' [Participation in the Dialogue], in G.A.Vernikos, op.cit., p. 223.
474 These were J.Pesmazoglou, R.Roufos, A.Peponis and V.Tsouderou. EMEP, as EKIN, exploited the fact that the legislative decree 795 of 1971 allowed for the freedom of unions and associations. A similar move that was oriented towards a more specialised audience but with the same results in terms of creating a circle of intellectual discussion with anti-regime underpinnings was the Society for the Study of Modern Hellenism (EMNE) and the journal Mnimon (1971), an initiative undertaken by young, left-wing historians.
475 After Robinson made a thinly-veiled attack on the regime at her Athens lecture, she found (echoes of the film Z) that the hall booked for her subsequent lecture in Salonika became inexplicably 'unavailable'.
caution, and stretching to the limit the tight margins which the regime allowed for the expression of open dissent’, these societies, ‘under [their] innocuous [names], ha[d] become the focal point for the desire of Greece’s intellectual leaders to engage in active opposition.’  

Participating in these societies gave the opportunity to those who did not join the clandestine organisations to ‘exploit the contradictions of the Junta’s governance and to publicly develop collective action and mobilisation, and in practice, surpass the traditional models of the Left, their conspirational practice and tradition.’  

However, according to an inner circular of leading member Alivizatos, in the beginning the Society’s ‘intellectualism’ was only reproduced within its tiny ranks and they ‘worked, published and read’ their texts among themselves.  

Soon going to EKIN’s basement became a sort of fashion that was extended to other students too. ‘It became trendy to be there’, remembers Lionarakis. Myrsini Zorba stresses the importance of this place which satisfied a great need for an alternative public sphere and social interaction. In her testimony, Zorba breaks the serious discourse on the organisation by maintaining that a particular good looking woman could act as a magnet for young students to join the meetings. 

From the very outset, Olga Tremi was coming with her fur and her little dog [...] I remember I was with some friends and someone came and told us ‘hey, it is nice out there, there are also some gorgeous chicks with furs’. (laughter) And all the boys from my group of friends went in reality because this was happening. Look, the social space was missing, what is the self-evident was that there was no social space. You were confined, in fact you felt suffocated. How to communicate with other people, what could one say? This was a social space. (Zorba)  

EKIN’s president, Panagiotis Kanellakis, is one of the few to make an explicit comment on the erotic and sexual aspect of the Society:  

These were nice periods. Rich in experiences and emotions. And we experienced them fully. And one should think that the other story of EKIN, the erotic one, has not been written yet, though it wasn’t small. (Kanellakis)  

---

478 Nikos Seredakis, Social Movement Production..., op.cit., p. 179.  
480 Panagiotis Kanellakis, ‘In those years’, op.cit.
Nevertheless, showing one’s ID to the policemen at EKIN’s door and later on being ‘invited’ to the police station in order to be advised, served as a sort of ritual of initiation, a passage to real life. The first beatings or the way to the police station were symbolic moments which condensed the transition to a definite politicisation. Accordingly, the opening up of the dictatorship did not have a psychological impact other than offering the possibility for the normalisation of oppression. Another fundamental issue here was that, as the bourgeois students did not have the fear of being filed, they confronted the police at least in this innocent phase, with a certain naivety. However, the fact that they broke their social identity helped others go along and led to the later multi-dimensional character of the movement, as upper class and non-affiliated co-existed with the working-class and with the highly ideological.

Overall, ‘legal action’ turned out to be one of the students’ greatest successes as they managed to win most of the battles. At the same time, however, this issue became the subject of great contention among the emerging student organizations. The so-called ‘reformist’ Communists, who emerged among student circles in early 1972 grasped this idea from the beginning and managed to realise it, whereas the revolutionary ‘leftists’ supported a point of view according to which this was a way of legalizing the regime, a de facto recognition of its legal authority.

In any case, the regime did not tolerate the two cultural organisations for any longer than two years, during which they were allowed to operate, despite constant punitive threats. They were both banned in mid-1972, on grounds of pursuing anti-regime activities, while many of their leading members were placed in detention. The president of the last Greek Parliament before the coup, Dimitrios Papaspyrou, stated that the regime would never be able to alienate the young from the struggle for freedom, nor ‘stupefy them with football, the pools, the racecourse, the casino of Mont

---

482 Policemen stopped the youths at Stathas Street, where EKIN was situated, checked IDs and warned them off that ‘nest of communists’.
483 Not everyone agreed with this. The Maoist response by M.L.K.L.E. and L.D.M.E. of Pimblis is to a large extent representative of Leftist intransigence: ‘These organizations were created two years ago and represented the parliamentary bourgeois classes and the Eurocracy’, in Manolis Pimblis, The Student Movement..., op. cit., p. 16.
484 The charges were deviation from the objectives outlined in their charters, engagement in illegal political activity and seeking to establish a ‘political movement’, engagement in improper criticism and attacks on the ‘National Government’, seeking to revive political passions, engagement in actions and activities aimed at [disrupting] public order, security of state and political and individual rights of citizens and incitement of mass demonstrations, thereby causing disturbances among the people and undermining their confidence in state, in education and national security. USNA, POL 13-2 Greece SOC 9-2 XR, Telegram, American Embassy Athens to Secretary of State, ‘Petitions filed for dissolution of Society for Study of Greek Problems and Greek European Youth Movement’, 16 May 1972.
Parnes, and the dictatorship’s literature’. In this way, he expressed his admiration for the protest actions of the youth which took place despite the Junta’s deviation strategies, as the above activities were seen by intellectuals at the time. Papaspyrou’s appeal encompasses the grief of all anti-regime figures for the loss of those rare niches of dialogue, such as the two societies represented. Concluding that:

The recent upsurge of cultural activity among the young has illuminated our epoch. It has proved that the sense of liberty has now withered in the new generation. The dictatorship, panic-stricken, resorted to old methods of persecution and deportation. Security police cells are crowded with brave and proud students… and there is much concern about their fate.

The existence of these two organizations was of paramount importance for the processes of student mobilization. As Bert Klandermans, among others, has argued, the role of existing organizations and networks lays the groundwork for the formation of social movements, as not only do they ‘increase the chance that persons will be confronted with a mobilizational attempt, but also make ‘bloc recruitment’ possible’.

The spread of student protest

The first mini-demonstration numbering some fifty students took place at the propylaea of the old Athens University on the anniversary of the institution of the dictatorship on 21 April 1972 and was followed by a number of arrests.

We started, within our revolutionality, not being content with that either. That is, we realised that we had enormous strength in our hands and that we should do something. If you ask me now where did this thing come from and if it was organised I wouldn’t know, but I imagine that there was no need for it to be organized. Some rumour was urging ‘everyone to the propylaea’. Alright, I spread it too and everybody spread it. Then we got caught, four people, as the ringleaders. Honestly, I don’t know if we were leaders. We were all leaders. Everyone was a leader. Everyone was. (Lionarakis)

We sang the slogan-song of the period which was ‘when will the skies clear’, we sang the National Anthem which is a hymn to freedom, you know, and the funny event happens that a soldier passed by that time, a soldier in uniform and he stood still and saluted (laughter), the guy knew that this is what one does when one hears the National Anthem. (Sabatakakis)

---

484 Mario Modiano, ‘Greek jails crowded with brave students says former politician’, Times, 12/5/72.
485 Ibid.
A second gathering took place outside the Archaeological Museum a number of days later demanding the release of the arrested students, while a major one at the courtyard of the Polytechnic, on 1 May 1972, numbering about 400 students, was directed against the refusal of the Faculty’s appointed council to have a meeting in the presence of students. At the same moment, some Athens University students attempted to demonstrate at Kotzia Square, a central point of the city. Mass arrests of students followed these protest acts.

According to the interviews conducted by the Greek-American Professor Kouloumbis in 1972, it emerges that ‘respectable’ figures (professors, retired generals) with anti-regime leanings thought that it was about time that some mass events took place in Constitution Square but did not figure out in which way they could make this happen. An idea was to bring back the self-exiled former Prime Minister Karamanlis, in order to provoke instant popular reaction. It is interesting that intellectual and political circles were thus envisaging a top-bottom reaction, rather than action from below. In fact, foreign observers, such as the correspondents of *The Economist*, expressed great astonishment at a later point:

Surprisingly enough, the demonstrations were organized and led by Greek university students, who have until recently been considered the most passive and timid in Europe.

What was the catalyst for spreading the ‘protest virus’, as US officials called it, that affected a part of Greek students, transforming them from the passive entity described in the report to a major headache for the military regime? The turning point had been the students’ initiation of a legal battle against the authorities on the issue of their right to elect their own committees. This student struggle against their exclusion from representational structures favoured mobilization. For Pizzorno, the combativeness that springs from a collective action which is directed towards acquiring the constitution of a group’s identity and therefore its right to representation, tends to be
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489 ‘A Mosquito on a Bull’, *The Economist*, 12.3.73, p. 12. The title of the article refers to a statement made by a higher official of the Junta that the students were to the regime just like a mosquito on a bull.
490 ‘[A] protest virus has affected students since last spring’, is a phrase taken from the Telegram. USNA, POL 13-2 Greece, Amemassy Athens to Secretary of State, ‘Initial reactions subdued following student elections’, 24 November 1972. Interestingly, US reports talk about a growing student ‘cynicism’, that undermines the governmental initiatives and attempts to demonstrate normalisation.
more intense than average trade-unionist demands and, therefore, assumes a new type of content.\textsuperscript{491} From this point onwards, conflict does not depend on the negotiation process, as the real aim is the constitution of this new collective identity, a fact that becomes the pre-condition of any negotiation.\textsuperscript{492}

However, in this case negotiation and its margins were equally significant. The aim of the students was to make full use of the legal platforms of elective representation and to mobilize against the regime’s control of student unions.\textsuperscript{493} In late March 1972 forty-two students of the Athens Law School followed by several of their colleagues in Salonica, appealed to the courts of first instance against the appointed student councils, demanding the right to have elections.\textsuperscript{494} Lionarakis, who was one of them, describes the limitations of this venture under the existing conditions:

We started collecting signatures, semi-legally by that point. In a Faculty of 6,000 people, 42 individuals were found. We could not hope for anything better. [...] 2.5 months in order to collect 42 signatures...

He further asserts that this soon became a fashion, as happened with EKIN, as this number was tripled after only a week and given that the police did not interfere, a fact that Lionarakis attributes to the right-wing credentials of most students.

Due to its youthful composition, the part of the student body that became active did not carry with it the weight of the Left movement’s past experiences and therefore did not have pre-conceived solutions of what had to be done.\textsuperscript{495} In this respect, there was an attempt to bring the students together outside of strict ideological affiliations, following a model of independent student action that was new and to a certain extent imported. In fact, the post-1971 student movement embodies a relatively successful attempt to go beyond party orthodoxy. Students acquired more autonomy of action during the Junta, partially due to the fact that party control was less tight. According to a testimony, the fact that student movements abroad did not seem to be controlled by the Communist Parties reinforced this tendency:

\textsuperscript{492} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{493} O. Dafermos, \textit{Students and Dictatorship…, op.cit., p.106.}
\textsuperscript{494} At this point, an interesting osmosis with previous generations was the interaction of these students with six left-wing lawyers who became legal advisers to the anti-regime minority.
\textsuperscript{495} Nikos Christodoulakis, television programme ‘Πλησώ από τα γευμάτα’ [Behind the facts], 16/11/87.
The fact that the student movements abroad did not seem to be guided, also pushed us in this direction.\textsuperscript{496}

In terms of organisational structures, the students were co-ordinated by the so-called Student Committees of Struggle (FEA), which had been founded in December 1971 by students of no strict political affiliation. Although they started off as circles of friends who shared an anti-regime spirit, the FEA soon began to operate in all Faculties separately and were co-ordinated by a so-called ‘Inter-Faculty’ organisation. The Committees’ structure functioned in a mass and open form including assemblies, gatherings and meetings with participation on equal terms, discussions and voting. In his detailed analysis of the anti-dictatorship student movement, Dafermos, himself a protagonist, argues that these committees never acquired a clear theoretical line, since their members were devoted exclusively to the overthrow of the Junta.\textsuperscript{497} This was, in his view, instrumental in the development of the movement to a more robust entity, as its mobilising structures were reinforced by this independence from political stewardship, which was short-lived as a gradual hard-core politicization led to the rupture of the committees.

It is noteworthy that students transferred the battle with the state machinery to the university grounds. Their right to vote, denied by a dictatorial regime, was vindicated in terms of a vote in the university microcosm. Although the regime initially declined to grant this right, in the end it conceded the holding of general assemblies that would lead to elections in November of the same year, mainly playing for time. In this interplay between state power and student unionism the issue at stake was how far the students could exploit the possibilities raised by the regime’s own contradictions. Lionarakis uses a discourse that combines a serious contemporary Leninist argumentation, talking about this strategy of infiltration, with a much lighter element (‘little trick’), dictated by the present-day gaze:

We were going to ensure just one thing, that the committee which would result from the assembly would have a 100% majority, that’s what we thought, and then even if they won the elections this would be ‘dual power’, as Lenin said. It was a nice little trick; we did it in the Law School.

\textsuperscript{496} Testimony in D. Kyparisis, \textit{Το αντιδικτατορικό φοιτητικό κίνημα} [The anti-dictatorship student movement], unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Athens 1999, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{497} O. Dafermos, \textit{Students and Dictatorship},..., op.cit., p. 52 and p. 70 b.
October 1972 signalled the final break with the old state of affairs as twenty student societies were summoned and demanded to vote for a supervising committee, modifying the existing appointed constitutional charters (ND795/69), and rejecting at the same time the omnipresence of the so-called ‘student branch’ of the police. In Salonica, things were tougher, as regular and general assemblies took place while commandos carried out exercises outside the university building, and at the same time the electoral offices for registration in the voting catalogues were closed. The large demonstration that took place in protest was followed by numerous arrests. In its usual fashion, the regime granted several rights in order to diffuse this explosive situation (14/11), while at the same time it validated the notorious decree 720/70 for the forceful disruption of the military deferment of male students, in case of ‘non demonstrated national behaviour’ (15/11). This measure was systematically implemented only some months later.

When in late November 1972 the student electoral procedures were rigged once again, 200 students abstained. In the end, only 15% of the student body participated in the elections with the rest boycotting them, occupying the electoral premises and denouncing the misconduct. Following the intervention of the police, Byron Stamatopoulos, the Minister to the Prime Minister, made an announcement in which he tried to analyse the whole situation, arguing that this minority of ‘terrorists’ wanted to revive the chaos which existed prior to the Junta by ‘mimicking the methods of Mussolini’. He also tried to demonstrate that older student circles were still active and disruptive by quoting the case of an arrested student, born in 1943. Stamatopoulos insisted that this minority of ‘modern stick carriers’, were not more than a few hundred.

---

498 These included an increase in the money given for the refectory, grants for all, full medical care, third exam period, third transferrable unit, free tickets for cinema and theatre, timely circulation of curricula, continuous teaching schedules, see Makarezos’ announced measures (14/11/1972). At the same time, however, the regime validated the Decree 720/70 for the forceful disruption of the deferral of the military service, in case of ‘non demonstrated national behavior’.

499 Even so, in some Faculties the left-wing students managed to gain the majority.

500 Stamatopoulos went on: ‘Prior to the Revolution of 21 April 1967, the commonly called student trade-unionism (because the term is unidiomatic) had been transformed into a factor that was undermining democracy and parliamentarism, as it had been placed under Communist control. Even George Papandreou wanted to replace some of the administrations of the student councils for that reason. A dark side of the action of the student councils prior to the Revolution consisted of [...] setting organs of informing public opinion (newspapers) on fire in order to blackmail them into a different position. And these students were so brave that as soon as an intervention of the Armed Forces took place they rushed off to disappear in basements.’ In ‘Αι διήθεσες του υφυπουργού κ. Σταματοπούλου’ [The statements of the Deputy Minister Mr Stamatopoulos], To Vima, 21/11/72. It is interesting at this point that Stamatopoulos uses Helen Vlachou’s notorious phrase from the mid-1960s concerning the old Lambrakides who should, in her view, return to their basements/ratholes. Interestingly, this expression is equally used by ‘Katerina at present when she says that ‘organised students had an open trade-unionist action, they were not conspirators in the basements’.
They were, in his description, anarchists, Communists and people guided by the ‘old parties’ which had become victims in the former. His explanation was that they were ‘kids of rich families, who [had] lost their privileges because of the Revolution and envied the great majority of Greek youth who could now study for free and have equal career opportunities’, a recurrent theme in governmental and pro-government argumentation throughout this period.

Similarly, the appointed National Student Union (EFEE) issued a statement condemning this Communist-led minority and threatened them with legal action.\footnote{A ιχθεσαι φισμηναί εκλογαί [Yesterday’s student elections], \textit{To Vima}, 21/11/72.} A relevant leaflet had been circulated during the events by the ‘Society of National Minded Students of the Polytechnic’ (EMP), referring to May ’68 as a desired goal of these anarchist ‘zealots’ and condemning the appeals for abstention in protest:

Dear Colleagues,

the Struggle is ideological. […] It is not us we who have rendered it politicised. It is these neoleftists, zealots of new Mays [’68] who wish for polarization. Isolate them. The legal order irritates the anarchists and the outflanking infuriates the ‘irresponsibles’. They react in a spasmodic way and having nothing to do about it, they abandon the battle. They propose abstention. Colleagues, abstention means weakness, negation, cowardice.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

The etiquette ‘a small anarchist minority’, used both by government officials and pro-regime students, would stick to them thereafter for the whole course of the events. Still, the violence and fraud involved in the electoral procedures and the fiasco elections that took place, including the mass abstention, proved to be defining factors for the evolution of the movement, headed by this minority, and for the amplification of its repertoire of action. Lionarakis argues that electoral irregularities made ‘appointed’ candidates lose momentum as they were utterly discredited. In order to underline this point, he uses an endlessly repeated sexist aphorism, invented by Savopoulos in the early \textit{Metapolitefsi} days:\footnote{In the highly politicized \textit{Metapolitefsi} years Savopoulos summed up the spirit of the time by saying: ‘he who is not left-wing at present cannot find a girl-friend’.}

Those who got appointed were pointed out with a finger because they were exposed in front of the people by that time; people knew them. There was say Giorgos, whom you saw in the street and you would spit on him. These people couldn’t find a girlfriend, such was their problem. No serious person would go there.
By that time student combativeness had increased, not least due to every-day clashes with the police and students supporting the regime. Kourmoulakis, a Panteios student, recalls:

In our school, as well as in the Industrial School in Piraeus fascists used to gather and we used to beat each other. Each time we had a meeting there was beating. And there came a moment in which I beat someone with whom I used to hang out. We had fun, we were drinking, and then we used to hit each other in some gatherings outside the Law School, in the Panteios. [...] Hard beatings, punches, blows, kicks, with wooden sticks, flying desks - we're talking about real beatings. (Kourmoulakis)

A Maoist leaflet which circulated at the time reflects the level of these confrontations, as it itself adopted quite an aggressive tone:

One impudent fascist who dared to sustain the proclamations made over the previous days by another arch-fascist student who had said that as soon as he was elected president he would ... (a vulgar word) everyone, was bravely beaten black and blue by a combative antifascist, with the support of the attendant students. 504

Law School dynamo Ioanna Karystiani underlines a major reason for this sudden explosion in student activity, drawing a line between the lower and the higher point of the movement: the fact that the movement itself meant an explosion in people's lives and was far too exciting an activity to allow people to consume themselves in everyday trivialities. Angeliki Xydi shares this view and underlines that thus politics was experienced in its purest form:

There was nothing else in our lives. And the simple everyday things that mattered to us were not, you know, to clean our house, the floor, you know, to wipe and get yoghurt for the fridge. It was how to organize the food problem inside the Polytechnic, during the occupation. It was how to collect money for people who needed it, how to get to know about more political prisoners, how to obtain information which would be necessary for the one and only thing that mattered to us back then, the movement. (Karystiani)

The politics which we were experiencing was not as the people seem to understand it in recent years, just a dry thing, an arid function, for the very reason, I believe, that it was a matter of life. (Xydi)

504 M. Pimblis, The Student Movement..., op. cit., p. 27. The comment in brackets is part of the text.
Katerina, an Architecture student in the Athens Polytechnic sustains that all these initial activities were above all else ‘a great political education, lessons of political conduct’.

**A technocratic future?**

As has been seen previously, for the first time young, privileged, affluent children started looking at themselves as an oppressed group. According to Nikos Serdedakis the fact that Medicine, Law and the Polytechnic, the most combative of all Faculties, were mainly composed of middle-class students, does not allow for any hypothesis, following the Marxist model, concerning a certain class reflex that was triggered by the Junta. On the contrary, Serdedakis argues for the purposive incentives of the students in joining the movement, namely their interiorised aspirations ‘concerning their future role as intellectuals who were destined for higher positions in the distribution of labour that guided the confrontation with the anachronistic, anti-meritocracy and anti-modernist regime of the militaries’. In other words, these students needed to ‘secure a new corporate identity within society or a new role in politics’ and saw their future as hampered by the regime in more ways than one.

This corresponds well with the point made by Jürgen Habermas, as early as in 1968. Although until that point, he was convinced that students did not play a political role in developed industrialized societies, he was nevertheless sure that ‘in countries in which revolutionary nationalist groups, usually army officers, have come to power, students exercise a permanent political pressure.’ Habermas, having in mind countries such as Venezuela, Indonesia and South Vietnam, where governments had been overthrown by students, explained that in these cases students had a more politicized consciousness because they understood themselves as future elites, responsible for the modernization process and they regretted the fact that ‘their studies were not organized according to well- [...] defined and socially normative models.’ More interestingly, he argued that the structures of the old society, organized according to kinship relations, were the same as those that defined the life of the students’

---

505 Nikos Serdedakis, *Social Movement Production*..., op.cit., p. 185. Serdedakis's point seems to justify the theory that certain categories of incentives have more appeal to specific social groups, as purposive incentives appeal more to the middle class, while selective incentives appeal more to lower class groups. Also see James Q.Wilson, *Political Organizations*, New York, 1973.

506 J. Wasserstrom, *Student Protest...*, op.cit.

families. Thus, Habermas concluded, "there is a singular parallel between the socialization process of the individual student and the overall process of social change. In this way, the student, connects the typical developmental experiences of adolescence with changes in social structure and comprehends 'the epochal process in the framework of his own educational process and conversely links his private destiny with political destiny.'

At this point, it is important to note that a series of purely student issues concerning future professional guarantees were in some cases a catalyst for student action. In March 1972 the Sub-Engineers, graduate technicians who handled minor construction projects, abstained from their lectures in both Athens and Salónica, in order to criticise the regime's decision to downgrade their status vis-à-vis fully matriculated Engineers. Although some other Schools (Humanities and Higher Commercial School of Athens) expressed their support for the striking students, soon after the student elections the Engineers abstained from classes in protest at the Sub-Engineers demands. At a later point the students would channel their actions against the English-speaking 'Technological Institute' that was functioning in Athens and which they saw as a threat, a source of antagonism, in a trend that proved to be die-hard in Greek education.

At a different point, however, the ideological prerogatives of the students came first. This happened when the US trained Education Minister Frangatos became the basic promoter of the technocratic reorganization of the university (August 1971- June 1972), clashing also with the 'feudal' establishment of Greek academic bureaucracy on the issue of 'assistant professors'. An institutional change such as the introduction of 'assistant professors', would break the personalised academic environment and its

---

508 Ibid. However, it is interesting that Habermas argues that these students left behind their traditionalist home and were embraced by the University and the universalistic roles that this promoted in a society in the process of modernization. Moreover, he adds, the University is a place for social change par excellence, as it generates technically exploitable knowledge and the consciousness of modernity; thus belonging to it provides an impulse for struggling against the traditionalism of inherited social structures (13). This normative sociological consideration fails to take into account the fact that in countries with authoritarian regimes Universities did not retain their independent thought and their prestige, but quite often became propagators of the ideology of the rulers, which at times were quite anti-modernist.

509 See N. Seredaklis, _Social Movement Production..._, op.cit., and G. Giannaris, _Student Movements and Greek..._, op.cit., p. 448.

510 See Stavros Lygeros, _Φοιτητικό κίνημα και ταξινή πάλη στην Ελλάδα. Από τις προσφυγές στα πρωτοκέλια στην εξέγερση της Πολυτεχνείου_ [Student movement and class struggle in Greece. From the appeal to the courts of first instance to the Polytechnic uprising], vol. 1, Athens 1978, pp. 79-81 and Kostas Krimbas, _'Η Ανώτατη Πανεπιστήμιο στον καιρό της Χούντας' [Higher Education during the Junta period], in _Δικαστηρία. 1967-74. Πολιτικές Πρακτικές, Ιδεολογία λόγου, Αντίσταση_ [Dictatorship. 1967-74. Political practices, Ideological discourse, Resistance], Athens 1999, p. 143.
closed cliques and would create large educational centres. In the light of professors’
professional competitiveness and in the view of left-wing students, this would mean
being placed under the direct control of the teaching establishment, as Frangatos was
imposing his own chosen professors from the United States. As a result of the crisis
Frangatos had to resign and the reform was postponed. The intensification of studies
was supposed to mean the transformation of the University to a technically exploitable
knowledge producer. This was connected to the image of uniform machine-like experts
in the service of American-driven capitalist production, and therefore was fiercely
rejected by left-wing students as ‘technocratisation’. Students also argued that this
would mean the exclusion of fellow-students who worked either part or full-time as
they would inevitably drop out due to time restrictions. However, Frangatos proved to
be instrumental in the changes that took place within the institutional framework of
Greek Higher Institutions, and assistants were indeed institutionalized. Overall, it is
possible to discern here an interesting bipolar system of prerogatives, whereby one’s
professional future clashed with ideology.

It is noteworthy that, at present, Lygeros presents student rage against Frangatos’s
reform as outdated and, in many respects, unjust:

How could they [professors] have proved to be right? They had on the other side a student
movement which allowed no room for changes in that period. They were right, I’m telling you,
that they wanted this but how could they manage? We had a different logic then. That is, the
climate didn’t allow this.

Similarly, the so-called Constitutional Charter for Education was considered as a threat
for the university administration and a prelude to the intensification of the studies
themselves. Through the Constitutional Charter the Junta attempted to intensify the
rhythm of studies, including the abolition of the third exam period, the reduction of the
possibility to transfer a subject and the obligation to attend classes and labs. Despite all
these corporate problems and demands it has to be noted that students in Greece did not
yet face unemployment as a realistic eventuality, as had already happened in
industrialized countries. *Katerina makes a fitting description of this:

Degrees were not yet discredited. Students, apart from the shine that they had because they
participated in the anti-dictatorship movement, were not necessarily the future unemployed. That
is, one did not say, 'poor kids, what are they going to do in the future; the family is going to feed them'. In one way or another they would find a place in production and in that sense they were receiving in advance the prestige that they would have in society in the future. They were the 'blue-eyed boys' of society for that reason too. [...] A student, especially of the Polytechnic, and secondarily of other Faculties, Law, Medicine, would be part of the future ruling class. There was a respect which was owed to that too.

I **Ideology and Organizational Affiliation**

Today's youths rush to hide themselves behind a ready-made theory, a doctrine, a 'law', and this almost always happens after early adolescence. So, they hide themselves behind a ready made system and order their relations with their fellow-beings with a laconic 'yes, I am one of you too'. The opposite case, moreover, condemns with the stereotypical phrase: 'Rubbish, what you're saying is rubbish'. Therefore, non-communication reigns supreme as there are different camps with diverse attitudes.

Ioannis N. Xirotiris, *Professor of Sociology in Salonica, 1972* 311

In his classic definition of the student movement, Altbach describes it as 'an association of students inspired by aims set forth in a specific ideological doctrine, usually [...] political in nature.' By this point, Greek students were linked as far as their common goal was concerned: that is, their need to struggle for more liberties with the authoritarian regime. This was what McAdam calls a 'master protest frame'. By late 1972, however, they were already split in terms of ideological affiliations and strategies of how to achieve this objective. Some of these new collective identities were involved in different political rituals, and were characterised by diversities in their discourse and performance. Marxist tradition in its variants constituted the common theoretical underpinning of their strategies and Utopias but their organizations reflected the international and local Communist dichotomies.

The various clandestine organizations made different political choices despite operating within the same context. By 1973, for example, concrete lines were followed by the two splinter Communist parties on the issue of a potential switch to a controlled political system.

---

311 Ioannis N. Xirotiris, 'What the adult generation should know about its stance towards the young', *Thessaloniki*, 1972. He concluded that this incapacity to engage in dialogue was the reason 'behind the uprisings of the young people and students in Western democracies'. Xirotiris, often commented on the nature of the '68 uprisings and their continuation into the 1970s, attributing them to the nihilistic attitudes of youth and their obsessive need to be part of a specific political grouping.
313 McAdam, 'Culture and Social...', op. cit., p. 42.
parliamentarism and ideological rifts became greater than ever. Debates between 'orthodox' and 'reformist' Communists, Trotskyites, Maoists and those who were non-affiliated were fierce, since the theoretical conceptualization of the struggle was assigned paramount importance. By that time, the radical split within the Greek Communist party of 1968, in addition to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, already had by that time a considerable impact on a number of students, making them either more critical of the traditional Left or more proud of its 'clear' and 'adamant' line. At times, these splinter groups were also aligned with different cultural politics. These rifts, as will be shown later on, reached a peak during the three days of the Polytechnic occupation in November 1973.

Apart from the coordinating role of the FEA, the students'organizational structures included another level: the formalized clandestine political organizations. An interesting aspect here is that the strict hierarchical structure of the organizations came into stark contrast with the basically anti-hierarchical and decentralised ways in which student societies functioned, with their respect for direct democracy. What is more, despite the open nature of the student movement, Leninist principles regarding clandestinity were respected and therefore the underground culture of resistance organizations was not deemed altogether obsolete. Accordingly, the Communist ritual including instructors and cells was reproduced. The first were members higher up in the hierarchical structure of each group, a post that everyone could theoretically achieve in due time as dynamic processes took place within the groups, 'reproducing the instructing ranks from bottom to top'. Each organisation was split into two sub-groups: one was the ideological head, the so-called 'clandestine mechanism', acting in strict clandestinity as its name suggests. The other was the so-called 'frontal' part that acted in public in the universities since the early 1970, as political organizations decided to focus their politics on unionist activities and on the professional problems of the students.

A 'high moral tone and deep seriousness' characterizes the organizations and their writings and are to be detected in the resistance journals. These alternative circuits

---

514 In the foreword to his book _Democracy at Gunpoint: The Greek Front_ (London 1971) PAK's leader Andreas Papandreou talked about the parallel between Greece's US driven Junta and Soviet intervention in the Czech Republic (p. vii). Although the parallel is somewhat exaggerated, it is an interesting point of view.

515 Antonis Liakos, _The appearance..., op.cit., p. 73._

516 I am borrowing this fitting description from Lumley, _States of Emergency..., op.cit. This characterised, in his view, the Italian movement and Communist writings before '68 and before their contestation._
of information were tied to the interests of the respective communist factions and acted as propagators of their lines. Apart from the fact that they sought to report all resistance activities in Greece and abroad, the political discourse that can be traced in them does not convey a common character, other than a shared anti-Americanism and ‘anti-fascist’ principles. These writings bear the mark of clandestinity and therefore cannot be overestimated as a source for the actual discourse and beliefs of the students, but rather as the ideological expression of their organizational structures. Nor were they characterized by a non-conservative tone or any particular avant-garde elements. They were rather old-fashioned in the expression of their militantism, reproducing the post-1949 Communist style of writing. A new element was probably the radicalism expressed by the Leftists, which again was often too extreme in its ideological reading of the Greek political situation. Moreover, it remains doubtful as to how far the writings were representative and shared by most members of a group. The texts were usually written by some members higher in the hierarchy who were in a state of ‘deep clandestinity’, as the term went, or abroad. Moreover, distribution could not be very extensive due to the obvious restrictions imposed by the limited printing facilities and the fact that this constituted illegal material. Usually an issue of a journal was passed from one student to the other in an endless chain.

‘Reformists’

The 1968 split in the Communist Party in Budapest had a considerable impact on a great part of the students, making them more critical vis-à-vis the traditional Left. Rigas gradually embraced a sort of ‘New Left’ attitude, with a clear anti-capitalist/anti-imperialist character but ‘Euro-Communist’ overtones. By 1971, however, the old Rigas had ceased to exist due to the fact that a significant number of its main cadres had been arrested. New conditions, including the Junta’s liberalisation experiment, led to a reformulation of Rigas’s objectives. Gradually, the organisation appeared as willing to defend a democratic and anti-hegemonic way of conducting politics. They were induced by ‘the KKE’s traditional and continuing devotion to Soviet policies and interests, a stance which was out of tune with the strongly patriotic and libertarian...
views of much of the left-wing public’ during this period. Katerina is one of the few arguing that in the end these differences deriving from the ’68 split were old issues for the younger students, which is maybe one of the reasons why she herself passed from Rigas to KNE:

We were not burdened by the old sins, in the sense of the KKE of the Exterior, of the Interior. This was coming to us filtered too. What Exterior? We are right here.

Rigas’s attempt to be less dogmatic was more often than not interpreted as ‘revisionism’ which had led to ‘reformism’, that is lack of revolutionary fervour. For example, a schedule for guided parliamentary elections, proposed by Papadopoulos in the summer of 1973, and embraced by the KKE Interior and consequently dictated to Rigas, became the focus for a major accusation of wishy washy left-wing politics. Still, Rigas was ‘the best in sowing the seeds of New Left, believing in the possibility of the creation of viable models of socialism that, instead of conforming to the emerging Stalinist straitjacket, would be flexible enough to fit indigenous conditions and needs’. What is more, the organisation had a more direct connection to culture, apart from straight politics, a fact which was used in order to label them with the derogatory term koultouriaris, as will be shown later on.

KNE, the youth organisation of the Communist Party, was created in August 1968 by old party members in prison or in exile. It soon attracted the smaller branch of Lambrakis Youth, that which was closer to Party orthodoxy and did not acquire a strong following until the early 1970s. By 1972 it was the second largest clandestine political student organization, competing and eventually surpassing Rigas in terms of numbers. KNE’s student branch, Anti-EFEE, founded in autumn 1971, propagated its action through the clandestine journal Panspoudastiki. The organisation’s name referred to the ‘National Student Union’ (EFEE) which had been disbanded in 1967 but was reappointed from this point on. This was a choice of label that was often interpreted as

519 See O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 76.
521 Its founding manifesto declared the need to organise for the day-to-day anti-dictatorship struggle, based on the ‘indoctrination of its members with endless love and devotion to the people and the fatherland, with the high and noble ideals of democracy, peace, national independence and socialism’. Brochure issued by KNE.
an attempt to place the entire student resistance under its control.\textsuperscript{522} A-EFEE was often accused of authoritarianism within student circles and of bullying individuals from rival groups.

A-EFEE tried to launch itself as an all-inclusive trade-unionist organization, fighting for more academic freedom. It appeared as a group which did not express one line only, stressing that ‘it was formed by students regardless of ideology and their social position, by students who struggled in parallel with anti-dictatorship organizations’.\textsuperscript{523} In reality, A-EFEE was strongly political. It expressed its hard-core orthodox dimension, had an admittedly hegemonic vision of the student movement and worked in a clear-cut organizational manner, that is, according to ‘democratic centralisation’, in the contemporary term referring to higher party control. A-EFEE became very efficient in recruiting students, as its small and strictly clandestine nuclei of action succeeded in attracting even indecisive students. Kouloglou, a later day AASPE leader, collaborated with them without realizing that he was thus becoming a member:

I was an independent, a trade-unionist. Then, there was a period in which some KNE people approached me, through A-EFEE, and they asked me whether I would like to enter the group etc, and I said, alright, I will collaborate, but they tricked me. They presented it in such a way, because A-EFEE was recruiting people very discretely, namely they were saying ‘we are discussing the movement’, and I accepted. (Kouloglou)

In A-EFEE’s founding manifesto, tradition was a major point of reference as in the case of Rigas, although this time the reference was clearly to the workers’ movement: ‘we are guided by our rich fighting traditions’. The manifesto numbered nineteen unionist demands, ranging from a better way of teaching and marking, to more sports facilities, the increase of scholarships, aid to working students and the reduction of military service. Apart from the liberation of imprisoned and exiled colleagues and the ban of decree 180/69 concerning the ‘governmental commissioners’ and 93/69 which endangered asylum, the banning of disciplinary committees and the Police student section, the text asked for the ousting of the appointed student councils and for free

\textsuperscript{522} A-EFEE was a play on words, referring to or rather using the name of the all-student union EFEE. In a similar fashion, EPON, the Communist Party’s student organization created during the occupation period, was playing with the name of EON, which was the fascist-like organization created by the dictator Metaxas, and it thus undermined it but also represented familiarity.

\textsuperscript{523} KNE in later years became a constant point of reference. On this, see Filippou Filippou, \textit{Oi Kvires [The Knites]}, Athens 1983.
student elections and participation, including in university administration. Only at the end of the text did the organization clearly label its initiative as part of the 'struggle against tyranny', and concluded:

Three cheers for our unruly student youth, our never enslaved Greek Youth, our proud people!  

*A-EFEE* stood in stark contrast not only to its rival Communist organization *Rigas*, but even more so to the so-called 'leftist' groupings. The age-old clashes with the Trotskyites -traditionally accused of being police agents- was extended to the Maoists. *Odigitis* often condemned 'leftist opportunism', claiming it led people to neglect the real problems of students. Leftists were consequently labelled as 'irresponsible'. Damofli remarks with a certain contempt:

The self-defined hyper-revolutionaries were calling [us] mass reformist groups of the traditional Communist Left.  

The official KKE strongly criticized the Dubcek experiment in Prague, who were seen as trying 'to blow Marxism-Leninism with bourgeois attitudes on youth' and saw no merits in the '68 movements, which were described as being the result of the irresponsibility of the 'masses of politically inexperienced students'. The latter, according to their Marxist analysis, could not be the avant-garde of a popular rising. The theoretical head of KKE in that period and later responsible for youth matters, stressed the shared opinion that it is wrong to consider the youth as a separate social group with its own political demands, as it is always connected to the interests of the various social classes, be it bourgeois, working-class or agrarian. Nevertheless, their input could be great in social revolutions, as they were aided by age and science, provided they were guided by the 'great party of the proletariat'.

---

526 Vera Damofli, 'Οι συνελεύσεις' [The assemblies], pp. 197-201, in G. Gatos (ed.), *Polytechnic '73*, op. cit., p. 201.
The ‘Robespierres’

Turning to the viewpoint of the ‘minoritarian subject’, there was a long tradition of Robespierresm in Greece. Leftists reappeared in the political scene of the 1970s with a new face, bred from the international protest movement and constantly trying to outbid each other in intransigence and maximalist rhetoric. Following Che Guevara’s maxim that ‘the duty of a revolutionary is to bring about the revolution’, for those people the use of violence, at least on a theoretical level, was a way of measuring the collective revolutionary engagement. The ‘new Robespierres’, with roots in the past, articulated ideas about social patriotic resistance, always in connection with the so-called ‘grandfathers’ of the revolutionary Left. They defined themselves as ‘revolutionary Marxists’ or ‘Communist internationalists’ and their discourse carried a romantic revolutionary tone, with the desire to ‘blackmail history’ and accelerate the arrival of the revolution, according to Tasos Darveris’s eloquent description.

Stergios Katsaros, mainly influenced by Guevarism, is one of the most fervent supporters of the violent route to revolution, even today. In his autobiographical book, Katsaros argues that the origins of this militancy in terms of stimuli and inspiration lie with Third World revolutionism. Disillusionment with the ‘reformist’ tactics of the traditional Left nurtured the aspiration that a left-wing offence would eventually replace the passive ‘martyr’ stance that Greek Communists had adopted ever since the end of the Civil War:

Cuba exercised considerable charm on all of us. It was the metropolis of world revolution. Castro and Guevara were known to the Greek movement. But our discovery starts with the death of Petroulas. Then, for the first time, the ineffectiveness of the methods of the traditional Left became evident. For the first time we said that we should not be just martyrs calling for mercy, but fighters who would generate fear in our adversaries. Guevara’s effrontery inspired us.

A number of heterogeneous internationalist groups were placed under the label ‘Leftists’, a term taken from the French word ‘gauchistes’, which was a new category born in May ’68. Cohn-Bendit’s Le gauchisme, remède à la maladie senile du

---

530 Isabelle Sommier, *La violence politique et son deuil. L’après 68 en France et en Italie*, Rennes 1998, p. 33. Although Sommier’s point refers to the French and Italian cases, it could also be applied to the Greek case.

531 This was a necessary pleonasm, according to Bensaid, in order to differentiate themselves from a Communism alienated by bureaucratic reaction, *Ibid*, p. 7.


533 S. Katsaros, ‘We, the Guevarists’, *op.cit.*
communisme, a response to Lenin's *Leftism: Communism's juvenile illness*, appeared in Greek in the early 1970s and became one of the absolute best-sellers of the time. There it analysed how leftism promoted petit bourgeois thinking through dangerous ‘deviations’ from straight-forward Marxism. Therefore, for the orthodox-minded the term ‘leftism’ bore pejorative connotations and became synonymous with opportunism. In terms of the usual left-wing speculation on whether the time was ripe for revolution or not, leftists went against the official Left’s theory of the necessary steps forward. Leftism questioned the classic Marxist presupposition according to which the revolt was subordinated to the unquestionable supremacy of the ‘workers movement’ and the class struggle.\(^{534}\) On the contrary, they were obsessed with what Alain Krivine has called ‘burning off the stages’, and a need ‘to analyse a political situation not for what it is but for what [they] would like it to be.’\(^{535}\) In order to achieve that, they saw as their task the elimination of the negative influence of the ‘revisionism’ of the old parties of the Left. Moreover, in a holistic approach to militancy, they (re-)introduced the notion of the austere revolutionary: the ‘professional’ revolutionary whose whole existence was dedicated to this cause. In fact, those militants, more than other left-wingers, rejected the idea of parliamentary democracy succeeding a potential downfall of the Junta, since the former was considered a by and large ‘petty-bourgeois’ political system.\(^{536}\)

Another obsession of leftists included references to ‘revolutionary violence’. Endlessly repeated aphorisms such as *political power comes out of the barrel of a gun* were never translated into concrete action since for these groups of students ‘dynamic action’ remained a verbal drive. According to Katsaros, ‘armed struggle was a declaration of faith, rather than a conscious and elaborated tactic’.\(^{537}\) This fits well with Pasolini’s acute description of the Italian leftists’ methodology of ‘oratory struggle’, namely of making direct declarations of their violent intentions.\(^{538}\) The light sarcasm, creating confusion and ambiguity, also attributed by the Italian intellectual to ‘anti-reformists’, was, however, missing from their Greek counterparts, at least in their official declarations.

\(^{534}\) José Álvarez Junco, 'Movimientos Sociales en España: Del modelo tradicional a la modernidad post-Franquista' en Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset, Madrid 1995.

\(^{535}\) Isabelle Sommier, op. cit., p. 42.

\(^{536}\) Quoted in *Neoi Stochoi* 4, 2nd period, January 1972, p. 48.

\(^{537}\) Stergios Katsaros, *I the Provocateur* ..., op. cit., p. 212.

The Trotskyite tendency had a long itinerary in Greek politics, including a powerful presence in the inter-war period and some leading members in the 4th International and its various branches, among whom figured Giotopoulos, Castoriadis and Raptis. They were usually dubbed ‘traitors’ and ‘stool pigeons’ by their Stalinist counterparts, with whom they were in constant vendetta since the 1930s. During the Resistance period and the ‘December events’ in Athens a number of Trotskyites were liquidated by the secret police of Communist-led EAM. In post-war years, their few but faithful followers practiced the strategy of ‘entrism’ within the official left-wing entities, in order to re-direct them ideologically towards ‘correct’ revolutionary positions, according to the 1917 model. Old Trotskyites, such as Agis Stinas, Christos Anastasiadis and Sotiris Goudelis, remained points of reference and of consultation in terms of how the movement should orient itself throughout the 1960s and 70s. These people, mainly old tobacco workers, shoemakers, tailors and printers, were famously residing in basements and were to become some of the first to open tiny publishing houses printing left-wing literature during the early 1970s.

Their main organizations were SEP (Socialist Revolutionary Struggle), members of which became connected with the latter-day terrorist organization 17 November, and EDE (Greek Internationalist Union), which was part of the International Committee of the 4th International in London. Other groups, such as Spartacus, were more peripheral. Interestingly, shortly after the coup, Spartacus’s homonymous journal condemned Yankee imperialism, warned youths to stay away from PAM’s ‘national unity’, which it considered as the utmost expression of reformism, and urged people to stop going to cinemas, theatres, football-matches or participating in pools. The journal claimed that if, in addition to that, people could considerably reduce smoking, then indirect taxation and state revenues would allegedly fall to zero and the regime would consequently collapse. These Trotskyite groups never really acquired a mass

541 The homonymous journal condemned Yankee imperialism, warned the youth to stay away from PAM’s ‘national unity’, which it considered as the utmost expression of reformism, and urged people to stop going to cinemas, theatres, football-matches or participating in pools. If in addition to that, people could considerably reduce smoking, then indirect taxation and state revenues would allegedly fall to zero and the regime would consequently collapse, in Spartakos, s.d., around April-May 1967.
542 Spartakos, s.d., around April-May 1967.
following and were characterized by constant quarrels and scissions reflecting the divisions within the international Trotskyite movement itself. The pejorative portrayal of Trotskyite environments as a 'secret, grupusculous and conspiratory universe', could also be a faithful description of some of the unconstructive aspects of these groups. An illustrative example is a leaflet circulated by EDE within the Polytechnic in November 1973, in which it proclaimed itself the only genuine Trotskyite organization in Greece, ‘fighting to give power to the working classes’. The rest were labelled as either Stalinists, ‘centrists’ or ‘Pablists’, with the latter described as a dangerous deviation from the true spirit of Trotskyism.

Right after the Soviet-Chinese split, old revolutionaries who were historical cadres of the old Stalinist leadership of the Communist Party, were also the point of reference of those who flirted with the Chinese model. OMLE (Organization of Marxists Leninists of Greece) and its frontal student group PPSP (Progressive Student Unionist Party) were formed in the mid-1960s in order to express this tendency and became a short-lived trend in student circles. Panos Theodoridis remembers that the ‘Chinese’, as they were called, were quite fashionable and almost exotic in their aesthetic preferences and combative spirit:

The ‘Chinese’ of the Architecture School, who were famous for the way they used to dress, for the way they used to challenge everything and the way they used to worship Mao’s experiments, his

---

544 'Σεχταρισμός, ο δίδυμος αδελφός του αποστολισμού' [Sectarianism, opportunism’s twin brother] in Neos Stochoi, 1975, p. 52. The Organization Socialist Revolution (OSE), which published the journal Mami in Paris was a group which was described as anarchist-Trotskyite. Its leader, Stavros Lygeros, does not agree with this designation, preferring instead the term ‘revolutionary Left’. The neo-Trotskyite ‘KO Machitis was a miniscule group that appeared in November 1973, as did the ‘Organisation Bolsheviks’, with its base in Paris. An early attempt to draw up a cartography of student groupings was made by G.N.Drossos immediately after the fall of the Junta in ‘Ακραίες τάσεις και φοιτητικοί’ [Extreme tendencies and students], Kathimerini, 29/11/1974.
545 This tendency, also called ‘anti-revisionist’, attributed to Khrushchev’s reforms the responsibility for the revisionist turn of the international Communist movement. Nikos Zachariadis, historic leader of the Greek Communist Party and its lider maximo during the Civil War, remained supposedly faithful to the true nature of the movement. OMLE’s most emblematic member, Polidoro Danilidis, was an old member of KKE’s Central Committee during Zachariadis’s times. The tendency of the so-called ‘Chinaphiles’, or simply ‘Chinese’, found its expression in the avant-garde journal Anagnisisi, later on Laikos Dromos (People’s Path), and the Historical Publications. These, coupled with other anti-Party and tiersmondiste entities, such as PANIK and the Friends of the Third World Society, succeeded in creating a rift within the ranks of the Lambrakis Youth. Petroulas, the student symbol of the mid-1960s, was affiliated to these groups.
546 That was mainly through their branch Fighting Front of Greeks Abroad (AMEE), which became all-powerful among student circles, especially in Italy.
swim in the Yang-Che river, all those things, they were the majority, the only majority in the then Polytechnic School.\footnote{P. Theodoridis, \textit{Macedonian...}, op.cit. p. 177.}

During the Junta years, these groups continued to exist and theorize their political affiliations, speculating on China’s ‘revisionist’ turn following Mao’s death and flirting for a while with the Albanian model. Their dynamism, however, was mainly channelled abroad, whereas in Greece they did not have a consistent and uninterrupted antidictatorial presence.\footnote{Nevertheless, five \textit{OMLE} members were tried in Salonica in the summer of 1971, receiving high sentences. See G. Yiannopoulos, ‘Resistance Forces...’, op.cit., p. 283.} As conditions were supposedly ‘immature’ for a popular uprising they opted instead for ‘passive combativeness’.\footnote{T. Darveris, \textit{A Night’s...}, op. cit., p. 69.} Followers of this line were advised to wait. Darveris, himself a member of the pre-dictatorship \textit{OMLE}, echoes in his novel the analysis promoted by this organization:

\begin{quote}
The Revolution would arrive later, when the proletariat, freed from revisionism, would build those conditions which would allow it to launch a campaign in order to crush the cancerous fascist cells and their origins, namely capitalism -or at least monopoly capitalism, to use the ‘Chinese’ terminology- and bring the bloc of ‘anti-imperialist’ classes to power.\footnote{\textit{Ibid}, p. 153. Darveris adds that \textit{OMLE}’s views were used as a pretext for the flight of its leadership abroad.}
\end{quote}

Agis Tsaras, a \textit{PPSP} member prior to 1967 who later on moved to the rival group \textit{EKKE}, argues the same.

\begin{quote}
They said let’s get organised, let’s get together, let’s become many, let’s do this, let’s do that. (laughter) They did not fight. They did not even issue one pamphlet. Other organisations, with only five members, issued pamphlets during the Polytechnic. They came out with pamphlets. Poor old Manolis Pimblis, he too originated from \textit{Anagennisi}, ‘People, come down to the Polytechnic’.

I saw them, I was in clandestinity and I got Pimblis’s pamphlets, I found them in the street.
\end{quote}

Tsaras’s claim that the Marxist Leninists did not circulate anything is not valid, since they were issuing two journals\footnote{\textit{Proletariaki Simaia} (Proletarian Flag) and \textit{Protoporia} (Avant-Garde).} in which they characterised themselves as the ‘consistent Left’, a much repeated, all-encompassing phrase among organizations of the
extreme Left. Still \textit{PPSP}'s journal, gave the following explanation for its absence during those years in an issue published some months after the fall of the Junta:

\begin{quote}
PPSP was an organizational form that corresponded to particular needs. It was created under the conditions of 1966, and for the same reasons it is re-constructed at present.\footnote{A Salonica student was supposed to be the leader of the organization and was therefore expelled from the University, tried \textit{in absentia} and sentenced to five years imprisonment. Ministry of Public Order to the Aristotle University of Salonica, subject: 'Mertzanis Ioannis, son of Georgios and Chrysoula', 12/8/71. Private Archive of Minas Kokkinos.}
\end{quote}

Nevertheless, the Marxists Leninists launched themselves as the continuation of a long tradition. Ideologically, they started to become more and more in favour of the so-called ‘Albanian’ model, that is closer to China but also to the Soviet ideal up to Stalin’s death. Vourekas sustains that their ideological rigidity was a positive aspect in terms of their image as ‘relentless fighters’, which in his view paid off psychologically when they were caught:

\begin{quote}
Absolute dogmatism, they were listening to Tirana radio station and were copying what it was saying. (laughter) Yes, this line of thought was terrible. But they also had certain heroism, a personal one, being the ‘unwavering’ ones. And this thing gave them prestige, you know, to be severe, to be able to confront the Police, suppression, to look ahead, you know, is an important element.
\end{quote}

In contrast to that, Lionarakis retains that OMLE members were accusing the students who had set up and were participating in EKIN of ‘legalism’, namely that they were \textit{de facto} giving legitimation to the regime as they functioned as a ‘society’ with an approved constitutional charter and so on. Instead, they were proposing a future ‘armed struggle’ which was to come, thus being ‘pseudo-revolutionaries’, according to Lionarakis’s own definition. His discourse reveals the great fragmentations within the ranks of anti-regime students:

\begin{quote}
A great part of the Maoist Left, [...] OMLE, was getting on our nerves. They might see someone who for some reason had spent ten days in jail or had been exiled, because few had been to exile and few got caught, and they were saying ‘you know, you shouldn’t do this kind of thing because we are ready to carry out the armed struggle.’ And we were saying ‘wait a minute guys, you sit at
\end{quote}

\footnote{‘Απάντηση της ΠΠΣΠ σε μια επιστολή της ΑΑΣΠΕ’ [PPSP’s reply to a letter by AASPE], pp. 54-57, \textit{Spoudasikos Kosmos}, 2nd period, Nr 1, November 1974, p. 54.}
home doing your job, your studies, reading, while we're taking great risks and you're telling us
these things? That is, they were the windy ones and the supposed great revolutionaries.

In a defensive way, PPSP accused EKKE, its main Maoist rival, of not being very
active during the Junta either. Instead of waging a 'consistent' political battle, its
members were further accused of immersing into Marcuse, who was regarded by these
circles as a degenerate intellectual. Accordingly:

Trotskyism, anarcho-syndicalism, and of course [...] Marcusism [are] carriers of capitulation and
compromise which disorient and disorganise the progressive movement, be it student movement
or not.\textsuperscript{554}

Far from being influenced by Marcuse, EKKE (Revolutionary Communist
Movement of Greece) had been the main group behind Maoism's reappearance in
Greece in the early 1970s. It was an idiosyncratic group which presented itself as a
mixed revolutionary organization of workers and students aiming at 'the radical
overthrow of the capitalist system and the dominance of the bourgeoisie classes and at
the creation of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the construction of socialism and
classless society'.\textsuperscript{555} All this would be 'imported' from West Germany, as the
organization was created in West Berlin in spring 1970. In this case too, the choice of
name was not incidental as it contained the acronym of the historical Communist Party
(KKE), with the addition of a revolutionary prefix. Accordingly, EKKE presented itself
as 'anti-revisionist' and vindicated the authenticity of its revolutionary aims as the
'real' Communist party.\textsuperscript{556} Already in its founding manifesto, this organization made a
hegemonic entry, by attacking rival Maoists for being an 'anti-proletarian stream within
the antirevisionist movement' and for suggesting examples taken from the Chinese
model, which could not be applied to the Greek conditions.\textsuperscript{557}

\textsuperscript{554} 'Ἡ ἕξεγερσι τοῦ Νοέμβριον' [The November insurrection], \textit{Neoi Stochoi}, 52, 1975, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{555} 'Προγραμματική Διακήρυξη του Επαναστατικού Κομμουνιστικού Κνήματος Ελλάδος (Ε.Κ.Ε.)'
[Founding Manifesto of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Greece, 1970, Archives of Contemporary
Social History (ASKI)].
\textsuperscript{556} In its founding manifesto EKKE refers to the need to be revolutionary and anti-revisionist, to be led
by the reborn working classes. Only in this way, it asserts, 'will the Velouchiotides really become alive
again'. This almost vampiristic evocation of Aris Velouchiotis, the controversial leader of the
Communist-led Resistance, shows the importance that Leftists attributed to people who symbolised the
non-compromising struggle, especially when they were condemned by the official Left. [1 March 1972,
publication of the Founding Manifesto of winter 1970].
\textsuperscript{557} 'It gives a summary of Mao's texts, written during the time of the anti-Japanese war of 1940, the main
responsibilities of the Chinese revolution and the basic social antitheses that define China and the phase
of New Democracy. Do the same factors apply to Greece too?', \textit{Kommunistis}, 1, May 1972, p. 18.
From November 1972 onwards it started circulating pamphlets and the clandestine journal *Kommounistis*.\(^{558}\) This Maoist block had an endless fascination for permanent mobilization and, as elsewhere in Europe, ‘Cultural Revolution’ was its magic word.\(^{559}\) Maoists believed that this was a method of avoiding Soviet-like bureaucracy and of having the masses in constant motion,\(^{560}\) even though EKKE did not hide its deep fascination for Stalin’s achievements. Moreover, it did not have serious inhibitions, at least in theory, against the use of violence, as according to Chairman Mao ‘revolution is not a banquet’. EKKE’s founding manifesto reads:

A precondition for the development of the class struggle in Greece at present is the breaking of the climate of terrorization that the fascist Junta implements, and as the attainment of power by the proletariat and its allies cannot but be carried out through armed popular violence, EKKE is preparing concretely and since its foundation the armed struggle.\(^{561}\)

However, as this declaration was never materialised, one could conclude that this large degree of talk about ‘armed violence’ functioned as a ritual invocation.

Soon EKKE became increasingly influential within student circles through its ‘frontal student group’ AASPE, whose name reflected its anti-imperialist, therefore anti-US, prerogatives (Anti-Fascist, Anti-Imperialistic Student Front of Greece). Its clandestine cells infiltrated the Greek universities declared ‘the need to link the corporate with the political struggle, the student movement with the people’s one and it is noteworthy that *Kommounistis* attacks the other organizations without much ado, for creating a ‘propagandistic organ’ as soon as they were formed as they failed to express the interests of the working masses and their publication became ‘sheer political mumble jumble’, ‘an end in itself’ and ‘only reason for their existence’. In contrast to them, EKKE boasts that it took pains to assure solid organizational structures first, faithful to its declaratory manifesto and when times matured, only then did it create its organ, which acted as a ‘collective agitator, propagandist and organiser’. (1 Μάρτης 1972, publication of the Προγραμματική Διακήρυξη of winter 1970).

\(^{558}\) Isabelle Sommier, *La violence politique...*, op.cit., p. 37.

\(^{559}\) From a particular point onwards, Chinese politics became a sort of fashion. In newspapers of the time, notably *Thessaloniki*, one could find daily reports on the Chinese Revolution, the succession of Mao, the conspiracy by Chu en Lai, the relationship with Enver Hoxha and Albania, which were full of detail but without a critical gaze. The ‘Great Helmsman’ seemed to be so fashionably exotic that in February ’73 a newspaper advertisement of a Chinese film read: ‘for the first time a Chinese super production straight from Mao’s country’, while the advertisement of the documentary ‘The awakening giant China’ reads: ‘A deep anatomy of the one-class society after the cultural revolution, the military way of life, the arts and sciences, the heavy industry, the communes, the red guards. A life guided by the thoughts of Mao. The first meeting - without censorship- of the country that numbers ¼ of the earth’s population’ *Thessaloniki*, 27/10/1973.

\(^{560}\) Προγραμματική Διακήρυξη του Επαναστατικού Κομμουνιστικού Κινήματος Ελλάδος (Ε.Κ.Κ.Ε."

\(^{561}\) Founding Manifesto of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Greece], 1970, *Archives of Contemporary Social History* (ASKI).
the struggle against the dictatorship with the struggle against imperialism. AASPE's first pamphlet, circulated at the time of the electoral imbroglio at the universities, makes clear reference to the fact that the student movement was the spearhead of the entire people's movement. Still, it purported that the student struggle would 'acquire perspective only when it will be tied to the struggles of working class popular strata'. The pamphlet analyses the increasing class cleavages which were not so much a result of the politics of the Junta but were owed to the nature of imperialist dependency. Despite the fact that AASPE expressed its faith in the possibilities of exploiting the legal loopholes allowed by the regime, it propagated an a priori abstention from student elections as, in its view, student participation would achieve nothing but the legitimisation of the regime. The group reckoned that student elections were of strategic importance for the Junta as they were part of the gradual implementation of the 1968 Constitution and the country's false 'democratisation'. It expressed its support for a vaguely defined mass struggle, but at the same time disclosed its attraction to the dynamic solutions of the past. Apart from their contempt for other organizations of similar or different leanings, EKKE and AASPE also expressed deep distrust of the cast of 'bourgeois politicians'.

---

562 Ibid.
564 In a later analysis, EKKE also boasted that 'the line of mass and energetic 'ABSTENTION' was the only line that corresponded to the real frame of mind of the popular masses', Kommounistis, July 1973, special edition. Abstention was coupled with demonstrations, gatherings and occupation as the only acceptable means of struggle, while the legal forms of action, such as petitions, memoranda and the creation of a Constitutional Charter and so on were rejected on the same grounds as the elections. See O. Dafermos, op. cit, p. 205.
565 Pamphlet 16/11/72, Ibid, p. 10. It is interesting to note that AASPE's manifesto concerning the student elections was published by the widely circulating liberal newspaper To Vima, in the same way as it published the leaflets of most contemporary clandestine organizations by this time also. There followed a brief description of the groups' nature and ideological leanings according to 'official quarters'.
566 The fierce Marxist-Leninist reply to this was that AASPE did not respect Lenin's maxims concerning tiny little victories as preparatory stages for something greater.
567 Apart from OMLE, EKKE criticised the orthodox KKE and its branches as highly revisionist, while at the same time it castigated KKE Int. for aspiring to 'a futile modernism and a radical revision of the implementation of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat', as it adopted 'the bourgeois principles of multi-party system', in 'Programmatiki Diakiriksi tou Epanastatikou Kommounistikou Kinimatou Elladas (E.K.K.E.)', 1970, published in Kommounistis, 1, March 1972.
568 A miniscule grouping was LDME (Popular Democratic Front of Greece) of Manolis Pimblis, which issued various leaflets and was struggling in order to prove that its line was the correct one. In contrast to this, it castigated AASPE and AMEE as opportunist-revisionist and Trotskyite-leaning, petty bourgeois. See M. Pimblis, The student movement..., Salonica, 1974.
Lastly, a leftist organization with no roots in the past was PAK. This hybrid of social-democrats, old Centre Union members and aspiring revolutionaries had limited representation among young people. Although Andreas Papandreou, its charismatic leader abroad, asserted also that armed struggle was the only way forward as ‘the country finds itself in a belligerent situation and a pre-revolutionary period’, he gave the signal to the group in early 1971 to enter the mass struggle. PAK’s activities were reinforced by the cultural youth organisation Panarmonta, which was mainly involved in organising concerts of anti-regime composers, which became a point of reference for anti-regime students. Some of its student members were strategically placed during the crucial events of November 1973 inside the Polytechnic. Interestingly, most of these students acquired several political positions when after the fall of the Junta PASOK, the party which came out of PAK, formed successive socialist governments.

**The ‘other’ among student groups**

Why choose a group and stick to it all the way through? Incorporation plays a significant role in the process of identity formation and the creation of a sense of belonging. A group creates a certain identity, mainly one of a social type, which is crucial in terms of personal encounters. Being part of a group and entering into collective action meant a fundamental shift in the individual experience of the world; it was a ‘state of birth’, to use Alberoni’s term. In turn, the organization required solidarity from its members and compliance with its rules and conventions. As Liakos points out, the relationship between instructors and those instructed corresponded essentially to the rapport between the initiator and the uninitiated. Part of the initiation into a group required putting on a particular face, a certain ‘uniform’, in a process of homogenisation. It is not a coincidence that people also tend to delineate their differentiations in aesthetic terms and insist that the group to which a person belonged could be discerned only through the semiology of his/her appearance. The militant, but non-affiliated Maoist, Kleopatra Papageorgiou, uses theatrical terms when talking about EKKE’s ‘colourfulness’ and attributes this to the fact that one of the organization’s leaders, was a director in Berlin and therefore knew how to stage the performance:

---

569 Ντοκοσοφήνα του ΠΑΚ [Documents of PAK], Athens 1977.
572 Ibid.
If somebody told you that he was a Maoist you could tell from the face, the clothes, the style if he was with PPSP or with EKKE. [...] PPSP people were a bit like religious people, their face and their way of dressing was more austere. (laughter) EKKE people were more liberal, more colourful we could say, they didn’t have this homogeneity of PPSP. Those were all shaved with the military jacket, you know... They were more military in style, but military of a religious kind (laughter), whereas the EKKE people were cuter. After all, Bistis was a director, he studied at the Berliner Ensemble and he knew how to put up nice scenery. And they had actors within their ranks, many more, you know. They knew how to make a speech in an old left-wingers’ suit. With a carnation here... Anyway, their scenery was better prepared. 573

Rather than the result of rational choice, in most cases affiliation was accidental, as it was largely a question of which was the first group to approach a student for ‘recruitment’. Kourmoulakis recalls this procedure as something quite grotesque. Xydi rather represents this process as an endless chain resembling a Greek *komboloi*:

> We went inside [the apartment]. There was no furniture; we sat down and he had some boxes with the *Epitheorisi Technis*, a journal that was circulating then [sic] and he took it out and started to read Mayakofsky to me: the guy started reciting poems. And in the morning he tells me ‘I’m going to have you enrolled into *Panspoudastiki*’ [sic]. ‘Come on’, I told him. ‘No, I will have you enrolled. In any case, someone will approach you; your codename is Robinson Crusoe.’ ‘Oh, com’on’, I told him. This was the first attempt to proselytise me. (Kourmoulakis)

Alekos Alavanos must have been organized first of all, and Alekos organised Ariadni and Ariadni very quickly, in a matter of days in any case, organized me. And this went on like a *komboloi* [chaplet], yes, you know, round and round. This is how it happened. (Xydi)

As della Porta notes, within a social movement, rational processes, such as identification, are placed next to more instinctive mechanisms. 574 In this sense, emotional and psychological motivations often tended to overtake rational ones; therefore the reasons for joining a particular group were not strictly ideological. Consequently, the attempt to reconstruct one’s life in a linear way, resulting from coherent choices, becomes a difficult task. 575 Undoubtedly, it is often hard for people to

---

573 Darveris also talks about the OMLE people before the coup with their clumsy blue tunics and little red books in their hands. See Tasos Darveris, *op.cit.*, p. 815.
remember what they believed once, if their later experiences led them to the total revision of these opinions, a frequent phenomenon, or if at a certain point of the narrative they do not consider it worthwhile remembering.\textsuperscript{576} When I asked a female activist of the Communist \textit{A-EFEE} about the rationale behind her choice to join that specific organization, she opted for a strategy of negation and chose to narrate the official story. Even though commenting that 'these details are a bit too personal' she argued unpersuasively and after a long hesitation that a strictly political motivation had led to this decision. In one exceptional case, a male activist highlighted a clearly non-political stimulus for joining that very group:

\begin{quote}
I was ready to get enrolled into \textit{Rigas}. As strange as it may sound and demonstrate a lack of seriousness, it was the relationship with a woman that was crucial in making me go to \textit{A-EFEE}.
\end{quote}

(laughter) (Kalimeris)

When searching for meaning, however, it is necessary to clarify 'the symbolic universe of actors, their organised system of representations, their attitudes, the affectively connoted norms which filtered their definition of the situation and oriented their behaviour'.\textsuperscript{577} There is no doubt, for instance, that certain groupings exercised a greater impact on the students' imaginary. Nikos Bistis, one of \textit{A-EFEE}'s leading members, attributes the fact that this organization attracted the largest numbers of people not to KKE's clandestine know-how but to the awe that the Party's history produced:

\begin{quote}
We realized that in reality we were the party machines. That is, there was no great party machine behind us. But there was History. The sense of it, many times the illusion of it. But suddenly you became part of a great tradition and this gave you a greater self-esteem. [...] So, there was a new batch of people that took all of this story into their hands. Without knowing it. Thinking that there were regiments behind them. But behind there was mainly History. [...] It had a symbolic weight. It is impressive how the thread got connected. That is, we, who had no connection, became all of a sudden the ones who kept up the tradition as if this thing was absolutely normal. This is why, you see, all those references were always made to the Generation of the Resistance, to the EPON.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{576} Riki Van Boeschoten, \textit{Troubled Years...}, op.cit., p. 221.
\textsuperscript{577} Isabelle Sommier, \textit{Le '68...}, op.cit., p. 25.
A-EFEE inherited KKE’s culture, which included discipline to the leadership and to the Party, as the ‘glorious past’ was a safe ground for the construction of identity. Still, despite his assertion that this sense of belonging to a certain tradition was ‘great equipment’ and ‘something that one needed in order to confront the difficulties of the struggle’, Bistis adds that:

At the same time it was a limit in terms of opening up one’s mind concerning certain things. It had both elements at the same time.

Accordingly, Bistis benefits from hindsight in concluding that despite being blessed by History, the attachment to the Communist Party meant a definite limitation of one’s capacity to judge without restraints. In contrast, Rigas attracted a vast number of well-to-do ‘progressive’ kids, as its line was less rigid. It was not inflammatory in its declarations, displayed no serious discrepancies between theory and action and no dogmatic attachment to a given ‘truth’. However, its members were accused of being so moderate that they were ready to negotiate and make concessions at any point, simply in order to prevent direct confrontation. Papageorgiou accuses the well known leaders of Rigas in Salonica for consciously postponing the all-desired clash with the regime until the future as ‘the time was not ripe’.

Creation and diffusion of protest involved imitation and competition between rival groups. The process of choosing one group or another, based as it was on exclusion, suggests that difference was a key notion. Identity only exists in relation to others and in relation to the ‘other’, against whom the sense of the ‘self’ is constantly re-negotiated. As identity is defined by poles of similarity and otherness, difference is an inherent component in its constitution. Going beyond the initial level of differentiation between those who tolerated or supported the regime and those who were keen to change things, there also was a gradual demarcation between ‘ourselves’

579 Bistis asserts that the American College of Athens, for example, was a Rigas hotbed due to the ‘social composition’ of its members.
and ‘others’ within the rank and file of the student movement itself. Ideological differences ended up cutting across any other divide of class, age or gender. So, even though the real enemy was supposed to be the Junta, classifications and behaviours based on ‘otherness’ were widely used within student circles. Ioanna Karystiani describes how non-radically left-wing students were bound to be treated differently from those belonging to one particular clique:

There is something from that period that burdens me. When the medical student Vassilis Pendaris got caught, as he did not belong to our group, in the wider sense of the word, the group of progressive left-wingers, let’s put it that way, we did not immediately issue an announcement. Ex post, I find this thing terrible. I think I realised this only later. I don’t remember how I felt back then, but if they had caught Nikos Bistis or Vernikos, Alekos Alavanos, one of our buddies of this period, we would have been mobilised in a second; for Sofoklis, for example. This also conveys a different dimension, which is, how can I say, not a good one.

Karystiani’s recollection evokes the difficulty in dealing with past events which had a hardly recognisable motivation. This explicit juxtaposition of past with present attitudes, in which what seemed normal then sounds entirely outrageous at present, is, however, a truthful indication of the atmosphere of the period in question. There was a very strong hetero-definition of the self as each organization and to a broader extent each faction, was possessed by the obsession to prove that it differed from its supposed ‘other’. The leftists wanted to differentiate themselves from the politics of the two KKEs and vice versa. The most dramatic side of discrimination among students was the accusation of being a stool pigeon or an agent provocateur, a tendency with long standing roots in the Greek Left. Tsaras describes how this accusation was often part of the organisations’ tactics to handle students who refused to collaborate with them or decided to change political roof:

While I was hiding I was in contact with some Anagennisi people, fellow-students of mine, that is. After 2-3 years some of them tried to [...] find me and have me enrolled again in the same ‘shop’ [...] I declined. I was already in contact with EKKE. And they called me a stool-pigeon, just like that, immediately. No one believed them of course. [...] ‘As he’s not coming with us he has to be a stool pigeon.’

Van Boeschoten, Troubled Years..., op.cit., p. 222. Interestingly, Van Boechoten adds that these sort of ‘perverse’ situations are recorded and recollected much more easily than ‘normal’ ones in life stories.

O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 205.
Lionarakis recalls a similar incident, involving the pro-Moscow faction, and his experience reminds him of the historical smear campaigns of the party, such as the one against Ploumbidis in the early 1950s:

I had a very traumatic experience; these were probably the worse days of my life, because coming out of prison there was a whisper, which was a very bad one, nothing precise, I hadn't even been beaten so that one could say that I turned in someone. Nothing, there was nothing, they almost didn't interrogate me. I didn't know some clandestine thing either, we were doing everything lawfully. But there was a whisper: 'Isolate him'. Which after a long-long search etc I understood originated from the KNE section, from A-EFEE. To come out of prison, to feel that 'something' and to have your own friends saying it, was very traumatic. I was shocked. That is, I realized how the whole thing with Ploumbidis and the rest functioned [...]. At present Nikos Bistis apologizes to me, because he pioneered in that then. I felt very bad, because we were very close friends with Nikos.

From people's testimonies one can gather a rejection of the 'other', who is most often described in caustic or ironic terms. Visceral statements are to be found when people designate rival groupings. According to an A-EFEE member, 'in AASPE People's Courts used to function' (Kalimeris), whereas according to an AASPE member, 'A-EFEE was a really dark organization' (Vanos). Even people belonging to ideologically related groups demonstrated equal or even greater hostility. Accordingly, A-EFEE members clearly despised Rigas members as conservative copies of them ['right-wing revisionists'], whereas Rigas criticised the former's infamous authoritarianism. In addition, EKKE rejected PPSP's apathy and PPSP castigated EKKE's self-proclaimed leadership of the Maoist movement in Greece. The so-called 'reformists' tended to reject the Maoists as somehow grotesque people. Leftist tiersmondist internationalism was often ridiculed by the rest of the students, such as the unaffiliated Vernikos, whose caustic statement about their incomprehensible and 'picturesque speculations' on the 'rural question in China' was quite a common one. These moral interpretations, characterised by bitterness and resentment, reveal a lasting pathos and an age-old fracture of the communal ethos.

Despite the fact that there is no stable concept of identity, as it is constantly evolving, certain 'hard' elements of past identities seem to survive. Accordingly, patterns emerge from the interviews, demonstrating a common attitude according to the
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584 KNE 1968-74, brochure issued by KNE, 1974.
585 G. A. Vernikos, op. cit., p. 150.
organizational affiliation of that time. This resonates with Passerini’s notion of a ‘hardening of subjectivity’, as well as with Fraser’s concept of ‘frozen memory’ and Raymond Williams’s ‘structure of feeling’. Riki Van Boeschoten talks about ‘parts of collective memory which remain unchanged’. Accordingly, people demonstrate deeply entrenched patterns of behaviour, such as, for example, those who used to belong to Maoist groups, and who at present often share a common conspiratorial code. Moreover, people tend to follow the analytical and hermeneutical categories of the time, such as the polarity between ‘organization’ and ‘spontaneity’, while the past rifts between ‘reformists’ and ‘leftists’ are also die hard elements which are strongly reflected in the interviews. As Van Boeschoten notes, these elements deriving from individual positions in the past, tend to survive and come to the surface, and often create a contrast with the present attitudes and beliefs of the interviewees.

Still, what is also stressed, by the same people are moments of solidarity and allegiance with their ideological rivals and a present bond that springs out of common action. This tension seems to have been part of the polarity between identity and otherness, which can also be seen in the ’68 movements, and is manifest in several recollections, despite noticeable self-presentational strategies that adopt a holistic approach to militant life, including elements of self-justification and self-knowledge. As Josselson argues, ‘we must cease [regarding] people as finished entities and, somewhat paradoxically, we must find those places within narrative where the self is most clearly in dialogue with itself’. This dialogue is clearly to be seen when in reviewing their life several ‘orthodox’ female cadres distance themselves from KKE’s dogmatism and Party discipline and seek to render an image of themselves as more anarchist at heart.

As my instructors used to tell me I was much more a person, as they told me, with a leftist psychology than with a typical KKE one. (laughter) And many times they used to warn me.

(Detsika)

588 Ibid, p. 221.
589 According to Luisa Passerini ’68 was marked by an uneasy balance between consciousness/unconsciousness, individual/collective, identity/otherness. See Luisa Passerini, ‘Peut on donner de 1968 une histoire à la premiere personne?’ pp. 3-11 in *Le Mouvement Social*, 143, April-June 1988, p. 7.
591 Ruthellen Josselson, op.cit., p. 37.
I was reading Bakunin and other anarchists, I used to like them very much. And I think they influenced me very much, that is later on as well. Although I remained many years within KKE I always had this libertarian attitude, I had it as a person, I had it, it seems, as regards my influences, and I still have it. (Xydi)

Accordingly, apart from mechanisms of cohesion within group identity, one can also discern conflicts within them. Angeliki Xydi, one of A-EFEE’s leading members, adopts a rather apologetic stance:

And I did things which I have regretted very much. In any case, things that I would have preferred not to have done. Both back then and later on. That is, a certain political stance vis-à-vis, say, the other members of the movement. And then, inside the Polytechnic, and later on things that I said from a position of power, through imposition, a certain authoritarianism in political behaviour. It would have been better to have avoided them, but...

On the opposite side of the spectrum, Kleopatra Papageorgiou, a Maoist of radical inclinations, admits that the Communist Party remained an absolute point of reference in their minds, even if the clashes they had with the ‘orthodox’ Communists were fierce:

The policemen in jail were telling us ‘Aren’t you ashamed? In the Soviet Union and the countries over there women sell themselves for a pair of nylon stockings’. And we were thinking, look at what these filthy, miserable, perverts are telling us. We didn’t believe this. Although we were anti-revisionists and although we indeed accepted that the regime that ruled over there was a form of state capitalism and that alright, there is a nomenclature that oppresses the masses and the workers. We could not grasp that the collapse that had taken place there was really that great. We didn’t believe it, we thought [they were saying this] just in order to disturb us, to accuse us. And of course, despite our critical stance and despite our non-agreement with what the KKE did, namely that it reacted and that it sought to control the masses, we had deep in our soul a respect for the Party. The Communist Party was a notion that was sacred for us. The old one, even so, with the History that it carried with it. Moreover, when Rizospastis circulated once again and got legalized under Karamanlis, it had such a sacred meaning for us, the word Rizospastis, the notion.

Others, like Bistis, fall into contradiction as initially they admit that A-EFEE reflected a tendency to put other groups ‘into its pocket’, but then turn this argument upside down by saying that this was never put in practice, as unity was of paramount importance. Bistis displaces the rifts among the organisations into the Metapolitefsi, the period
following the Junta, thus understating the tensions that were an integral part of the pre-
dictatorship movement:

We too had [this tendency] as persons. Of course, this depends on each person, we in the Law
School occupation had the upper hand. We were the best known trade-unionists that existed, that
is. Nevertheless, we had natural and good relations with the rest. No, there were no attempts to put
the others into our pocket etc. The conditions we experienced inside the Law School, which was
the epicentre, were so important that an organization could not control things on its own even if it
wanted to. You were forced to communicate with the rest. We could not afford not to be
coordinated with the Rigades for example. They were leading figures as well. And beyond this,
there was a need that we had, you could not leave people out: the juncture was of a kind that
prevented people from it. This is why the fanaticism and the confrontations took place after the
political change.

This is a common statement shared by most student groups, who stress that prior to
November 1973 differences were lurking but never came out in such a direct way.
Alavanou and Kourmoulakis also sustain that as the dictatorship was the main issue at
stake, differences were given lesser importance. When that main goal ceased to exist,
things became much more severe and the 'age of innocence', in Kourmoulakis's words,
ended abruptly:

During the first period of metapolitefsi [there were] many clashes, this is where the ideological
distinction became very clear. That is, while during the dictatorship there were differences, I have
the impression, at least for myself, that I had no knowledge of the differences, which was the
difference between Interior, Exterior, the leftist groups, Anagemis, all these were... How can I
put it to you?... Byzantinisms, the main thing was all being together against the dictatorship, that
element was dominant. Very much so. (Alavanou)

I remember the gathering, taverns until late, wine, sexual relationships within this space, these
were developed on a very tender and very nice level. Even today, even though relationships have
matured or ended, some have been maintained, in a very nice and tender way; we meet each other,
we talk and laugh and remember. It's nice, these were beautiful years, from this point of view
because we were connected with a common element in that period, after the Metapolitefsi this
thing broke because we got organized into parties and the thing turned bad, but at that period, it
was still the period of innocence for the student movement in Greece, because we were still all
together, not yet split, we had a common target, a common enemy. And it was still very early to
take different itineraries. (Kourmoulakis)
Jeffrey N Wasserstrom argues that in the study of student movements one should put 'less emphasis upon tracing the relationship between student protesters and political parties or upon analyzing the attraction of specific ideologies and much more upon locating student protests within the context of their social milieu and the dynamic [...] political culture of which they were part.' However, as can be concluded from both the contradictory elements in people's memories and by the writings of the time, clashes had also been fierce before, even if not as violent. In effect, earlier events are seen through the lenses of later developments, as memories are mediated by time and experience and tend to be distorted in two different ways. For some, the rancour created during the *Metapolitefsi* is also applied to the past immediately prior to it. Accordingly, as the *Metapolitefsi* stiffened affiliations and broadened divisions, rather than a hardening of subjectivity this looks like a certain anachronistic judgment. In other cases, one can discern nostalgia and a sort of idealisation of the remote past and the steely solidarity of the dictatorship years, as opposed to the post-dictatorship fratricide. So, while for some there is a clear continuation from the Junta years to the *Metapolitefsi* divisions, for others this is represented as a dramatic rupture. All of these discontinuities in history and discourse are part of what Bourdieu calls 'l'illusion biographique', namely a narrative organised according to intelligible relations on the basis of the postulate of the sense of existence. In either case, memory both distorts and reveals interesting aspects, as there is an interchange between the present and several layers of the past that intermingle. Even so, the testimonies provide authentic elements of subjective representation, often of a collective character, as the above-mentioned value judgments and their respective pathos reveal.
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Chapter Three

A long cultural battle

Media Information

Now, if someone feels much besieged, despite the fact that he is free to talk, and he cannot shape and articulate his correct idea regarding the Constitution, we can build a tower at Syntagma Square, to bring him higher than the roofs, so that he can feel there freer to think and talk.

Colonel George Papadopoulos

Preventive censorship was in operation up to 1969 and no printed document could circulate without the authorisation of the Censorship Office. This created a large vacuum in terms of information and intellectual cultivation, as the heavy weight of voicing any sort of opposition fell on the clandestine papers. Inevitably, the very moment the regime gave a relative freedom of expression to the press, a part of the latter started to exercise a mild critique on its governance. Whereas artists continued to protest by refusing to write, publish or exhibit, journalists came up with a range of strategies as to counter the effects of censorship, for example through techniques of allusion. Part of the phenomenon of resisting censorship is the fact that repression helps to create a new sort of knowledge and different ways of communicating a message. According to Foucault, 'censorship not only cuts off or blocks communication; it also acts as an incitement to discourse, with silence as an integral part of this discursive activity.' Therefore, erasure is not necessarily delimiting but can also be enabling.

The press was a major factor in relation to the dissemination of information and the development of an awareness of the political situation. From a particular point
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594 I would like to thank Professor Karen Van Dyck for her extremely useful comments on various draft versions of this chapter.
595 Georgios Papadopoulos - President of the Government, To Pistevo mas [Our Credo], Athens 1968, p. 15
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onwards the court martial trials were fully covered by the press and the full transcriptions were published, thus providing a great opportunity for students to see that some people tried to resist. The pleas of the accused offered them the opportunity to defend their actions, while condemning the regime and reporting being tortured. Another major issue was the full coverage of student mobilisations in a detailed and often provocative way. The Athenian daily *Ta Nea* and the Salonicean daily *Thessaloniki* dedicated a daily column to student issues which served as a means of a constant update on student mobilizations, both using as their logos associational pictures of May '68. Minas Papazoglou's column in *Ta Nea* ('Youth and its problems'), during Spring - Summer 1972, promoted the anti-regime students' demands and criticized the appointed student councils. Significantly, the column also published letters of protest by students. In the Salonica newspaper *Thessaloniki*, the same pattern was followed by the student journalists Zafeiris, Tsaousidis, Gousidis and Memis ('The Column of the Students'). Chrysafis Iordanoglou, a law student in Salonica, emphasises that 'if this means of communication with the journalism they represented had not existed, it is doubtful that the student movement of Salonica would have survived'.

Accordingly, as was the case with students elsewhere, Greek students also read the papers voraciously in order to find out what was going on in the world in a period of dramatic events (Vietnam, Middle-East crisis), and also in order ‘to read accounts of events in which they themselves had participated’.

Messages were coming, even if curtailed, but they found prosperous ground and they touched us. And somehow we started as well little by little also to get revolutionised. (Kounoulakis)

Apart from that, the dictatorship’s liberalization experiment proved to be crucial for the development of the student movement, as it contributed to a significant change in the political and social climate of the country. Part of this was the production and circulation of books, a defining factor for the enhancement of anti-regime consciousness among students.
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600 Zafeiris recalls that he had taken the logo from a report on May '68 by the radical French daily *Liberation*. Discussion with the author, February 2004. According to a US report, *Thessaloniki* was ‘anti-American, anti-regime, ambitious’ and would ‘probably continue to exercise a strong influence among younger leftists and students in this area’. USNA, POL.6 Greece, A-74 Confidential, From American Consulate Thessaloniki (Brennan) to the Department of State, ‘Antonios Kourtis, Publisher of “Thessaloniki”, 24 October 1972. The report notes that Antonios Kourtis, the newspaper’s publisher, was repeatedly fined and warned by the regime.

601 C. Iordanoglou, ‘The anti-dictatorship…’, op.cit., p. 278.

602 R. Lumley, *States of emergency…*, op. cit, p. 121.
Diffusion of ideas

We are going to find weapons. Oh, yes, weapons we have. But where are we going to find books?

P. Abatzoglou, \textit{Death of a salary man}, 1970

Since 1967 Greek writers refused to publish as a means of demonstrating ‘passive’ resistance through silence. ‘Refusing to submit your writings to be examined by the police authorities and the censorship office is after all an issue of self-respect and self-dignity’ says Spyros Plaskovitis talking about this period.\footnote{Spyros Plaskovitis, ‘
\textit{Χρόνια Μνήμης και Αμνηστία}’ [Years of Memory and Oblivion], pp. 240-249, \textit{I Lexi}, 1987, 63-64, April-May 1987, p. 245.} The critical moment for breaking this silence, in terms of publishing, was the publication of the \textit{18 Texts} (1971) that followed the famous statement by the Nobel prize-winning poet George Seferis condemning the Junta.\footnote{For an elaboration of this decision to break the silence, as a symbolic gesture in the light of Julia Kristeva’s analyses, see Dimitris Papanikolaou, ‘Η τέχνη της χειρονομίας: ξαναδιαβάζοντας τα Δεκαπενταώρο Κείμενα’ [The art of the gesture: Re-reading the Eighteen Texts] in \textit{Nea Estia}, March 2003.} The latter was the first public condemnation within Greece made by a respected, non-Communist intellectual. Those eighteen allusory literary texts were published by well known intellectuals. The experiment was followed by the publication of \textit{New Texts} and \textit{New Texts 2} and the journal \textit{Synecheia} (Continuity) by the same circle of intellectuals, including a number of left-wing writers.\footnote{Other publications such as \textit{New Poets, Katathesi ’71} and \textit{Katathesi ’72} were also inspired by the need to be evasive or slippery for the sake of conveying an anti-regime message, being ‘alternative’ and avant-garde at the same time. Papanikolaou calls them ‘collective publications of a manifest anti-dictatorship character’, in ‘The art of …’, op. cit., p. 3.} One of the main contributors to this symbolic rupture, the poet Manolis Anagnostakis, indicating that this generation decided to communicate with the young, commented in April 1973 in a moment of self-criticism:

\begin{quote}
What could be [...] the picture - if there is any - that today’s twenty-year old youths, who were fourteen then, might have of the situation and the processes of our cultural and political landscape before the April coup? If we talk to them [...] about the Spring that was about to bloom on our intellectual horizon, what mechanisms of representations do they have to follow us? With what depot of non-existing experiences would they grasp what the three-year relentless silence meant
\end{quote}
and how would they be convinced about the necessity of the intellectual transition to a specific moment in time from speechlessness to direct Discourse?\(^{605}\)

This choice coincided, more or less, with the regime’s decision to open itself up, suspending preventive censorship and abolishing the last black list of books in 1970.\(^{606}\)

The softening of censorship led to a spectacular increase in domestic cultural output, and publishers found a way out of the previous stagnation. Up to 1969, the only publishing houses which had been established and whose books became a point of reference were Keimena, Kalvos and Stochastis, focusing on classical political thought and literature.

From late 1970 to late 1971, one hundred and fifty new publishing houses were opened and two thousand new titles were printed in inexpensive paper-back editions.\(^{607}\)

This over-production of ‘free publications’ aimed to satisfy the need of young readers for critical thinking, which could help them to conceptualise the existing realities. Moreover, books were needed which would provide a ‘practical perspective’ or way out of the impasse. Publishers believed that through books they could ‘ideologically awaken the people against the dictatorial regime’, as they believed that books functioned as food for thought for the intellectually starving Greeks and were a direct means of political acculturation.\(^{608}\)

Some publishers were steadily oriented themselves towards the publication of left-wing books (*Neoi Stochoi, Odysseas, Praxi*) with a program that ‘covered the range of Marxist and Leninist books’ (*Synchroni Epochi*), the ‘renewal of official Marxist thought’ (*Odysseas*), the ‘ideological armament of young people’ (*Neoi Stochoi*) and the ‘creation of an anti-authoritarian movement in Greece’ (*Diethnís Vivliothíki*).\(^{609}\)

Moreover, books such as Schreiber’s ‘The American Provocation’, Galbraith’s ‘New Industrial State’ and Baran and Sweezy’s ‘Monopoly Capital’ soon became best-
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\(^{609}\) Loukas Axelos, *Εκδοτική δραστηριότητα και κίνηση των ιδεών στην Ελλάδα* [Publishing activity and circulation of ideas in Greece], Athens 1984, p. 4.
sellers, just as they did abroad. Soon Lenin and Marx, but also Reich and Marcuse appeared in bookshop windows, with the latter’s motto ‘the only hope lies with the hopeless’ becoming a slogan. Other publishing projects aimed at satisfying the readers’ need to re-examine the phenomena and problems from within the tradition of contemporary Greek philosophical and sociological standard works. Those books pioneered closer theoretical scrutiny. Publishing was diffident at the beginning (1970-71), but explosive later on.

There was something that was of very much of help, apart from the illegal books that circulated, which in a way helped everybody. That just before this political explosion took place, political publications started coming out, like those of Kalvos, or others, but which were coming out little by little, since up to that point no books were published. So, everyone reads the same books. [...] A book was coming out and since there was no other, everybody was talking about it. So, we were analysing from all sides. Same thing when another book was coming out. So, in a way we were following some common steps. There was no chaos in information. (Vanos)

Accessing the three Ms

Don’t you know, witness, that all documents on Communist theory are circulating freely in Greece?

The re-appearance and large-scale diffusion of an old series of basic Marxist texts by Greek and foreign authors by a traditional left-wing publishing house (Themelio), which had been closed down immediately after the coup, had an important impact on students. An equal influence was exercised by a series of Trotskyite publications, Neoi Stochoi (New Aims). Including articles from a whole range of Marxist revolutionaries and writers (Lenin, Trotsky, Gramsci, Guevara and Mandel), Neoi Stochoi made the first attempt to defy the barrier of censorship and test its limits by openly adopting Marxist terms. So-called ‘alternative’ Marxist analysis soon became an extremely popular and common point of reference.
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(Frankfurt School, Althusser) and psycho-sexual theory (Wilhelm Reich). Marcuse, Gramsci and Debray, ‘heretical’ writers according to the standards of the Old Left, were among the most translated authors. These became fashionable readings but also intellectual landmarks for many students, as they presented challenges to Marxist orthodoxy. A growing demand for revolutionary and subversive texts was revealed, since those texts tapped into the students’ desire to oppose authoritarianism. Even though Marcuse’s existentialisation of Marx and Freud did not become the major tendency, for Ilias Triantafyllopoulos his *One-dimensional Man*, ‘the gospel of ’68’, was a sort of sacred and guiding book, which enlightened the whole new era that had started with the youth movements abroad:

Through Marcuse I started rather to realize, to rationalize or to interpret the world. Marx came afterwards, then came all the other things, but we started from those everyday situations, the elements of lived experience. (Triantafyllopoulos)

The need to be up-to-date with the latest trends in the social sciences was also translated in terms of socialisation. Nikos Alivizatos notes the significance of French thinkers of the time, stressing that whoever did not possess some basic knowledge of theories, such as structuralism, was not ‘cool’ enough:

In terms of readings, France was, of course, the centre of the universe and the whole Marxist structuralism with Althusser, Poulantzas and all the things you can imagine. To put it bluntly, in the post-’68 climate you could not date a woman if you hadn’t read Althusser. (Alivizatos)

Less influential were the Soviet books published by *Synchroni Epochi*, the publishing house affiliated with the Communist Party, as for example ‘Leninism and the Contemporary Epoch’ that were widely read but often perceived as *dépassé*:

Books of the Soviet school of thought did not endure in time. A book on Czechoslovakia, which had come out right after, which justified the invasion with puerile arguments. We realized then as well that they were puerile, we were not convinced. (Bistis)

616 Louis Althusser’s structural Marxism was very popular at the time. Even though he had not endorsed the student rebellion of May ’68 he was worshipped, as Hobsbawm points out, by ‘a new generation of rebels [who] require[d] a new version of revolutionary ideology’ [Cited in Gregory Elliott, *Althusser. The Detour of History*, London, 1987, p. 186]
617 An interesting introduction, however, was written by Sofia Kana to the publication of basic political texts by some of Dubcek’s main collaborators. What she describes in relation to Czechoslovakia could easily be applied to Greece, insofar as she shows the universality of the human experience of being
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616 Louis Althusser’s structural Marxism was very popular at the time. Even though he had not endorsed the student rebellion of May ’68 he was worshipped, as Hobsbawm points out, by ‘a new generation of rebels [who] require[d] a new version of revolutionary ideology’ [Cited in Gregory Elliott, *Althusser. The Detour of History*, London, 1987, p. 186]

617 An interesting introduction, however, was written by Sofia Kana to the publication of basic political texts by some of Dubcek’s main collaborators. What she describes in relation to Czechoslovakia could easily be applied to Greece, insofar as she shows the universality of the human experience of being
Nikos Kaplanis, a Dentistry student in Salonica and head of the clandestine KNE, argues for the contrary:

In terms of Prague, I personally was fooled by KKE’s myth that whatever thing is not ours cannot be revolutionary either.

The leftist Smyrnis recalls that people of his like were obsessed with books on Marxism-Leninism, in order to deal with the theoretical deficit that people like himself had, as they did not enjoy a family or other background. Still, the vast bulk of students joined the ‘orthodox’ Communists, reserving their heretic training for future occasions.

It is impressive that despite the fact that the first books that were circulated were ‘heretical’ books of the Left or the American Left, Marcuse and so on, the great majority of the youth in the end joined the KKE. This is impressive. (Bistis)

Indeed in a chaotic way we read everything. In this way, we were open to the ideas of the French May too, but in the hard core of politics, not in our general culture, in the hard core of politics, you know, we had the political beliefs that were represented by our parties. (Sabatakakis)

Marxist indoctrination was so widespread, that even conservative Professors who outlived the purges of the Junta were aware of it. Xydi goes as far as to maintain that they even adopted an apologetic stance towards them, while Rigos reconstructs a tendency to use one’s theoretical arsenal in order to confront the Junta’s professors. Interestingly, he creates a contrast between this period and the period after the fall of the Junta, sustaining that the politicised students’ discourse in the years of oppression was much more significant than that in the years of democracy that followed:

I remember that we had a Philosophy Professor at the University, Mr Moutsopoulos, who entered at the second year of the department, where I was and I knew that the things he would say, would seem to us as to be rubbish, even if we wouldn’t tell him that they were rubbish, and he said ‘All right, I apologise to the Marxists’. Yes, and these things in the middle of the Junta...

suppressed: ‘We do not need to explain to you the special interest that these texts have. Because as violence and ideology have no country, equally the free thinking man is everywhere, in all places, a thinking man. On the one side stand the tanks and on the other the Human, naked, with his thinking being his only weapon. He is standing, in Czechoslovakia, Dubcek, Jan Palac, a people that knows what it wants. Opposite them an armoured reality. With a predetermined fate.’ Η Ανοιξη της Πράγας. Κέλυμα [The Prague Spring. Documents], Athens 1971, p. 7.
We had many Junta Professors in the University, namely Minister of the Junta. Our Professor of Sociology was Tsakonas, who was Minister of Presidency, that is of Propaganda of the Dictatorship, and who was giving some supposedly free seminars, in which, after we argued with each other on whether to participate or not, we decided that we should participate, but that we would destroy them. We would show off how left-wing we were, but with arguments. One couldn’t have the void political discourse that we had right after the Metapolitefsi. One talked about the substance. This helped me very much to read. (Rigos)

Rigos here draws a clear distinction between the fruitfulness of the discourses and the explorations during the time of the Junta and the later period, after the end of the Junta that is collectively recorded as a turnover of a negative character.

Moreover, in this period the publication of any book of critical thinking, including literary works, could be assessed as a political action of resistance against the authoritarian regime and almost every book could be considered political. Dissident figures such as the Turkish poet Nazin Hikmet were translated repeatedly during the dictatorship and were read in a heroic light, and Pablo Neruda, long before the Chilean coup, was considered a 'pillar of the whole student movement', according to a testimony. Karystiani stresses the importance of poetry in the training of the students. In her view, it was literal rather than ideological, though for her own part, she argues for a romantic determination that reached the levels of self-sacrifice:

This is how I got in, reading poems, having read Ritsos, Dostoyevsky, by reciting Mayakovsky, and these were... the ideological equipment in the full sense, you know, poetry, songs and nothing more. And a mood to become a holocaust if necessary. This is how I found myself there.

It seems that publishers who sympathised with these developments often exploited this trend as young people were starving for new ideas and the conditions for taking advantage were great. An article that appeared in 1973 in the literary journal *Synecheia* condemned the fashion of 'transferring the foreign problematisation which emerges from a different reality [and] translating it into Greek without any introduction or even warning about the differentiation of the conditions in every distinct environment.' In fact, in many cases the introductory sections of the books seem entirely out of place, always trying to establish connections with the Greek case no
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619 Fanis Ralos, ‘Μερικές σκέψεις για το κοινωνιολογικό βιβλίο’ [Some Thoughts on sociological books], *Synecheia*, 7, September 1973, p. 189.
matter how different the paradigm was, while the quality of the translations was often of a very poor level. In another issue of the same journal a literary critic concluded that ‘we had forgotten that enlightenment needs enlightened people’. Apart from this polemic, for many people this was not necessarily misleading, but could serve as a sort of intellectual exercise. For Myrsini Zorba:

I fall onto Gramsci and there I start having more complex thoughts, but this how you realise that you can interpret any text and any thought on the basis of your own needs and your own experience. Radicalise it, orientate it towards a different direction. (Zorba)

Sabatakakis, however, is firm in his conviction that there was very little attention paid to Italian and French alternative Marxism, in comparison to what should have been given:

There was a suffocating absence of books about the stream of thought which in that period was blossoming in Europe within the environment of the Communist Left and was called Euro-Communism. [...] In reality, we did not systematically follow all this stream of thought, whether this was the Italian Eurocommunist school around the PCI, the Italian Communist Party, or the French one let’s say, with the characteristic case of Poulantzas. Only too occasionally. This was our contact with the political book.

Vanos stresses the fact that readings created cohesiveness, a crucial factor in which was the people’s need to put these things into action. In his view people with a solid theoretical background were produced from this process:

I think that people with a solid theoretical training were shaped, who had read, who had discussed, who had exchanged views, whose aim was not on a theoretical level, an exercise on paper, but on applying it [theoretical training].

Theodoridis, on the other hand, stresses the fact that all these heterogeneous and fragmented readings often created an intellectual havoc:

Fanis Ralos, ‘Παθήματα των βιβλίων στις μεταφράσεις και εισαγωγές άσχετες προς το περιεχόμενο τους’ [Books’ misfortunes in translations and introductions, irrelevant to their content], in Synkecheia, 3, May 1973, pp. 189-190. A typical example was Th. Papadopoulos’s introduction to a translation of Gramsci’s Intellectuals which attempts to find connections with the Greek War of Independence of 1821.
Kostas M. Sofoulis, ‘Social Science...’, op. cit., p. 93.
We were reading chunks from Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, the anarchists, all the time; our education was full of things like that. We were continuously reading French intellectuals and monopoly capitalisms [...], things that we half understood, half we didn’t understand a word of. 622

Books on the history of the Greek Left, focusing on the 1940s, the Resistance and the Civil War, were another constant point of reference for students. These were very popular at the time, since students liked to think of themselves as the continuation of the mythical, albeit defeated, Greek Left, just as the dictatorship was seen as the natural outcome of decades of arbitrary right-wing rule. Les Kapetanios (Paris, 1970), a book written by the French author Dominique Eudes providing a rather idealised version of the Greek partisans, became a vehicle of instruction and a best-seller, as for Greek students up to that point ‘there was a gap, a void, a black page’ (Tsaras) concerning this period. The partisan model was also very influential in terms of music, with the old partisan songs re-emerging as an emotional form of entertainment and a sort of ‘transfer’ of the revolutionary spirit of History. In terms of aesthetics also, the ‘wild bearded men’ were strongly reminiscent of the communist guerrillas. Students were inspired by the resistance group EAM/ELAS and considered it as a model for the struggles they were envisaging, and perceived it as a glorious antecedent.

In addition, a whole series of journals of protest and ‘critical thinking’ started to be printed (Prosanatolismoi, Protopororia, Anti, Politika Themata), the publication of which, especially that of Anti, caused a considerable stir with the authorities. There followed a large series of translations of basic texts on student uprisings abroad, which provided the theoretical tool-kit for student revolt. The collective volume Student Power and Fred Halliday’s Student Uprisings Worldwide, ‘a little booklet on Argentina, Vietnam, Palestine, revolts from which one could draw valuable conclusions’ (Felekis), are but two examples. 623

622 P. Theodoridis, Macedonian..., op.cit., p. 203.
623 O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 53. Few people considered this a disadvantage, but one of them was the eternal Pimblis who criticized the Cretan Society’s journal ‘Xasteria’ for talking too much about foreign developments: ‘There was no need whatsoever to analyse why there is a student revolt on a global level but only why the revolt of the Greek students took place. This generalization weakened the antifascist spearhead of our student movement’, M. Pimblis, The Student Movement..., op.cit., p. 165.
Just as the third world movements have long since decided not to wait for the liberation of their countries through the imperial metropolis, so the students at present refuse to wait for their salvation from elsewhere.\footnote{Introduction', pp. 9-28 in A. Cockburn, G. St.Jones, D. Adelstein, L. Tinkham, T. Fawthrop, T. Nairn, J. Singh-Sandou, D. Wouigry, D. Triesman, H. Marcuse, D. Cohn-Bendit, Φοιτητική Δύναμη, Greek translation of Student Power, Athens 1973, p. 19.}

All these readings were a precious source for the circulation of information on theoretical matters connected to the movement as well as on international developments.\footnote{In the foreword to Student Power, the Greek editor issues the warning that although “the assimilation of the experience of others is necessary, at the same time the mechanistic transfer of models of thought and action which were shaped under utterly different conditions would be unrealistic”. Nonetheless, this book would provide a chance to Greek readers ‘to approach the questioning, the demands and the methods of students beyond Greece’, in A. Cockburn et al., Φοιτητική Δύναμη, Athens 1973, p. 7.} Often, the Spanish model was evoked as similar to the Greek one and as a prototype to be followed:

The Spanish students succeeded. They created reaction in the illiberal regime of the Caudillo, proving that student forces can act under conditions of fierce repression.\footnote{Fred Halliday, ‘Student Struggles: Spain’, cited in Protoporia, 2, January 1972.}

Finally, the ritual whereby these books were acquired should not be underestimated. The books were either to be found in the left-wing bookshops or at street vendors. Some of the bookshops became meeting places, where discussions occurred, such as Kaiti Saketa’s bookshop in Salonica, or Glezos’ bookshop in Athens, which were attacked by extreme right-wingers on more than one occasion. Saketa remembers that people’s enthusiasm was so great that when a new book was published and ordered from Athens they used to put its cover in the bookshop window for students to see: ‘such was the longing of the people’. A ‘student bookshop’ in Athens with a fanatic readership was The Clockwork Orange, a typical cinematic reference of the time, in fact to a film that had acquired a cult status although it had been expectedly banned by the authorities.\footnote{Kubrick’s film was only shown a couple of years after the fall of the Junta. Anthony Burgess’s omniuous novel had not been translated into Greek at the time. Even so, the film had acquired a cult status due to frequent references in the press.} The bookshops also became meeting points where hard-core political analysis took place. As Han Johnston argues, ‘when political opportunities are severely constricted, much of the doing of contentious politics is talking about it’.\footnote{Hank Johnston, ‘Talking the Walk: Speech Acts and Resistance in Authoritarian Regimes’, pp.108-137 in Christian Davenport, Hank Johnston, Carol Mueller (eds), Repression and Mobilization, Minneapolis, London 2002, p. 108.}
We were going to Kaiti Saketa’s [bookshop] and we gathered there, she was [KKE] Interior. She had a basement down there. And we were saying ‘what is the Revolution like?’ ‘Is it this way? Is it that way?’ ‘Should we publish Avgi clandestinely?’ ‘Should we not?’ Letting of steam through discussion. (Theologidou)

To paraphrase the assertion of Primo Moroni and Bruna Miorelli’s assertion, one could say that that in 1970s Greece ‘the old eighteenth century idea of the bookshop as a place of culture’ was combined with ‘the modern one of the market opening onto the street’. 629

Many students immersed themselves fully within this climate of intellectual overproduction and became manic consumers of the printed word. The Guardian pointed out in 1972 that ‘the security authorities have long been worried about the effect these [books] might have among students as, with the news media comparatively muzzled, these are making increasing use of the wave of left-wing books which have been appearing.’ 630 Thereafter, the new list of ‘discouraged books’ included books by Marcuse, Garaudy, Sartre and Brecht, which were, however, already sold and circulating in massive numbers. As Axelos suggests, ‘regardless of the quality of the responses they gave as far as the present and the future were concerned, they were literally sucked in by the already existing, and at this point reading, public which had taken shape and mainly the students which were its basic body’. 631

And all of a sudden, one person borrowed books from the other, often without returning them, books with a Marxist content. (Papachristos)

According to the analysis of Mariana Sotiropoulou ‘the political book, in times of periods of democratic deficit and authoritarianism, contributes to the creation of a critical stance and to the shaping of an alternative stance and a political position, opinion and climate’. 632 Book consumption and the circulation of journals helped to create a common style and to transmit a common and direct message by a creative re-elaboration of the practice of reading.

631 Kostas Axelos, Publishing Activity..., op. cit., p. 52. According to Axelos these books offered students basic feedback on resisting not only the regime but also the Old Left’s arteriosclerotic stance and its traditional viewpoint. See also Stavros Lygeros, Student Movement and Class Struggle..., op. cit., p. 69.
632 Maria Sotiropoulou, The political book..., op. cit., p. 2.
Inciting Revolt: Cinema

Alongside this, cinema became extremely significant not only in terms of form, content, symbolism and reception but also as a meeting and recognition point, due also to the discussions that followed after the plays and movies.

[I remember] the terrible explosions in the discussion of Alkyonis following the movies, where again the hard-core ideological confrontation lurked as soon as the lights were turned on. (Zorba)

In Salonica, a Law student, Vangelis Kargoudis, took the initiative of organising a cine club, which ended up having 4,000 registered members. This soon became an important meeting point, attempting to bring students closer to the spirit of the movies of the time, including political cinema, such as Bertolucci’s ‘The Spider’s Strategy’ and ‘The Conformist’ (1970). Screenings were often linked to political provocation:

We searched and found Melville’s movie, the ‘Stool Pigeon’, and we put big posters around the city, ‘The Stool Pigeon!’, ‘The Stool Pigeon!’ (laughter), and below that Pierre Melville. (Kargoudis)

There too, the movies were followed by a three-hour discussion, directed by Kargoudis himself. This collective character of cinema, the communal experience of watching a film, underlined its crucial difference from the consumption of books. The debates following the screenings, which were also attended by policemen in civilian clothes, seemed to aim at surpassing or even abolishing the passivity of the reader/spectator. Students soon became real film buffs.

The cine club was in reality a forum for political discussion. It was a context which legalized politics, ideological discussions, confrontations within the Left and its streams. So it happened. We all got registered of course in the cine club, with i.d. cards and everything. Naturally the Police watched [the movies] too, and there were screenings of Italian neorealism but also more recent movies, for example Godard, hermetic, difficult, but it looked as if he was saying something. (Vourekas)

In a characteristic discussion following the projection of Theo Angelopoulos’ first movie, Reconstruction, at which he was present, a hard-core group of Maoists attacked the up-and-coming filmmaker and the most charismatic exponent of a new cinematic
tendency in Greece, as petit-bourgeois. Kargoudis was the one to pay the price for any sort of revolutionary exaltation:

And the story went that I got beaten black and blue for any nonsense that the PPSP and EKKE people said. This had become typical; screening on Sunday, on Monday I was arrested at home. (Kargoudis)

Kargoudis recalls the Cine Club’s last session:

At some point we realized that this was the last Sunday and that they were going to hit us. [...] Around 9, 9.30 in the morning there came two riot vehicles, which were brand new, they were received in ’72. And they blocked Palos cinema in a vertical fashion, one from here and one from there, and there was a big gathering, according to the more modest calculations 700-800 persons. And the whole thing turned into a demonstration and the respective beatings took place too.

An interesting contradiction concerning Maoist organisations was the fact that although they were - alongside a handful of anarchists - the most faithful carriers of a spirit of contestation, similar to that of the ’68 uprisings, they were often contrary to any sort of culture. This was probably inspired by the general destructive mania of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, which rejected all artefacts as bourgeois. Similarly, the Greek carriers of ‘revolutionism’ were highly suspicious of cultural products. ‘The intensively politicized discussion on art acquired Zdanovite characteristics in some Stalinist-Maoist circles and became suffocating’. Clearly, these attitudes illustrate the rejection of ‘bourgeois’ aesthetics that we find in most ’68 movements and were reinforced by the conviction that art could only be engaged since its main task was to create an oppositional political consciousness. Panos Theodoridis, an Architecture student of a general left-wing inclination, recalls that in 1973 the composer Manos Chadjidakis came to Salonica with the filmmaker Voulgaris in order to present the film The Great Eroticism. As they were invited by the students of the appointed student council, left-wingers got furious, although ‘deep inside we were all Chadjidakean’. The real reason,
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633 Stavros Zoumboulakis, ‘Ο πολιτικός ριζοσπαστισμός στη δεκαετία του ’60’ [Political radicalism in the 1960s], pp. 12-15, O Politis, 99, April 2002, p. 15. A typical punchline of the time which followed that line of thought went: ‘when I listen to the word culture I load my gun’. This stood in marked contrast to the fact that important exponents of the arts, such as Free Theatre, were Maoist, having entered EKKE en masse. In contrast to them, the ‘reformist’ Rigas members tended to be the most open-minded in terms of culture. In contrast to above, the ‘reformist’ Rigas members tended to be the most open-minded in terms of culture.
however, shared by Vourekas and others, was that it seemed to them utterly out of place to produce an artistic creation that in a way disregarded the political situation.

It seemed to me quite extreme to release the *Great Eroticism* during the Junta. It broke my nerve, I couldn’t ... this thing seemed unbearable to me. I considered the man as a... I was an enemy of his music precisely because he could not express what all the rest were feeling. Expression for us was action, political struggle, anti-Junta, anti-dictatorship action, what could the *Great Eroticism* say to us? We considered it as an irony at least. A man, a petit bourgeois, closed inside his world, ‘here the world is falling apart and the whore is washing her hair.’ Precisely this; this was the sensation. And we snubbed him and despised him. Whereas, in the end, Chadjidakis was very big. In the end...

Theodoridis also regrets this attitude today:

To have in the midst of the years of the Junta and all this turmoil [...] two sensitive persons talking about erotic discourse was for us the most insulting thing, so we went into the dress circle and booed the *Great Eroticism*. This is one of the deeds about which I will be ashamed for the rest of my life.634

Andrianos Vanos, a Maoist student himself, vividly remembers Angelopoulos’s screenings, though in a very different way. In his recollection, this is recorded as the point in which the conflict went public:

The movies of Angelopoulos played a very important role. So, the fact that we were gathering and from a point onwards we could be prevented from gathering, this alone could be a big issue. And clashes took place, no matter which movie was coming to the Cine Club. But the people in charge brought Angelopoulos; they brought him and he made a speech. Another hundred policemen gathered, and we couldn’t get in anymore, and a conflict started in the city. Into the open. Not introvert, within a cinema. So, everything was going outdoors.

Apparently his description is about the screening of *Reconstruction* at the State Theatre where it won the award for Best Film of the year. Angelopoulos recalls too that a demonstration was started immediately after the ceremony, with students cheering at him in exaltation since ‘at any opportunity that was given there was an attempt to do something against the dictatorship’. A poignant moment for Angelopoulos that characterises the cryptic communication between artists of the time and their audiences is his description of a screening of the film at the University of Patras in the same year.

Because of the presence of policemen in civilian dress, Angelopoulos recalls that during the discussion that followed the film, students were asking questions in a hidden manner and he was giving affirmative answers: 'at that particular moment did you want to say what we understood?' This peculiar communication 'between the lines' is described by the director at present as magic, as in his view, it was denser than any detailed explanation.

The generally enthusiastic reception of the French and American avant-gardes and the aforementioned trend in Greek political cinema, known as New Greek Cinema, were also connected to the large-scale diffusion of the journal Synchronos Kinimatografos [Contemporary Cinema], which became a standard point of reference. The journal was not only concerned with cinema issues but also reported general theoretical discussions and debates, usually by seeking connections with politics. It was the successor of the influential Greek Cinema, which had published five issues before the coup, including articles by the French critic André Bazin on 'how film as a medium was difficult to read for clear cut messages'. New Greek Cinema, starting off in the late 1960s, defied this rule, by adopting indirect expressive codes in order to communicate socio-political messages. However, this sort of cinema was rejected by younger viewers and already in 1971 there was criticism for the 'students and liberals who fill the cincmsi Alkyonis and altogether praise often insignificant films, just because they were "transmitting a message"'. In the face of strict censorship, rather than allowing censors to shape their final product, the filmmakers of New Greek Cinema began using a cryptic visual language that could elude the censor’s eye. This was done, for example, through metaphors. In Pantelis Voulgaris’ movie The Engagement of Anna (1972), the restriction on female subjectivity, personalised by a 30-year old
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635 From the television documentary by Stavros Kaplanidis, Ιστορία των χρόνων μου [History of my Times], ΕΤ1.
638 Actually although the term ‘New Greek Cinema’ (NGC) was coined by Fotis Alexiou with reference to Voulgaris’ first film ‘Jimmy, the Tiger’ in 1966 and that a number of representative films of NGC preceded the dictatorship (Face to Face, Kierion, Until the Ship Sails), the new tendency in film-making reached an apogee during the Junta itself, facilitated by the censorship’s restrictions in filming expression and by the emergence of a new group of spectators, predominantly students, who sought these kind of ‘filmic texts’. The main group of NGC, apart from Angelopoulos and Voulgaris, were Papastathis, Theos, Katakouzinos and Chatzopoulos.
639 Kokkali, op. cit., p. 149.
641 Ibid. Exactly the same tendency is to be found in Spain.
domestic servant working for a middle-class family, in a world dominated by male power relations, apart from being a strong critique of social relations in Greece of the early 1970s, could also refer to the country’s suppressed state under the domination of the Colonels or the United States.

Another element of these films is a return to an authentic Greek rural spirit, symbolised here by the maid from the provinces and the ‘real’, ‘authentic’ culture that she represents, which is seen as a liberating force. In a similar manner, Angelopoulos’s aforementioned Reconstruction, was filmed in a remote village which made him ‘discover’ the traditional rural spirit:

This was the image that was representative for me. I, a man of asphalt, pollution, Athens, suddenly came to know a part of Greece, I came to know Greece, the middle Greece, the unknown Greece.

It will be analysed later on, how this rediscovery of the ‘roots’ and rural tradition became conceptualised as a pole of resistance, also in terms of music. Katerina is one of the few who remembers a discussion at EKIN following a screening of that film where she was irritated by Theo’s ‘folklorist mannerism’.

This new manner of film making led to a rift with the mainstream Greek cinema productions which consisted of farce, war epics and melodramas. This type of cinema had proven itself to be commercially successful, in the years prior to the coup also. The fact that it was endorsed by the dictators constituted a major cultural weapon, aimed at imposing a ‘stupefying sentimentalism’, according to film critic Giannis Soldatos. In contrast to this, the new film production was characterized by social sensibility and a need to approach everyday stories in a direct and non-sentimentalised manner often
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644 In his autobiographical account regarding these years, Panos Theodoridis expresses similar amazement at the unknown beauties of the Greek provinces, Macedonian..., op.cit., pp. 201-202 & 242-243. The reason for his frequent visits to the Macedonian countryside alongside his friends was in order to ‘finally find what was going on with our character what was going on with our generation and what was happening in general to this country’ (: 242).

645 In the documentary We decided and we order, by Eva Vernardou, Nikos Sarlis, ERT Archive.
evoking neo-realist and Brechtian characteristics. Vourekas points out a film that had already been successful abroad and was shown in Greece with many changes inflicted by the censorship:

The New Greek Cinema, for example Stamboulopoulos’ *Open Letter*, ridicules the whole post-war period, the juridical and cultural situation. These are not blatant political movies as you may realize. Nor is Angelopoulos’s *Representation* a political movie. But for us in the end it had many political features. (Vourekas)

The dictatorial regime, in its attempt to censor movies constricted itself to a naive handling of the topics, searching for messages on the surface (slogans, songs and labels), so that movies with indirect social implications and political dimensions escaped the censor’s eye. From the early 1970s onwards, however, with the softening of censorship and the rise of a general radicalism, the politicization of Greek directors had become blatant. This is to be seen, for instance, in T. Rentzis and N. Zervos’s movie *Black-White*, which contained constant references to the growing student movement and the revolutionary tendencies in Greek society, and castigated social apathy. Even ‘conformist’ directors chose to use the words ‘democracy’ or ‘weapon’ in their titles, in order to attract the audience through vague references to politics or ‘revolution’.

Alongside discovering Soviet cinema, first and foremost Eisenstein, and the legendary Hungarian Milos Jancso, Greek students were equally attracted to the innovations and experimentations of the French *Nouvelle Vague*. They were also seduced by the liberating energy of films such as Paul Williams’ *The Rebel*, on the rebellious youth in the States, and the hippy hit *Easy Rider*. The opening credits with
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647 Giorgos Stamboulopoulos’s *Open Letter* (1970) was, according to the newspaper *To Vima*, a film about a disoriented young man and his constant mental references to the Occupation period [‘Ανοιχτή Επιστολή’ [Open Letter], 9/12/1970]. Lines such as ‘No one dares do anything; a move might destroy him but it could also bring him ahead’ and ‘we are weak-spirited, let’s admit it’, clearly hinted at the stalemate situation in the Greece of the Colonels and the lack of any systematic resistance initiatives.


650 These two films achieved sales of more than 150,000 tickets in the period of their release (1970), as *Woodstock* and the *Strawberry Statement* did in the same year. See Chrysanthisi Sotiropoulou, *Ελληνική
Steppenwolf's hymn 'Born to be Wild' and the completely positive depiction of hippy communal life and sexual freedom were strongly imprinted in the minds of Greek youth. Antonioni's *Zabriskie Point* was another hit, with its different handling of the same topic and an aggressive depiction of the rebellion of upper-class youth against their background. The film further familiarised the students with the music of the Grateful Dead and the experimental rock of Pink Floyd, who created the original musical score. Apart from being a means of drawing closer together, films were a major means of broadening out. Cinema acted as a universal code and a means of 'transmitting experiences', the very experiences that Greek students were lacking. Xydi remembers that youthful defiance struck her through the film on the festival of *Woodstock* rather than through the standard channel of the '68 events, which for some reason passed unnoticed for her:

Various things that were taking place abroad reached me of course, but these too came through in strange ways, not very clearly. I do not remember, that is, being intrigued by May '68. I should not lie about that, I discovered it later on. But I remember that I was impressed by *Woodstock* and that I saw the movie three times and that once I also took my mother with me by force. I wanted to bring her to the cinema and make her watch as well and understand what incredible things where taking place outside Greece. (Xydi)

Movies depicting the counter-cultural hippy scene of United States youth or its political embarkment incited an emotive response in the youthful Greek audience. In some instances they led to instantaneous anti-regime manifestations and were therefore banned shortly after their release, thus acquiring a legendary status. According to newspaper reports, the screenings of such films were often followed by staged performances of the film's story in the streets. Here we can observe an interesting phenomenon of re-enactment and mimicry, whereby imitation was tuned into active interpellation.\(^\text{51}\) As the director of the French Institute in Greece recalls in his diaries:
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Yesterday [30 November 1970], on their way out of a screening of the film *Woodstock*, which presents American youth pop festivals, two thousand young Athenians demonstrated in the centre of the capital, shouting slogans against the police, while engaging in a confrontation with them.  

Kallivretakis, a school student at this period, recalls the police ordering the closing of the doors before the screening started and with the cinema still half empty. The result was that three thousand youths broke the cinema’s shutters and staged street battles with the police in the entire centre of Athens, whereby many got beaten up, arrested and had their hair cut.  

Effectively, Greek youths were dis-placing their opposition to the dictatorship by adopting the countercultural energy of *Woodstock*. ‘They were thus locating their struggle in (the context of) the 60s and dis-locating the abusive topos of the Greek dictatorship.’  

They were, however, out of tune with the conservative Greek society’s attitude towards protest and counter-culture. In an article published in the liberal newspaper *Ta Nea* (5/12/70), the playwright Psathas observed with revulsion:

> The whole story was that some people wanted to get inside [the cinema] and watch the hippies and listen to the hippy songs, and the Police was so scared by the possibility that our youth also would be seduced during the screenings by the frenzied action, the hysteria, the madness and the maniac crises of foreign youth - especially American - that at some point it thought of prohibiting the movie [...]  

Later on in the article Psathas continued in the same line:

> The hysterical yelling of youths with their hair pulled out and of singers wearing long moustaches and beards, dressed in rags, covers the greatest part of the hippy movie. The whirling dervishes of hippy music beat themselves, pull their hair out, get a hell-bent, faint while singing, bleat desperately or holler. Of this sick category of kids maybe there are a few here as well, among whom were certainly those silly chits with or without long hair, who created the fuss last Sunday. The greatest part of our youth, however, is not being seduced by such rubbish.

The day following the failed screening, Deputy Minister Georgalas visited Panteion University and made a speech ‘analysing the aims and ideology of the Revolution of the 21 April’. Thereafter, a pro-regime medical student complained about the fact that
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'after three and a half years of efforts to detoxify the youth nothing has been achieved' since 'the distancing of the youth from other activities has pushed them deeper to hippyism'. Georgalas retorted that the youth was effectively detoxified, that the Revolution had not yet used all its potential and that the Woodstock incident was of no great importance. When the student mentioned the appearance of ‘three to five thousand anarchists’, Georgalas responded that ‘they weren’t anarchists but vivacious youths’, as it was probably too hazardous to label them otherwise. The interchange between the two, including the constant reference to ‘de-toxification’, Georgalas’ favourite phrase when referring to the youth, and the adjectives attributed to the latter by the student (anarchists, hippies), conveys the level of public debate on those matters and the negative charge with which these were overloaded. It is noteworthy that at this time the Greek films ‘My aunty, the hippy one’, ‘One hippy with tsarouchia’ and the theatrical play ‘Hippies and dirladas’ enjoyed great success. This fact indicates an almost obsessive treatment of the subject of ‘hippies’, who were presented as a grotesque, buffoonish and engaging in decadent cultural behaviour. Equally interesting was the main-stream film ‘Marijuana Stop’, supposedly on the same issues, including drugs, with a strongly moralist character.

However, the fact that Greece was a stage of hippyism (Matala, Mykonos, Samothrace) contributed to locals being accustomed to freer habits, even if by 1971 the Holy Synod of the Greek Orthodox Church [was] calling all monks and nuns to pray for help as Greece was ‘scourged by the worldly touristic wave’ and ‘contemporary western invaders’. According to a foreign report

The Greeks, and not just the soldiers, don’t much like to see unwashed, barefooted and shabby youth sitting on the pavements in the centre of Athens; nor do they have any respect for the dropouts hitch-hiking their way to Istanbul, Kabul and Goa without a drachma in their pockets. But they tolerate them.

In contrast to the above article’s assertion, however, the hippies’ attire became fashionable in Greece, even though drugs, yoga and Zen Buddhism remained unknown paths. ‘The spirit, the fashion and the aesthetics of the hippies [...] influence[d]
The wearing of bloomers and handwoven bags sprang out of this fashion. In addition, apart from words such as Mad, Hippie, Twigge, Carnaby and Bonnie that penetrated the vocabulary, a multicolour, dream-like psychedelic aesthetic was equally promoted and propelled by commercials.

Another 'cult' feature movie of the time was Stuart Hagman's *The Strawberry Statement* (1970). The film, based on a best-selling autobiographical account of a 'college revolutionary' of the time, treated the uprising of Columbia University students in 1969, by exalting student activism and free love and rejecting university authoritarianism and police brutality. The most powerful point in the movie is its final scene in which the barricaded students welcome the storming police while rhythmically chanting 'Give peace a chance', before the action turns into brutal clashes and beatings. The film produced enthusiastic responses from Greek students who identified themselves with the protagonists, confirming Laura Malvey's Lacanean analysis that 'among other things, the position of the spectators in the cinema is blatantly one of [...] projection of the repressed desire onto the performer.' Myrsini Zorba remembers this as an explosion: 'But we were internally ready for it'. An American report of November 1970 on the screening of the film in Athens read:

Towards the end of the week film showings were accompanied by disturbances by groups looking for [an] opportunity to express views regarding present Greek political situation. [...] At several performances in at least two theatres, spectators in front rows stood up and shouted slogans. In one case groups shouted '1-1-4' which refers to [an] article in [the] former constitution promising equality to all citizens and was popular leftist street chant before coup. In another case disturbance was so great that police were called in to remove some of those causing disturbances, although as far as informant was aware no arrests were made. [...] Anti-regime slogans [were] shouted during performance of feature film and accompanying newsreel, reported applause for episodes in which students beat up police and applause following glimpses of photographs of Robert Kennedy, Che Guevara and Mao Tse Tung.
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Apart from offering a space for mimicking foreign student movements, cine-halls also served as meeting points and sites for information exchange. They were, after all, places of recognition:

It was a place for meeting people, especially the two cinemas, *Alkyonis* and *Studio* [...] It was also a place of recognition. (Damofli)

*Alkyonida* was a point of reference. It started playing movies. In the movies everyone participated - police spies and left-wingers. They all watched along. [...] And you started getting to know faces, you saw them at the university, you saw them in the places where you hung out. And you started, you know, acquiring a visual connection to some people. (Skamnakis)

It became a nucleus; it became an agitational network between us, a very serious agitation, meaning that all the preparation was taking place there. Afterwards I realize that most people who were acting in the student movement were also there. (Vourekas)

The only issue was how to break the ice. This was the big issue. How to break it, how to bring the people out, how to get to know each other. So, all these things were signs of availability. (Iordanoglou)

**Salonica Film Festival**

'This wasn't the film that we wanted to make, or, more secretly, this wasn't the film we wanted to live'  
*Paul in Jean Luc Godard's, 'Masculin, Féminin'*

Salonica's annual Film Festival, which took place in the city's large State Theatre, was a place of recognition but also a *lieu par excellence* of voicing dissent. The movies offered a great opportunity for getting together and soon became the definite meeting point of students in late September, each year. The common state policy was to promote and award war epics such as *The brave men of the North*, *Concert for machineguns* and *Captain Natasha*, all about Greek bravery during the Second World War, either against the German or the Bulgarian aggressors. There was a place reserved for fascist Italy too in films like the war epic *No!*, but mainly *The Unknown War*, the favourite television sit-com of the time, who had as its protagonist a brave Greek officer in the wake of the 1940 Greek-Italian War. Since these films supposedly
promoted the military virtues of Greek people, students tended to jeer them as well as their messages. The darkness and the relative anonymity that Salonica’s large State Theatre provided was a perfect setting for young people to vent their anger against the state-imposed winning movies, and, indirectly against the general political situation.

More than often the students opened a sort of dialogue with the characters in the movies, asking them questions, responding to their lines or just commenting. During the same season, the political satire of the Junta’s main producer James Paris (Boom) provoked the angry disapproval of students who exited in protest (‘shame on you!’), but also the outburst of a young film-maker who asked in a loud voice ‘is there no censorship for this?’ Mavragani remembers that it was a must to go to the upper circle and shout. She particularly remembers a short film on the monastery from where the 1821 War of Independence had supposedly started. As the Byzantine double-headed eagle is also the symbol of a local team, PAOK, the association created havoc, as the youths did not hesitate to mock a religious symbol:

There was a very beautiful moment in the upper circle, because, as it [the screen] showed the double-headed eagle and the blisters over there in Saint Lavra, the whole circle started shouting ‘PAOK’. (laughter) It was among the nice moments, because, you know, the upper circle and the booing which was, you know, exaggerated. But I was going to these festivals, you know. Once I changed my parterre ticket with an upper circle one, in order to be in the upper circle and shout.

The students’ reactions tended to be overtly subversive, using irony and associations with television commercials. This fact also points to the growing presence of a mass culture, reinforced by a growing level of mass consumerism. Another film presented at the same festival was called Raging Youth, hinting at young people’s rebelliousness, but clumsily presenting them as disoriented and vain. Students repeated slogans of television commercials in order to ridicule the dialogues, for example by starting to sing the tune of an advertisement called ‘Mr Forte’, when the film’s male protagonist demonstrated his toughness to the female actress. When, in another scene, he was informed by his girlfriend that she was pregnant, young people
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used yet another common television commercial called ‘Now you know’. During a moment of sheer provocation some youths shouted that they preferred watching the well-known porn-star of the period Gousgounis than the film. In the end, the youths were reported as organising a small demonstration outside the theatre.

During the thirteenth Festival and the screening of Hippocrates, an ancient drama, in September 1972, Hippocrates at one point said ‘Then we have democracy’ and a student from the gallery asked ‘Come again?’ When at a certain point Aspasia, Pericles’ wife, said ‘there are greater sorrows awaiting us’ someone replied ‘us too, us too!’. The playful mood of the students was reflected when Pericles, unable to remain in Athens said ‘I’m leaving for Larisa’, and the audience’s answer was ‘by train?’ By establishing this situationist practice of dialoguing with the films, students overturned the propaganda spirit of the movies’ messages and the official character and ‘seriousness’ of the festival.

Accordingly, the movies offered a great opportunity not only for expressing anger and dissatisfaction with the cultural priorities and aesthetical approach of the pro-Junta artists, but also provided the space for stretching out. More importantly, subtle references were made to the political situation. Little by little, however, and especially in the year 1973, people’s reactions in the gallery of the theatre tended to be determined by overtly political rather than qualitative criteria. A critic of the time characteristically argued that

We understand the hunger of the audience for politics but we should not completely loose our aesthetical standards; it is not possible that a bad movie is praised just because there are shots of the Vietnam War or because we hear revolutionary songs and political slogans.

In the end, cinema was a major factor in terms of the creation of a common consciousness and self-education. Greek students shared what Peppino Ortoleva has
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defined as the ‘eros of student movements for cinema’. According to a Salonica student, Chrysafis Iordanoglou, cinema was ‘a whole internal world’. Angeliki Xydi recalls a very particular day in her student life, associated in her memory with Alain Resnais:

I remember that I saw ‘Last Year in Marienbad’ the day in which I went for the first time to the Police Station for ‘a private matter’. This terrible piece of paper had arrived home calling me to go for ‘a private matter’. It was 8 November 1972; I remember well because it was my name day. [...] They wanted to advise me of course in the way that they knew best. In any case, I was beaten black and blue that day and I used to have very long hair back then, which I had just shampooed because it was my name day, it was beautiful. And they pulled it so hard (laughter) that it became like a wig and my head was aching terrific. But the evening was booked: in no case would we miss ‘Last Year in Marienbad’ (laughter).

This passage vividly depicts not only that the regime partly retained its repressive character even in the period of liberalization, but also the strong connection between students and culture, with the latter being a ‘window to the world’, a tool which could reverse and smoothen existing harsh realities.

**Theatre**

Another privileged site of communication and mutual interaction was theatre. From April 1967 through November 1969 the Colonels exercised direct state-imposed censorship, making it ‘virtually impossible for stage companies to mount anything capable of being construed, or misconstrued, as a challenge to authoritarianism’. Theatrical references, such as ‘rhinoceros’, became a code word to indicate those who still believed in the Junta’s good intentions. The initial ban on plays included the following, which were quite radical in their political ideas: *Prometheus Bound* by Aeschylus (revolutionary ideas and unbowed spirit of Prometheus), *The Phoenicians* (heretic in morality, non-belief in religion, radical in politics), the subversive *The Suppliants* by Euripides, *Ajax* by Sophocles (lack of solidarity within the Army) and above all *Antigone* (a standing incitement to civil disobedience to a military usurper who has taken over an enfeebled monarchy). Similarly, Aristophanes’ comedies,
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characterised by a general distrust of authorities and intellectuals alike, and especially *Lysistrata* with its ‘ithyphallic apparatus [...] and thrasonical soldiers on stage could not be tolerated by Pattakos’. As a foreign correspondent observed:

...the censors consider that they contain ideas subversive of society, the King and religion, the three pillars of the regime instituted by the coup of April 21. They have substituted other plays regarded as ‘less dangerous to the public mind’.

Still, Aristophanes and the satirical *epitheorisi* were two non-conformist and irreverent artefacts, which were occasionally allowed by the dictators in an attempt to be presented as ‘liberal’ and in using them as ‘safety valves for venting dissent’. However, this trick failed miserably: as modern opposition plays were banned, Aristophanes was seen as providing the raw material for criticising the excesses of the often ludicrous dictators. It was up to the audience to identify the resemblances.

By the early 1970s a certain opening up took place in the field of theatre as well. The softening of censorship allowed certain plays to re-enter stage, even if production and reception norms remained distorted. Moreover, as the classical actress Anna Synodinou maintained in late 1972 one of the main reasons for the come back of artists, including playwrights and actors, was a growing concern that the new generation should not suffer from a cultural void, a statement similar to that made by Anagnostakis concerning books. In other words, the previous generation of young people, which suffered the absence of any substantial cultural activity from 1967 to 1971, should be succeeded by one which would experience an intellectual dynamism, facilitated by open and not entirely controlled creation. In July 1972, Synodinou re-emerged with *Elektra*, a political play about citizens’ forceful criticism of the Athenian Republic, containing references to *catharsis*. Soon, the subtext became more important than the apparent subject-matter.

Despite talks about the ‘crisis of theatre’, the latter soon became a standard place of dissent, an antithetical sphere where audience interaction played a fundamental role. The privileged relationship between spectacle, text, music and dance and mainly the
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students. As the state-controlled theatre did not make a serious effort of transcendence concerning its repertoire, this tendency indicated that there was a new form of group socialization and exchange through the theatrical ritual. Gradually, the pre-occupation of young people with theatre became a widespread phenomenon, which ended up rendering the students important and influential actors, at least as consumers of cultural artefacts. This led to the effect that the general director of the State Theatre of Salonica, Kitsopoulos, stated in an interview to the pro-regime student paper *Foiittis* in late 1972, that he was seriously considering asking the opinion of the students, whom he considered a 'class' on their own, each time before staging a play:

> The attendance of all these students in theatre, the get-together, this lively participation, the notes with opinions and comments, have created a community. We have the perspective of having a closer relation to the class of youth, so that you should not be surprised - this is the first time I say this - if in the future we invite representative groups of youth before staging a play, in order to read it to them and let them give their opinion on the reasons why that play should be staged or not. 679

If this was an official view-point, which could be seen as exaggerated in terms of its respect for young audiences, it is also true that 'alternative' drama-teams issued free theatre tickets 'acknowledging the contribution of students to the promotion of theatrical tradition in our country'. 680 As an actor of an alternative drama group *Nea Poreia* (New Route) argued, 'we issued free student tickets because they are our audience, tomorrow's audience. And we want to make a theatre for tomorrow. Young people praise us'. Commenting on that, *Protoporeia*’s student journalist proposed that companies should, nevertheless, have a minimal ticket for students because they also had to make a contribution. 'After all', he concluded, 'it is, we think, time that the students too say that 'it's necessary to avoid the dead-end, becoming protected from confusion, abyss and intellectual appropriation.' 681 So, here we see an overtly critical conclusion, adopted by a student journal, concerning the general cultural situation, which is expressed by quoting an actor and sharing with him the conviction that something had to be done against the cultural stagnation caused by the authoritarian

679 *Foiittis*, 4.12.72 'Η «Νέα Σκηνή» του ΚΘΕ και οι φοιτητές’. [The 'New Scene' of KΘΕ and the students] Interview with the General Director of the State Theatre of Salonica (K.Θ.B.E.), G. Kitsopoulos.

680 *Protoporeia*, 1, November 1971.

conditions. In a daily newspaper, young directors Aristopoulos and Arseni are equally quoted as saying that ‘young people should not be cut off from the problems of their country’.682

Theatre journals containing quite radical standpoints started being published and readily consumed. First and most influential was Open Theatre, a ‘monthly review of political theatre’, containing articles by renowned left-wing intellectuals like Lúkacs and tracing international breakthrough developments such as Living Theatre. In an interview to Protoporeia its director, Giorgos Michailidis, was clear in stating that ‘for us political theatre means, first of all, opposition to any form of power’.683 Similarly, the journal Theatrika (Theatre Issues) had as a logo in its issues a phrase by Ionesco saying that ‘all people that have the tendency to dominate others are paranoid’.

From late 1971 onwards things started changing in Salónica as well, with students, once again, constituting the main audience. Here, interesting links were created between the world of books and the Theatrical Workshop, run by students. One can see in this case an interacting trio of publishers, theatre and accommodative student groups being fused. Kaiti Saketa recalls a characteristic incident:

Filippos Vlachos of the Keimen publications came to Salonica. Salonica was then a distribution centre for books and we were in contact with all the publishers of Athens. So, where did he go when he came over here? To the Theatrical Workshop, as he did not have another shelter.

Equally, as Saketa argues, new creative spaces were developed, which facilitated new meaning. As for a long time there was no student society that could accommodate anti-regime students ‘it was as if they had theatre as their base’.

When the Theatrical Workshop brought Brecht’s A Man is a Man in late 1972, a play full of references to everyday alienation in one’s life, including the loss of innocence, the impossibility of communicating and the estrangement with one’s self (‘you should forget about your opinions’) the first performances were in front of half-empty seats. The theatre columnist of Thessaloniki wondered ‘how many - if not everybody in the theatre room - should leave the Amalia theatre sceptical every night? It is an obligation, it is a dictate to get to know ourselves, to judge ourselves.’684 The moralist tone has to do with condemnation of the passive attitude of most people who

---

682 Thessaloniki, 29 July 1972.
683 Protoporia, 1, op.cit.
684 Gavriil Th. Lamsidis, ‘Ο άντρας είναι άντρας’ [A man is a man], Thessaloniki, 18/11/72.
conditions. In a daily newspaper, young directors Aristopoulos and Arseni are equally quoted as saying that ‘young people should not be cut off from the problems of their country’.\textsuperscript{682}

Theatre journals containing quite radical standpoints started being published and readily consumed. First and most influential was \textit{Open Theatre}, a ‘monthly review of political theatre’, containing articles by renowned left-wing intellectuals like Lúkacs and tracing international breakthrough developments such as \textit{Living Theatre}. In an interview to \textit{Protoporeia} its director, Giorgos Michailidis, was clear in stating that ‘for us political theatre means, first of all, opposition to any form of power’.\textsuperscript{683} Similarly, the journal \textit{Theatrika} (Theatre Issues) had as a logo in its issues a phrase by Ionesco saying that ‘all people that have the tendency to dominate others are paranoid’.

From late 1971 onwards things started changing in Salonica as well, with students, once again, constituting the main audience. Here, interesting links were created between the world of books and the \textit{Theatrical Workshop}, run by students. One can see in this case an interacting trio of publishers, theatre and accommodative student groups being fused. Kaiti Saketa recalls a characteristic incident:

Filippos Vlachos of the \textit{Keimena} publications came to Salonica. Salonica was then a distribution centre for books and we were in contact with all the publishers of Athens. So, where did he go when he came over here? To the \textit{Theatrical Workshop}, as he did not have another shelter.

Equally, as Saketa argues, new creative spaces were developed, which facilitated new meaning. As for a long time there was no student society that could accommodate anti-regime students ‘it was as if they had theatre as their base’.

When the \textit{Theatrical Workshop} brought Brecht’s \textit{A Man is a Man} in late 1972, a play full of references to everyday alienation in one’s life, including the loss of innocence, the impossibility of communicating and the estrangement with one’s self (‘you should forget about your opinions’) the first performances were in front of half-empty seats. The theatre columnist of \textit{Thessaloniki} wondered ‘how many - if not everybody in the theatre room - should leave the Amalia theatre sceptical every night? It is an obligation, it is a dictate to get to know ourselves, to judge ourselves.’\textsuperscript{684} The moralist tone has to do with condemnation of the passive attitude of most people who
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did not join the spectacles and who did not question themselves either about the restrictions that were imposed on them on a daily basis, apparently by the regime. However, once again the students seem to be redeemed, as they had proved to be some of the most sensitive receivers, establishing a direct dialogue with these art forms and their content.

*Free Theatre*, the most remarkable of all groups, was created in 1970. With 'living theatre' features and a Brechtian repertoire, the group 'abolished the director', since everything was supposed to be the result of group work. Most of *Free Theatre*’s actors were members of the Maoist *EKKE*, not least because one of them, Kotanidis, belonged to the organisation’s leading group. Political radicalism also inspired a stance critical of the ‘absolute spectacle’ and a search for a sort of theatre of contestation. *Free Theatre*’s manifesto declared with extraordinary frankness in its Marxist wording, that this was a group comprised by people under twenty eight years old, who detested bourgeois theatrical values. The group was composed of graduates of the *National Theatre*, some of whom were also registered as students in the universities of Athens or Salonica, just in order to retain student status. This link with the student world was intensified through their close collaboration with *EKIN*, through the subsequent staging of plays in the latter’s basement and the active role of some actors in its initiatives. Similarly, as Kotanidis recalls, ‘many guys from EKIN helped us in the theatre’. The main contact was *Free Theatre*’s leading actor Skylodimos, himself a graduate of the prestigious *Leonteios School* and therefore a fellow-student of most of those who comprised the main circle of EKIN.

Kotanidis records that at a certain point he was afraid that a demonstration was about to take place. *Free Theatre* had a spectacular debut in Salonica too when they staged John Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera* in 1971:

> This was a revolutionary act for Salonica, to have a play similar to Brecht’s *Opera of the Penny* staged at the Royal Theatre, with innuendos, with pantomime against the dictatorship, things which were not stated clearly. (Saketa)
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685 Brecht’s epic theatre was much more influential at this point in Greece, and on young people than, for example, agitprop street theatre, which did not manage to penetrate the country. In addition, the *Theatrical Workshop* turned to a more Greek-centred repertoire and set on performing Bost’s *Fafista*, a satire of bourgeois life and its linguistic anarchy. Its contributors articulated a desire to form a sort of ‘Greek Theatre’, by adopting a Greek repertoire and themes close to the Greek reality. The whole play is a sort of feast, in which the spectators themselves are involved in the end, in this way taking part in the spectacle in a dynamic way. The play, a farce, invited the spectators to act, thus establishing a special relationship to them.

A breakthrough event in Free Theatre’s itinerary was its staging of Petros Markaris’ *Ali Retzo’s Story*, a succinct but unambiguous statement of social protest. In 1973 *Free Theatre* became directly political. With *And you’re cutting your hair...*, in the tradition of the Athenian *epitheorisi* theatre and the contribution of the renowned left-wing playwrights Mourselas, Bost and Logothetis, it advanced the idea of abstention from the July plebiscite for the abolition of the monarchy. By this point, *Free Theatre’s* comments were experienced as political interventions with great potential and impact.\(^{687}\) For Theologidou, this play was a real Revolution within the Colonels’ ‘Revolution’:

And of course there was *And you’re cutting your hair*, which was a revolution within the ‘Revolution’, a real revolution. We used to go to Alsos every night, I could go on stage and play it. We knew it by heart, the dialogues, everything. (Theologidou)

By 1973, even mainstream actors, such as Tzeni Karezi’s company, staged political plays, with first and foremost *Our Great Circus*, written by Kambanellis and staged in the spring of the same year. The play was filled with allusions and references to the stagnation that followed the War of Independence of 1821, such as ‘why do the great ones who fought for peace rot in prison?’ The period of so-called Bavarian rule was effectively linked to the rule of the Colonels and even more to what was seen as US colonialism. Referring to the Constitution that was granted by King Otto in 1843, the slogans that were heard during the play included ‘the people’s voice equals God’s rage’, ‘Constitution’, and the evocation of yet another hero of 1821, General Makrigiannis, who had famously opposed Otto’s authoritarianism.

The play was highly charged emotionally, and the audience, mainly composed of students, went off to demonstrate soon after its premiere. Kambanellis recalls with emotion that the popular response was so enthusiastic that in later performances when youths went to the theatre they did not simply ask for tickets but for ‘tickets to freedom’.\(^{688}\) An interesting feature, highlighting the influence of these plays on young

---


\(^{688}\) Iakovos Kambanellis in Stefanos Stratigakos’s documentary *Nikos Xylouris and Three Poems*, ETI, 8/2/05.
audiences, is that the play’s above-mentioned slogans, written in huge placards, were taken up by the Polytechnic protesters. This included the major slogan promoted by the Polytechnic radio station and ever since connected to it: ‘Bread - Education - Freedom’.

After the latter’s occupation, Karezi spent a month at the EAT/ESA and was subject to mainly psychological torture.

All in all, students were consumers of cultural creations and bearers of a new cultural radicalism, which again was facilitated by their predominantly middle class background. They experienced, and contributed to, the radicalization of the entire cultural scene, a process in which theatre played a fundamental role partly due to the direct interaction between artists and audience. Theatrical journals openly questioned the boundaries between culture and politics, introducing a new, direct discourse that differed from the previous secrecy. In due time, the term ‘political theatre’ had penetrated everyday jargon. In contrast, the phenomenon of staging political plays reached such an extent, that critics started doubting the purity of their intentions. As had happened with political books and cinema, performances with an *engagé* content were often judged to be superfluous and cunningly misleading, as the political subject matter ensured success with audiences. An editorial by *Open Theatre* is so harsh in its criticism that it calls extreme ‘politicisation’ demagogy:

> The pseudo-resistance of big words, the people with their collars turned up, the blood-shedding students, the red cloaks, the iron bars of prisons, and, in general, the ‘pornography of violence’ do not render anybody emotional. Being a creation of the last few years, the theatre of demagogic findings has tired and disappointed. [...] The audience neglected the political messages when it realised that this was leading nowhere. The youth was initially misguided when flashy slogans were cunningly thrown from the stage to the parterre, but it seems that they soon realised that the role of the theatre is more serious than plain demagogy.689

This whole discourse on the crisis of theatre - a similar one was articulated by literary circles - seems to come from the *Metapolitefsi* period. Apart from politicisation and commercialisation, critics identified three more potential enemies for Art, which were introduced or boosted by the military regime: television, football and the Ford Institute. The fact that the latter was famously granting abundant scholarships to Greek intellectuals and artists during the Junta period was often interpreted by left-wingers as a sell-out to the Americans.

---

689 Giorgos Chatzidakis, ‘Ενός χρόνου’ [One year old], *Anoichto Theatro*, 12, 1972, pp. 4-5.
Music

Space was also given to the circulation of ‘revolutionary’ music, which led to a certain use of language and expressive forms. Here, eclecticism, one of the landmarks of the ’68 movements, ruled the way. A mixture of Theodorakis’ banned revolutionary re-workings of poetry and Savvopoulos’s ‘paralogical’ texts was coupled with the discovery of *rembetiko* and also American music, revealing a fusion of the ‘old’ with the ‘new’. Traditional folklore was further mixed with experimental rock, creating an ecumenical blend.

Rock music was becoming popular and a form of rock culture infiltrated Greece and the anti-dictatorship student movement in different forms and colorations, either directly, or indirectly; through the folk rock of Dylan and Baez, through movies, such as Woodstock, or even through Greek artists, such as Savvopoulos. Apart from the Beatles, the Rolling Stones and the Doors, Frank Zappa, Pink Floyd, Deep Purple and Led Zeppelin and most of the artists who had played in Woodstock (Hendrix, Jefferson Airplane, Grateful Dead, Janis Joplin) were points of reference. Davanelos argues for a differentiation in schools between ‘politicised’ and ‘a-political’ rockers, arguing for two separate identities based on the respective musical tastes, which were attributed a political character:

I remember that in my school we were split in two, the non political rockers, that is Led Zeppelin, to put it in a schematic way, and the politicized part that listened to Dylan, Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young, and these were like Gospels. (Davanelos)

He goes on to argue that the spirit of contestation was arriving from abroad via music channels, and that in fact the point of reference was the United States and Woodstock rather than France and ’68, even though he places them together today.

The message that was coming from abroad, mainly from abroad, was the following, the wind of freedom that was unleashed after May ’68. Since in Greece there was no political discussion, it was banned by the Junta, it’s strange but I think, without being sure, these are at least my memories, that the message was coming mainly from the States and mainly through music. Woodstock, the music, Dylan, Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young and so on.

---

690 Savvopoulos often represents an interesting case of counter-borrowing, as his hit *The Joker and the Thief* is an adaptation of Bob Dylan’s *All Along the Watchtower* (1968), but actually resembles much more Jimi Hendrix’s remake of the same song, thus in a way appropriating and popularizing both.
Music from the *Dark Side of the Moon* by Pink Floyd is the soundtrack of the best part of the aforementioned movie *Black-White* (1973), whose initial scene copies the opening of the documentary ‘Live at the Pompei’ (1971). An interesting point in the movie is when the student protagonist enters a music store in Athens and stares at a poster of Frank Zappa, while in the background one can hear a song by Deep Purple. There is a noteworthy moment also during the Polytechnic occupation, when the speaker in the student radio station asks someone codenamed ‘Pink Floyd’ to bring over his records. All this shows the extent of familiarization with western pop culture, including progressive rock groups, among young people at the time.\(^{692}\)

More importantly, however, a number of Greek groups made a dynamic appearance, by making a certain and influential use of language and expressive forms, with references to drugs and rebelliousness. The most significant were *Socrates*, *Exadaktylos* and *Damon and Feidias*, which were about to dominate the *Metapolitefsi* rock stage. Other groups continued the trend of the 1960s, often combining political with counter-cultural elements. The hippy message ‘make love not war’ is reflected in the great hit of the time ‘Make love, stop the gunfire’ by the rather conventional, rock group *Poll*, referring directly to the Vietnam War (1972).

However, as Leonidas Kallivretakis recalls, this generation, despite its contact with the rock scene, clearly preferred the Greek political song.\(^{693}\) Greek resistance music led the way, with Theodorakis’s heroic tone encapsulating the spirit of the time, but also marking continuity with the past: the *Lambrakis* movement, whose founder and leader was the composer himself. In the early 1960s Theodorakis was the first to gather large crowds of people in big stadiums in order to perform his musical re-workings of pieces of poetry by Seferis, Elytis and Ritsos, in a conscious attempt to popularize them. Theodorakis’s music had often been persecuted by right-wing governments or ultra right wingers in the past, with the tendency to disrupt his concerts when given in the province, a fact that was ‘widely reported, and contributed to the political reinvestment of [his music’s] symbolic status before the dictatorship’.\(^{694}\) However, ‘it

---

\(^{692}\) Pop culture in general is extensively referred to in *Black-White*, as one of the protagonists is a student in Fine Arts who spent his semester abroad in the United States. He thereafter makes references to Pop Art (Andy Warhol, Roy Lichtenstein) and uses English words in his discourse (level, intellectual), anticipating a later fashion in Greece but also delineating the differences between Greek students at home and the ones studying abroad. Another character who studies in Great Britain is not surprisingly portrayed as the son of a well-to-do Athenian family, who, nevertheless, analyses in detail the origins of student radicalism both in Greece and Britain.

\(^{693}\) Leonidas F. Kallivretakis, ‘Problems’..., *op. cit.*, p. 172.

\(^{694}\) Dimitris Papanikolaou, *Singing Poets*..., *op. cit.*, p. 169.
was the Gramscian overtones of Theodorakis's rhetoric that made all popular culture described in his [work], potentially political. In fact, Theodorakis invested much of his time in trying to demonstrate that true popular art is political.

As could be expected, his music was immediately banned in Greece after 1967, a situation which was to continue even after the regime lifted censorship on theatre and literature, for it thought that the people ‘must be protected from any contagious disease, such as Left-wing views or Left-wing music, which could delay the day when [Greeks] will all become true Greeks, following truly Greek policies and principles’ in a general process of re-education. Accordingly, the buying, selling, transmission, reproduction, or lending of Theodorakis's music became a court martial offence. Other effects were more serious: ‘On Wednesday Miss Athanasia Panagopoulou, a 23-year old Athenian girl, was sent for court martial for playing Theodorakis records in her Athens flat. Twelve records were confiscated.’ According to an article at the Times, ‘his records now change hands at $10 a piece instead of $4’.

Soon, ‘not only his music, but even his face, his words, his anecdotal whereabouts, became political par excellence’, rendering Theodorakis a powerful icon of resistance, a fact reinforced by his legendary escape from arrest for many months after the coup. People usually had his records brought in by friends who were studying abroad. The records were given different covers in order to escape police control, and in general copying and reproducing them resulted in a sort of common clandestine activity. His famous Song Cycles, such as The Songs of the Struggle, mostly about freedom, prison and lost dreams, often inspired by old partisan melodies, became the necessary companion of young people who eagerly reproduced them in the taverns. Theodorakis’s music and its poetics have led many more commentators to see him as the embodiment of the Sixties’ spirit of liberty, the engagé artist par excellence, leading to mythologization at home and commodification abroad.

---

695 Ibid.
697 V/42/231 TIMES, 14.7.67, ‘The News Team investigates the fate of Greeks who fail to conform. Even football is under state supervision’.
699 According to Gail Holst all Theodorakis’ songs were banned, even though his love songs were hardly subversive, quoted by Van Dyck, op.cit., p.15.
700 D. Papanikolaou, Singing Poets..., op.cit., p. 170. Despite Theodorakis’s actual domination during these years, Papanikolaou’s comment that his own condemnation of the so-called ‘light song’ and his suspicion towards western music as being non-Greek led to the increasing domination of youth culture by a ‘Greek first’ cultural ideology, seems exaggerated.
It was more revolutionary for us back then, let’s put it this way, to receive the illegal songs of Theodorakis which arrived here in tapes and we learned them, no matter if they were nice or not, you know. But in those days it meant something, that hey, the tapes came from abroad and this was spread out, the one told the song to the other, you know, we put them in our house and this was something. (Damofili) 701

Hybridisation: ye-ye politics

There was a strong divide between Theodorakis, who was committed to Communist ideals and partisan traditions, and another figure of the early 1960s, the poète-chansonnier Savvopoulos, who also represents continuity as he was an exponent of the New Wave, a sort of renewal in Greek song-writing up to 1967. Already therefore, his songs were expressing a New Left-like subversiveness, encapsulating the alternative spirit of the times. During the dictatorship years, he took disparate strands of traditional music and wove them together with electric guitar into a form of ‘serious pop’ with folk elements. His paralogical texts were one of the landmarks in his production, in which allusions were blurred with parody, not in an ‘attempt to write the wrong’ but in order to ‘participate in the confusion’, thus provoking semantic instability 702 and coming into stark contrast to the regime’s obsession with linguistic clarity. 703

olaria olarâ
the kids in a circle
the Marquis de Sade and a hippy
the murderer and the victim embraced (1972) 704

In Savvopoulos’s songs there is a constant reference to the youth of his time (‘the kids with the long hair and the black clothes’), but also descriptions of the mass consumption that had already arrived in Greece by the late 1960s. Mass consumption and its by-product, mass culture, were dubbed ‘tons of excrement’ in his 1972 hit ‘Filthy Bread’. In a 1970 interview he recounted:

701 It is interesting to note that shortly before the Polytechnic uprising in November ’73, the Minister to the Prime Minister Spyros Zournatzis stated publicly that Theodorakis’ songs were finally no longer banned. Precisely forty songs of the pre-Junta period were put back into circulation, including the famous ‘18 lianotrogouda of the bitter motherland’, to lyrics of the Communist poet Yannis Ritsos. On being asked whether all Theodorakis songs would be allowed free circulation, Zournatzis left this eventuality open.


703 K. Van Dyck, Cassandra and the Censors, op. cit., p. 51.

704 Ibid, p. 52, Van Dyck’s own translation.
I haven't been to Salonica for seven years. [...] Last time I went I was impressed by the change. Many things which were not accessible to the lower classes now have been put everywhere. You find them being sold in every corner: Refrigerators, Televisions, Kitchens. Let alone the building blocks. 705

Savvopoulos's description is a very accurate one, as mass consumption only became possible after the seizure of power by the Colonels. This was partly the result of a certain well-being ensured by the still booming economy and the dictators' inclination to buy off political dissent through increases in state allowances and benefits. Electrical devices and, in general, elements of household modernization had made their way through to Greece in the 1960s, but were consolidated on a massive level throughout the country only in the early 1970s. Stereos but mainly television, both major exponents of mass culture in the Western world, were gradually becoming necessities and were made possible by payments through several instalments that facilitated the purchasing capacity of the average Greek family. While in the late 1960s television was still a luxury, by the early and mid-1970s it was a standard accessory in half of Greek households. 706 Interestingly, this recent invasion of television was initially seen by artistic and intellectual circles as 'the new dictator', 707 an epidemic that facilitated people consuming cultural garbage at home, 'with their sleepers on', as a celebrated drama actress put it. 708 As was the case in Spain, television became a major means of regime propaganda but also of entertainment and a certain homogenisation of models, not least because of the advertisements. 709 Savvopoulos goes on to delineate that new aesthetics, including long hair and alternative ways of dressing, infiltrated and homogenised even parts of the city which were far from the fashion of the city centre.

705 Interview by Rena S., Epikaira, December 1970.
707 See for example Giorgos Chatzidakis's editorial, 'Ένας χρόνος'[One Year Old], Anoichto Theatro, 1972
708 Quoted from 'Το Θέατρο, το Κοινό και ... άλλα. Γιατί επέστρεψε έπειτα από πέντε χρόνια απουσίας. Συνέντευξη της Άννας Συνοδινού στο BBC' [The Theatre, the Audience and... other. Why she came back after five years of absence. Interview of Anna Synodinou to the BBC], Thessaloniki, 14/11/72
And there are more and more young people with long hair who get dressed in the American Market. The old days they were doing that only at Tsimiski Street. Now you can see them in the most distant neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{710}

In contrast to Theodorakis, Sawopoulos was shaping and reflecting on youth culture, without feeling himself to be an instructor or educator. Accordingly, in the same interview he questioned:

Who are you? Is there a group around there with a common conscience, a different desire, needing a ‘representative’? Because from your side I don’t hear any sound! […] Ah, of course! Singers in London and New York can easily make the ‘representatives’. But down here?\textsuperscript{711}

Sawopoulos was a central figure in the revival of folkloric elements as part of a new revolutionary spirit in those years, following Bob Dylan and the revival of folk music in the United States. In his shows he promoted folk artists and used folkloric musical tunes and traditional instruments, often referring to an idealised bucolic past.\textsuperscript{712} In a similar way to Nikolaos Psaroudakis, the publisher of the left-wing religious paper \textit{Christianiki} who was convinced that the Greek youth ‘has a particular sort of revolutionarity, which is founded on tradition’,\textsuperscript{713} Sawopoulos argued:

Tradition with one hand was giving us shapes of life and with the other was reducing our revolutionary spirit. How can I be revolutionary and traditional at the same time? Revolution is a mute instrument without tradition. And tradition without revolutionary spirit is a fossil.\textsuperscript{714}

His daily programme at the Athens \textit{boîtes} in Plaka was the absolute meeting point of anti-conformist students, ‘who had no relation to tradition, no serious education, but were full of imagination and passion and a suppressed drive which at some point [was] about to come to the surface’.\textsuperscript{715} As Giorgos Karambelias has written:

\textsuperscript{710} Interview by Rena S., \textit{Epikaira}, December 1970
\textsuperscript{711} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{712} Including the singer of folk and demotic songs Domna Samiou, the shadow cartoonist Spatharis and a street fighting man, Jimmy the Tiger, a Zampanò-like figure from Fellini’s \textit{La Strada}.
\textsuperscript{713} Interview of Psaroudakis with K.Tsoufidis and Ch.Zafeiris, ‘Αναβλήθηκε η υμνία του εκδότη της ‘Χριστιανικής’ Νικόλαου Ψαρουδάκη με θέμα ‘Παιδεία και Δημοκρατία’ [The talk of the publisher of the ‘Christian’ Nikolaos Psaroudakis with the subject ‘Education and Democracy’ has been cancelled], \textit{Thessaloniki}, 27/2/72.
\textsuperscript{714} Interview with Dimitris Gionis, \textit{Avgí}, March 1975, quoted in O Σαββόπολος στη Λέρα [Savvopoulos at Lyra], p. 104.
\textsuperscript{715} Giorgos Notaras, «Βρώμικο Ψωμί. Ένα test drive αυτοτοίχος» [Filthy Bread. A Test Drive for a Utopia], in Dionysis Savvopoulos (ed), \textit{H Σούμα} [The Sum Up], 2003, p. 115
Sawopoulos was already a magnificently new voice, expressing the then ‘marginal element’ of the period, that element which was secondary to the central aims of modernization and democratization, but which was already mobilizing the most progressive section of youth.\(^{716}\)

Sawopoulos himself criticises the purely political songs, implying Theodorakis, and pinpointed that the songs which went beyond party folklore, attacked ideological discipline and were closer to everyday realities, were more appealing to students who thought critically:

It used to be fashionable and people wrote political songs, like ‘we have to strengthen the struggle’. Some epic stuff... The Gathering at the EFEE was more meaningful, where the guy fancies a chick who is not at the gathering. This became a symbol for students, you see... That is, if you were a bit more wind of the things that were happening this is the song you sought.

Sabatakakis comments that Sawopoulos was an element that brought Greek society in contact with the spirit of international student protest:

Sawopoulos’s presence was propitious for the student culture of that time, giving a fresher dimension to some things than the traditional one which derived from within the ranks of the Left, which we knew.

Given the success of Sawopoulos’s concerts, the Kyttaro club was created partly in order to accommodate his large audiences. Accordingly, this was a change from the seventy seat boîtes to large music clubs that could host up to four hundred persons. During his sessions, Sawopoulos was coupled with dynamic exponents of the emerging rock scene, with stated intent to not only copy the foreign model but to integrate rock with Greek lyrics and explore the realities of the youth, as in the legendary recording ‘Live at Kyttaro’. This documents a fusion that contained a mixture of progressive, folklorist and acutely political elements, both indigenous and foreign. His song Black Sea, a Heptote folk tune mixed with psychedelia was followed by Exadactylos’ controversial lyrics and foreign imported pop and Socrates’ imitation of Jimmy Hendrix’s famous napalm bomb-like solo at Woodstock. Socrates’ guitarist Spathas describes his guitar effects as containing ‘the sense of protest’ and brings to

mind the young people who were at the concert as ‘an audience full of energy’,\footnote{Giannis Spathas, Introduction on the jacket of the new edition of Ζωντανοί στο Κιτταρό. Η Ποιήσις στην Αθήνα [Alive at the Kytararo Club. Pop music in Athens], Lyra, 2003, first edn. 1971.} singing along and applauding with exhilaration. The fact that as soon as 1971, when the student movement was still low key, a major event of such transgressive intensity took place, bringing together the avant-garde with the underground rock scene of Athens, indicates that in terms of counterculture things were quite explosive.

Fusion is reflected in exchanges between the repertoires, with Bourbouli grouping with Savvopoulos, and ‘heroes’ of the underground scene, such as Pavlos Sidiropoulos, Nicolas Asimos and Uncle Nondas adopting political or at least anti-authority verses.\footnote{‘When, where and when one is obliged to, the gentleman there is looking at us, run, at the end of the road, is lurking the lord of fear, for us’ Lyrics by Exadaktylos. The word ‘gentleman’ replaced the word ‘cop’ from the original version, in a usual act of self-censorship. Akis Ladikos, Πάνω Στον Νότο [Pavlos Sidiropoulos. Παύσε να γερίζετε; [Pavlos Sidiropoulos. Where are you wondering around?], Athens 1998, p. 31.} It is noteworthy, that one of the most promising rock producers of the time, Stelios Elliniadis, was a member of the Maoist EKKE. De facto fusion was such that the anti-regime student paper Avant-Garde constantly promoted rock groups such as Socrates and the ‘folklorist duet’ Damon and Feidias. Apart from the phenomenon of politics entering the rock stage, there was an appropriation of folk music by rockers too. Damon and Feidias were eventually fused with the Bourbouli into one group that was playing songs ‘based on demotic music and classic rock’, with lyrics in Greek and with ‘sociological elements’, according to the group’s own description.\footnote{Olga Bakomarou, ‘Μπουβούλια: Καινούργιοι δρόμοι’ [Bourbouli: New paths], Fantasio, 6/2/1973.} Elliniadis, a frequent habitué of the cult record shop ‘Pop 11’, plainly describes the hybridisation of the cultural tastes of this generation:

Verses, characters, underground social streams, political environment, aesthetical tendencies, cinema and literature were shaping the rock scene together. Paul Butterfield, Electric Flag, Grateful Dead and John Coltrane, instead of the treacle Baez and the childish Utopia of the flower children. And at the same time Vamvakaris and Chadjadakis and, of course Savvopoulos, in Rodeo. Light behind the dazzling façade.\footnote{Stelios Elliniadis, ‘Ο πρίγκηπας της δισκογραφίας’ [The prince of the record industry], in E-On Line, 6/8/2002.}

Music halls too became a meeting place and a melting pot between the a-political youth, who were still called ‘yé-yés’, and politicized students.
The main audience at the boîtes were students. At Rodeo, in those clubs, there were students but not [an] unmixed [group] anymore. A youth was coming too, that liked to listen to rock groups. [...] We called them ‘yeyedes’. Different kinds of youth started meeting each other. (Savvopoulou)

This mixture, leading to the creation of a new youth culture, combining political with counter-cultural features, is furthermore illustrated by similarities in appearance, as the politicized started adopting the yé-yé style, therefore moving from being clean shaven to wearing long hair and beards.\(^\text{721}\) The opposite was also true, as Panos Theodoridis, a student who considered himself a typical rocker of the time, argues that politicization got his group of friends off the hook:

So, whereas we were rockers and did not have responsibilities, being apolitical and cool, out of the sudden we got transformed into political creatures.

However, he then asserts a certain co-existence of these elements, in contrast to Kallivretakis’s own experience, in which rock elements were left out when students were ‘organised’ into a political group with anti-regime incentives as the two features were supposedly considered to be incompatible.\(^\text{722}\) The aforementioned film Black-White shows how politicised students could adopt the counter-cultural rhetorics and style alongside their political militancy. In a crucial scene, it shows how shortly after the Law School occupation politically engaged students rush after an assembly to a record store to buy rock music, thus underlining the strong hybridisation in youth identities of the time.\(^\text{723}\)

\textit{Re-inventing Tradition}

Savvopoulou was often coupled with Marisa Koch, a flamboyant singer - ‘a mixture of the wildness of Janis Joplin, the endurance of Yoko Ono and the sensitivity of Joan Baez\(^\text{-}\text{724}\) specialized in performing demotic songs. ‘Folk song and rock music become one in order to convey the new Greek musical ‘colour’”, according to a comment

\(^\text{721}\) A number of youth journals, such as Fantasio and Music Generation, kept the yé-yé is updated and provided the necessary toolkit for their aesthetic exploration, without, however, digging deeper into its social underpinnings.


\(^\text{723}\) Even though the movie’s protagonist ends up embracing a more conventional lifestyle despite his alternative ideas, the film convincingly depicts the every-day student life of the period and was labelled as ‘prophetic’ in terms of future Polytechnic events, and because of its continuous filming of students within the Polytechnic yard.

\(^\text{724}\) ‘Οι συναυλίες της Μαρίσα Κοχ’ [Marisa Koch’s concerts], Thessaloniki, 10/4/73.
appearing in *Thessaloniki*, again going against the regime’s demand for cultural authenticity. The article describes Koch’s repertoire, alongside the support group *Kichotes*:

Demotic songs, Markopoulos - the song ‘Enemies’ (*Οχτοι*) was applauded more than anything - the famous *Arrabas, Gianni mou* etc, and in the end acid rock, funk, garage and also country.

Here we see the mixture between famous folk songs (*Gianni mou*), with progressive rock and songs with clear anti-dictatorship connotations, such as Markopoulos’s emblematic song ‘Enemies’ (*The enemies have come to town*), pointing at the Colonels. Koch recalls:

When in 1969 I met Dionysis Savvopoulos and we arranged the program for *Rodeo*, I didn’t want first of all to sing any song that had been submitted to the censorship committee. [...] So, it crossed my mind to sing old songs in a way in which I could express my inner drive but also the sounds that I had in my ears back then, listening to them day and night [...] The issue was to not let anyone hinder the cry and the wildness in singing, in order to sing in a ‘traditional’ way. [...] The songs had such an immediate success, as if the people were waiting for this. As a matter of fact, the people then, at least the ones who were coming to those places, were the same people that a bit later were inside the Polytechnic, and they wanted to do ‘harm’ to the traditional songs, because every statement of the Colonels was accompanied by a traditional song.  

Theodoridis remembers with emotion a combined concert of Savvopoulos and Koch in Salonica where they launched demotics:

In 1970, I think, Savvopoulos’s *Ode to Karaiskakis* came out, with those bagpipes at the end, or was it a clarinet, well, this thing came out and Savvopoulos came over, I think in ’70 with Marisa Koch to Palais des Sports and Marisa Koch sang the *λαπίνα [doe]*, namely a demotic song to three, three and a half thousand enraged students.  

Tradition became a point of departure in terms of fighting the regime’s hypocritical attempts to defend the routes of Hellenic civilization. ‘The dictators promoted every form of ‘low entertainment’ as a component of their own nationalistic motto’, that is,

---

725 Ibid.  
‘Greece of Orthodox Greeks’. Through propagandistic venues such as the Olympics of Song and with the Greek pop song (laiko tragoudi) becoming increasingly commercialized and populist, the Junta progressively succeeded in exercising its ‘hegemonic control of a wide range of social strata through decisive mediation of popular art-forms’.

In reaction to that, and given the fact that the dictators were great partisans of folk songs and dances, as they never missed a chance to publicly demonstrate their skills in kalamatianos or karagkouna, there was an attempt by alternative artists to explore genuine folklore in a more in-depth way. According to Karen Van Dyck, this could be interpreted as a sort of homeopathic use of folk whereby ‘that which is threatening can be used to strengthen the immune system’. This created two antithetic, competing folk cultures: the dictators’ favourite dances broadcasted and promoted by radio and television, versus the ‘authentic’ one, represented by these artists. The students followed this pattern of using a well-established register, in order to undermine it from within. This is what Luce Giard describes, paraphrasing de Certeau, as the inversion and subversion acted out by oppressed people, who metaphorise the dominant order by making its law and representations function ‘in another register’, within the framework of their own mental tradition.

The most popular of the folk songs were from Western Crete, the Rizitika, rediscovered by the composer Yannis Marcopoulos, who also crafted ‘political songs’. These were usually sung by one of the students’ idols, the Cretan singer and lyra-player Nikos Xylouris. The songs, originally about the fictional struggles with Charos but mainly the historical Cretan uprisings against the Turks in the late nineteenth century, already belonged to the canon of resistance. Crete itself functioned as a place with symbolic value, condenser of the traditional patriotic sentiment:

---

728 Dimitris Papanikolaou, Singing Poets..., op. cit., p. 169.
731 Apart from embracing these forms of experimental folk, anti-regime students, such as Angelopoulos set out to discover the ‘authentic’ spirit of rural Greece, as opposed to the vulgarity of modern cities. This was, in ‘Theodoridis’s words, a return to the roots ‘in order to understand after all what was happening to our character, what was happening to our generation and what was happening in general to this country’. See Panos Theodoridis, Macedonian..., op.cit., p. 241-242.
peripheral but proud, in a word, ‘Kazantzakean’. The absolute favourite theme was the cortege song ‘When will the skies clear?’ (Πότε θα κάνει η ζωή πάλι), which became the constant soundtrack in student actions. Jane Cowan remarks that ‘this song was unmistakably a call to arms’. 734

When will the skies clear?
When will February come,
so that I can take up my rifle?

The reference to February became particularly associated with the Law School occupation in February 1973 and was particularly sung on the Law School terrace (see Chapter 4). In one incident, after Markopoulos’s concert in Sporting in summer 1973 the students made a big demonstration.

As Van Boeschoten argues, songs reflect the emotional expression of an ideological brewing, which leave many questions open for interpretation. 735 However, contrary to Boeschoten’s conclusion that in Greek partisan songs there is no mentioning of revolutionary violence, 736 in the constantly repeated songs of the students there was plenty. Xasteria in reality declares in a celebratory manner a series of intended massacres: ‘I shall leave mothers without sons, women without men’. Another mythical song of the time, Theodorakis’s Ena to chelidoni [A solitary swallow], based on Elytis’s Axion Esti, concludes in an almost Jacobin way:

For the sun to turn it takes a job of work, It takes a thousand dead sweating at the Wheels, It takes the living also giving up their blood.

The cathartic energy of the taverna ritual

Part of all this was also the revival of the old left-wing guerrilla songs, the so-called andartika, whose ‘boisterous militancy’ 737 gave the illusion of communicating with the legendary heroes of the resistance. 738 Similarly to Xasteria the students appropriated

---

734 Ibid.
735 R. Van Boeschoten, Troubled Years..., op. cit., p. 15.
736 Ibid. Also see Riki Van Boeschoten, From Armatolik to People’s Rule. Investigation into the Collective Memory of Rural Greece, 1750-1949, Amsterdam 1991.
737 Jane K. Cowan, Politics, Identity..., op. cit., p. 11.
738 Papapolizos and Martzoukos call this ‘retro resistance’. See Η δεκαετία του '70. Η Ελλάδα στα ράφια [The 70s. Greece on the shelves] in Filimon Papapolizos, Kostas Martzoukos, Hellads: Η Ελλάδα μέσα από τη διαφήμιση (1940-1989) [Greece through the commercials], Athens 1998. One of the most popular resistance songs (‘To arms, to arms!’) was a call to arms in order to gain ‘precious freedom’.
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other songs too, taken from the period of Ottoman rule and the klephtic tradition, a fact that fitted well with the imaginary of the premodern, uncompromising, renegade freedom-fighter figure. A well-known klephtic song called ‘Black is the Life we Black Klephs are Leading’ was paraphrased as ‘Black is the Life we Students are Leading’:

Μαύρη ζωή που κάνουμε
Εμείς οί φοιτητές, εμείς οί φοιτητές.
Με πόνο πάμε στη Σχολή
με θάρρος τραγουδάμε
Όλη τη μέρα στα σκαλώ
το βράδυ στην ταράτσα.739

Students also discovered and re-appropriated the rembetika, songs imported from Asia Minor in the 1920s, which were strongly associated with the underworld, and at the same time marked a form of social protest. The rembetika had a strong countercultural resonance because of their plentiful references to drugs, being ‘songs of love, sorrow and hashish’, to use Gail Holst’s phrase.740 They were banned in the inter-war period and officially denounced by the Communist Party as luben, as they supposedly led working class fighters to degeneration and stupefaction. Needless to say that during the first years of the Junta the rigid moral code of the ‘Hellenic Christians’ regarded the rembetika as offensive.741 However, things were not as restrictive as one might think, as old rembetes such as Tsitsanis, Vamvakaris and Bellou performed in certain dives in Athens and, to a lesser extent, in Salonica. Savvopoulos himself turned to this sort of musical matrix in order to acquire raw material, as many a composer had done before him, including Chadjidakis and Theodorakis in the late 1940s and early 1960s respectively.742

739 Song entitled ‘Freedom will come again to our poor country’ [Θάρρος, μαρά, ξανά η λευτερία στη δόλα μας παράσκευα] in Takis Mamatsis, ‘Οι αγώνες των φοιτητών’ [The student struggles], pp. 5-16, in Neos Kosmos, June 1973, p. 6.
740 Gail Holst, Road to Rembetika: Music of a Greek Sub-culture; Songs of Love, Sorrow and Hashish, Limni and Athens, 1977.
741 A major example is the fact the breakthrough study of Ilias Petropoulos Rembetika Tragoudia (1968) was banned and he himself was imprisoned.
742 In a polemic article published in 1972, the rock producer and critic Tasos Falireas rejected the appropriation of the rembetika by the above-mentioned ‘national composers’ as in his view this stripped them off their contestatory aspect. In the same text, Falireas made an interesting reading of the rembetika, in which he found links between their underground elements and those of the late 1960s rock scene in Great Britain and the United States, which he also saw as having recently commercialised and been ‘sold out’ by its own gurus (Dylan, Lennon) in order to make profit. See ‘Μερικές Σκέψεις για τον τίτλο’ [Some Thoughts about the Title], in Mousiki Genia, 12 February 1972.
The *rembetika* offered rich associational material with older epochs, a favourite habit in that time. Kaldaras’s song ‘Night has fallen without a moon’ (*Nichtose choris feggari*), recorded in 1947, during the Civil War goes:

A door opens, a door closes  
but the key is turned twice;  
what’s the kid done  
that they threw him in jail?

Jane Cowan rightly observes that ‘with the regime’s prison cells full of young people brought in for interrogation and torture, the lyrics simply achieved too direct a hit’. A similar example is offered by Markos Vamvakaris’s song called ‘The prisons are ringing out’ (*Antilaloun oi fylakes*), another very popular tune of the time. These songs, always sung collectively, fitted neatly with the formation of large groups of friends who met in taverns or went to the basements where the old *rembetes* sang. Damofli remembers this improbable meeting with the old *rembetes*, while pointing out that what counted was the allusion, that ‘one word within the song’:

Some students, a bit older than me, had managed to watch and listen to Vamvakaris in a place at Patissia. And he, according to them, welcomed them by saying ‘hallo boys’. (laughter) […] We used to go to Tsitsanis. And often we were truant, as us women did not have such freedom from our home. (Damofli)

Ilias Triantafyllopoulos remembers this as a joyful recurrence, a rediscovery of a long-lost socialization through music:

It’s the rediscovery of Bellou, Tsitsanis, again the popular songs and the *rembetika* and of course Savvopoulos and the others and the international streams, rock and all the rest. But the tavernas start all over again, the songs restart, and this was what created the groups of friends. (Triantafyllopoulos)

In a way, *rembetika* leads one to the notion of culture as a ‘map of meaning’, namely practices that make things intelligible to a cultural group’s members, in this
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case the politicized students. For them, *rembetika* became part of the canon of resistance, acquiring particular signifiers that were not recognizable by others. So, it is noteworthy that *rembetiko* became a general fashion at the time: *rembetomania* one could say, also publicized by the pro-regime student paper, in this case stripped of its subversive nature.\(^{745}\) This tendency of embracing similar cultural features and attributing different meanings to them is also to be seen in movies, rock music and theatre.\(^{746}\) Angeliki Xydi's affirmation recapitulates this tendency and highlights the ways in which 'anti-regime' students conceptualized *rembetika*, focusing on its social characteristics:

> And of course we had the tavernas. Where we gave away our souls, right? Regularly, with *rembetiko* until the point of exhaustion. Which was in a way a fashion, but not only. I think that it fitted well, it corresponded to this situation of social upheaval and discontent towards a suppressive regime. (Xydi)

However, the drug effect of the *rembetika* is hardly to be seen, at least among the politically engaged students. Drugs were rather marginal, and were still associated with un-political behaviour and marginalised hippies, who were often attacked and ridiculed by the press.\(^{747}\) This was coupled with the aforementioned tendency to exclude and mock such inclinations. Greek hippies were identified with the underworld and were not considered fashionable among the students, who longed to be energetic and were

\(^{745}\) 'Η Σωτηρία Μπέλλου συγκεντρώνει την προτίμησή των φοιτητών που ξετρελαίνονται για ρεμπέτικο τραγούδι' [Sotiaria Bellou is preferred by students who get mad about *rembetiko* songs], *Foititis*, 9/4/73. The same article continues 'Rembetiko, which touches a large part of the student world, finds in Bellou an 'authentic' interpreter and is applauded'.

\(^{746}\) More than often, however, the gap was immense, especially when contentious issues came to the fore, such as, for example, religion. Accordingly, we can read in *Foititis* of 30/4/72 that the film 'Jesus Christ Superstar', a counter-cultural hit of the time, was 'a caricature, a hybris for our faith and religion'.

\(^{747}\) An interesting example of how the trio of hippies, drugs and free love were portrayed and perceived by the papers/people and perhaps also by the students is provided by the episode of the discovery of opium in Athens. Both the reportage and trial demonstrate the utmost contempt vis-a-vis such phenomena. When the defence questioned the hippies about the music they listened to and the answer was 'modern music', the defence replied in astonishment: 'this is the first time that I've heard of an 'opium dive' without *rembetika*.' An even more interesting point is that at a certain point the defence commented on the general mobilization for the arrest of the hippies as a false alarm for a large resistance organization. Instead 'they bumped into kids'. So, a juxtaposition is established between the 'dangerous' and 'mature' resistance fighters and the 'harmless' and 'child-like' hippies. Despite the well-founded nature of this argument, the latter could be seen as equally subversive, at least in the private sphere, as a hedonistic community. (‘Καταδικάστηκαν οι 'χίτσες' που συμμετέχουν σε χρησιμοποίησαν και δράμα σε τεκέ στο Κοκκάλι', *Thessaloniki*, 12/10/73) In yet another famous incident, in which an architect had created a commune in the centre of Athens in which foreign but also Greek hippies gathered and took drugs among other things, the most conservative newspapers expressed their surprise at the fact that these came 'from the finest families of Athens'. *Eleftheros Kosmos*, 9/2/73.
getting their ‘fix’ with adrenaline alone. ‘It seems that the movement is like a drug’, Vernikos concludes.748

The act of singing in the tavernas was the first testing ground in defying the authorities and a way of non-conformist socialization. These places became the sites where the radicalized rebellious identity of students could be freely expressed. These shared, collective forms were ways to express things, one could not otherwise ‘say’.749

We used to go to the taverns in order to let off steam by singing the banned songs, and in a provocative manner in fact, as if we were looking for trouble, for some cop passing by to ask us for our I.D. and bring us to the police station. You know, this thing that you have when you are 18 or 20 years old and you want to be provocative. (Karystiani)

This description by Karystiani, apart from her age group analysis, complies quite well with the imaginary of the renegade figures, who defy the authorities in a collective way, without being sacrificed. Groups of friends acted as a sort of ‘collective subject’, whereby the context of the collectivity reinforced the individual will of defiance, braving fear and danger. Tavernas became the meeting ground par excellence, in an osmosis, where strong clashes among the students were temporarily suspended in a celebratory process. This also testifies to the existence of a parallel, antithetical sphere/world to the existing authoritarian order and its institutions. The day’s threatening reality gave way to its joyous flipside, as those niches of relaxation offered a therapeutic way to unwind. Damofli preserves in her memory moments of liberating laughter, which brings to mind Bakhtin’s assertion on its subversive character:750

And of course the nights we went to tavernas and we sang and laughed, and we laughed. We used to laugh a lot.

Kleopatra Papageorgiou also makes a similar comment, stressing the communal element in life and drawing the classic opposition with the present:

We had some great years back then (laughter) in the taverns. We were very lucky kids because despite the sufferings inflicted by the Junta and stuff, we had a very intense social life, a great

748 G.A.Vernikos, op.cit., p. 152.
750 M.M. Bakhtin, Speech genres and other late essays; translated by Vern W. McGee ; edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin, 1984.
comradeship and we shared everything. Our thoughts, our desires, everything. We weren’t closed in ourselves as today’s students are, I suppose.

Papachristos makes a list of favourite places, which were reminiscent of a particularly charged incident, and so delineates the continuity between past and present. Exarcheia, a particular zone in the centre of Athens, still bears a certain significance in people’s present-day routes in the city:

The tavemas of Katsinopoulos at Evoias Str in Kypseli, the one of Kitsinis in Kaisariani, I remember them because things were happening in these taverns, and the one at Chanion Str in which this motherfucker came out and turned us in and called the police because we were singing, after the Polytechnic at Chanion Str. There were the Exarcheia, the Exarcheia always played a role; it was in the centre. (Papachristos)

Another favourite meeting place was the nightclub Hydra, where Xylouris performed. It was temporarily closed with a police order in 1973 due to ‘serious disorders taking place’ and the fact that it ‘constituted a definite danger for the public order and the safety of citizens’. Afterwards, it was called ‘Secret School’ by an Observer report thus referring to Greece’s Ottoman past and a well-known myth concerning that period and a continuity of defiance, while a US paper referred to ‘250 square meters of freedom in Greece’, a formulation that bears in mind the aforementioned statement issued by Greek students in Paris. These social spaces facilitated exchanges between different groups and also the planning of strategies of action. It was a movement that was being born, and as Robert Lumley notes on the Italian case, a beginning ‘is bright and vibrant with hope and expectation as protest spreads and individuals find themselves through collective action.’ Dimitris Papachristos encapsulates this spirit in saying that ‘as young people we shone and we proved our youth every day’. As may be expected, those communities and this social interaction also provided the necessary space for the development of strong bonds, both of friendship and sexually. One of EKIN’s leading members, Giorgos Kanellakis, notes that ‘in the groups of friends, in the political

---

751 Interview with the nightclub’s owner, K. Manioudakis in Stefanos Stratigakos’s documentary Nikos Xylouris and Three Poems, ET1, 8/2/05. According to the ‘Secret School’ myth, Orthodox clergymen were preserving the Greek consciousness of young pupils by preaching and teaching them in clandestinity in the churches’ basements throughout the Ottoman rule.

quarrels, in the taverns, in the excursions - with the banned songs - there was an excitement, euphoria, to the extent of ... libertarian paranoia.\footnote{P. Kanellakis, ‘In those years’ ..., op. cit., p. 49.}

The Greek student movement reinforces Alberoni’s conclusion that when a movement is about to be born there is a ‘collective falling in love’.\footnote{Francesco Alberoni, \textit{Falling in Love}, New York 1983. This concept is also used by Elvio Fachinelli in his classic psychoanalytic interpretation of ‘68. See Elvio Fachinelli, ‘La protesta sul lettino’, in Marco Conic, Francesco Marchioro (eds), \textit{Intorno al ’68}, Massari 1998, pp. 75-83, cited by L. Passerini, ‘Utopia’ and Desire’, op. cit.} Alberoni argues that ‘participants in a collective movement acquire a new, exalted self-concept, one that differs substantially from the day-to-day self. Such diverse experiences as falling in love or joining a collective movement contribute to a dynamic period of self-regeneration and self-reconstruction he calls the nascent state.\footnote{Peter Braunstein, ‘Possessive Memory and the Sixties Generation’, pp. 66-69, in \textit{Culturefront}, summer 1997, p. 66.}’ However, Damofli is quick to leave space for the romantic feelings brought about by common action that did not necessarily lead to a sexual encounter, and in some cases, in her view, overlooked sexual liberation and remained unfulfilled over time:

One could not easily go to bed with the one with whom one struggled. That means there are many unfulfilled loves. There have been people who came after years and said ‘I wanted you back then’, ‘I had a crush on you then’ and so on.

All in all, apart from hard core political thinking, students became liberalised, especially vis-à-vis the everyday habits of the 1960s, despite the fact that Damofli argues that ‘it was the previous generation that started the sexual revolution and we the ones who consolidated it’, probably referring to libertarian outbreaks around the ‘July events’. At this point, the term ‘sexual revolution’ is valid with reference to the Greek context, but rather abusive if we compare it with the sexual advances, either in verbal vindication or in lived practices by their counterparts in other countries. In Greece the real breakthrough is that almost demonized ‘pre-marital relationships’ became a

\footnote{Sexuality was a suppressed side of Greek society at the time, following the rigid social attitudes of the post-war period. In addition, and despite the fact that the Colonels’ Greece was as macho as it was possible to be, exercising and promoting tight social control, a sort of homosexual and ‘transvestite’ liberation movement sprang up during these years, a phenomenon that could be witnessed in Spain as well. Still, the respective regimes insisted that homosexuals ‘did not exist’ in their countries any longer. Part of the repressed eroticism can be seen in the journals of the period which are filled with nude pictures and ‘spicy’ comments. In contrast to that, a common attitude of kiosk owners was to ‘hide’ the graphic parts of erotic magazines with magic marker spots (Van Dyck). It is telling that although Bertolucci’s \textit{Last Tango in Paris} was banned by the puritanical censors in 1973, the whole script of the film was published by \textit{Thessaloniki}, attracting a wide readership.}
common and trivial fact.

We used to talk about 'pre-marital relationships'. Afterwards not anymore. This is fundamental. There was an issue of 'premarital relationships'. There was the brother who did not marry in order to have the sister married. These are things that get dissolved. (Theologidou)

There is disagreement concerning the nature of these encounters, as some stress the arousing effects of tension under such circumstances, while others castigate the strict monogamy that reigned supreme. Maria Mavragani remembers that, at least in her environment, sexual experimentation was a reality:

It is a fact, in my circle, however, right? But I think it was, like that, in a minority in relation to the rest of society. Certainly. Yes, yes. We, that is in my group of friends, we discussed it, naively or not, but we discussed 'can I go out with others', the couple, you see? It constituted a subject of conversation and speculation and many things happened, you know, sure, we had taken it seriously.

Kleopatra Papageorgiou insists, however, that no 'revolution' took place:

There was very much social... companion life. We ate out together every night, in taverns, in pizzarias, we talked, our life was collective, almost communal. Alright, we might not have slept in the same houses but we ate together, we discussed much. Now, sexual relations were not that far out as in the United States or in Europe. Sexual revolution - no, this was a myth. In the end, there was conservatism, big time. And this was seen later on in the course of events; you see how these people evolved. They got married, they did the trivial stuff that the previous generations did. From within the organisations they married, they made koubaries. (Papageorgiou)

Bistis also argues that numerous couples of the period have remained intact ever since, even though a great number of the Generation identified themselves at the time with what Savvopoulos rejected as the 'couple's unbearable burden'. There was no attack on the institution of marriage, nor was there any considerable sexual experimentation. Homosexuality and homoeroticism were taboo subjects that did not emerge as a transgressive demand in the student movement, as they did in other countries. The celebrated translator and novelist Kostas Tachtsis, himself a homosexual, commented that when students shouted Eleftheria they only meant it in terms of political freedom, not general, including sexual emancipation: 'if freedom was not to be uniform and
indivisible, to hell with it." And he added, drawing a connecting line between May '68 and the Greek student movement of the early 1970s:

The struggle for freedom had to aim at the liberation of every kind of sexual desire too, namely also of the homosexual, and this would be realized only if one day all those who shouted 'bread! education! freedom!' did not only mean political, but also sexual freedom, and in fact not just the right of some fuckers to come and go to the dormitories of women students at night, as happened in '68 in Nanterre.  

Despite the validity of his accusation, Tachtsis overlooks the revolutionary character of the demand of allowing people of the two sexes to sleep together in a guilt-free environment, both in the Paris of 1968 and the Athens of 1973. This was part of discovering the political side of every sphere, including the private one.

Another limitation was the real or perceived restriction imposed by the respective organization on the private life of cadres. Comments on sexual restrictions within rival organizations echo the stereotypes of the time concerning interpersonal relations and are to be found in most testimonies. A common allegation is that the Maoists were the tightest and most disciplined concerning sexual life. According to a Rigas and an A-EFEE member respectively:

There was an incredible social conservatism, right? Mainly among those EKKE people, they were marrying each other. A sect. (Mavragani)

We were making fun then of a leftist organization, PPSP, which had issued an announcement; it was very characteristic; it was written in their paper too, saying how many times in the week the fighter should make love. (laughter) Yes, decision of the central instructional organ. (Alavanou)

The same argument is also used in the opposite direction, as a member of a Maoist grouping (Tsaras), argues that in the Communist KNE it was not permissible to have sex with someone from a different organization ('a KNE guy should go out with a KNE girl'), and that, on top of that, sex should lead to marriage. Similarly, the fierce animosity characterising the two Maoist organisations, EKKE and PPSP, is clearly recorded by the student actor Giorgos Kotanidis, one of the former’s leading members.
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758 Ibid, p. 299.
It is clear from his tone that accusations of orgies and open relationships were considered stigmas rather than praise for those militants of the Left:

[PPSP] hated us more than anyone else. [...] They were saying that we were libertarian, followers of Marcuse, having orgies. And we blamed them for being [...] conservative, prudish, supporting organizational orthodoxy.

Kotanidis goes as far as to maintain that PPSP members were so prudish, that they were 'fucking with their underpants on'. Here again, we can observe a macho attitude in judging the organizations, describing rivals as ludicrous and potentially castrated by their organization. It should be noted that discipline was indeed imposed on Maoist cadres, following the dictum that the revolutionary should not consume his/her energy on physical pleasure, a behaviour which 'the workers' would neither understand nor sympathize with. As Eric Hobsbawm ironically pointed out in around the same period, '[sex] consumes time and energy and is hardly compatible with organization and efficiency'. The only organization which is not accused of rigid sexual control is Rigas, probably because it represented a New Left ethics in cultural politics. In fact, in the interviews it is often stressed that Rigas had the reputation of having the most open-minded members.

'Revolutionising' everyday life
There is a direct interconnection between the personal, the every-day, and the political, 'without necessarily involving direct protest or strategically calculated action', but definitely including unity of emotional expressions and symbolic meanings. It is in 'everyday life practices' that the interconnection between conditions of life and subjectivity take place. In order to understand the tropes of experience, we should
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760 Eric Hobsbawm, 'Revolution and Sex', pp. 256-260, in Revolutionaries, London, 1999, first edn 1973, p. 260. Hobsbawm added that apart from rejecting indiscriminate sex, Maoists and Trotskyites also tended to be the most hostile to the taking of drugs and all other means of personal dissidence.

761 An actual slogan promoted by Rigas when during the Metapolitefsi it became the official Youth of the KKE Int was: 'for even better nights', an ironic reference to an often repeated pre-electoral slogan of other parties: 'for even better days'. In contrast to that, the rigidity of KNE and A-EFEE's successor Panspoudastiki was institutionalized and reinforced by the moralist slogan that a good fighter should first and foremost be the best in his/her studies. Theologidou rejects this tendency with manifest sarcasm, arguing that the main figure responsible for the instruction in KNE, G. Farakos, 'issued a circular in order to regulate at what time the KNE members should go to bed'. (Theologidou)

understand the process of the transformation of 'objective conditions' of action to cultural meanings, in the context of everyday production and reproduction.\textsuperscript{763}

At the 'trial of the eleven', which took place in early February 1973 and was the starting point of a series of key-events concerning the student movement, including the Law School occupation and the decree on conscription, Emmanouil Tzanetis, a Polytechnic student accused of 'teddyboyism' and misconduct against policemen, accused, in his turn, the police of excessive brutality: 'I have been dragged by the hair, like Hector by Achilles'.\textsuperscript{764} Apart from describing an extremely violent scene, by comparing himself to Hector, Tzanetis placed himself within a mythological paradigm, with a very strong associational resonance. Elements of narcissism go hand in hand with pure violence and suffering in this graphic description. The element that is stressed is long hair, a symbolic, almost heroic feature at the time. As we can read in newspaper reports and also in student recollections it was a common tactic of the policemen to pull people by their hair, women and men alike. In addition, at the notorious 'interview-interrogation' which the well-known television presenter and music producer of this period Nikos Mastorakis (\textit{At the crossroads of Rhythm and Music}) conducted with arrested students following the Polytechnic events (18.11.73), one of the students stated bluntly that his hair was cut off by policemen right after his arrest. Mastorakis, himself a long-haired man, expressed his great surprise.\textsuperscript{765}

Long hair proved to be a major issue of contention and concern, both for the regime, the students, and the media which systematically treated this trend as an unacceptable sort of androgynous gender-bending. Long hair, although initially a 'yé-yé' feature, was soon associated with a particular type of leftist politics. Colonel Ladas called it 'the hirsute flag of nihilism', and the Junta associated it with abnormality ('men becoming women') and homosexuality which, expectedly, were treated as almost identical.\textsuperscript{766} As long hair started becoming a fashionable means of defiance and a rival feature to the masculine ideal, a series of negative references started appearing in most everyday newspapers and pro-regime student journals. Equally, as the majority of left-wing students wore beards, articles started appearing such as 'Are beards anti-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ibid}: 44,52
\item \textit{Thessaloniki, 19/12/73}
\item Another comment on the importance of style which follows from this incident, is that through his long hair and by wearing a military jacket Mastorakis attempted to appear familiar to the students, as being one of them, close to them, a person from whom they had nothing to fear.
\item Van Dyck: 104. Also special issue of \textit{Epikaira}, 'Μακριά μαλλιά. Από τον Άδαμ στους χίλιες' [Long hair, from Adam to the hippies], \textit{Ibid}.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
An article in the pro-regime student journal criticized the swapping of roles between men and women caused through the wearing of long hair, which also caused a lack of decency. For policemen, calling male student ‘poofers’ because of their appearance was a typical insult, as it was to call female students ‘whores’. In a similar article, in the same journal, alongside wearing long hair and beards, smoking a pipe was also rejected, as part of a wider set of pretentious and grotesque behaviour of left-wingers. Part of the general discourse on ‘hairism’ (malliarismos) was also the rejection of a certain use of language, which referred back to the age-old language controversy, in which colloquial language had been traditionally rejected by the learned elites as ‘hairy’.

Long hair, however, was not accepted by the traditional working class or hard core communists either and ‘caused the condescending semi-ironic smile of the leadership of the pure left-wing youth’. Of course, beards, apart from the aforementioned connection with the Greek partisan tradition were a way of imitating Che Guevara, one of the student movements’ mythical figures, omnipresent also in pictures and posters.

It was Che Guevara. The dominant prototype. And I think that I have this love from that point onwards. It’s the same for everybody. Angeliki must have it very intensively and Vera must have it and many more. And for Latin America too. (Alavanou)

According to Stergios Katsaros, by 1973 there was no student room in Athens without the poster of Che. This again, is a constant feature in the '68 movements, to the extent that the Librerìa Feltrinelli, to take the Italian case, ran out of posters.

Another point of contention was that clothes such as suits and ties, the standard outfit of the overwhelmingly male-populated universities, became redundant and young people started redefining their dressing habits: roll-necks, jeans and freewheeling flared trousers created a clearly defined dressing code, while mini skirts and make-up were used by women less and less. In the summer of 1971 The Economist was reporting that the Greek youth
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767 Thessaloniki, 16/2/73.
768 ‘Οι πίπες’ [The pipes], Foititis, 16/9/72 and ‘Βασιλής ή Κουλά; [Vassilis or Koula?], Foititis, 16/10/72.
Have adopted the sartorial fashions of their age-groups in London, Paris, Amsterdam and Düsseldorf, though their sense of taste and their personal vanity ensure that they look cleaner, neater and more elegant.\textsuperscript{771}

In contrast to the article’s conclusion, a new militant style became popularized as military jackets, an international anti-Vietnam item, became the necessary accessory of the young rebel’s outfit, again containing a sort of homeopathic use of the military Junta’s aesthetical standards. Papageorgiou describes how a well-known police torturer in Salonica referred to her ironically as a partisan, since the phrase ‘to go to the mountains’ was literally used for guerillas during the occupation period. She also makes a cultural identity statement, when in order to describe her limited stock of blue jeans she refers to a popular rock song of the time:

Imagine, I had two pain of blue jeans... \textit{Cleopatra in blue jeans!} There was such a song at the time, incidentally a rock one. I had two pairs of blue jeans, I was interchanging them until I finished the Polytechnic. Some hobnailed boots from Monastiraki, and Tetradakos asked me ‘are you ready to go to the mountains with those boots?’ He thought they were a provocation, that I did it on purpose.

In a more practical way, clothes acted as visual markers with a subversive content, creating recognisability:

In this period the military jacket was very much in fashion. There was something of Che Guevara in our look. It was a means of recognition. Namely, very few non-politicised people wore these kinds of clothes. Yes, dressing habits were important. (Kouloglou)

I looked at you with your little glasses, you know, and the long hair and the beard and all this. It was something, the gaze, the clothes, all these were signs. (Damofli)

This sort of attire, apart from the fact that it was subversive and did not enjoy social approval, also acted as a linkage between the imaginary and style of the student movements. By mimicking the aesthetics of students in France or the United States students felt that they communicated with the movements abroad. Even if they did not do so consciously, this remained a point of reference and comparison:

Everyone was wearing a military jacket and I remember a friend of mine who used to comment on the way I was dressed; she had studied in Paris; ‘I think I will soon see you taking a petrol-bomb out of the jacket. You look like that, just like a girl I saw in Paris in May ’68’. (Mandelou)

A Humanities student at the time, Titika Saratsi, is one of the few who confesses that she did not adopt these sort of aesthetics, in order to avoid being a replica of revolutionary prototypes, in this case a Palestinian guerilla fighter; still she did not follow the ‘Lenin-Levis’ rule either, ‘out of pure respect for Vladimir Ilich’:

I dressed and went around like a normal girl and not in a military jacket and threadbare jeans like some bad imitation of Leila Haled - my jeans were always well ironed, with everything that this implies.\(^\text{772}\)

Katerina Detsika too, is quick to add a ‘comme il faut’ element in her self-representation, clarifying that apart from long hair and black clothes, ‘we were not filthy, in any case’.

In due time, a new notion started to be applied to progressive students, and that was koutouriaris, meaning ‘arty fellow’, a term that became inflated during the Metapolitefsi.\(^\text{773}\) The students’ idiolect and their idiosyncratic conduct were shaped by their strong attachment to culture, as a way of living. A highly illuminating article that reenumerates many of the prejudices but also the actual habits of young intellectuals in 1973, makes specific reference to the dressing habits and the discourse of the ‘arty parties’.

The real arty fellow believes that external appearance does not play a role in people’s lives, being occupied with it is something petty bourgeois and for that reason he goes to all the lengthy and often laborious efforts that would make him look as if he does not care about his appearance. In terms of clothing everything is allowed (up to this point rightly so), provided that certain basic rules are not violated, such as: the amount of filthiness should not reach the limits of unacceptability, and the amount of shabbiness should not degrade to a too striking pennilessness. Prohibited are, of course, all sorts of hats, anything clean washed and ironed, any careful hairbrush or haircut, while, on the contrary, all variations of coats, weird socks (black for funerals), zippers that come up and down in all directions are allowed (objectively useful only in order to satisfy the speed of a sexual act or the fulfilment of a physical need - but what happens when they

\(^{772}\) T. Saratsi, op.cit., p. 102.

get stuck?) and, finally, all folkloric fabrications: belts, skirts, bracelets, beetlings. The full ensemble, very often should be complemented by some trendy book (preferably tatty and grimy) or with an issue of some arty journal.

Apart from the strikingly blunt, for the time, reference to a ‘speedy sexual act’, that is facilitated by a particular way of dressing, the article goes on to assert that the koutouriaris ‘believes in free love’ and adds sarcastically that he thinks that ‘at least once in his lifetime he has to contract a venereal disease’. Accordingly, the journalist adds, ‘arty fellow circles are impressed by the ones who suffer’. Moving beyond the external appearance, the best way to spot arty fellows, the article suggests, is the manner of talking. Although their vocabulary is presented as sensitive to changes of time and fashion, it is stressed that it is never ordinary (‘a deadly sin’) and consists of phrases of the sort:

Have a smoke. What time are you going to turn in? I’m desperate for a smoke. The play (film, theatrical etc.) cut to the core. You are ignoramus and you use clichés. All in good time. These kids (young people writing, drawing, playing theatre etc) are doing good.774

Interestingly the above expressions, at times reductive, leaving out the articles, and often using learned phrases from katharevousa to express simple notions, are by now standardized in everyday discourse. Especially the latter phrase, ‘kids’, is a common lexical survival found in interviews, as it still remains at present the favourite way of referring to fellow students and friends of the time. In the early 1970s, ‘the interrelation between discourses of censorship, urban life, consumerism, and a politicised version of the American Beat produced new themes and a new language’, used by young people and strongly reflected in the poets of the so-called ‘Generation of the 1970s’.775 Apart from this ‘arty’ input, a series of semantic neologisms, including derivational prefixes, and a jargon peppered with sophisticated concepts became markers of an alternative discourse that delineated a specific sort of identity. This elaborated invented slang was
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774 Atzil, ‘Ο δεκάλογος του κουλτούραρη’ [The Decalogue of the arty-fellow], Thessaloniki, 14/3/73. [Κάνε τοτάρο. Τι ώρα θα γείρεσαι; Σκέφτεταις να καθιερώσεις μεσημεριανό ύπνο; Εγώ πάω να πέσω. Είμαι χαριμένος. Το έργο (κινηματογραφικό, θεατρικό κλπ) ήταν γραφικά στο στομάχι. Είσαι άσχητος και μαλάς με κλισέ. Αυτά θα τα κουβεντιάζουμε εν ευθέω χρόνω. Αυτά τα παιδιά (νεαροί που γράφουν, ζωγραφίζουν, ζαίζουν θέατρο κλπ) κάνουν καλή δουλεία.]

775 Georgia Gotsi, op.cit, p. 353. Special mention is made of Poulis’s drawing of obscenities and to the anonymity of commodity culture, and Steriadis’ ‘fluid visual languages, inspired by techniques of the comic strip and film’. Ibid. Among the most influential prose works of the period were Marios Chakkas, O Μαντές [Bidet], 1970, and Giorgos Ioannou, Σαρκοφάγος [Sarcophagus], 1971.
strongly influenced by the Marxist jargon of the time— for instance, the words ‘[revolutionary] process’ and ‘system’— and was characterised by the frequent use of an excessive (revolutionary) demotic, that is, the fact that they always used ch [χ] instead of k [κ], a fact that attributed to their discourse a grassroots flavour. This was a set of carefully chosen signs which were appropriated in order to make a distinctive image/discourse of their own, used both to define themselves and to ‘mark off their symbolic territory against out-groups’, notably their parents and their ‘passive’ peers. A Salonican poet and artist composed the following poem for Domna, a tavern in the old part of the city, that despite its sarcasm does encapsulate much of the spirit of the art fellows and their aesthetics:

Nτουμανάζει μες στη «Δόμνα»
η κουλτούρα,
σούζου μούζου μανταλάκια
kai βαζούρα.
Αρχιτέκτονες μελαζέ
με Μπρούζε σγκαζέ 778

All in all, the appearance of a ‘revolutionary’ every-day life, based on a new habitus in terms of style and behaviour, came into stark contrast with the conservative outlook of the previous age group, with the ties and sexual rigidities that did not differentiate them from the ordinary adults. The new generation made a breakthrough in terms of its own socialization and aesthetics, which was reinforced by the difficulties of openly reacting. In other words, exterior appearance acquired enormous symbolic meaning, as in

776 For instance the word δικτατορία [dictatorship]. In addition, ‘βασικά’ [basically], ‘σαφώς’ [clearly] and ‘οπωσδήποτε’ [definitively] were three typical ways for young intellectuals of emphasizing their discourse that became contagious throughout the 1970s. See «Η δεκαετία του ’70. Η Ελλάδα στα ρόφια» [The 70s. Greece on the shelves] in Filimon Papapolizos, Kostas Martzoukos, Hellads. Η Ελλάδα μέσα από τη διαφάνεια (1940-1989) [Greece through the commercials], Athens 1998.
778 ‘Domna gets smoke stuffed
with culture,
mumbo jumbo
and hubbub.
Blasé architects
holding Marcuse’s books’
Kostas Lachas, ‘Domna’, cited by Christos N. Zafeiris, ‘Νεανικά στάδια του ’60, καρφενέα και ταβέρνες’ [Youth places in the ’60s, coffee-houses and taverns], in his collection of articles Η μνήμη της πόλης. Κέιμανα και σπάνιες φωτογραφίες για τη Θεσσαλονίκη [The Memory of the city. Texts and rare pictures about Salonica], Salonica 2004, p. 58.
general did all the indirect, subterranean semantic codes and signals that implied an oppositional politics to the regime and its aesthetics. Interestingly, Theologidou contrasts her generation with the former in relation to a particular matter, which in her view indicates a blatant difference between the two: the freedom of speech.

We couldn’t shout, while the others were rousing the whole of Athens for years, this is fundamental. It is the essential difference between the two generations. They could express themselves, while the others couldn’t.

To paraphrase de Certeau students used ‘formal structure[s] of practice’ to produce ‘everyday creativity’. This opposition culture provided a channel through which demands of freedom of expression could be voiced. In that sense, ‘micro-resistances, which in turn found micro-freedoms, mobilize[d] unsuspected resources hidden among ordinary people, and in that way displace[d] the veritable borders of the hold that social and political powers ha[d] over the anonymous crowd’.

**Gendered Militancy**

As was mentioned before, women in post-war Greece were still considered to be destined for house-keeping and were by and large regarded not as able as men to work. Things started to change as the massive urbanisation and new needs of the developing Greek society led to an increase of women in both the workplace as well as in universities. Still, even though by the early 1960s things were considerably improved in terms of female presence in the auditoria, at the beginning of the decade the student body was still male dominated. High-schools remained segregated and reason for that was also to preserve ‘in a variety of ways the traditional concept of the role of women’. In terms of left-wing politics also the pictures of the demonstrations of the period up to the mid-1960s hardly reveal any woman among the youth. About this time, things started to change as a break-through development introduced by the
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783 For a detailed analysis of the role of the few women in university politics during this period see Andreas Lendakis ‘Report on the women fighters of the time’ in *Eleftherotypia*, 19, 20, 21, 23/3/1982. An interesting fact here, underlining their scarce participation, is that almost all women who were present in the movements of 15% and 114 are considered as leaders.
Lambrakis Youth was the inclusion of a relatively large number of women in its ranks. Still, there was no spectacular rift in terms of leading positions within this organization. Zogia Chronaki, a later day feminist, remembers being the only woman in EDA’s student bureau:

I remember that in the hierarchy I had reached the bureau of the Student Section. There was Nikos, there was Moskof, and me. I think I was the only woman there.

In Communist imaginary and discourse, however, the worshipped generation of the 1940s had opened the way for the interaction of women and men on an equal footing and this was regarded as an established practice. It is a fact that during German occupation the provisional guerrilla government of the ‘mountains’ did indeed grant women the right to vote, almost a decade before its sanctioning by the official Greek state. Still, the assertion, shared by most female left-wingers in the 1960s and 70s, that war-time women became for the first time agents of their own political fate, was more legendary than real. Vanos goes even further in time and creates an imaginary connecting line in terms of a Greek tradition of dynamic female participation, which allegedly goes back to the early nineteenth century (1821):

I believe that at least in Greek society there is a tradition. Ever since the andartiko, where the andartisses were leaders, and the ’21 in which they were chieftains. (Vanos)

Apart from the imaginary of the Left, the official rhetoric employed by the official state once the Colonels took over brought a regression in terms of public discourse on women. The dictators considered females to be simply reproducers of the Nation, bearing in this a striking resemblance to the fascist and national socialist ideologies. As Papadopoulos puts it in his manifesto, called Our Credo:
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784 See Alki Zei’s semi-autobiographical account of a Communist woman’s itinerary during the occupation and the Civil War period. Although a literary representation, Zei’s novel is highly illuminating with regard to the gender hierarchies of the period, as well as the de facto restrictions concerning sexual contacts imposed by the Greek partisans. See Alki Zei, Achilles Fiancée ..., op.cit. For an oral history approach, which draws greatly upon the left-wing canons about women during this period see Janet Hart, New Voices in the Nation: Women and the Greek Resistance, 1941-1964. Ithaca and London, 1996. For a somewhat more balanced view see Tassoula Vervenioti, Η γυναίκα της αντίστασης: Η εισόδος των γυναικών στην πολιτική [Women in the Resistance. The entry of women into politics], Athens 1994.
The Revolution sees in the Greek woman her primary biological mission of the Mother. It honours her for this capacity with a deep consciousness of her importance.\textsuperscript{785}

An American report of the time, describing the famous incident in which right-wing students disrupted the lecture of Prof Fatouros in Salonica’s Architecture School in December 1970, provides an insight into the moral standards that were shared by military authorities. The report quotes the wording of ‘Governmental Commissioner’ General Polizopoulos in his correspondence with the Ministry of Education:

The General, arriving on the scene immediately after the incident, was shocked at finding anti-government ‘Communist’ slogans chalked on the blackboards and general anarchy in the conduct of the class including the actions of one girl student who was seated on \textit{a table displaying herself in a most immodest manner}.\textsuperscript{786}

Maro Douka’s semi-autobiographical novel \textit{Fool’s Gold} (1979) is an interesting exposé on the difficulties, including on a family level, faced by a girl who becomes a woman during the years of the dictatorship. Douka militated in the same group as Vervenioti, whose recollection reveals the constrictions that her own family imposed:

Many women participated whose parents did not know a thing. In my case it was just my mother who suspected something. [...] But other peoples’ parents didn’t know anything. (Vervenioti)

Zogia Chronaki makes a direct contraposition with the preferential treatment of her brother:

Kostis, a boy, was coming home at 4 o’clock in the morning because he was sitting at Dore to solve the global problems of History and the Left and I had to be back home at 9. Anyway [...] In petty bourgeois or working-class households what continued to be applied was that girls should not go to demonstrations. (laughter). And on top of everything, we had to clash with the parents too. I was about to explode. (Chronaki)

Following a pattern of political participation connected to a certain left-wing ethics, the imposition of the dictatorship led to a limited number of women students joining the

\textsuperscript{785} Georgios Papadopoulos, \textit{Το Πιστεύω μας} [Our Credo], Athens, 1968, p. 134. 
\textsuperscript{786} USNA, XR POL 13-2 Greece, Amconsul Thessaloniki to Department of State, subject: ‘Follow Up on Rightist Student Demonstration, University of Thessaloniki, December 8, 1970’, 14 January 1971. My emphasis.
clandestine organizations. In her self-representation, Myrsini Zorba, a leading student nicknamed Rosa Luxembourg as she was in her words ‘dogmatically radical’, makes an interesting juxtaposition between the freedom of spirit that left-wing women acquired over the years and the female image of the happy housewife, promoted by television commercials at the time:

Much later from commercials and images I realized too that [...] [women] had many initiatives, and if you have a look at Greece of the period, that is Greece in the ’60s, women were very lowly placed, they didn’t work, right, they stayed at home, they were very oppressed. Left-wing women, in contrast, went out of their homes, they ran out. (Zorba)

However, it is interesting to note that at the beginning of the next decade television commercials also had embraced the ‘trendy’ issue of female emancipation as a selling strategy. According to a washing machine commercial of the early 1970s, ‘the emancipation of the woman, working or not, starts from home. It begins when she gets rid of the stress of laundry, for example’.787 Other commercials embraced the sexual liberation model by promoting, for the first time, overtly sensual images, or associational names that referred to the general climate of the period.788

To return to the clandestine organizations, most of the female participants did not acquire high operational functions within these groups. Still, Anna Mandelou, for a while connected to the Salonica-based Trotskyite group Spoudastiki Pali, claims that given the shared tough conditions her male comrades regarded her as equal a priori. She further represents her action within the group as an indirect form of feminism:

When you come into conflict with such a tough regime you look at things in a profound way, you know what I mean? You get to the essence of things, you cannot say ‘I am a woman, I won’t speak’. [...] By rebelling, you also challenge the role of women in patriarchal society. (Mandelou)

However, Vervenioti argues for a basic inequality consisting of the fact that contrary to men, women students had limited space for action because of a more claustrophobic family control. So, they could not spend, for instance, the night out, printing leaflets, in contrast to those who studied away from home who enjoyed a greater freedom of
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787 ‘For the emancipation of the housewife’. ‘Valiant’ washing machines commercial. See Filimon Papapolizos, Kostas Martzoukos, Hellads ..., op.cit.
788 The much-advertised shampoo ‘Libera e Bella’, for example, used ‘words that corresponded fully to the demands and movements of the period’. Ibid.
movement. The fact that young females were living away from home for study reasons was an unprecedented break-through element in Greek society and was lived through by the women in question as a liberating experience. It has to be noted, that two female members of the clandestine Rigas were tortured and acquired a legendary status through their courageous pleas during their trial. Lionarakis recalls with emotion having ‘fallen in love’ with both:

For Margarita Gerali and Tsebelikou I had cried bitterly, I had fallen in love with them out of their plea in the court. Even now if you want I can tell you their pleas by heart. [...] They were mythical figures.

In the meantime, the numbers of women were steadily increasing, to the effect that by 1972-73 they represented 33.7% of all students and 38.5% of all graduates.\footnote{Maria Eliou, ‘Those whom Reform Forgot’..., op.cit, p. 69. Still, women remained largely unrepresented in professional training colleges in the same year numbering only 18,146 out of a total of 123,081 students, i.e. 14.7%., \textit{Ibid}, p. 67.} Still, despite this significant change in the composition of the student body, long-established elements in people’s mentalities remained die-hard. Most men were still in favour of segregated socialization and women students themselves remained in general intimidated and socially conservative. In a series of interviews (‘Female student in three acts’), conducted by the anti-regime student journal \textit{Protoporia} in 1972, several female students were asked some vague questions on their views about university life, interpersonal relations and established social practices.\footnote{‘Οφορίτρια σε τρεις πράξεις’ [Female student in three acts], in \textit{Protoporia}, 2, January 1972.} In replying, their discourse is characterized by social conservatism, whereby condemnation of premarital sex and the merits of the traditional ‘Greek way of life’ are eagerly defended. The sexual act is habitually referred to as ‘that thing’, parents are mentioned with fear and awe, and fear is expressed for the eventuality of being caught doing something ‘improper’. Last, but not least, women students complained about being treated by their male fellow-students with scorn and arrogance:

- A guy would never start a serious discussion with a woman maybe because he would think that she’s incompetent to follow.
- Yes, yes! You’re right. Once it happened to me to that I intervened in a serious discussion and then they said surprised ‘Ah! So, you know something about these things too!’ and then they started taking me for a ride!\footnote{\textit{Ibid}.}
Growing female participation in anti-regime activities, such as the first student committees of action, facilitated a somehow practical extortion of parity. An important stage for the development of the student movement and a juncture at which female students acquired a pivotal role was when the Junta passed a decree enforcing the military draft of eighty male students who had a leading role in organizing student unrest (1973). This decision of the authorities to defer military suspension was a measure which was directed exclusively at men, leaving women aside as less harmful; it was sexist and misplaced in its conceptualisation of the student movement as exclusively male driven and directed. Apart from the Humanities School which was traditionally female dominated, women students moved to the forefront in other faculties too in order to prevent more males from being conscripted. Albert Coerant, a Dutch reporter in Athens, recalls that during the Law School occupation in winter 1973 many female students surrounded their male counterparts in order to protect them from being photographed and consequently sent to the barracks.792 In addition, both in Athens and Salonica specific women are cited as leading figures inside the student movement. Kleopatra Papageorgiou and Ioanna Karystiani, in particular, are often referred to as two inspirational figures, the 'Pasionarias', according to Vourekas. Tsaousidis argues, as does Pastor on the respective Spanish case, that Papageorgiou was

792 Albert Cerant, 'Ήταν μόνοι τους' [They were on their own], in Giorgos A.Vernikos, op.cit., p. 116.
very well-known, including to the police, as women leaders were few and far between and thus were immediately spotted:

She was also a girl that stood out, she was not some silent girl, she was a shouter and she distinguished herself.

Karystiani is indicated by everyone as the northern star of the student movement, the most charismatic personality *par excellence*:

Given the situation, equality was imposed by reality. When you had Karystiani in the Law School would anybody doubt her because she was a woman? Ioanna was a tornado. She would sweep everything. She was a personage. [...] Up to '73, before the Polytechnic, she was the point of reference of the whole movement. And it was a big thing that she was with us, she was with KNE. (Skamnakis)

Contrary to this affirmation, however, Alivizatos remembers that in the immediate past Karystiani was given secondary roles as was the norm concerning women:

I remember that in those first days Ioanna Karystiani had come to EKIN with a scared look. ‘I want to help’, and things like that, and we didn’t know who Ioanna Karystiani was, the future writer and leader of the student movement, but she was a fresher; we put her to sweep the floor. ‘Why don’t you do a bit of mopping?’, ‘Guys, don’t let me just do the mopping’, and we had those kinds of conversations. (laughter)

In addition, Vervenioti recalls that, apart from a few cases, it was the men who led the way in terms of corporatism, not least due to an established habitus of talking in public. Women remained far more intimidated:

We would possibly say better things than they did, but we didn’t do it. Men did the talking. I remember that very well. (Vervenioti)

Zorba too claims that the role of women in the Left, though comparatively privileged, was still not one of taking the leadership, as emancipation did not coincide with empowerment:

Despite the fact that within it women really do the ‘dishwashing’, always the ‘dishwashing’, they are nevertheless dynamic, responsible and in the end equal. (Zorba)
Female consciousness, nevertheless, gradually became an embodied fact. Traditionally, male practices such as smoking, but also the act of using offensive language, were adopted by a new generation of left-wing women, not least because of a mimetic attitude vis-à-vis female prototypes abroad. International developments in fashion influenced dressing habits too, as in 1960s' Greece trousers were still considered as a male trademark. Tasos Darveris's own impression was that this passage took place in a very limited time-span during the late 1960s. His own surrogate in his novel takes notice of that fact during his transfer to another jail and perceives it as a huge transformation, an impression which was probably reinforced by the fact that he had spent eight months in isolation: 'Several women wore trousers, which was something unprecedented in the history of Modern Greece.'  

From early 1972 onwards, moreover, the result of every-day interaction with their male colleagues in shared anti-regime activities and socialisation also led to a more guilt-free attitude concerning sexuality.

Sexual liberation was a trademark. We women became more liberated, we started finding jobs, anything you can imagine, next to university, and sexual liberation, were integral elements. (Zorba)

Contrary to the rigidities and inhibitions of the previous generation, the new one appeared more open in terms of sexual conduct, not so much in seeking to transform the public sphere as in conquering a private one. In early '70s Greece maternity control remained a resistant taboo, abortion was 'a crime in all circumstances' and female adultery a serious offence.  

In addition, female contraception was still finding its way as, in fact, the selling and advertising of the pill was prohibited and punished by criminal law. In these conditions, and with social conservatism being reinforced and rewarded by the regime, the enjoyment of open sexual relations was soon conceptualised not only as a means of social emancipation but also of political resistance; and this despite the fact that the absence of the pill deprived Greek female students of a major emancipatory practice in terms of commanding their sexual practices. An interesting factor here, in terms of self-representation, is that possible
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793 Tasos Darveris, op.cit., p. 130.
795 Ibid.
abortions, underground and traumatic as ever, are a silenced fact in the otherwise very open testimonies. Karistiani was the only one to break that barrier when she mentioned clubbing together for students’ abortions as an example of collective bonding and solidarity.

Still, as will be also demonstrated in the Spanish case, provocation, a major trait of ’68 and its environment, was absent. A possible exception is swearing. Accordingly, Damofli delineates the difference between women who exercised this new practice because they wanted to and the ones who were rather unwilling but did so because it was part of the package of a new transgressive identity. Interestingly, by using the more impersonal third plural she leaves herself out of this process:

So, for example, they were calling a poofter ‘poofter’ and they were saying many things, because the literature ... For me swearwords are part of a literature, there developed a literature. So, others were doing it, they didn’t feel it but they were doing it and others felt like it and talked this way. Probably boys were shocked but didn’t show it, what can I say? Or others were probably commenting on it. (Damofli)

Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros was an associate professor at the University of Salónica, an uncommon position for a woman to occupy during this period in Greece. Shortly before being expelled from the University of Salónica as ‘non law-abiding’, 796 she too argued at an interview given to the pro-regime student journal that things were changing in female students’ behaviour:

In contrast to the older female students, the new ones are not intimidated anymore, but are very active [...] In general there is a big difference between the old and the new ones. The new female students are much more easy-going. 797

In addition, in the socially backward society such as was the Greek one at the time, traits which could be regarded as innocent bore a strong symbolism for both the movement participants and authorities alike. Papachristos writes in his collection of memories that when in an instance in 1973 he entered court to defend eleven colleagues of his, the most striking feature to be seen were his girlfriend’s hippie trousers, which infuriated the policemen:

797 'Ερευνα της Μαρίνης Πρινιότακη 'Ο ρόλος της φοιτήτριας στην σημερινή κοινωνία' [Enquiry by Mary Priniotaki ‘The role of the female student in present society’], Foititis, 1/5/72.
Above all, I will never forget the bellbottomed jeans that Olga wore, on which she had imprinted the symbol of peace and this was provoking them and it became the excuse for arresting her…

In that sense, provocation as such was probably inexistent, but nuances were that subtle that an act of the sort could be considered by protagonists as a micro form of defiance and could also act in this way. Women’s limited emancipation, nevertheless, was not necessarily greeted with enthusiasm by everyone inside the movement, and especially their male peers:

You have to ask the boys too how they looked at things. Probably some of them were shocked. Some girls were very loose-tongued. In our generation this became established. Or it was starting to be accepted that girls could use swearwords too. And for some of them it was also part of their style, others were exaggerating, you know, they were saying things that often shocked people.

(Damofli)

Lionarakis reports being shocked by his girlfriend’s ‘provocative’ way of dressing, which in his words consisted of a simple low-neck and tights, thus revealing a long lasting puritanism in left-wing ethics among male militants:

Melpo was a nice chick back then and very emancipated and all that stuff. I was containing myself, containing myself, containing myself, and one day, at 5 o’clock in the morning, after a night-long I don’t know what, at Nea Philadelphia Square, I told her, ‘Look. I’m fed up. I’ll tell you everything so that I can let myself go. I don’t want us to be together any longer, because you are humiliating me, you dress like a whore!’

Kostas Kalimeris, on the other hand, expresses the conviction that equality was a given but as a negative outcome of extreme politicisation:

Relations with the opposite sex were forcefully equal. Now, how can this function? It was the male comrade and the female comrade, it wasn’t man and woman. There was no space to discuss such matters. (Kalimeris)

However, contrary to Kalimeris’s assertion about being gender-blind inside the movement, enforced equality did not abolish a protective male stance towards the

---

798 Dimitris Papachristos, Ζωός της ζωής σα να τη θυμίζαν [He lived life as if he was remembering it]. Athens 2003, p. 29.
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'weaker sex'. In Darveris's novel, the protagonist confesses a deeply courteous posture towards women:

Despite all your efforts, you couldn't stop looking at women as creatures who were too delicate for prison cells and tortures, even if they were comrades.\(^799\)

Even in the moments of panic during the Polytechnic evacuation, a gallant behaviour by male students towards women could be recorded. A later testimony evoked that during the brief and abortive negotiation prior to the Army’s entrance (see Chapter 4), more time was requested on the grounds that ‘there are women inside, small, delicate, how can they get out, they will be trampled’.\(^800\) Still, on an organisational level, the Polytechnic signalled to a large extent the institutionalisation of female participation on equal terms. The presence of quite a few women in the Coordinating Committee and the crucial role of two women militants as speakers in the radio-station are but two examples.

In ideological terms, women militants of Marxist inclinations often envisaged a socialist turn of society as the necessary pre-condition for an improvement in gender relations. In general, however, gender was and would be an issue of discomfort for the majority of left-wing organizations, since for them such matters were subordinate to the fundamental conflict which was mainly defined by class. So, it has to be emphasised that no early signs of feminist politics or separate women’s sector are to be found and discerned in the Junta years. Issues concerning the oppression of women as the root of all oppression were not a dominant feature in this period, and not even after the breakdown of the Junta and the more vindicating period of the Metapolitefsi. Xydi attributes the fact that no explicit feminist politics was exercised or propagated by women themselves or their organizations to the fact that this was too sophisticated a demand for the conditions of the time:

I think that in general there was no such issue. Men, women, the feminist aspect, that is, which I discovered only after the dictatorship was over, did not appear to us then. It is always like that in the great moments of struggles, both the Resistance, the Civil Wars. I remember I read a nice phrase by Rossana Rossanda saying that after the Resistance women went back to the kitchen. Yes, you know, as long as the struggle needed it they inveighed against the male-dominated establishment, they put us in the first line, afterwards in the calm... And this is how it was here

\(^799\) Darveris 131
\(^800\) S. Karatzafetis, The Polytechnic Slaughter..., op.cit., p. 197.
and everywhere, it happens this way. But back then we didn’t know and we couldn’t foresee it, how many would survive politically, they were many, very many, not just one or two. (Xydi)

In general, it can be concluded that although women militants acquired an important role in politics and more emancipation in everyday life, this was never translated into full equality, separate demands or leadership, apart from a few notable exceptions. However, their massive presence, compared to earlier years, and an ‘alternative’ socialization, including the free management of their private life, were among the most innovative elements in the movement, with the effect of subverting longstanding moral codes. In many ways, this went hand-in-hand with the exigencies brought forward by the movement’s philosophy but also by a general wave of foreign female prototypes coming from the post-’68 cultural climate, which helped change the configuration of the way people looked upon women as whole. In many ways, moreover, the student movement was a carrier of modernization in the sense of renewing traditional perceptions on gender relations. In terms of self-representation, furthermore, one can often observe a more self-assured attitude by women of the 1970s students, even though assertions about total equity are often contradicted by bitterness in terms of a male controlled party hierarchy.
Chapter Four

Evénements: From Protest to Resistance

The 1973 reforms and student radicalization

By 1973 the Colonels’ regime was moving towards the apogee of its liberalisation experiment, which would be a sort of ‘paternalist democracy’, to quote Andreas Papandreous’s term. The ‘evolutionists’ within the Junta, primarily Colonel Papadopoulos himself, were deciding on a bold step: the abolition of monarchy through a plebiscite (29 July 1973) followed the definite lifting of the ‘state of siege’ from the whole country, the granting of an amnesty to all political prisoners, the recognition of all individual and collective freedoms and the creation of a political government for the holding of elections. This move led to the great dissatisfaction of the hawks/hard-liners who thought that the ‘true meaning’ of the ‘Revolution of 21 April’ was being betrayed. However, Papadopoulos was determined to accomplish his plan, as his attempts at reforma had been twice frustrated by the hardliners in the past (1968 and 1971), but was also reinforced by his repeated talks with several politicians. The
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801 Mantoglou argues that ‘towards the end of 1972, and especially 1973, the military regime started to be led to an increasing apparent impasse. George Papadopoulos, seeing that the military regime’s absence of legality was becoming dangerous was forced to partly ‘liberalise’ his policies. His aim was to win popular support, while at the same time preserving the dominant position of the Army in power relations.’ op. cit., p. 182. Despite the merits of this assertion, Papadopoulos was not really forced by any internal force to liberalise since all the main resistance groupings had been outnumbered by that time and student protest was only beginning. The experiment was driven rather by a pragmatic conviction that the regime should evolve. If there was pressure on Papadopoulos this was mainly coming from the United States side, which was pushing for more democracy, in order to save itself from more embarrassments concerning its involvement in Greece. On the opposite side of the spectrum, the hardliners within the regime became very uneasy about Papadopoulos’s experiment, which they saw as a deviation from the true spirit and goals of the ‘Revolution’. See Ambassador Tasca’s report, USNA, Pol 15 Greece, American Embassy Atens, ‘The Papadopoulos-Markezinis Tandem: Prospects for the Return to Parliamentary Government in Greece’, 17 October 1973.

802 According to Manuel Castells the application of a broad amnesty, with all that implies in terms of the elimination of criminal records and the removal of subsidiary civil responsibility, is a highly political act since it is very likely to indicate that a change of regime is in progress. See Castells, Los procesos políticos. De la cárcel a la amnistía, Madrid 1977, p. 158. Paloma Aguilar adds that the more profound the political transformation in progress, the more complete and genuine the amnesty, op. cit., 1996, p. 10.

803 These were recognised for the first time since 1967, see Alivizatos, op. cit., p. 294.

804 The internal rifts within the Junta had started as early as 1969 with constant clashes between ‘hawks’ and ‘doves’. An interesting account of this clash is to be found in Ioannis Tzortzis paper ‘The Metapolitefsi that Never Was: a Re-Evaluation of the 1973 ‘Markezinis Experiment’, op.cit. The whole liberalisation process is seen as a point in which regimes become dispensable for their elites, when the latter judge that their interests can be better served by a democratic government. In his view, the success of this has to do with the bargaining process between regime, elites and counter-elites. In his words ‘civil society has an important role to play in the final stages of the experiment, mainly the first elections. Its absence rather than dynamic presence is needed more in order to appease hardliners and to ensure the regime elites that they can embark on institutional changes without jeopardising the process of a peaceful
whole experiment included the dictator’s decision to personalize and in a way politicize the regime,\textsuperscript{805} and to some extent at least to partly put the Constitution of 1968 into force. In late 1972 starting with a counselling committee or ‘little parliament’ as it came to be known, Papadopoulos had already urged his trusted men to speed up the process of restoring some form of parliamentarism, by saying that ‘we must definitely leave office this year’.\textsuperscript{806}

However, the state attitude to protest had been wavering. In the beginning, and always in line with the normalization experiment, protest policing - ‘the barometer of the political opportunities available for social movements’\textsuperscript{807} - was milder, compared to the previous period. This concurs with Della Porta’s conclusion that a more tolerant style of policing favours the diffusion of protest.\textsuperscript{808} Accordingly, in contrast with the period of ‘clandestinity’ when public space was devoid of any exchange, now the latter became the object of open contestation. As students were denied a private space, since any indoors assembly of three or more people was prohibited, public spaces such as squares and avenues became a limitless territory of open confrontation and the repertoire of student action switched to collective action expressed in large demonstrations, gatherings and open confrontations with the police forces.

The student movement acquired a greater following, higher visibility and, occasionally, open support. This helped it to make the conflict public and to turn to more successful forms of struggle, acquiring more space, going over traditional politics and methods and, ultimately, becoming a movement. Still, during all this time the notorious Security Police was active in trying to decipher the mechanism of student mobilisation, by arresting and torturing those who figured as the main student agitators.

\textsuperscript{805} Papadopoulos concentrated so many powers in his own hands that one can certainly talk of ‘sultanism’. For an elaboration of this term see Robert M. Fishman, ‘Rethinking State and Regime: Southern Europe’s Transition to Democracy’, pp. 422-440, \textit{World Politics}, vol. 42, No.3 (Apr., 1990), p. 428.
\textsuperscript{806} This is according to one of his close associates, Spiros Zournatzis. Quoted in Tzortzis, op.cit., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{808} Della Porta proceeds to argue that contrary to this, ‘a repressive and hard policing of protest results in the shrinking of mass movements but a radicalization of smaller protest groups.’, \textit{Ibid}: 92.
and leaders. On top of that, as soon as it became obvious that there was serious potential within the movement, the Junta authorities once again resorted to, this time extreme, violence in public. Confrontations between students and police forces started to become increasingly violent in terms of repression.\(^{809}\)

Although Greek students were not responsive to state sponsored violence, for instance through the use of petrol bombs which were widely diffused in student agitations elsewhere, they did not remain entirely passive. Part of their repertoire was verbally attacking the policemen. An ‘Economist’ report of that period offers an interesting insight:

> [T]his fairly parochial protest might have died down in a few days, but a government official (no one is certain who he was) sent squads of policemen to the campus to break up a meeting on the sub-engineer problem. Outraged by the ‘violation’ of the university, students began taunting the invading cops with cries of ‘Fascists!’ and ‘Gestapo!’ For good measure, some also threw in two peculiarly Greek insults: *pustis*, meaning the passive partner in a homosexual relationship, and *malakas* (masturbator). The police responded by beating and dragging off a number of the student demonstrators; eleven of them were charged with ‘insulting authority’. Eight students were later found guilty and given eleven-month suspended sentences.\(^{810}\)

In late January 1973 several students confronted raiding policemen in the area of the Polytechnic, an incident which came to be known as the ‘little Polytechnic’. Eleven students were arrested and tried on several charges, including ‘insulting authority’ and ‘teddyboyism’. Part of this was that the students used the words ‘Fascists’, ‘Nazis’, ‘lackeys’, ‘starved out’ and ‘sold outs’ when confronting the policemen. They were also accused of spitting on the policemen and using a slogan that, interestingly enough, also irritated their adversaries and was about to become a standard motto after the Law School occupation: ‘Eleftheria’ (Freedom).\(^{811}\)

Those frequent clashes with the police, charged with adrenaline and high risk, acted as a sort of rite of initiation for students. From one point onwards this was a

\(^{809}\) Christos Lazos, op.cit., pp. 353-378. It is noteworthy that as early as 1972 the Junta passed a decree (Royal Decree 269/1972) according to which any use of weapons was allowed in order to disperse a demonstration, in which […] the participants commit unlawful acts or act aggressively towards the police forces. *Ibid*, p. 361.


\(^{811}\) ‘Δική των 10 των για τις ταραχές του ‘μικρό’ Πολύτεχνου [Trial of the 10 of the ‘little’ Polytechnic riots], *Thessaloniki*, 19/2/73. Interestingly, the pro-regime newspaper *Eleftheros Kosmos* referred to the riots as reviving a climate close to EAM, the Communist-led resistance during the German occupation. ‘Επεισόδια χθες εις το Πολυτεχνείο’ [Riots yesterday at the Polytechnic], 17/2/73.
necessary step in order to become more radicalised and be further immersed in the
movement. Dimitris Papachristos places his decision to circulate a petition in the
ASOEE School of Commerce within the context of the fact that he had already passed
this rite:

In any case they knew us. We had been caught; we had been beaten up; what more could they do
to us? (Papachristos)

Kournoulakis, himself of a ‘national-minded’ family, describes the different stages of
this rite of initiation, including the passage from passivity to action:

We pass the phase of non-involvement, energetic involvement and non-intense politicisation, as
far as the Junta’s years are concerned; we start entering some events actively and politically
minded. They summoned us to the Police, they gave us warnings, during the first phase what
happened was what I’m telling you: ‘you are from a good family, why do you get in trouble’ etc.
Then they call us to the Police Station ‘for a matter of ours’.

Clashes further constituted an ‘expressive behaviour’, in as far as they tended to be
ends in themselves, since part of their objective was the constitution of a new identity,
to use Pizzorno’s description. Kournoulakis stresses that clashes were part of the
everyday routine, a sort of constant hide-and-seek. Interestingly, the way he describes it
recalls Portelli’s observation on similar narratives made by Italian students concerning
their clashes with the police. This ‘dangerous game’ was to a large extent the
continuation of football matches, hide and seek and playing Cowboys and Indians,
which were an all too recent experience for these students, who had just come out of
infancy:

In that period, I have to stress to you, there were everyday clashes between students and
policemen at the Museum and the Polytechnic and the universities etc. That is, everyday there
were police there, a turf war inside the narrow streets. (Kournoulakis)

The twelve students of ASOEE that passed on the petition, that is, a set of proposals on
how to improve the functioning of the particular University, were summoned by the
Principal and were given severe warnings. In their plea they talked about the students’

812 R. Lumley, States..., op. cit., p. 69.
813 Alessandro Pizzorno, ‘Le due logiche dell’azione di classe’, pp. 7-45 in A.Pizzorno, E.Reyneri, M.
need to be involved in the learning and educational processes in general, the need to prevent football and the pools (PRO-PO) from monopolizing the media and ‘alienating the students’ intellectualism’, and to start searching instead for more profound and authentic knowledge. The plea further expressed the students’ repulsion towards a formalised type of thinking and a predestined itinerary in society:

Our destination is not to become low-range professionals, little screws with preconceived roles within the social system. We did not climb up to Higher Education in order to remain passive listeners to dry knowledge and rodents of tinned up perceptions. We do not ask for truth to be served ready to us. [...] Formalized thought and expression, the lack of any imagination, any personal structure, gives us the creeps. We are struggling to improve our intellectual forces, even with mistakes, even under pressure.\(^\text{815}\)

Contrary to the petition, which was articulated in formal and scientific language, this outburst on the part of the twelve is a very authentic text, probably the only one produced by students and made public at the time, that encapsulates in such a clear manner the anger towards an educational system that was not up to their expectations, and the striving for more involvement by all means. The references to football as an element of manipulation is a recurrent one, but the demand for participation in all educational processes and the indignation towards the unimaginative and static intellectual life are strikingly direct and new. This incident created an unprecedented wave of solidarity with the twelve and a step forward towards the massification of the movement.

Remarkably, at the same time the pro-regime supporters were expressing their disgust for those who uttered their opinion without allegedly knowing well the ‘real student issues’ at stake. According to their accusation, the anti-regime students acted as patronizing and professional trade-unionists (\textit{foititopaters}), with no real knowledge of the student problems, as they never went to classes but were only to be found in the refectory and the assemblies. The resigned council of electrical engineers went even further in expressing its non-agreement with the politics of the anti-regime motivated students, arguing that there were issues more vital for the well being of the student world than ‘the abolition of the disciplinary council, US or European imperialism, the solidarity of the building workers and the creation of a climate of anarchy and

\(^{815}\) Εξερρος ευς το Φοιτητικον. Ανελογηθησαν οι 12 της Εμπορικης [The student issue is booming. The 12 of the School of Commerce have presented their pleas], \textit{Eleftheros Kosmos}, 6/2/73. 
unaccountability in the higher Educational Institutions'. Although these issues were not yet voiced by the protesting students, as they would be later on, it is noteworthy that their counterparts were aware of the latter’s’ preoccupations and tried to capitalize on them.

The movement gains prestige

The ‘little Polytechnic’ took place as a result of the students’ decision to switch to the offensive, with a student delegation sending a memorandum to the Principal of the Athens Polytechnic and saying that students were struggling for intellectual freedom and academic dignity. The text concluded that ‘we struggle for the benefit of our nation’, a clear statement against the Junta. Despite its conservative wording, this text was yet another articulation of the students’ demands and in fact demonstrates a feeling that would be further elaborated later on: the confidence which the students had in their ‘mission’. The regime’s immediate reaction was to stiffen its attitude, by issuing the decree 1347/73, which unlike similar decrees (93/69, 180/69, 720/72) granting the right to the authorities to forcefully conscript all male students acting in an ‘anti-national’ manner, was about to be put into action.

In an unprecedented move, the Polytechnic Professors opted to oppose the decree. At that time students were gathered in the courtyard of the Polytechnic, staging an anti-Junta demonstration in which they used slogans such as ‘freedom’, ‘democracy’, ‘fascism shall not pass’ and ‘down with conscription’. Slogans turned to ‘torturers out’, as the building was encircled by police who tried to intimidate the students. Police forces entered the Polytechnic and beat the students up, violating the asylum, but also attacking them even inside professorial offices. Professors who dared to oppose this behaviour were equally harassed by policemen. This was partly the reason why the trial of the eleven arrested students turned into a political event, and the trial defence was undertaken by a number of prominent political figures opposing the Junta (Kanellopoulos, Mavros, Pesmazoglou). As a result, the trial was given immense publicity by the press, which probably contributed to the court giving low or no
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816 'Παρατάθηκε το ΔΣ των Σκοποδατών Μηχανολόγων' [The AC of the Mechanical Engineers’ Society has resigned], Eleftheros Kosmos, 6/2/73. Formally, the student demands were for participation in the creation of the Educational Charter, the abolition of the ND 1969 and the granting of guarantees concerning the university asylum.
817 O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 105.
819 O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 107.
sentences. On this occasion, the first pictures of students with bruises caused by police beatings appeared in the papers, contributing to the rise of sympathy for the combatant youth.\textsuperscript{820}

From February 1973 onwards a sort of chain reaction led to one event after the other and consolidated the students as a contestatory force. The trigger for the concretisation of protest came with the Law School occupation in February 1973, which again partly resulted from the ‘small Polytechnic’ incident. On the eve of the ‘trial of the eleven’, as the aforementioned trial came to be known, the first occupation of the Law School took place as a means of protest against police brutality and with several student issues put forward, following the standard strategy of the movement at the time. The great publicity that the ‘little Polytechnic’ had acquired, contributed to this decision and resulted in an occupation that lasted only a few hours (14 February).

The qualitative leap of the movement, resulting from growing radicalism and self-confidence, was met by Papadopoulos with a decisive move: one hundred and twenty male students who were supposedly amongst the most active were given short notice that their suspension of military service for study reasons was not active anymore and that they should appear in the army headquarters in order to ‘serve the patria’. Deputy Minister Pattakos commented that these youths were in reality nice kids, misled by others, and, for that reason, not entirely absorbed by the ‘wrong path’. After all, he said, the Greek Army was not a punishment but a good training and if they were hard-working they could still manage to graduate earlier than others. ‘Real students should not fear anything’, was his conclusion.\textsuperscript{821} However, military conscription was very much a severe penalty, as apart from the violent interruption of student life that this meant, the Army as an institution was the direct extension of the Junta and everything that this represented.\textsuperscript{822}

The immediate student response was to organize new mobilizations, this time with the demand of bringing back their conscripted colleagues. Expectedly, the decision of the Junta to show a tough face backfired, on the grounds that the draft threat, reminiscent of a similar situation in the United States during the Vietnam war, proved to be a major rallying factor. Moreover, it acted as a springboard for the radicalisation of the student movement, ensuring a lasting mobilisation, whereby those who had been

\textsuperscript{820} The first and most impressive appeared in the journal \textit{Epikaira}, showing the ASOEE students Balaouras and Papatheodorou with obvious signs of mistreatment.

\textsuperscript{821} \textit{Thessaloniki}, 22.5.73

\textsuperscript{822} O. Dafermos, \textit{Students and Dictatorship...}, op.cit., p. 113.
taken away acquired heroic status and their release became the standard objective of the whole movement. De la Villa and Desdentado’s conclusion that ‘solidarity strikes and demands for the readmission of sacked workers are a historical constant which define the very identity of the labour movement’ is applicable to any sort of social movement. Accordingly, the same pattern is to be found in the student mobilizations in Greece for the liberation of their imprisoned and conscripted colleagues. Significantly, one of the main slogans in the Law School occupations was ‘Give us our brothers back’.

* The Law-School sit-ins

As the action repertoire of the students was enriched with that brief occupational experience (14/2), a week later (21/22) anti-Junta students decided to remain inside the Law School building overnight. Several thousand persons barricaded themselves for about two days inside the Law School building in the centre of Athens, in an action which was mainly organised by A-EFFE and to a lesser extent by Rigas, and was carried out mainly by Law and Humanities students. The Physics and Maths Faculty was by and large excluded because of the leftist character of its student leaders and their confrontational attitude, which was aiming at a popular overthrow of the Junta. A-EFFE and Rigas wanted instead to restrict themselves to pure student demands, a fixation that was surpassed by the movement’s own dynamics, as was to be seen in practice. The student action was further enhanced by an occupation committee and a ritual: they made an oath which praised the youth of Greece and rejected the regime’s terrorism and violence. Thessaloniki reports in a telegraphic way:

Students rose up spontaneously in protest against law 1347 on conscription. 650-3,000 inside. They made an oath which praised the student youth of Greece and rejected the terrorism and violence of the regime. Many outside screaming ‘We are with you’. Slogans: ‘People Show Solidarity’, ‘Bring our brothers back’, ‘Freedom’.

Karystiani records this moment as one of the most vivid in her memory, as she was the one who drafted the oath, although she describes the text as insignificant. In his thorough analysis Dafermos too notes that the oath was awkward and out of tune with

823 Quoted by P. Aguilar, La memoria..., op.cit., p. 6.
824 Anna Mantoglou, The Polytechnic..., p. 164.
825 O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., 121-122.
826 Ibid, p. 122.
the character of the occupation. The text referred to a relentless struggle on the part of the students for freedom, and demanded the guarantee of asylum and the abolition of repressive laws. It further declared solidarity with the tormented students, rejected violence and terrorization and concluded: 'Long live the student world of Greece.' This epic gesture, rather than having a clear cut nature and value, rather added to the theatricality and symbolic charge of the occupational practice.

Apart from this, the students had gone out to the building’s terrace, where they sang the classic rousing song *Xasteria* ('Clear Skies') and shouted slogans concerning student matters, which soon turned to anti-Junta ones, despite the above-mentioned directive of the two main organisations. Karystiani recalls with emotion that it was at the Law School terrace that students wrote the first anti-United States slogans. Other slogans such as ‘Down with the Junta’ and ‘Democracy’ were for the first time uttered outspokenly, aiming at more than one interlocutor, that is, the police and all those who found themselves in the centre of Athens, despite the former’s massive presence. Similar slogans, including ‘no to football’, referring to the regime’s over-projection of sports, were written and thrown down to the streets in fliers, while at some point large cartons were placed along the terrace carrying the letters F R E E D O M. This moment was symbolically charged as it signalled the breaking of fear.

It had never happened before during the dictatorship period that a building was occupied and to shout ‘Down with the Junta’, ‘Long live Freedom’ and other slogans, sometimes far out ones as well, which were thrown and people picked them up. Because, you know, in the beginning there was a line that we shouldn’t say ‘Down with the Junta’, we should say ‘Freedom’, ‘Democratic Liberties’, ‘Student Rights’ instead. (Damofli)

Soon the passers-by stopped to look up at that rare and unexpected spectacle. Many stopped out of curiosity, others out of solidarity. Accordingly, people did not rush to go to their homes during the occupation but instead they stayed there watching. When the students called for solidarity (‘people, show us your solidarity’) some dared to shout ‘we stand at your side’. Others beeped their horns as a means of solidarity. Soon, an immense traffic jam occurred all over the Sina, Panepistimiou and Solonos streets,
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827 O. Dafermos, *Students and Dictatorship...*, op.cit., p. 123.
828 '3,000 φοιτηταί εκλείσθησαν αυτοβούλως στην Νομικήν' [3,000 students barricaded themselves on their own will inside the Law School] in *To Vima*, 22/2/1973.
Stavros Lygeros, a leader of the leftist OSE describes this atmosphere:

We are talking about a situation of being besieged, we did not even have food, if you can imagine, and the people beneath us were worrying. They were waiting at the bus stops intentionally, as an expression of solidarity, this was of a different nature, you understand, the moments and the atmosphere were really charged.

This was the first moment in which the students felt solidarity and that that they were not a ‘Generation of Robinsons’ anymore, to use Sirinelli’s term, doomed to be isolated, with no one to hear or share their frustrations. Mantoglou quotes an interviewer, a student at the time, who remembers this change with enthusiasm:

The people were supporting us ... we knew it!

Still, the Dutch reporter who covered the occupation recalls that people in the neighbouring buildings were closing their stories, out of fear that they would be accused by the authorities of showing sympathy for the insurrectionists.

In collective moments, people carry along ‘their own expectations, reasons and frame of mind’. Kouloglou remembers these moments as a great uplift, despite the relative deprivation, caused by the lack of food supplies and cigarettes. He describes the occupation experience as landing on a free island, a liberated space within an occupied city:

The best moments were when we went out to the terrace and talked, when we went out there. This was a niche of freedom, it was like being on a little island, which might have been encircled, but it was free, this is what I felt.

Damofli stresses that this was a most liberating moment after years of introversion. In her imagination freedom is linked to a symbol from 1821, the Missolonghi, the
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830 A. Mantoglou, The Polytechnic..., op.cit., pp. 165-166.
831 A. Coerant, “Ηταν μόνοι τους” [They were on their own], in Vernikos, Giorgos A., Οταν θέλαμε να αλλάξουμε την Ελλάδα. Το αντιδικτατορικό φοιτητικό κίνημα: Η EKIN και οι καταλήψεις της Νομικής [When we wanted to change Greece. The antidictatorship student movement: EKIN and the Law School occupations], Athens 2003, p. 117.
832 A. Portelli, ‘Intervistare il ...’, op.cit., p. 130.
Peloponnesian fortress where Greeks barricaded themselves in fear of the Ottomans and which was celebrated by Solomos in his unfinished poem ‘The Free Besieged’:

A very strong image that I have and a feeling, was the night on the Law Terrace when I felt really free. Freedom. We were up there and beneath us there were people gathering all around. So, I felt free, but in a very intense way. It was very nice. I was there with the people and we shouted, this was the heart of Athens. That thing was very intense, it was an illusion of freedom. A very beautiful feeling. And we were doing things, we were singing, shouting. This was something man, a Missolonghi, you know, in inverted commas. This was something. (Damofli)

The intensity of feeling also reflected the fact that all these students were about to sleep overnight away from their homes; this was a new sensation, especially for the women. The strongest memory, however, that *Katerina retains is of a weird, non-verbal communication code, which included a romantic reproduction of the so-called ’30s generation icons, rather than something ‘extreme’, as she herself mentions:

It is a bit picturesque. There was the wake within an auditorium. Most of us didn’t know each other, we were from various Faculties, and most of us were snoozing on benches, on chairs, on tiers, and every now and then someone would stand up, anonymously from the crowd, and would write with chalk on the blackboard a verse of Seferis, something by Makriyannis, don’t think of anything extreme, and then without saying her name, without saying anything she would return to her seat. It was again the triumph of allusion which, however, said more than would a 10 minute oration, a stump speech. I’m telling you this as a very temperate, condensed way of communication.

During the evening many of the people who stood outside the Law School staged a demonstration in solidarity across the nearby Akadimias Street. An interesting feature here is that the demonstrators held candles in Coca Cola bottles, in an unlikely, albeit functional, combination between the anti-regime movement, Orthodoxy and US imported consumer products.\(^{833}\)

All this time, a mass of EKOF students was trying to force the gates of the Law School to enter the building, despite shouts of disapprobation from surrounding students and backers of the occupation (‘Shame on you!’). EKOF’s usual aggressiveness is ignored in police reports of the period, which exaggerate, on the

---

\(^{833}\) I owe this observation to Karen Van Dyck.
contrary, the intention of the barricaded students to use violence. Accordingly, an ESA lieutenant observed:

During the meeting of the 22 and 23-2-73, the students barricaded inside the building were spreading the rumour that they were armed and that lots of blood was going to be spilled if other people tried to enter the building. Indeed, many of them carried daggers, while women students carried design razorblades (having an ejector blade, capable of causing serious wounds), which they demonstrated threateningly to the National minded students.

The regime showed great self-control by its standards. Both the movement and the authorities were testing their limits. Interestingly, professors for once sided with the students. At a certain point Toundas, the Dean of the University of Athens, offered the students assurances that they could leave unharmed, also guaranteeing water and electricity until they evacuated the building. However, the students rejected this, as well as the University Senate’s request to leave peacefully, insisting on the abolition of 1347 and expressing distrust regarding police guarantees.

On the second day of the occupation things gradually changed, as many students were tired and many decided to leave; indeed some were largely unprepared for such a venture. Most people in the occupation did not really know what they were doing there. Vernikos illustrates this point in his writings, conveying with evident irony a picture which largely deconstructs the ‘heroic’ aura of the events and other testimonies:

Others were hungry, others got ill, others had their mom waiting, others were afraid, others were making a different analysis.

As the Dean had already promised to seek the withdrawal of the notorious decree within ten days and the recognition by the Senate of the councils elected by the students, the occupation committee decided to lead the students out of the building. This act was seen as a ‘victorious withdrawal’, with a great communicational and symbolic impact, apart from the fact that conscriptions did not cease thereafter.
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835 O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 126.
In many respects this event marked the synchronisation of the Greek student movement with the international one. The occupation, a newly imported practice in Greece, reflected '68 practices and proved to be a powerful weapon in the hands of Greek students, who realised that a concentration of strength in a building could be more feasible and effective than a large open air gathering. It is interesting that at the same time that on 22 February the Greek papers reported ‘1,000-3,000 students spending the night at Law School’, they also talked about the University of Barcelona becoming a ‘theatre of student unrest’. They also mentioned ‘demonstrations of thousands of students in British cities’, ‘condemnation of students in Milan for participation in illegal demonstrations’ and ‘confrontations between police and students in Cairo’. In other words we can clearly see yet another student year, as from Barcelona to Milan and from London to Cairo the student unrest was a globalized and constant phenomenon. Despite the contextual differences, the Greek uprising, at its height by this date, can be finally placed within this context. The Greek students proved to be self-conscious, demanding and rebellious.

In contrast, however, in his telling article entitled ‘Anything except May '68’, the Le Monde correspondent came to the conclusion that the Greek student movement was miles away from its counterparts abroad and especially from the French agitators. The description he gives of a Greek woman militant is full of references to the fact that these students were mainly asking for basic rights, trying to separate their demands from further political elements:

They were fourteen or fifteen years old when the military took power in Greece on 21 April 1967. From the democratic period they have only a vague recollection of the disorders. Nevertheless, it is while screaming 'Democracy!' that these students descend to the streets and confront the Colonels’s police. The latter looks for the 'Communist leaders' that Mr Papadopoulos, on March 2\textsuperscript{nd} denounced with virulence in a long speech. Swarthy, with big round glasses, chewing a gum while smoking. On 16 February, in the scuffle at the Law Faculty of Athens, she received a blow of bludgeons that left her even today -with eye-sight problems: 'We have not even heard Papadopoulos's speech. He does not talk about the things we're not interested in.' Very little politicised, she refuses to see in her action anything else than a protest against the 'brutes', the counter-demonstrators, nationalist students and policemen in civilian, who [...] insulted and beat her since from the moment that she left the Faculty: 'They are the ones who provoked the scuffle. We just wanted our elementary rights.'

\textsuperscript{37} Thessaloniki, 22/2/73.
As J. Raschke argues, macro-social conditions (stability/crisis) or ‘dramatic events’ can accelerate, retard or break up the mobilization process, but definitely act as fully-fledged factors in the movement’s process.\(^{838}\) Also Pierre Bourdieu argues for the innovative role of ‘critical events’, which in a way are the generator or the result of general crises, with no relation to each other, so bringing about a casually created ‘synchronisation effect’.\(^{839}\) In the Greek case, the event that marks the evolution of the student movement was the February ’73 occupation, which reinforced the students and widened their circles of support. The movement was already under way, having already carved out a public space, an ‘opportunity structure’\(^{840}\) for the reinforcement of student cohesion.

Parallel to the Athens occupation, in Salónica 2,500 to 3,000 students gathered outside the Physics and Maths Faculty in order to discuss the invitation of the appointed commission of Aristoteleion University (FEAPTH) but did not manage to conduct open talks. Although Salónica always looked to be behind, trying to copy Law School without success this is still recorded as the biggest meeting of anti-Junta students in the seven years of the dictatorship.\(^{841}\) This incident was marked by savage fighting between pro-regime students, including FEAPTH’s vice-president, and anti-regime groups. Chrysafis Iordanoglou justly castigates the otherwise accurate Thessaloniki’s lack of information on this extreme violence committed by EKOF’s members, thanks to the authorities’ intervention. Many students were injured, some where brought to the hospital and others pressed charges in the following days, again using the very system that oppressed them in order to obtain justice, turning it upside down. In the following days the Polytechnic was shut down and lessons were suspended for about three weeks (26/2-14/3) in order to appease the students.\(^{842}\) A certain snowball effect was taking place in Salónica too.\(^{843}\)


\(^{840}\) Eyerman, *Social*, p. 104.

\(^{841}\) Iordanoglou in Dafermos: 252.

\(^{842}\) Ibid.

\(^{843}\) During these days, a sarcastic comment appeared in the classic *Thessaloniki* column ‘Here and Elsewhere’ by Christos Memis, showing the confrontation between students and police in Sweden, as the former were trying to prevent a bulldozer destroying a forest (27/2/73). Rather than linking the two cases, Memis commented on the fact that the students in Sweden were so privileged that they could fight for woods, whereas Greek students had to struggle for basic rights.
Despite its tactical retreat, the regime showed a tough face right after the Law School events. Given the high media coverage of the occupation, Pattakos threatened to close down any newspaper that promoted student issues from that time on. In his talk to the University Senate, which was characterised by a barrage of hysterical remarks, Papadopoulos took over the task of aligning the Professors with the regime. At a certain point he contemptuously remarked:

Go stand in front of the mirror and have a look at your heads. If they are not white or grey think about your struggles until the present day, analyse your personality, as teachers of the Nation, and with this coherence to yourselves, Sirs, respond: is it possible that you cannot control your students? I don't believe it.\footnote{O. Dafermos, \textit{Students and Dictatorship}, op.cit., p. 130. Interestingly, Papadopoulos's arrogant behaviour and tone bears striking similarities to a speech made by Ronald Reagan in late May 1969. Reagan, then Governor of California, summoned Berkeley's Professors, whom he rebuked with particular harshness for not being able to discipline their own students. At the end of his talk, Reagan indigently walked off, without giving the Professors the right to speak or defend themselves. See the relevant excerpts in the films of Paul Alexander Juutilainen's film \textit{Herbert's Hippopotamus: A Story of Revolution in Paradise} (1996) and Mark Kitchell's \textit{Berkeley in the '60s} (1998).}

Still, apart from intimidating the professors, Papadopoulos rendered them responsible for the student situation, giving them assurances that he would not intervene without their call. He clarified that 'non-student' demands would not be tolerated but committed that he would satisfy all student needs. Interestingly, he demonstrated a great lack of understanding of the real situation as he tried to find scapegoats, by identifying outsider groups as responsible for the student unrest; a retired officer was photographed as the leader of the Law School occupation, while four Communist Salonica students were believed to have forced the rest of the students to stay inside the building. Papadopoulos concluded that he would be ruthless if riots and 'anarchy' persisted. At the same time, the Education Minister, Gandonas, was quick to announce new student loans, as part of the old carrot and stick trick. In a change of mood, the recently considerate professors now sided with the regime, in an attempt to appease the dictators' rage. They called for the students to cease their strikes, proclaiming that the asylum and the independence of higher institutions were guaranteed, but announcing, however, that student gatherings would not be permitted on university premises.

The students' morale, boosted by their recent 'outing', rendered them more demanding than before. Law School and Humanities students continued the abstention from their lectures and asked for a permit to hold a general assembly, opposing the ban
on gatherings. There was a very high percentage of abstention from the ‘progress exams’ at the University of Salónica too, especially in the department of Architecture, in which, for certain exams, only a few students showed up. It is interesting, that at the same time 50,000 students were holding a strike in Barcelona, the biggest university in Spain, where the authorities blamed the unrest on leftist groups. In a resolution which was handed to the Principal of the Law School, a commission of students insisted that the general assemblies were the only way to bring the authorities in touch with the students:

General assemblies strengthen the dialogue on a democratic basis and put the foundations for the creation of a consciousness of students as social thinking individuals. 

At the same time, the President of the Free University of West Berlin (FUB) expressed his support for the demands of the Greek students and solidarity to the Senate of the Polytechnic. The President of the Union of University Students of Berkeley also expressed his solidarity with the demands of Greek students. This was a sign that this was becoming a globalised conflict, and that '68 now looked to Greece: FUB and Berkeley, two of the hotbeds of student action were expressing their solidarity; Athens was finally heard, and the students were breaking their isolation. In contrast, the Greek Junta proved myopic, as it was taken by surprise by the sudden rise of the student movement, having paid little or no attention to problems within educational institutions and the contagious capacity of the protest waves in Europe and the United States. Similarly to the death of Benno Ohnesorg in Berlin in June '67 which accelerated student agitation in West Germany, and the ‘night of the barricades’, which led to the explosion of the Parisian événements in May ’68, the Law School occupation was the turning point for the whole course of the student movement in Greece. This was the beginning of the 1973 cycle of protest that would end up with the dramatic Polytechnic events half a year later.

*We shall crush the students*: the Junta’s recourse to violence

After the Law School debacle the dictators made it clear that they would resort to ruthless force in order to suppress similar incidents of protest. However, from this point on more violence on the part of the state would only produce more radicalisation on the

---

845 Thessaloniki, 20/3/73.
part of the rebellious students. This is what was about to happen after yet another Law School occupation which was under way in late March. The recent successful experiment and the open popular support had created greater expectations on the part of the student movement, which translated into less caution. Already at the beginning of that month police reports reflect the fears of the authorities that the next occupation was going to last longer due to the students greater experience and enhanced organizational capacity:

It is being spread among the students that during the all-students meeting on Tuesday (6-3-73) those who gather ones will carry with them food supplies for a week.846

The occupation did not take place when the authorities suspected, but was launched only two weeks later, on the anniversary of the February events. This time, those mainly responsible for the venue were the leftists, who insisted that the right line was to seek a frontal confrontation with the regime, as opposed to other groups who maintained a smoother tactic after the regime’s recent setback:

I experienced this as a compromising tactic towards the dictatorship. When did this come forward in reality? This situation started becoming clearer during the second occupation of the Law School which took place in March '73 [...] I sustained that we had to remain there, but this was entirely spontaneous. We should do something, you know. We have had a victory here, so we should do something more, in a way out of impatience. (Kouloglou)

Shortly after the fall of the Junta one of the protagonists, Grigoris Kossyvakis, recalled:

At 4 o’clock a meeting took place at Saripolos lecture theatre. At that meeting for the first time the AASPE coordinated, the Chinese, as we called them, whose representative, Dionysis Mavrogenis, stated that the committee of the Physics and Maths was about to take over the building, regardless if the remaining Faculty committees departed. Naturally, the other committees did not depart. We stayed.847

And Angeliki Xydi:

---

847 Vangelis Angelis, Olympios Dafermos (eds), Πεντες ηπειρο... Το Αντιδικτατορικό Φοιτητικό Κίνημα και τo Πολεμικό με το βλέμμα των πρωταγωνιστών [It was a only a dream... The Anti-dictatorship Student Movement and the Polytechnic from the point of view of the protagonists], Athens, 2003, p.115.
A resolution was taken from the committee of the second occupation, which was read - I remember it well because I was the one who was reading it at the exits, notifying all people that they were not obliged to remain, as there was a great concentration of police forces, this was obvious, and the information we had was that there were special forces coming too, probably armed forces as well dressed up as firemen etc, in order to make a huge invasion, there was a public prosecutor outside, and we were reading a resolution saying that whoever wants to leave could do so at that moment, for the rest we were resolute to stay whatever happened.[...] And indeed, this is what happened, many people left, from the ones who had come to the gathering, and rightly so of course.(Xydi)

The occupation did not last long, as the University authorities asked for the intervention of the police, who invaded the Law School building, beating all the students black and blue. Xydi has very grim memories of this second occupational experience, as she was ‘just saved from death’.

The second occupation was tragic, a tragic event. Because it happened de facto, it was almost forced to happen, it was a matter of honour, rather, we had a rather coincidental demand - they had caught eleven kids and they had them inside prison and we asked them to let our eleven companions free and of course they had responded negatively and there was a great gathering at the Law School and we had to decide what to do, either to pick up everything and go, so we would be simply defeated, but with low moral, or we should do some heroic deed.

A French commentator, who reported the Law School events for Le Monde, compared an unspecified Greek leader, most probably Vernikos, to Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the enfant terrible of May ’68, pointing to the former’s lack of provocative feeling. Interestingly, the journalist characteristically underplayed the importance and influence of the Communist groupings, to which most students belonged by that point, as Vernikos himself was non-affiliated:

Law student, with a big black moustache, poorly hiding his still juvenile lips. George attempts to analyze the revolt: ‘All we want, we other students, is to show that the government doesn’t accept even elementary demands such as the right for us to freely choose our representatives.’ When questioned about his opinions, he says that ‘I am a left-winger’, pulling a face that excuses himself. Nothing in him of a strident Cohn-Bendit who was spitting vitriol to all sorts of requisitions. This is about one of the ‘thinkers’ of the affair, in which leftist or Communists play a rather oblique role. ‘Of course, the leftist ones have tried ‘to politicize’ as they say, the ‘Law School’ occupation by making us shout: ‘Down with the ‘Junta!’ ... But the majority refused and
shouted rather ‘Democracy!’, ‘Freedom!’", and he sings the Cretan song ‘When will the dawn come!’... 848

Despite *Le Monde*’s juxtaposition, however, in terms of major differences between the Greek and the French case, on 27 February *Thessaloniki* carried a very ambiguous message. While the headline referred to the student protest against the Debrais Law in France, in reality it was referring to the Greek student revolt: ‘Students. Yet another attempt... The recent student unrest brings back to memory the French May of ’68.’ In fact, the Law School imbroglio led to more marches and demonstrations from students in Athens, often very combative ones. 849 Ariadni Alavanou remembers that participating in such ventures had become her daily bread:

> We were always up for it! Do you know this? Such was our mentality in that period. Wherever was an occupation, a demonstration, fuzz, we were in for it. This was our tendency, our impulse. And when I say we, I mean, say, this group of friends. We used to call it a group of friends [καπέκα].

More importantly, the open and brutal violence exercised by the police and experienced by the students was a typical radicalisation factor, which reinforced the confrontation potential of the latter. The political baptism of the Law School occupations transformed fear into determination. Moreover, ‘these events showed that patience was running out for the regime in the most sensitive social groups like the students. Six years had been enough for a people tired by military rule and willing to see its freedoms restored’. 850 Papadopoulos was also losing the toleration of other elites in the country, including certain sections within the Armed Forces, a fact expressed bluntly by the Navy Mutiny in May ’73.

**The cost of participation - Lacerations of Memory**

The particularity of the Greek students was that they acted in an authoritarian regime that was employing heavy violence in order to maintain order. Therefore, a distinction should be made between willingness to participate in different forms of action, in moderate and militant, as well as in low and high risk activities, because of a divergent
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849 ‘Η δικτατορία των Συντηγματαρχών. Το Απριλιανό καθεστώς’ [The Colonels’ Dictatorship. April’s regime], pp. 265-286, in *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Εθνος* [History of the Greek Nation], op.cit.
cost-benefit ratio.\textsuperscript{831} It would be wrong to assume that the cost of clandestine action was significantly greater than that of the open actions, because we see that the dangers were similar, including prison and torture. However, the open action tactic gave the possibility of tangible results, which would be more visible than the blind bomb placing tactics. Open action was also dictated by specific demands, such as university unionism, and was not an abstract protest move. Overall, participation in protest or resistance had a high cost, in contrast to the Western countries where 'Resistance' meant 'street fighting with the police until arrested.'\textsuperscript{832} Still, greater repression leads to the reinforcement of a common identity:\textsuperscript{833}

It was not as when you pass by a demonstration at present, or an occupation and ... This was a different thing, because risk was involved, they made it with risk. This thing marked it. It gave a nuance of gravity and drama to the whole movement. Because clashes took place where they smashed your head, policemen caught you, there was risk, it was not a safe thing. I am not saying here that safe things are bad but in any case they are different. (Lygeros)

The regime, parallel to its 'liberalisation' experiment, resorted to extreme violence in order to crush the presumed 'heads' of the student movement, ignoring its poly-cephalous character. Accordingly, in spring '73 two waves of arrests took place, in which all the male student leaders who had not already been arrested or conscripted before and some of the legendary women students were put in solitary confinement at EAT/ESA and tortured. The regime started exercising sheer terror against the students when the Military Police (ESA) took over responsibility from the Public Security Forces (Asfaleia), as the latter was held responsible for failing to control the student movement.\textsuperscript{834} Apart from the fact that by 1972 a fifth of the 330 prisoners serving sentences for crimes against the regime were students,\textsuperscript{835} on 8 May 1973, during the so-called St Bartholomew's night, all student leaders and their defendants were arrested and tortured at ESA. As a Civil War veteran commented:

\textsuperscript{833} Della Porta, 1998, op.cit., p. 139.
\textsuperscript{834} Dafermos: 132
\textsuperscript{835} 'Athens students quick to rebel', Guardian, 27/10/72.
They don't bother torturing us older communists, although they may knock us about a bit and make us feel impotent and helpless. They torture the young mainly. They want to break them.\(^{856}\)

One of the most prominent members of the Law School occupations who got arrested that night was Ioanna Karystiani, president of the Cretan Society and the northern star of the entire movement. She argues, applying this to the entirety of the movement, that anyone who entered it knew well in advance the risks involved, which were high and unpredictable:

The ones who entered [the movement] knew that they were possibly taking a great risk of having, say, certain consequences, to be beaten up, to go to jail, and then to go to jail meant to be aware that they might charge you with the law nr 375, law nr 509 on espionage, and if you were there in the front, you'd be given twenty years of prison. Twenty five. (Karystiani)

Vernikos was yet another leader arrested and tortured by the ESA. His description of his transfer to its headquarters again involves the imaginary images which he had created from descriptions about this place, which were coming to his head 'like film movies'. In his view, an additional factor for torturing him with particular harshness was his high-class background and the fact that this contributed to his torturers' conviction that they were conducting a 'popular struggle'. Accordingly, Vernikos quotes his interrogator telling him:

'We are struggling for the nation-saving revolution and you spoiled brats and rich kids are making resistance.'\(^{857}\)

As a result of physical and psychological mistreatment Vernikos confesses that he came to the verge of suicide. ESA was notoriously known for its methods, including complete isolation and interrogation accompanied by ruthless tortures, with the most common one being the *falanga*, that is being beaten with iron rods on the soles of the feet and the hands tied up.\(^{858}\) Most of the time interrogation served as nothing more
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\(^{856}\) Paul Rose, ‘Vicious’ pressures from police may paralyse opposition’, *Tribune*, August 1972.

\(^{857}\) Giorgos A. Vernikos, op.cit., p. 151. Vernikos also recalls that those belonging to Communist organizations blamed him for everything in order to protect their comrades.

\(^{858}\) When Tzeni Karezi, one of the country’s top actresses, was arrested for joining the student uprising, she managed to smuggle out a request for ear plugs to deaden the sound of the screams of students being tortured in neighbouring cells. [*Thus spoke Ioannidis*, *Newsweek*, 10/12/73]
than an opportunity to perform acts of domination and submission. As the days people spent in EAT/ESA were full of physical pain and psychological pressure, such a rite de passage gave its victims a sort of credential.

Each time we admired someone who returned from arrest on his feet; he had acquired a prestige. (Papachristos)

Torture and psychological violence were even more intense towards women, due to the propensity of torturers to rape and to verbal assault with a sexual content.

There were more erect roosters, it happened to me during a transfer from EAT/ESA to a military camp, to be taken out to the yard where there were Colonels, the ones who were later on court-martialled of course, and all the EAT roosters gathered there, telling me: ‘Why did you get involved? Go back to your kitchen to wash your dishes.’ You know what I mean? A woman should be in the kitchen, washing dishes. (Xydi)

As a 22 year old woman, who was arrested during the demonstration of 4 November on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of George Papandreou’s death, told a foreign paper:

Policemen took hold of me, beat me on my private parts, and put me in a police can. One of them told me ‘We will put a black man in your cell to ... you’.®

The use of deliberately and stereotypically sexist and vulgar offensive language was a standard means of humiliation. One of the phrases catching this spirit of hate, mixed with a rapist drive, is recorded by Darveris who quotes military officers during the Polytechnic uprising as saying ‘we should take all the women students and tear their cunts apart with bayonets’.® However, direct sexual assaults are rather repressed and silenced in the testimonies. The same happens in terms of written accounts, as in

---

859 Several accounts describe the experience of torture. One of them, written by Periklis Korovessis, a young actor who was jailed and subjected to very harsh tortures, was published at the time abroad in English. Korovessis’s personal experience (electrical shocks, isolation, beatings) made for a book that was clandestinely but widely circulated. The graphic descriptions of the tortures that took place on the notorious terrace of Bouboulina Street, ‘the best known lavatory in the world’, were so appalling and terrifying that they might have resulted in preventing people from pursuing clandestine action. See Periklis Korovessis, The Method. A personal Account of the Tortures in Greece, London 1970.

860 Dimitris Papachristos, ‘Από τη Νομική στο Πολυτεχνείο’ [From Law School to the Polytechnic], pp. 192-196 in Giorgos Gatos, cit., p. 195.

861 ‘Threat’ to Greek woman in cell’, Guardian, 14/11/73. The underscore is part of the original text.

862 Darveris, cit., p. 332.
the book of the young actress Kitty Arseni, which was written and published when she was already abroad. Although Arseni describes in detail her extensive detention, rape is implicit but never mentioned as such.\textsuperscript{863} Vervenioti was arrested and ruthlessly tortured by the Security Police while pregnant. Her recollection provides a graphic description of the ethics of the time as her personal suffering was reinforced by her fear for the ‘shame’ of her family that an illegitimate child would cause. She nevertheless presents her father as quite open-minded, drawing a distinction between his attitude on ‘private’ issues and ‘public’ ones. Despite the fact that Vervenioti regrets not informing her torturers of her condition in order to spare her, other incidents suggest that this would not necessarily have led to a more lenient treatment.

Look, I, because we’re talking about me, I had a problem. Some days before I got caught I realized that I was pregnant. I was already together with my husband then, we were both students, and I was in trouble at home for all this. And of course I would go and have an abortion. When they were doing those tortures I didn’t know that I had to say ‘don’t hit me because I am pregnant’ and they would spare me the beatings, as another girl did whose mother had been exiled and so on, and so she knew that she had to act this way. I didn’t say anything. On the contrary my preoccupation was that my father shouldn’t know about it, as the fact that I was arrested would have been a greater blow. At the end of the day, the fact that they caught me was because I was working against the dictatorship. Father would not be ashamed of this. While about having a baby in such a way, he had different principles, although he was very open-minded.

Evidently, in the case of torture and its subsequent trauma memories are often so poignant that narration becomes extremely difficult and sometimes impossible. Here, it is instrumental to note the role of forgetfulness. More than once, when the life story narration touched on an incident such as interrogation and torture, the interviewees wished to continue the narration off the record, thus demonstrating their sense of being degraded and humiliated by making such a story public. In other cases, narration has a healing side, even if the trauma will never be eradicated/has a long-lasting effect. Rigos remembers the isolation and the impossibility of forgetting it:

No, it is not claustrophobia. It is not the closed, it is ... the parting from the world, the violent parting from everything that exists, and I talk about the isolation cell. You were on your own. Entirely. Absolutely. These are sensations which remain with you ... forever. They never end and

this is why we resemble in a way the old fighters. We narrate, and narrate, and say... And sometimes we try to analyse it too. (Rigos)

Nevertheless, a typical theme, recognisable in the narrations as a whole is the division between those who did ‘talk’ during interrogation and those who did not. This reflects a sort of clandestinity honour code and reveals a lot in terms of the value system of the students of the time. Xydi attributes her stance to what she describes as an enduring tendency of hers, namely determination. She then makes it clear that the visual image she had in her mind while under the adverse circumstances of prison, was how she would come out of prison proud of having maintained her integrity. In fact, at this moment of the interview this thought made her so emotional that she broke into tears.

It was very cold, outside and inside. Externally and internally. [I had] this determination, a determination that follows me up ever since. That I should stand the interrogation and that I should go out holding my head high, in order to be able to look my comrades in the eye. (Xydi)

Xydi’s assertion is that the very thought of her comrades was a strong incentive in making her survive what she went through in prison. This conveys a comfort, rendered by the idea of a collective belonging. In a way the ‘collective experience’, which, according to Passerini, accompanies a ‘fatal sacrifice’, is present.\(^64\) In contrast, people who were not part of a specific organization attribute their greater frustration during these hours to the fact that they did not have a collective structure in their mind.

The feeling of loss, the solitude, you didn’t have anything to lean on, we had yet another handicap, we didn’t have comrades, I did not see anything I could lean on, I had nothing to defend, my comrade, not to betray him, I didn’t have anything, this is why I remained in jail briefly, this is why I was probably tortured less than others. Nevertheless, as an experience it was extraordinary. That is, they did not unleash cigarettes on me, as they did to Nadia Valavani, they did not do as they did with her, but she had come better prepared, I was completely unprepared for such a treatment.

\(^64\) L. Passerini, «Πλήγες της Μνήμης. Γυναικεία Ταυτότητα και Πολιτική Βία» [Wounded Memory. Female Identity and Political Violence], in Σπαρτάκες του 20ου Αιώνα. Η Ιστορία ως Βιωμένη Εμπειρία [Fragments of the 20th Century. History as a Lived Experience], Athens 1998, pp. 213-270. Passerini adds that in this context ‘the individual is not evaluated outside the group. Not just in the anthropological sense of a nexus of relations […] but in a cultural, intellectual, psychological sense.’ I owe this excerpt to Dimitra Lambropoulou’s outstanding treatise of facets of the subjectivity of political prisoners in Greece, Γράφοντας από τη Φυλακή. Όψεις της εποχαγορικότητας των πολιτικών κρατουμένων 1947-1960 [Writing from Prison. Facets of the subjectivity of political prisoners], Athens 1999, pp. 79-80.
The flipside of this was, however, that the stakes were high whether one would rat on one's comrades or not. Individual strategies were worked out, such as giving names of companions who were abroad or of persons who were already known or imprisoned. Despite the time, distance and the subsequent mental elaboration, Vervenioti does not hide her contempt for those who turned her in. In most interviews, there is an implicit rancour when dealing with this issue.

I was very much disturbed by the fact that they talked, it disturbed me that so many kids went there after us, they could have stopped with us, without bringing along the rest of the kids. One of these girls was also Maro Douka, the writer, my sister had met them in the Humanities and they were in a triplet too, in which my sister acted. My sister didn't turn them in. As we reached the Police Station, early in the morning, we had been dragged from home, we found the girls there. And you feel a great responsibility for the ones you have introduced to the organisation, if they are there, and if you haven't turned them in.

Further on, Vervenioti laments the fact that her group was small and inexperienced, as opposed to the depth and know-how of the Communist Party, a view that also marked her later day political choices:

Maybe I was all tough towards them. They were older than me, supposedly more into, further up in the organization and I expected from them to be better, not to talk. They said it all, with the logic that they [the Police] already knew everything as we were all there. And they gave details. [...] This was a thing that I said 'Never again be involved in a small group'. You should offer your life, do things, but at least there should be a party behind, a serious mechanism, I thought that this was, that there was no seriousness, they played at revolutionaries without being such.

Papageorgiou similarly shows little respect for those who talked and refrains from naming these people as the time is not yet ripe:

You see how the organizations collapsed, the clandestine ones when A-EFEE people got arrested. They gave in everything, they squealed, they shopped on everyone when they got caught. That's it, better not say names now. I know them but let them be for the time being.

Kourmoulakis finds himself at the opposite end of the spectrum, as he recalls in despair the fact that he was forced to speak, a fact often repressed by the majority of interviewees:
I think that they broke my spirit, despite all resistances, namely I got scared. I did not say 'fuck off, I’m not writing anything', I sat down and wrote. What did I write? I sat down and wrote. It doesn’t matter what I wrote, if I turned people in, if I didn’t turn people in. I got scared, they broke my spirit, that they might kill me, that they might throw me out of the window. (Kourmoulakis)

Of course, this biographical and psychological rift, at least for males, was linked to a certain idea of manliness, and in fact of a Greek idea of being a leventis, a man of daring and honour. This coupled well with the notorious ‘statements’, documents renouncing left-wing political beliefs, which ever since the inter-war period had been the bogy of the Left. Consequently, a large number of people were stigmatized as traitors, since according to Communist moral standards a ‘good fighter’ should not yield to any duress. Makis Paraskevopoulos, a Law student and Rigas member at the time, wrote an account shortly after his long detention, where alongside a stirring description of his state of mind during that time, he makes reference to the imaginary of the relentless fighters of the Civil War years that came to haunt him:

You are all the time in your cell and the dyspnoea is inevitable. Terror has become a steady feature and at every sound you’re scared to death. You’re constantly trembling, so much that you’re spilling the beans from your spoon, you are floundering in your words, you are incredibly cowardly, the most cowardly man in the world, and the people in Makronisos were made out of stone.865

Building up the tension

Meanwhile, Papadopoulos proceeded to the final steps concerning the ‘liberalisation’: he granted a spectacular and broad fully-fledged amnesty and organized a referendum on the abolition of the monarchy. This fact caused great splits within the clandestine left-wing political formations and the remains of the political parties of the pre-dictatorship period, as did the announcement of forthcoming elections. It is noteworthy, that Papadopoulos could have just given a pardon, instead of an amnesty, in order to satisfy criticism from abroad and mainly the United States. Instead, he gave an amnesty, which cancelled the ‘criminal’ case from the records of the accused. More importantly, Papadopoulos proceeded for the first time to the creation of a political government (8 October 1973) around the old liberal politician Markezinis and other

865 Makis Paraskevopoulos, ‘Σημειώσεις μετά την αποφυλάκιση’ [Notes after coming out of prison], pp. 63-72, in G.A.Vernikos, cit., p. 70.
political figures from the past, the so-called ‘interlocutors’, willing to dialogue with the Junta and be given governmental positions.

Markezinis had been known as a ‘magician’ since 1953 when he stabilised the inflation ridden post-Civil War Greek economy. In an interview to the Times in early October ’73, he referred to the 1973 inflation pressures on the Greek economy and proposed austerity in public expenses and control of development rhythms. Moreover, Markezinis appeared provocative as he thought that the Middle Eastern problem could be exploited to Greece’s benefit, but he opposed the anchoring facilities provided by the country to the US 6th Fleet and US aircraft carriers, expressing security and environmental concerns which resulted from the concentration of bases, shipyards, oil refineries and so on in the Athens periphery. Markezinis’s negative stance was often referred to in the future as an explanation for the failure of the ‘liberalisation’ experiment and the overthrow of Papadopoulos by Ioannidis shortly after the Polytechnic in November ’73. Finally, he considered Lenin a great statesman and was favourable to the legalisation of the KKE.

In terms of the ‘student problem’ and the fact that the students who protested in spring ’73 for the improvement of academic matters and more academic freedom were met with suppression, violence, arrests and the freezing of their right to defer military service, Markezinis appeared very optimistic. The situation in October could not be compared to that in spring, he said, when the political question (‘το πολιτικόν ζήτημα’) was still open and reinforced the creation of unrest. He was confident that by now the students would feel more reassured and that all their problems could be re-considered. Still,

This does not mean that the channel of elections will make the problems of the student youth disappear, as these are of a general nature, meaning that they are also to be found outside the Greek borders.

Thus, Markezinis places the issue of student unrest in Greece within the wider context of international student agitation, saying that a government could not possibly deal with student rebelliousness, no matter what measures it might take. Markezinis concludes the interview in an ironic fashion, hinting at the fact that only if there was political repression would students’ revolts be legitimate, thus placing Greece’s condition at that moment on a different register. In other words, he stated, over-optimistically, that there
was no democratic deficit in the country any longer and therefore any skulduggeries by
the students were incomprehensible:

Only where democracy does not function should the universities protest on political grounds. 666

‘Greece is stretching out’

In the meanwhile, the students were diffident about the whole experiment and endowed
with two other models of inspiration: Tayland and the shock generated by Pinochet’s
coup in Chile in September ’73. 667 The latter led to a demonstration in late September
in Athens. Rigas Feraios even voted a resolution on the Chilean case, linking it directly
to the Greek case as parts of the same US plot. While in Western countries Chile’s
authoritarian twist reinforced the lack of trust by left-wingers in the capacity of a
democratic state to make socialist reforms without making or suffering a coup d’état, in
Greece it was proof that American interests were ruthlessly pursued in the same manner
all over the world and always at the expense of people’s democratic rights. A leaflet
from Rigas read:

For the Greek students, who have lived for six years now under the dictatorship of Papadopoulos,
the scenario is well-known. Just like Papadopoulos in Greece, Pinochet in Chile talks about
‘patient and plaster’, they have the same obscurantist ideology, they use the same rough-and-ready
demagogy, the same lies. And it is not strange. Because the assassin of the Chilean people and the
Greek Junta have been trained in the same centres of international subversion in the USA, the
plans of the people behind the coups have been elaborated in the same offices of the American
KYP. The two Juntas serve the same interests: they defend the privileges of native oligarchy and
the strategic and economic positions of the popular movement which threatens directly or in the
long term, these privileges and positions. The Greek students are aware of all this, and this is why
they shouted in the demonstration of 25 September in the centre of Athens ‘Allende, Allende’. 668

666 Interview to The Times, 12/10/73.
667 For a contemporary ‘revolutionary’ view on what happened in Chile see the treatise by the Trotskyite
militant Michel Raptis, Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Chile, London 1974. For a more balanced
analysis see the classic book by Arturo Valenzuela, Chile, Baltimore 1978. For the Latin American
dictatorial turn in general see Arturo Valenzuela, Juan J.Linz (eds), The Failure of Presidential
Democracy, Baltimore 1994. For a comparative approach between Argentina, Chile and Greece see
Nikos Mouzelis, ‘On the Rise of Postwar Military Dictatorships: Argentina, Chile, Greece’, Comparative
668 ‘Κάτω η χούντα του Πινοσέτ! Ζήτω η αντίσταση του χιλιανού λαού! Απόφαση του Κ.Σ. του «Ρήγα
Φεραίου» (1.10.73) [Down with the Junta of Pinochet! Long live the resistance of the Chilean people!
Decision of the C.C. of ‘Rigas Feraios’}, Thourios, New Period, 2, November 1973, p. 63
Allende’s name did indeed become a slogan and is to be found written everywhere during the Polytechnic. Another slogan that established this imaginary connecting line between the various oppressed countries went ‘Chile, Greece and Spain, let’s march on towards democracy’. In a similar manner, Thailand’s unrest became yet another quoted symbol. In October 1973, 200,000, mainly student, protesters attacked and occupied a government building against the military Junta of Thanom Kittikachorn, dating from 1971 and thought to be corrupt and backed by the United States. After ten days of violent clashes and assaults between the Thai police and the crowd of protesters, a series of teargas explosions instigated the riots during which 66 students were shot dead and 876 participants injured. Kittikachorn had ordered the Army to ‘do its duty’ against student ‘terrorists’ who were ‘destroying life and property’. The striking similarities with Greece place the Polytechnic bloodbath closer to this sort of experience than to the Parisian May. The main slogan of Greek students ‘tonight there will be Thailand’ was realised only in terms of its first component: violence. In contrast to the Polytechnic, the massacre of Thai students brought about the overthrow of the dictatorial government.

In general, this tendency of referring to international incidents and identifying oneself with them, betrays the students’ self-perception of being part of a wider, global struggle, with international symbols and points of reference and a common enemy: American imperialism. A certain positive identification emerged among Greek students for the repressed ‘other’, also reflecting an orientalist certitude of possessing a privileged gaze that could distinguish between the positive and the negative elements in foreign experience. This was a trait which they had in common with many of their...
counterparts around the world who shared this feeling. All in all, two different cultural images emerged in which the Western block's uprisings acted as a source of inspiration, while third world movements were a revolutionary guide.

By early November things were turning explosive in Greece as well. The Junta proceeded with its experiment in a rather unorthodox way. By 18 October, for example, all expelled students could return to the University, thanks to decree 168)73 on amnesty. On the same day, the president of the Cretan local society in Salónica, Perrakis, was arrested after a meeting of the society. Some days later, Chrysafis Iordanoglou, President of the Thrace Macedonian local society, would launch a lawsuit against police pressures that did not allow the society to hold elections in accordance with the law 93)1973, but the public prosecutor refused to discuss the case because he said it was beyond his responsibility. Soon after, the Athenian local societies of Cretans, Patrans, Chiotans, Ilians and Epirots called all students to mass inscriptions and participation in elections, due to the fact that the elected administrative councils wanted to hold elections with the existing small number of registered members. In their announcement the societies repeated the classic 15% for Education, the abolition of decrees 93)69, 180)69, 720)70 and 1347)73, abolishing the deferral of military service and the holding of general assemblies until 1 November in order to elect committees which would hold elections in January '74. Lastly, Law School students criticised the pro-regime appointed student union Themis who insisted on distinguishing between 'strictly student matters' and political ones, 'as if the conscriptions were not student matters'. By that time 150 students were conscripted.

More importantly, public insecurity was doubled when on 20 October the new economic measures of the government were announced, freeing prices, which meant an automatic increase in the prices of bread and agricultural products. A politics of austerity was announced in order to compress these prices and make the flow of goods constant. The government expressed optimism that because of price controls, the capacity of the buyers would increase and that the revaluation would not cause problems to imports because of the liquidisation of supplies. In short, with a rise in the consumer index and inflation booming during the period of the oil crisis, finances

---

872 This tendency is to be found under democratic governments as well. In Italy, for example, the Greek and mainly the Chilean coup caused massive demonstrations, as they were conceived as a sort of warning that 'the same could be happen here as well'.

873 Despite the easing of price restrictions in order to re-shape the dynamic between offer and demand, products such as iron, milk products, meat, concrete, flour and fuel belonged to the category of 'necessary products in short supply' and therefore high prices would lead to prosecution.
were getting tight and in fact, this is what the Polytechnic slogan ‘more bread’ would refer to.\textsuperscript{874}

Moreover, the prospect of elections was creating a new potential. The Markezinis experiment signaled a certain opening, a certain way out of stagnation that created new and greater expectations, not so much in terms of the Junta’s own intentions but in terms of how civil society sensed that it could exploit this opportunity. The undersecretary of Public Order, Zournatzis, proposed a politics of oblivion by ‘forgetting and forgiving the past’, even announcing the rehabilitation of Theodorakis’ pre-Junta songs.\textsuperscript{875} However, his appeal was not heard. In 1968 George Papandreou’s funeral had provided one of the few big demonstrations in the first years of the dictatorship. On 4 November 1973 was the fifth commemoration since his death and the short memorial service provided a terrain for the expression of more public protest. Kourmoulakis remembers the violence that took place between the two conflicting parties, demonstrators and policemen, with victims on both sides:

Papandreou’s memorial took place. Something unprecedented happened there. 500,000 people were gathered and there was mayhem. Beatings, all hell broke loose! I was involved in the beatings too. There with the police. I hit some policemen too, over there, and then they searched for me all over Athens in order to find me and put me out of the way. There I really had a close shave. I remember in particular a cop who had cornered a guy on a car bonnet and was hitting him with the clubb. And we had uprooted some saplings and had made a stick out of them, and with that I hit him on the head. He fell down, then 5-6 persons encircled me and started beating me. I made a heroic exit, I hit my head but managed to escape. (Kourmoulakis)

Seventeen people were brought to trial on the grounds that they were ‘a few extremists committing anarchist acts and outrageous activities against the small police force maintaining order’.\textsuperscript{876} Some days later the trials took place, causing renewed unrest around the University of Athens, throwing anti-Junta slogans and coming into conflict with the police. In the meantime, Markezinis kept postponing his measures, thus creating even more tension. Prominent politicians defended the seventeen, among whom were Kanellopoulos and Mavros. The main accusation was that the youths attacked the policemen, that they had used swearwords against Markezinis and that

\textsuperscript{874} For an analysis of how social movements are reinforced by crises in the world economy see Edmund Burke (ed), \textit{Global Crises and Social Movements. Artisans, Peasants, Populists and the World Economy}, Boulder 1988.

\textsuperscript{875} \textit{Thessaloniki}, 2/11/73.

\textsuperscript{876} \textit{Thessaloniki}, 6/11/73.
they insulted the Army. The most important feature of this trial was that a film with the most savage beating to date seen in public was used by the defence, a reel that was later widely used by the press, undermining the image of a smooth transition. At the same time the foreign press covering this incident reached a correct conclusion: ‘Greece is stretching out’.

The ‘mission’ of the youth

As a result of their constant mobilisations over the previous two years, the students sensed that as an intellectual minority they had the mandate of the Greek people to act in their general interest, for the sake of the majority, as a legitimate avant-garde aiming at a socio-political reconfiguration. Alkis Rigos, a Panteion student at the time and one of the movement’s so-called ‘grandfathers’, due to his relatively older age, describes these self-perceptions of the students:

We had the widespread sensation that all of society went in circles around us. There was a particular sort of authorization by society to us, that ‘it is you’. Of course one could go off one’s rocker through this, it had negative aspects too.

This connects to the legendary image of the students as a non-conformist avant-garde in Greek society, which goes back to the Lambrakides but is further reinforced, acquiring vast levels of idealization after 1972 and above all after the Polytechnic events. The publisher Psaroudakis was saying in 1972:

The revolutionarity of this youth has a purity. Such a youth is the foundation of a free people. If a people goes ahead this is owed to the youth’s revolutionarity. Tomorrow’s people will spring out of the youth with opinion and character. The rebelling youth is the foundation of the future.

Another reason behind this faith in the young was the positive representation of youth by periodicals and publications. Students were often represented as millenarian carriers of change, reflecting the post-’68 mood. An interesting example is provided by a widely circulated book by a Nobel prize-winning biologist, entitled The Crazy Ape, where it was written on the back cover that:

877 Thessaloniki, 14/11/73.
878 Interview of Psaroudakis to K.Tsaousidis and Ch.Zaferis, ‘The talk of the publisher of the ‘Christian’ Nikolaos Psaroudakis with the subject ‘Education and Democracy’ has been cancelled’, Thessaloniki, 27/2/72.
The means for our salvation lies with the young.

The world is mature for radical changes, necessary for human survival. If the young betray this chance, they will enlarge the tragedy and they will mar the luck of humanity.\(^{79}\)

In addition, apart from the aforementioned columns reporting student mobilisations in a very detailed way, the great dailies had everyday specials on the problems of youth, the students’ world and especially what was happening in other countries, creating parallels. The subject of youth as a whole was a heated topic for debate in the late 1960s and early 1970s, with constant analyses of its role, function and potential, to the extent that it is often argued that it was by and large a non-existent category that was ‘a pure construction of the media, a surface phenomenon only’.\(^{80}\)

Moreover, apart from being a valuable source for the circulation of information on international developments, newspapers also provided a means of bringing the students closer to the spirit of protest movements abroad. It is interesting to note that everyday reports in Greek newspapers analysed the unrest in Spanish universities - with big headlines such as ‘when the students dare the dictatorship is shaken’- and the situation in Portuguese universities and society in general when the parallel opening of Caetano was taking place - referred to as ‘pseudo-elections’. All this generated an obvious ‘transfer’ and identification on the part of the readers.

The return of the conscripts was an event that had a major impact on the student movement. It was considered a victory, and was a fact that encouraged and rallied the students, leading to the growth of the mass movement. The image of shaved students at the Universities reinforced the self-confidence of the rest.\(^{81}\) Logothetis recalls in an interview that as they were recently dismissed, ‘we still wore our military jackets’.\(^{82}\) This was yet another interesting element, as the aforementioned semiology of the military outfit and its homeopathic use was further enhanced by the Junta’s own symbols, as at this time real Hellenic Army jackets came to replace the American ones, expressing a stark contrast to their wearers’ political identity. Mimis Androulakis, a

---


\(^{80}\) John Clarke, Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson, Brian Roberts, ‘Subcultures, cultures and class: A theoretical overview’, pp. 9-74 in Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson (eds). Resistance Through Rituals. Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain, London, 1975, p. 10. As far as recently arrived Greek television was concerned, in the sitcom Geitonia, there was a young ‘eternal student’, who was absent most of the time, hinting at the students conditions of being suspended somewhere between university and semi-clandestinity.

\(^{81}\) O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 153.

\(^{82}\) Stelios Logothetis, ‘H κατάληψη [The occupation], pp. 207-213 in G. Gatos, Reportage..., op. cit., p. 209.
student leader at the time, recalls that the fusion between the legendary students in uniform with their colleagues had explosive results:

And you can imagine, a whole train full of left-wing soldiers, what a celebration, singing songs from the moment we left, and then we all met and all this crowd entered the Polytechnic. In fact, I didn't change clothes, I went in with my military uniform. During all the days of the Polytechnic I was in military uniform, apart from a gabardine that someone brought me. [...] I insist on the chemistry that existed when the conscripted ones came and met the other movement which is in turmoil. This made the movement sprout up, it was a big mistake by the Junta to let us go.**^ Androulakis, describes the soldier-students' epic return to Athens in trains, an image which is often used in life histories and seems to be connected on an imaginary level with the Marxist icon of the 'locomotive of history'. Following the impact of May '68 which posed the problem of defining the subjects of history, the role of the individual in the historical procedures appeared to have shifted and for the first time Greek students, as had happened elsewhere, considered themselves as vehicles of historicity and as factors of social change.**^ Dafermos writes that:

The people who participated in the movement [...] were experiencing each moment with the feeling of History.**^ Others, such as the Secretary of the Coordinating Committee at the Polytechnic occupation, argued that the important feature in a movement is to 'eavesdrop the people's historical consciousness'.**^ This image of themselves intervening in the process of History, a recurrent theme, was part of the conviction that there was an informal authorisation from Greek society, that they should lead the opposition on its behalf. As Kouloglou put it in a documentary 'the students carried on their shoulders the weight of the whole of Greek society',**^ acting as a pardon for six years of apathy.

**^ Audiovisual Archive of EDIA, interview taken on 2001.
**^ Luisa Passerini, 'Le mouvement de 1968 comme prise de parole et comme explosion de la subjectivité: le cas de Turin' in Le mouvement social, 143, April-June 1988, pp. 39-74. Cohn Bendit himself commented several years later that 'in May '68 we were in a certain way the engines of History, instead of suffering from it, we were making it.', in Nous l'avons tant aimée, la révolution, Paris 1986, Greek edition 1989, p. 66.
**^ Olympos Dafermos, 'Η δεκαετία μου' [My decade], pp. 47-52 in Dimitris Papachristos (ed), 19+1..., op.cit., p. 49.
**^ Stelios Papas, 'Αντικατάσταση θέσων' [Juxtaposition of Opinions], pp. 244-248 in G. Gatos, Reportage..., op.cit., p. 246.
**^ In the television documentary The real 17N, NET 2003.
So, it is not a surprise that when the amnesty of '73 took place, many attributed it to the
students’ mobilisations. While on their way out of prison, some profane political
prisoners talked about a ‘people’s victory’, most of them clearly pointed at the students.
Two prominent members of Democratic Defence in Athens and Salonica respectively,
N. Konstandopoulos and S. Nestor, thanked ‘our youth who struggled to bring us out of
prison’ as it was ‘their victory’. A third member of the organisation, D.
Karagiorgas, an economics professor who lost two fingers by a bomb, concluded that
‘we owe everything to the youth and their struggles’.

Three Days that Shook Greece: The Polytechnic takeover

Moving on to the Polytechnic occupation, it has to be stressed that people have
difficulty distinguishing eyewitness testimony from hear-say. This event has been
memorialized and analysed in such a thorough way during the past thirty years that
biographical memory in individual testimonies often relies heavily on ex-post feedback.
Therefore, often the perspective shifts and interviewees tend rather to ‘see’ themselves
through the viewpoint of an observer rather than of a protagonist, most of the time
thus reproducing the public discourse and its hermeneutical schemata. As a great shock
creates the need for adequate circumstances, causes, and consequences, namely
‘adequate causation’, people tend to formulate ‘objectified’ conclusions based on
cognition about the nature of these three days and their signification, instead of
analysing their own individual experience. For Boeschoten and Rosenthal, moreover,
when present public discourse is the prevailing component of a life story this can also
be an indication of a particularly traumatized memory. Even conflated narratives and
anecdotal recollections constitute, nevertheless, powerful transmitters of emotions,
imagery or silences, all being of high interpretative value.

By early November 1973 almost all corporate student issues were satisfied by the
Markezinis administration, including the restoration of the deferral of military service
and the return of the conscripts. However, the thorny question of the student elections
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888 Thessaloniki, 22.8.73.
889 I Synecheia, 5, July ’73, p. 291.
890 Thessaloniki, 22.8.73.
891 For an elaboration of this issue see Elizabeth Tonkin, Narrating our Pasts ... op. cit., p. 87. Tonkin,
however, quotes Vancina as saying that in general one out of a hundred eyewitnesses is able to observe
the entirety of an event and later reconstruct it.
892 William F. Brewer, ‘What is recollective memory’ pp. 19-66, in David C. Rubin, Remembering Our
893 Alessandro Portelli, The Death of Luigi Trastulli..., op.cit., p. 15.
remained. The latter were postponed for February instead of being scheduled prior to Christmas, as the students insisted. As this issue was not solved at a meeting between student reps and the Minister of Education, Sifnaios, on Tuesday 13 November a new impasse was created. A report by the newspaper *Thessaloniki* the following day openly attributed the distinct student demands to their varied political affiliations. On the same day, the spontaneous occupation which occurred at first superceded the divisions between different student lines, but ended up, however, exacerbating them.

Despite the fact that the climate of general discontent was rising, there was no automatism in the emergence of collective protest. The occupation started only three days prior to the scheduled and eagerly awaited press-conference by Markezinis, in which he would delineate the strategy of his government, announce the election day and probably touch on the ‘student issue’. On 14 November a false alarm brought students who were already gathered at the Law School to rush to the Polytechnic in solidarity with their colleagues who were supposedly bullied by the police. 300 enraged students created a clamorous demonstration all the way through the central Solonos Street. Although, upon their arrival, they found out that there were no beatings and despite the police forces that tried to prevent them, the almost 2,000 people who found themselves gathered, spontaneously decided to enter the building. Damofli describes the scene and stresses the fact that there was a general feeling for something to ‘happen’:

We had a meeting at the Law School and some EKKE people came and said ‘in the Polytechnic there is hell breaking lose’. We stop the assembly and we go on foot to the Polytechnic where no hell was breaking loose. But some people were shouting at the gate bars and they were throwing some sour oranges and some other people inside who were holding assemblies were saying ‘hey guys, stop it, we’re having an assembly’. In any case, people started coming, because anyway, I’m telling you, the wish, the climate for such assemblies to take place existed. (Damofli)

The ensemble of students who accidentally found themselves in the Polytechnic, decided to boycott classes and occupy the building. This time the takeover took place not in an organized way, as in the Law School occupations, but in an entirely
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895 In the immediate period following the Polytechnic, the infamous issue nr 8 of A-EFEE’s paper *Panspoudastiki* appeared, dubbing these students as the ‘300 provocateurs of Roufogalis’, the notorious chief of the Secret Services (KYP).
spontaneous one. As Tarrow points out 'a few people who break away from the forms of collective action in unusual circumstances produce intensive mass movements at the peak of the protest waves'. The already tested measure of occupation, a highly symbolic performance, gave students the feeling of controlling the situation. Mantoglou quotes a testimony expressing the feeling of enthusiasm that characterized that move:

Then we went and locked the Stournara Street [gate]. This is where enthusiasm possessed us: OCCUPATION. When we were saying this, we really thought we had the POWER at this moment. [...] At that point we might have had some illusions, but with the enthusiasm of that moment, that we finally had our own space, we did not so much think of what was going to happen after that point.

The occupation took place, in a way by-passing the two main left-wing student organizations, and therefore there was no effective control of the direction that the occupation was taking, neither of the demands promoted by the students, at least during the first one and a half days. In reality the occupation was not within the scope of the leadership of the pro-Moscow Communists, which considered it to be 'an irresponsible and hasty move of an intense leftist character'. In fact, A-EFEE was from the very beginning diffident to the whole venture as it disliked non-organised action which could get out of hand. Although Xydi followed this line, she expresses a contrasting attitude at present by saying that 'it was a mature moment':

I wasn't sure, you know, about what we were going to do, I had far too many doubts, even a disagreement. Because I thought that it was too risky. From one point of view, yes, it was maturing, from another it was not organised. Not the least organised. And ... Of course I did not try to be an obstacle, from the very beginning I expressed my doubts and my disagreements openly, in the assemblies.

Rigas more or less shared this attitude, without however expressing a clear-cut position, as it was not ready for such an eventuality. *Katerina, still in Rigas at this time before
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896 Dafermos: 154 Dafermos stresses that it is certain that no organization or organized nucleus had foreseen or even considered such an eventuality, in contrast to the Law School occupations which had been decided in advance. However, his assertion that the Leftists did not acquire any considerable momentum and for that reason did not play any substantial role in the movement is contradicted by the evolution of the occupation.
897 S. Tarrow, Democracy and Disorder..., op. cit., p. 60.
passing over to KNE, argues that she was taken aback by the fact that an occupation could take place without a specific demand:

It went down well with the people, all of a sudden, and the idea that one could make an occupation, which is one of the advanced forms, and in fact without a specific student demand, a unionist one; this thought was shocking in the beginning. That an occupation could not take place vaguely, without any specific demand, you know our conscripted brothers had returned, the soldiers, which, eventually, would be a demand that would justify... So, beyond the surprise and the shock that this could happen even without a central student demand and from the moment that we realized that this was possible, I believe, I was back then in Rigas, which had fallen apart, I wasn't organized in KNE yet, there was no issue, everyone entered and stood on the first line, the dilemma didn't last long.

This demonstrates the pragmatic attitude of these students and the great distance from the largely imprecise, non-specific contestations that took place in other countries in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Sabatakakis underlines this issue very clearly in a condensed phrase:

There we have a contradictory fact, which is that the protagonists of an insurrection do not believe in its insurrectory character straight away.

In fact, in the Greek case the smaller groups of Leftists and even outsiders and marginal elements to the student movement, such as anarchists, led the way, by writing anti-government slogans on the walls and circulating leaflets containing anti-Junta messages. The Polytechnic gestalt was, in fact, marked by a constant rift between spontaneist Leftist frenzy and extreme Communist pragmatism.

In due time, the two main organizations tried to keep the situation under control by creating the first Coordination Committee of Occupation (CC) that lasted up to Thursday, exercising light control. Overall, however, as the Leftists were the ones who were from the beginning to the end supportive of the occupational practice, as it was a form of direct provocation, they had the lead in the entire endeavour during its early stages. Their declarational line supported an anti-imperialist social upheaval, with slogans such as ‘People’s Rule’, ‘People Make the Revolution’, ‘Workers-Farmers
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900 The Committee was comprised by six to seven A-EFEE members, two to three affiliates, one Rigas and one affiliated, a leftist and a member of PAK.
The existence of a few anarchists has been traditionally contested by all sides, being alternately over- or underplayed. It is almost certain that the anarchists’ role during the 1973 Polytechnic’s occupation was marginal but highly controversial. The anarchists were accused of a libidinal conception of politics which was harmful to the movement. A famous instance has one of their leading female figures, Aretoula, writing on the walls of the Polytechnic ‘long live the orgies!’ This was rejected as sheer provocation by all student groups and was effectively appropriated by the regime in order to smear the student movement as a pansexual party of nihilist and anarchist trouble-makers. Katsaros also records that a slogan written by female anarchists rejected the universal dominance of the phallus. In those instances anarchists were immediately pigeonholed as agent provocateurs. A member of Rigas and the Coordination Committee recalls this conflict:

the extreme and high-sounding slogans of the anarchists, such as ‘down with the state’, ‘sexual revolution’ etc were extinguished, and they in turn howled at us as ‘antiquated’.

In contrast, Lionarakis, another Rigas member, reacts to my assertion that the followers of the two Communist Parties were in search of provocateurs and argues that this was a trait of KNE, the rival organization:

This is what KNE tried to do. We were more reasonable. We were aware of the fact that not everyone was a provocateur.
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901 Christos Lazos, Thourios, 15.11.1975.  
904 In fact, the reports on the occupation showed by regime-controlled television focused exclusively on these statements in order to reveal the ‘anarchist’ character of the demonstrators, a major objective of the dictators. In his infamous ‘interrogation interview’ right after the Polytechnic uprising the well-known television producer Mastorakis exercised great pressure over the arrested students who agreed to participate in his documentary in order to make them agree with his main point that the uprising was anarchist and characterised by nihilist and destructive drives. However, even without the regime’s propaganda, people were often estranged by the radical tone of such slogans, a fact which indicates a societal unwillingness to support a type of contestatory behavior beyond certain limits.  
905 Stergios Katsaros, I the Provocateur..., op.cit., p. 219. In fact, Katsaros describes them as ‘militant lesbians’.  
906 S. Logothetis, ‘The occupation’, op. cit.
The anarchists were quick to write anti-establishment slogans such as ‘Down with the Authorities’, ‘Social Revolution’, ‘State- Repression’, ‘Down with Capital’, ‘Down with the Army’, ‘General Insurrection’, ‘Down with Salary Jobs’ and ‘Patriots are Morons’. Interestingly, they also spread pro-worker slogans such as ‘workers councils’ and ‘workers have no motherland’. The ‘hyper-revolutionary’ character of their slogans irritated the communist students. The latter’s attitude was partly dictated by the pragmatic estimate that this was a serious situation which could be hardly linked to the libertarianism of the French May. Accordingly, those who would surpass the common line would offer the Junta the advantage of accusing the students of being anarchists. These slogans were daring and probably too provocative for the calibre and aims of the movement, being too much ahead and much more extreme than the rest. Revolutionism, if any, had to be undercover and well-hidden, while non-political demands were still defended by some organizations. Great sensation was created when a vast anarchist placard reading ‘down with the State’ was put in the gate of the Polytechnic, creating great sensation and being indeed used later on by Junta’s propaganda.

Ballis and Konstantinidis, two leading anarchists, were not students, but rather underground intellectuals of Parisian - in fact Castoriadean - training. OSE leader Lygeros describes the activists close to KKE as treating these anarchists in a violent way. As their slogans were, in reality, closer to the radical left than to the anarchist tradition, leftist groups felt less hostile than the rest to this sort of radicalism. Lygeros sustains that the anarchists relied on him to defend them, thus implying a certain complicity:

These were intellectuals, they didn’t have any relation... They had come from abroad these people. I was protecting them. They were beating them up, KKE people got them and beat them up within the Polytechnic and they asked me for protection. (Lygeros)

---

907 Quoted by anarchist newspaper Allilegyi, 1, 15/11/83.
908 One of the few incidents in which drugs were stated as transgressive was when some anarchists wrote the slogan ‘Freedom and hash go hand in hand’.
909 The novelist Kostas Tachtsis recalls how shocked he was by gazing at similar slogans while passing by the Polytechnic during the first day of the occupation. Tachtsis too thought initially that the whole thing may have been staged as part of a provocation. [Kostas Tachtsis, 'Ἀπὸ τὴν χωμηλή προσωπική σχοινία: [From the low personal viewpoint], pp. 250-266 I Levi, 63-64, April-May 1987, p. 261].
910 In reality, however, agents-provocateurs were there and numerous, according to later evidence. Again external appearance became a means of recognition. A female student in Law, interviewed à chaud shortly after the return of democracy, stressed that ‘many people with short hair, who did not look like
Stergios Katsaros, a self-designated ‘professional revolutionary’ of the previous generation who was released from prison just before the events, presents a much more benign picture:

The slogans of the anarchists, such as ‘down with the state’, were not adopted by anyone. They sounded somewhat weird, as the anarchist movement had no tradition in Greece. However, no one moved against them, even if some Stalinists tried to. Their attempts were absorbed within the wider tolerance of people. [...] There was tolerance, respect, one could say, to anyone who participated in the events.911

All this time, the reaction of the regime remained surprisingly measured. Naturally, the General Secretariat of Press and Information denounced student mobilisations as a result of anarchy. Particularly castigated were the ‘far out’ political slogans, such as ‘power to the people’, ‘kato i exousia’, ‘down with the Army’ and ‘NATO out’:912

Groups of people gathered in the premises and in front of the National Metsoveio Polytechnic, mainly comprised by students streaming in from various Faculties, providing admittedly an improper spectacle, as they make noise and obstruct the movement of people and vehicles. None of the slogans which can be discerned from within this noise expresses a student demand, but they all without exception are of a political nature. This is normal, since with the governmental measures declared on 1 November 1973 all remaining logical student demands have been essentially satisfied.913

The declaration of the Junta stressed that the police also would restrain themselves from any involvement apart from making sure that no ‘peace-loving civilian’ was harmed. It further attributed the responsibility for the occupation not to student students entered the Polytechnic massively, equipped with student IDs, that my colleagues asked for at the gates” (Quoted in F. Kavvadias, Eδώ Πολυτεχνείο, Eδώ Πολυτεχνείο [This is Polytechnic speaking], Athens 1974). Similarly, the fact that several military policemen had long hair and beards on purpose and were often supplied with student IDs, made them less susceptible to recognition. Incitation to violence and vandalism, such as calls to burn down police stations, pick up guns or destroy the Polytechnic’s library, were also a means of uncovering the provocateurs. In addition, incitations to protect the ‘red proletariat’ and slogans that were exuberant in their attack of bourgeois values and in revolutionary fervour were dubbed as the act of provocateurs. Policemen were reported as having set fire to buses so as to attribute this to the demonstrators.

911 Stergios Katsaros, I the Provocateur..., op. cit., p. 219.
912 F. Kavvadias, This is Polytechnic speaking..., op.cit, p.107.
elements but to ‘other’ circles, thus alluding to the leaders of the old political parties and the exiled KKE.

The government is firm in insisting on these lines, as it has the certainty that the ensemble of the student world denounces the deeds that are attempted by irresponsible elements and that it does not wish anything other than the smooth continuation of its studies. It also has the certainty that the Greek people and public opinion see the aims pursued by the irresponsible individuals mentioned before and would attribute the responsibilities to those to whom they actually belong.  

However, the policemen who gathered outside the building never tried to break in, especially after the Dean of the Polytechnic denied the Police Chief the right to storm the building to ‘restore order’. This was interpreted by students as a weakness of the regime and acted as a factor that stimulated a particular framing of the existing conditions which enhanced mobilizational efforts. As McAdam notes, the ‘dramatization of system vulnerability’, that is highlighting the supposed weakness of one’s political opponents, is one of the main factors that set framing efforts in motion spurring the protest activity. Despite this subjective reading of the regime’s stance, however, the dictatorship was indeed experiencing a structural inner crisis, which was, however, not yet visible.  

As the occupation went on for a second consecutive day, even more people entered the Polytechnic. Meanwhile, the leaflets and slogans enabled the collective and individual expression of feelings and opinions on a massive scale. The central streets around the Polytechnic were jammed with traffic, which was exploited by the students in order to distribute leaflets and write slogans on trolleys and buses, calling everyone to come and demonstrate against the dictators. At a certain point, 10,000 people were gathered around the Polytechnic cheering and taking part in this sort of celebratory atmosphere. In fact, most of the testimonies describe this day as a ‘celebration’, blessed by a feeling of solidarity and participation. The individual got entirely absorbed by the collective, creating a huge ‘collective subject’ that constitutes one of the favourite loci  
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914 Kavadias: p. 90
915 While the second day of the occupation was already under way, the Senate decided that the university asylum should not be violated by the police, a decision that was respected by the Ministry of Education.
916 D. McAdam, ‘Cultural and Social…’, op. cit., p. 41.
917 O. Dafermos, Student and Dictatorship, p. 122.
of memory of this generation. Accordingly, the occupation is often described as an explosion in its protagonists’ lives.

The Polytechnic, moreover, also proved to be a test of the organisational efficiency of students. Apart from the influential radio-station, the students created patrols, a little first-aid compartment, a canteen and a general co-ordination of writing and distributing leaflets. However, contrary to what was taking place outside, inside the building things were heating up. Since all attempts to control and guide in one way or the other the occupational components, such as the committees for the duplicator, the radio station and the loudspeakers, were one-sided and undermined by the other groups, assemblies were organised Thursday night, supporting the creation of a robust coordinating structure. The clashes within the 31-membered Coordination Committee [CC] that was set up, revealed for the first time in such a stark manner the vast conceptual differences of the various organisations. Moreover, the struggle for a majority vote tested the power and ability of conviction of each organisation. Ariadni Alavanou, an ‘orthodox’ Communist at the time and member of the CC, recalls with bitterness the great hostility of leftists against her organization as a major memory in her occupation experience:

They were very hostile towards us. That is, while there was a big event going on, you know, in which these things should in some way, ... hostilities and differences between the parties should soften in a way in order to promote the event, these ones were very much against A-EFEE. This is what I remember.

This was, however, also due to the fact that the CC signalled the first direct intervention exercised by ‘revisionists’. The anarchical and leftist far-flung slogans were eradicated and from a particular point onwards all slogans had to be permitted by the Committee, while anarchists themselves ran the serious risk of being thrown out of the building. Xydi confesses that these practices were of an undemocratic character:

Probably we were doing certain things in a rather unorthodox way, namely we imposed them in some way. Especially after Thursday the control of emotions, what was being said from the radio-

918 Ibid: 161.
919 The fact that the CC was composed of two representatives of each Faculty with the right to one vote, testified to an overwhelming presence of A-EFEE and Rigas but also non-affiliated students, and an under-representation of the Leftists. These latter were strong in influence but did not manage to make their way into the students’ organisational structure. Dafermos attributes this to their organizational and political weak points, as they were not coordinated enough, and their flamboyant rhetoric was often castigated as unrealistic and somewhat grotesque.
station, what was coming out. Maybe from our side, which was the strongest one proportionally, some things were made by imposition, by force.

Mantoglou quotes an interviewee who argues for the correctness of this decision:

'Bread-Education-Freedom' was the right slogan. The slogans that did not express us were others, which might have slandered us, and I mean ‘Down with Capital’ and ‘Power to the People’, which are enthusiastic slogans and which expressed the left-wingers. Certainly, we should have anti-dictatorship, anti-imperialistic slogans then, and we tried to promote these ones. But I remember that slogans were written like ‘Sexual Freedom’, ‘Down with the State’... We snuffed out these slogans and we put in a patrol group. We managed to promote anti-imperialistic, anti-monopoly and anti-dictatorship slogans. In short, we could say that we put a patrol group at the gates. One could say that the first Coordinating Committee put some order. It put some order on the duplicators.  

In many ways, however, the anarchists’ voice expresses the provocative side of '68, against the ‘serious’ Greek student movement, whose earnestness resembled rather the student uprisings in third world and eastern bloc countries.

The slogans that were used from that point onwards were direct and succinct, memorable and ready to be copied and recounted, but deprived, however, of any anti-hierarchical connotations. The burlesque character of many of them, such as ‘we’re hungry, we’re gonna eat you’, ‘woe to the Notaries, the Pharisees, the hypocrites’ and ‘People do not want you, take the ape and go away’, referring to Markezinis’s physical repulsiveness, were a remarkable element that underlined spontaneity. Quoting Portelli’s description, slogans were ‘formalized, metrical, anonymous, collective, oral’
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920 Mantoglou, op.cit., p. 187
921 Interestingly, one of their leaders, Christos Konstantinidis, had published some of the major '68 texts (Cahier d'Etudes Antiautoritaires) in his publishing house called Diethnis Vivliothiki (International Library). In 1973 in a series entitled Pezodromio (Pavement, also meaning the ‘streets’), he published a text by 'Le Voyou', organe de provocation et d'affirmation communiste, which is typical for its anti-authoritarian character: 'the objective is not to get hold of power, but to destroy it'.
922 A list of the most popular demonstrates the diversity in sloganeering during the Polytechnic days: ‘People show us Solidarity’, ‘All people with us’, ‘Down with the Junta’, ‘People break the collar’. More radical ones were ‘Death to tyranny’, ‘People make a Revolution’, ‘Tonight it will be Thailand’. The classic ‘1-1-4’ and ‘the only leader is the sovereign people’ made their way in, as well as the already popular ‘Democracy’, ‘Freedom’, ‘Tonight Fascism is dying’, ‘ESA-SS, torturers’. Others shouted ‘Free elections’. In addition, some of the most-heard slogans were anti-American (‘USA out’, “Throw the 6th Fleet out’) and anti-Atlanticist (‘Nato out’, ‘Nato-Cia, traitors’), also to be found written on walls and at the Polytechnic’s main gate, expressing the certitude of students that the Americans were the major mainstays of the Junta and were therefore the Colonels’ accomplices, if not their bosses. See A. Mantoglou, The Polytechnic uprising..., op.cit., p. 191, O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op.cit., p. 165. Dafermos stresses the fact that there were no pure student demands included in the sloganeering.
items, acting as the equivalent of proverbs and popular tunes (stornello) in the province. Tzortzopoulou and Syriano stress that many slogans calling for solidarity had a weird climax, starting from ‘people, you’re starving, why do you bow to them?’, to the more radical ‘people, you’re starving, why don’t you hang’ em?’ ‘May ’68’, ‘Revolution now, now, now’, ‘Women Unite’, ‘The People are starving, Capital is chewing’ were some more out of the ordinary sound-bites. Interestingly, economic deprivation was stressed as the financial crisis and the devaluation of the currency had created an entirely different atmosphere than that of the relatively prosperous years of the late 1960s. Other slogans referring indignantly to Papadopoulos’s wife as ‘laundress’ received negative comments, as for example by Le Monde’s correspondent.

A-EFEE soon stopped insisting on the evacuation of the building and the projection of student demands, while Rigas proposed the creation of a ‘government of national unity’. This reflected a major problem concerning the objectives of the occupation. Was the real aim that of bringing down the Junta in favour of a return to the pre-1967 political situation, or was it rather to introduce something more radical? In short, to what extent was this movement aspiring to pass from protest to revolution? Whatever the answer to that question might be, the ‘workerism’ of the students, endowed and indoctrinated with a solid Marxist background which was part of their framing of events, was evident. It is no coincidence that beside the students’ representational structure, a workers committee was formed. This was mainly comprised by a bulk of building workers with strong left-wing credentials, even though workers’ trade-unionism had up to that point barely existed. Building workers, alongside the Megara farmers who happened to protest during the same days against the exploitation of their soil by a powerful industrialist, were the only ones who went out on strike. In its manifesto, the workers’ committee also asked for a general strike, in a more direct political manner than the students as it called for mixed student-workers

924 See Panos Kazakos, Ανάμεσα σε Κράτος και Αγορά. Οικονομία και οικονομική πολιτική στη μεταολισμική Ελλάδα, 1944-2000 [Inbetween the State and the Market. Economy and fiscal policies in post-war Greece, 1944-2001], Athens 2001, p. 287-288. Other slogans were ‘people combat, they’re sucking your blood’, ‘general insurrection’, ‘all people united’, ‘Junta will fall through the People’, ‘tonight fascism dies’, ‘tonight the skies will turn clear again’, ‘freedom is dawning’, ‘strike’, ‘popular sovereignty, people’s power’, ‘students and building workers all to the struggle’, ‘people to the streets’, ‘People, People, it’s now or never’, ‘if the tyrant won’t die, Greece will not breathe again’, ‘Power to the People’.
assemblies, rejected the cost-of-living index and praised the ‘working People’.

Giannis Felekis, a worker at the time and a member of the clandestine Trotskyite group *Spartacus*, remembers that the people repeated these slogans in a mimetic fashion:

The people snapped up the slogans straight away, no matter what bullshit we were saying, no matter how far out these were. Just like the dry cane gets on fire.

Bistis agrees with this viewpoint and adds in an ironic tone:

The ones who were getting politicized in those moments were willing to do everything you told them. To destroy the State and to become Thailand, the slogans exist, ‘tonight there will be Thailand’ and things like that.

Felekis further points out that in the assemblies the workers talked about a ‘Soviet Popular Democratic Workers-Farmers Government’ and things that could hardly be realized. So, in a way, a part of the barricaded group was progressively losing touch with the situation on the ground. The worker committees were mainly filled by the Leftists, who had a certain fixation with the term. Of course, there were many who saw in the apogee of the students’ feeling of being the avant-garde of the nation a danger of neglecting the rest of the society. Pappas, the Secretary of the Coordinating Committee, indicates the limits of revolt, which aspired to be national and radical at the same time:

When everyone is singing the national Anthem, swinging Greek flags, you cannot be waving the sickle and hammer.

Nonetheless, this event seemed a first class opportunity to materialise the ideological fantasies of this limited number of people and the concept of a ‘people’s democracy’ after the popular overthrow of the Junta was quite widely diffused. Hirschman’s comment about human incapacity to imagine different scales of social transformation and the tendency to aspire to ‘total’, rather than modest, changes in times of crisis is
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927 S. Papas, ‘Juxtaposition of Opinions’, op.cit., p. 246. Another CC member, Chatzisokratis, indicates that the very fact that leftist intransigence was ‘defeated’ by the more unitary elements in the occupation accounts for the occupation being made into a national event, instead of a marginal one. Dimitris Chatzisokratis, *Πολυτεχνείο ’73. Αναστοχασμός μιας πραγματικότητας* [Polytechnic ’73, Rethinking about a reality], Athens 2004.
fitting, and was reinforced by Marxist messianism. At this juncture, when anything seemed possible, the perception of time itself was altered. As the waiting had come to an end, an immediate future seemed urgently close. The experience of collective liberation and the fusional communion, which brings along 'the expansion of Eros', in Alberoni's words, is a source of the unanimous group exaltation and the individual surpassing of the self; hence the feeling of becoming a serious actor in History and the conviction that 'everything is possible'. As Portelli notes, apart from 'objective' events, the really important facts for interviewees are in reality those which took place inside their heads. Leftist leader Mavrogenis recalls that his sense was that 'this is what revolution must be like'. Another element which is often stressed about these three days is the density and the condensed nature of experiences in relation to time.

Vernikos writes

Under the increased danger and the tense situations in a very little time you came to know the inner self of people, which in normal conditions takes years to discover. Fear, cowardice, bravery, sorrow for the wretchedness and other human capacities coexisted side by side, and were easily coming to the surface.

Kanellakis writes similarly concerning the potential emerging from periods that involve great risks:

Some times I wonder whether there is some kind of natural determinism, according to which danger is a precondition for joy and delight.

From a certain point onwards, the main tone was set by the radio station, which was created ad hoc and which was broadcast with ever greater frequency as the occupation continued. While, in the beginning no control was exercised over the station, after the creation of the CC it too came under central direction. Its main line was one that maintained that the revolt was a blow against tyranny, with underlying
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930 A.Portelli, 'Intervistare il Movimento... ', op.cit., p. 131.

931 V. Angelis & O. Dafermos, *It was only a dream...,* op.cit., p. 177.


933 Panagiotis Kanellakis, 'Το καιρό εκείνο [In those years], in G.A.Vernikos, *When we wanted...*, op. cit., p. 49.
statements concerning popular freedom, national sovereignty, exit from NATO and above all the opposition to foreign monopolies, ‘imperialist coalitions’ and their domestic props. However, and apart from this rhetoric, the main message that was diffused was that the students barricaded themselves inside the Polytechnic building, calling for the people to revolt. Theodorakis’s records were played throughout the three days of the occupation by the radio-station and heard by the loudspeakers outside the Polytechnic gate. Radio proved to be the largest means of propaganda in the hands of students and also the major means of information dissemination. The radio station of the Polytechnic fully exercised its power of turning individualism into collectivism and of involving people intimately.

Dimitris Papachristos, one of the four main radio station announcers emphatically argued that through the broadcasting ‘the poetic exaltation of an entire people found its expression’, while ‘discourse re-discovered its meaning.’ Another announcer, Tonia Moropoulou, remembers the initial embarrassment of the ‘cold announcement of dreams’, including the proposed modernisation and solutions to the economic problems that would supposedly take place after the creation of a social democracy, all of which were propagated by the radio. The station also resisted American domination and called for national independence. When, on Thursday evening, more people came down to the streets the discourse became more ‘talkative’. The third announcer, Papadimitrakis, recalls that as time went by expression became ‘more political, freer, more human’.

Interestingly, what went on within the building was in stark contrast to what was taking place outside of it, where spontaneous demonstrations and enthusiasm ruled the way. While the collective come-together was reaching real heights, the slogan ‘People-people, it’s now or never’ encapsulated the conviction that this was a once and
The one who had been tortured and humiliated in the den of the Police [...] was raising the fist to his torturers shouting 'Tonight Fascism Dies'. The 'good Mr Vasilis' who sat down prudently for six years, with a little car or some prison-flat as a reward, tried to smother the guilty feelings for his subordination by showing the greatest intransigence in the clashes with the police. The one who was passing by just in order to satisfy his curiosity, was overtaken by the grandiose spectacle of the liberation of the masses and participated in the demonstrations. The worker, who for years felt inside his skin the alienation, the suppression and the barbarous exploitation was awaking from a lethargy and united his voice with the extremist provocateur: 'Down with Capital'.

The occupation of the Polytechnic, located in the centre of Athens, underlines the importance of performing acts not only in campus yards but also in public stages. Despite the courageous and enthusiastic following that the movement received at the beginning of the occupation, the popular response was not colossal. Contemporary reports talk about 100,000 on Friday morning and 50,000 by 7 o'clock Friday evening. The daily To Vima and the Athens Polytechnic Principal Konofagos reported 20,000. Karystiani offers her own version, drawing an oppositional relation between students and people:
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942 I the Provocateur..., op. cit., p. 227.
943 Jery Wasserstrom, Student Protest..., op.cit., p. 23.
944 F. Kavvadas, This is Polytechnic speaking..., op.cit, p. 56.
945 To Vima quoted by K. Konofagos, The Polytechnic Uprising..., op.cit, p. 51.
Certainly, when I was inside the Polytechnic then, the last day, I had already inside me the impression that the Athenian people did not make their way down in solidarity. And I thought that nor have the parents come down, the ones who had come down there were few, there was a radio station which could mobilize the people, but there was fear. The people didn't make their way down, they got scared. And perhaps this is how our full-of-guilt mass participation in the marches later on can be explained, one million, one and half million, full of guilt, but that night there were very few people out there... Because the course of events could have been entirely different if 100,000 persons had made their way down, 200,000, it could have been different.

The novelist and then activist Maro Douka utters a similar thought:

It occurred to me that if all the apartment blocks in the neighbouring streets were to throw open their doors and windows, if all the rooms and balconies were suddenly to be illuminated, then we could not be massacred this night. And I knew that whatever was to happen here tonight, would happen with the complicity of the apartment blocks - of the silent majority. And what Franz Fanon says about cowards and traitors, could be applied with perfect truth here. I wondered what they could be doing in these flats. Surely not sleeping?  

In any case, by extending beyond the strictly student nature of their demands, students for the first time made it blatantly clear that university issues could not be separated from society as a whole. Through their slogans and repeated appeals they sought for an interlocutor beyond the Junta and the university authorities and expanded, in this way, their social basis. This was a crucial transition for the movement, as its mobilization processes passed from pure student protest over to a wider social conflict. As with most major student movements, the Greek also was ‘triggered by incidents with broader political implications, and struggles that began as conflicts over internal matters’ and in the end escalated into a protest that ‘involved social issues and social groups far beyond the walls of individual campuses’. Furthermore, and for that reason, the Polytechnic was the first and only moment of genuine osmosis between different generations within the movement.

As far as the private sides of a public event are concerned, Lionarakis comments that some of the parents who were standing at the Polytechnic gates ‘were outside not out of support but out of concern for their kids’. Leftist leader Mavrogenis describes
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947 J. Wasserstrom, Student Protest..., op.cit., p. 23.
how the presence of his mother, who had greatly suffered during his detention at the
Security Police Headquarters, reversed his mood concerning the revolt:

My mom had come in order to take me out of there, she had experienced the whole story with
EAT and she had come to pick me up. [...] She lay down there on the steps and remained until the
evening participating and listening to slogans, she was a young woman, together with other
women over there. At a certain point they brought her up to the CC and I saw her, she told me ‘I
know that you’re not going to come’. She wanted to put pressure on me and take me out of there.
‘I know, but try to get out of there, so that they won’t bring you home dead’, and she left. This
thing influenced me.\footnote{A. Portelli, ‘Intervistare il Movimento...’, op.cit, p. 130.}

The affectionate family image that is conveyed by the interaction between Mavrogenis
and his mother creates an interesting contrast to his self-identification as an intransigent
revolutionary and re-positions the student militants of the period into their real
dimension, that is, of being 20 year-old adolescents in a traditional family-based
society. Portelli comments on the Italian case and the fact that such dramatic socio­
political happenings were happening parallel to the gradual, osmotic biological changes
inside these adolescents’ life cycle, which created an explosive blend that it is often
difficult to analyze or narrate.\footnote{Audiovisual archive of EDIA.}
The theme of worried parents is a common one.

Kleopatra Papageorgiou remembers her father too:

We had met in fact after my arrest, the next day, the one after, and he told me ‘why do you get
involved? Haven’t I told you to protect yourself so that you get your degree and then you can do
whatever you like?’, and I told him ‘but no, it’s now that it’s needed’.

As this event took place shortly before her father died, Papageorgiou’s bereavement
turned to an even greater determination to fight against the Junta, as she associated it
with her father’s death:

I even told them once; I told them ‘you put my father away, what else you think you can do to
me?’

Xydi recalls with emotion her parents’ dignity when they came to visit her in ESA and
her father’s comprehending stance concerning her long-lasting absence from home:
And I remember afterwards when I got out of ESA, after some one and a half months without any
communication with them all this time and they didn’t even know that I was coming home, when I
went home everything was so normal, that is, I knocked the door, my father opened up and I went
in and he hugged me and said: ‘Come in my child’. *Ela vre paidi mou...*

Sabatakakis recalls with emotion the fact that his father drove him back to the
Polytechnic shortly before the tanks arrived, knowing that the regime would eventually
violently suppress the movement.

What remains in me is the fact that in that moment my father knew that I returned to a place which
would be shortly invaded by means of arms and therefore it’s a matter of living or dying and he
didn’t tell me don’t go. Whereas I, for instance, would have said to my kid ‘don’t go’.

In contrast to that, Dafermos recalls his mother as being entirely incomprehensive and
preaching in favour of the benefits of a pro-regime stance:

My mother, well, she was crying, she was screaming, at times they caught me, they released me, I
was running, hiding, leaving, well, she didn’t understand, she was saying ‘the smart ones now are
with the regime, what did you do?’ She didn’t exercise any influence though, alright.

Left-wingers were often more anguished about their children’s political endeavours. In
her fictional representation of the student movement Maro Douka too confronts the
tense relationship of her female protagonist to her father, who in the end succumbs to
his daughter’s will. Her heroine recognises as a major parental legacy that her father
taught her verses by Solomos, marking a recurrent evocation of the romantic
revolutionary past:

I thought of my father - yesterday he’d come to look for me, I’d been much moved when he’d
taken me unexpectedly in his arms, quoting in broken tones, *my eyes have beheld no land more
glorious than this small battle ground*, and kissed my hair and the realisation came to me once and
for all that no matter how much or how wrongly I might judge this man, he was after all my father,
and thank you, I said to him softly, for getting me to read Solomos and the *Free Besieged*. He
begged me earnestly to take care of myself, the news was not encouraging, but he hadn’t the right
to hold me back, only he begged me to be careful, and he kissed me.950
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However, Lionarakis’s statement hints not only at parental concern for the physical safety of their children, but at a general distress - especially concerning females. What had happened briefly and on a smaller scale at the Law school occupation was repeated now on a massive level: women students of eighteen and nineteen years old stayed out of the house all day long and spent the night with their colleagues. The intensification of experience extended from daytime to night-life. Naturally, the intimate aspects of the Polytechnic were self-censored at the time in order to avoid offering the Junta more arguments about the ‘anarchist and pan-sexual’ character of the occupation, but also due to the fact that, officially at least, sexual emancipation was not one of the movement’s priorities. However, the hidden side is more visible in later recollections that expose the inevitable change that militancy and the day and night symbiosis had on people’s private lives. Papachristos, the flamboyant announcer during the last hours of the occupation, remembers:

The other side of politics that existed behind the bars happened in many ways. The three to four thousand people who found themselves barricaded awakened and realised another reality in front of the danger. The danger and the fear of the conflict and death were creating an eroticism, an atmosphere of love and co-existence. This was expressed by eating all together, singing all together. Even relationships were created in there. This eroticism was overflowing in everyone’s face, in men and women.\textsuperscript{951}

Lygeros, talks about the ‘orgasm of the feast’ of the Polytechnic, an ‘element which is often neglected by political analysis’, \textsuperscript{952} while Lionarakis also argues that an enhanced sexual coming-together occurred during these days, aided by symbiosis and the intensity of the moments. Still, Kleopatra Papageorgiou polemically sustains that the ‘sexual revolution’ was a myth and takes a very critical stance on this story, even if her own experience is that of the Salonica occupation:

\begin{quote}
You see that Rallis had said too that inside the Polytechnic they had orgies. How stupid was that. Where? I wish this had happened. It didn’t. These were things they got out of their heads. Maybe they had heard that they were happening abroad, but here they didn’t. (Papageorgiou)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{951} V. Angelis & O. Dafermos (eds), \textit{It was only a dream...}, op.cit., p. 188.

\textsuperscript{952} Stavros Lygeros, ‘Η συγκροτία’[The conjuncture], pp. 202-206, in G.Gatos, cit., p. 204
At the opposite end of the spectrum, Darveris convincingly conveys the atmosphere created among conservative circles and the Army, by presenting the repressed officers and soldiers as being enraged by the 'pansexual' nature of the occupation:

"Don't you know what the students were doing all those days at the Polytechnic? I'll tell you what they were doing. They were fucking. When the storm-troopers came in they found condoms in piles."\(^{953}\)

Petros Efthymiou makes fun of this conviction, very widely diffused at the time, by turning it upside down and arguing that the occupation was naturally accompanied by sexual encounters, but that the use of condoms in the pre-HIV era was limited.\(^{954}\) Still, in the pre-contraception era in Greece, Efthymiou's assertion looks equally spurious.

Friday morning was marked by the embrace of the student venture by some illustrious exponents of the political world.\(^{955}\) This was, furthermore, the moment when A-EFEE decided to walk out of the building, as their 'instruction' suggested that a further occupational strategy would only harm the aims of the movement. But they left only to come back some hours later upon the realization that the dynamics of the occupation could not be controlled. This is why the third day inside the Polytechnic was crucial, as the students entirely surpassed the organizations' lines, even though the slogans and the radio announcements were by that point fully controlled by the CC.

However, the CC continued to suffer greatly from the so-called 'line struggle'. The declaration it issued manifested the difficult task of its members to find a common ground and a compromise in the formulation of their demands and positions. Chatzisokratis, himself a member of the Committee, laments this 'political self-limitation' due to the fragile climate at the assemblies.\(^{956}\) Maro Douka offers a quite powerful literal representation of the whole situation:

---

\(^{953}\) T. Darveris, *A Night’s Story*..., op. cit., p. 334. Maro Douka also describes scenes of policemen and soldiers who upon their entrance to the Polytechnic insulted the female students: 'Whores, been enjoying yourselves have you, all that time in the whorehouse?', *Fool’s Gold*, op.cit., p. 268.

\(^{954}\) P. Efthymiou, ‘The echo in Greece…’, op. cit.

\(^{955}\) A statement was published which had been made by three of the most prominent politicians of the Center Union and ERE, Mavros, Zigdis and Kanellopoulos, in which they supported the Polytechnic uprising. Andreas Papandreou made similar statements from abroad.

\(^{956}\) D. Chatzisokratis, ‘The coordinating…’, op. cit.
The invisible hand of the Coordination Committee was everywhere - come on now, cut out the Velouchiotis stuff, come on you bloody anarchist, leftist, provocateur, bomber, petty bourgeois extremist, and all the rest of the shit.\(^{957}\)

The CC’s statement made it clear that the movement’s aim was the overthrow of the regime, within the framework of a national struggle.\(^{958}\) It is interesting that, apart from this vague formulation, the manifesto makes no mention of the condition that it envisaged after the fall of the ‘tyrannical Junta’, nor does it place itself within a wider political milieu that would include other political forces too. It calls on the people to support the ongoing revolt with all their means, mainly by going out on strike, and stresses the necessity of being detached from the so-called ‘foreign factor’, which it held responsible for all odds including the mastermind of the coup. The manifesto initially contained an appeal for the creation of a ‘government of national unity’, which was in the end rejected due to the intransigent stance of the Leftists, who threatened a walkout as they considered any mention of the so-called ‘bourgeois politicians’ to be totally out of tune with the subversive character of the revolt.\(^{959}\) Accordingly, the manifesto, announced by the CC at its first and only press conference on Friday afternoon, was only approved when a part calling all anti-dictatorship forces and the old politicians to show solidarity was cut. The call for ‘national independence and popular sovereignty’ remained intact and was repeated by the radio station.\(^{960}\)

Friday was also the serious turning point that transformed the occupational experience into a massacre. As it was the third consecutive day without police intervention, in one of the major paradoxes in recent Greek political history,\(^{961}\) people

\(^{957}\) Maro Douka, op. cit., 1991, p. 264. Even though I am using Beaton’s translation here, I chose to add some of the elements that he deliberately left out of the text for reasons of simplicity, for instance the reference to Aris Velouchiotis, which I consider to be important.

\(^{958}\) O. Dafermos, Students and Dictatorship..., op. cit., p. 166.

\(^{959}\) Ibid, p. 168.


\(^{961}\) In fact, it is still not known whether Papadopoulos allowed the Polytechnic to happen because he wanted to have a tangible reason to return to authoritarianism and satisfy the hard-liners [see, for instance, Nikos Kakoumakis, 2650 Μέρες και Νύχτες Σχεδίων (2,650 Days and Nights of Plotting), Athens 1976, pp. 5-10] or whether he fell prey to the plans of the latter who by refraining from intervening influenced the course of events and weakened the ‘President’ before deposing him altogether. For others, like Tzortzis, however, the non-interference by the police is a clear indication of the fact that Papadopoulos’s liberalization was sincere.
started to believe that this would be the event that would bring down the regime. In fact, Papadopulos did not order a violent dissolution of the occupation by this point as, to paraphrase Dahl’s axiom, the costs of suppression seemed to exceed the costs of toleration. Accordingly, as the occupation proceeded, people had the growing sensation that they were changing things and were sensing History in the making, with the latter being framed as a collective process that takes on the sense of an advent.

Karystiani presents this as an instant of pure transcendence:

In such elevated moments all people make crazy scenarios. And because those are moments of elation one tends to think of the better scenarios, the most... [...] I think I saw it everywhere, everyone was determined, no matter how mad this seems to you, it was transcendence, from one point onwards this makes you have no touch with reality and put all the ‘whys’ and the ‘because’ and the questions one must ask. In transcendence, how can I put it, one takes off, we had taken off, this did not touch us any longer... Without knowing consciously that History was being written at this moment.

According to Dafermos, the wide-spread feeling was that this was a unique chance that would not be repeated as it was expressed by the slogan ‘People, it’s now or never’.

People were heated up, excited, saying ‘the hell with it, I cannot stand it anymore, here, there are so many of us, now we’re going to screw them’.

Contrary to this view, Angeliki Xydi recalls having an awkward feeling of precariousness due to the lack of clear direction, which was in contrast to the ‘heroic’ mood of the previous days:

On Friday I started asking myself where this entire thing was leading to... and I couldn’t give a reply either ... and there was no one there to enlighten us... In contrast to that, on Thursday night I was very enthusiastic because I went out to the Patision Street and I saw that there were... I don’t know if there were thousands of people, they must have been thousands, because I saw Patision Street up to Patisia, up to its end full of people. And all these people were shouting ‘tonight Fascism is dying’... and yes, I was very enthusiastic. But on Friday in the morning I had a ... not exactly fear, but a freezing sentiment. That I don’t know anymore what I’m doing here and no one does. [...] From Friday onwards I think that there was a generalized perplexity. Up to

---

962 This conviction was shared by segments of the ruling minority. According to the state documents there was indeed a growing apprehension in some Junta circles that if the occupation continued things would get out of control and this would undermine the foundations of the regime.
that it was, say, heroic. You know, we were organizing life, the crews which were writing the pamphlets, the CC, the radio station, all of this. There was an excitement of everything, of the emotions, of the sensations, of all situations. I think that on Friday this thing started becoming perplexed and more difficult and, in the end, we had to organize pharmacies and surgeries. And it was getting into another track, entirely different. And when it finished and we got out of there, I think that the climate was unpleasant.

At the same time, inside the building, the Coordinating Committee was still facing a tragic dilemma without managing to reach consensus: to proceed to a 'victorious' withdrawal without victims or to go on with the occupation on Saturday in order to 'have the place put on fire'? However, as the first option was becoming increasingly unrealistic the occupation started to steadily lose a coherent vision and became a series of emotional moments, with no articulate philosophy, risking a devastating assault by the governmental forces. In parallel to this, fever-pitch demonstrations started taking place in the centre of Athens, focusing on the Ministry of Employment and Attica's Municipality. These government buildings were surrounded and attacked, while all central roads were filled with barricades. Vanos, a student from Salónica who went to Athens in order to participate in the events, makes contradictory statements about this last day of the occupation, as initially he describes it as 'the most beautiful day of my life', but ends up calling the evening's clashes 'the saddest demonstration I have ever been to'. The duality of his testimony to a large extent reflects the biographical tension between exaltation and trauma, but also the transition of the Polytechnic itself from a celebratory process to a massacre.

The orders given by Police Headquarters were false and misleading in as far as the events were concerned, reporting a thousand demonstrators using weapons and cocktail bombs, policemen being killed by enraged workers and crowds isolating a phalanx of armed vehicles. Capitalizing on this misinformation, Undersecretary of Public Order Zournatzis argued that

---

966 As AASPE put it after the Polytechnic: 'The people rushed in order to occupy public buildings, symbols of bourgeois state violence and oppression.' In Two Years of Struggles..., op.cit.
967 Various testimonies in the Polytechnic trial as recorded by Spyros Karatzaferis, Η σφαγή του Πολυτεχνείου. Η Δίκη [The Polytechnic slaughter. The Trial], with a preface by P. Kanellopoulos, Athens 1975.
if today there are violent clashes between protesters and policemen, who try not to use violent means, then the one who embodies the real revolutionary spirit should be the Police and not the protesters.\textsuperscript{968}

His point strongly resembles Pier Paolo Pasolini's anathema of the Valle Gulia ‘battle’ in Rome (March 1968), when, after these violent clashes between students and policemen, the Italian intellectual sympathized with the latter, for being the ‘real’ proletarians.\textsuperscript{969} When some major political figures, such as the right-wing intellectual Kanellopoulos, the last Prime Minister before the Junta, passed by the Polytechnic, Zournatzis expressed his surprise that respected figures came to support an entirely ‘anarchical’ movement, as was the favourite phrase of the authorities. This was a conscious attempt to evoke memories of ‘anarchy’, as the years prior to 1967 were frequently referred to, due to the constant social turmoil. He did not miss the chance, moreover, to draw parallels with December 1944, when the British troops got involved in a bloody conflict with the Greek Communist guerrillas over the control of Athens, leaving dozens of dead behind and a ravaged capital and marking the official start of long-term civil strife.\textsuperscript{970} The so-called ‘December events’ marked a climax in the ongoing civil strife and left a dark legacy of particular cruelty and a considerable number of civilian victims on both sides; the conscious interpellation of these memories by the authorities aimed at creating alarming associations. In previous times, the so-called ‘red December’ had been paralleled in rightist propaganda with the popular unrest of July 1965.

Eventually, however, the regime dropped its passive stance and opted for measures of extreme terrorisation. After tear gas canisters were thrown into the crowd, snipers were placed at the top of buildings surrounding the Polytechnic, and started shooting on protesters shortly before midnight. The students initially thought that the bullets were plastic, whereas later on rumours were spread that they were dum-dum, as people who got hit bore unnaturally severe wounds. Interestingly, this was the only time in the entire seven years of the dictatorship in which the regime resorted to such an amount of violence and actually caused bloodshed. In response to my question on which were the strongest memories that he preserved from the Polytechnic occupation,

\textsuperscript{968} 'Κανελλόπουλος, Μαυρός, Κ.Κ.Ε. και Ανδρέας Παπανδρέου συμπαράσταται εις τους αναρχικούς' [Kanellopoulos, Mavros, K.K.E. and Andreas Papandreou show solidarity to the anarchists], \textit{Eleftheros Kosmos}, 17/11/73.

\textsuperscript{969} See P.P.Pasolini, \textit{Il Caos...}, op.cit.

\textsuperscript{970} \textit{Ibid.}
Kourmoulakis, himself a member of the CC, made a reference to the Akropol snipers, alongside his detention. The radio announcers insisted that ‘we are unarmed’ while the slogan of the day became ‘no more blood’. Katerina remembers that:

In the School of Architecture they were pulling out the desks from the drawing tables and were making stretchers for the wounded.

Over-riding fear is one of the standard points of reference in testimonies. Karystiani draws an oppositional picture between the ‘people’ being scared and the students being in a fearless state while Sabatakakis’s words, echoing a popular film of the post-Junta period, creates a powerful imagery:

I’m telling you, there were 5,000 kids at the Polytechnic and they were all ready to die. No one was afraid, there were tanks all around, if one only thinks of that moment, that there were tanks all around, it was dark, bullets were flying, some kids were already killed, in the medical office they were bringing people, I remember they brought one whose leg was hanging from a slight piece of flesh, I saw killed ones, I saw... and no one at that moment went away in order to save his skull. (Karystiani)

The bullets were falling like haze, they were running next to our heads and we didn’t know if we would die any second. (Sabatakakis)

As several people got killed or wounded things started getting out of hand. Damofli emphasises the presence and massacre of pupils as the strongest and most poignant memory that springs into her mind. Karystiani also refers to the pupils, as several of the officially recognised Polytechnic dead were school children.

The presence of pupils and their action during the Polytechnic occupation was something sensational, I’ll never forget it. (Damofli)

The kids were a bit further out, they were playing truant from their moms and the frontistiria in order to come over there, it was easier and more barbarous to look at a child and shoot at it... (Karystiani)

---

971 As tear gas was thrown from the Polytechnic up to Omonoia and Syntagma Squares and people lit fires in order to confront it, the radio station gave instructions on how to deal with the fumes. It also asked for help from the Red Cross for the wounded.
Katerina argues that some years earlier many of these same kids were jumping into the Omonoia fountain to celebrate Panathinaikos’s entry into the final of the European Cup at Wembley. In her view, most of them used to be a-political youth who were involved in different everyday activities from the politicized students. She makes an interesting speculation about a radical change taking place inside them, transforming many of these ‘motorcycle-freaks’ to political activists:

They were busy with mopeds; they were making them, dissolving them, motorcycle freaks, in Kypseli, precisely. And whereas before they used to have in the garages posters with motorcycles and women they tore them apart and made wallpaper out of hand-written slogans, ‘down with the Junta of Papadopoulos’ etc. That is, in a few days all those, all this myth about the youth which was disorientated, football-friendly and this and that, collapsed. And I think that this means that none should underestimate the young people in all times, not just inside the Polytechnic. These kids knew nothing about Marcuse, Koligiannis or Zachariadis, which we thought very important, they came immediately, they got the spirit. And with less hesitations than many of us who were discussing about the organised and the spontaneous and so on.

From a certain point onwards, armed vehicles started moving towards the Polytechnic area. Contrary to the Junta’s declaration that the students were armed with weapons and rifles, it was already decided by the CC that no cocktail bombs or any sort of weapons should be used against policemen. At a point when the occupation gestalt was suspended between expectation and desperation, the strategy of pacific protest was judged to be of paramount importance, marking a clear difference from its violent Thai prototype. Not everyone agreed with this line and this is to be seen also in later accounts. Katsaros, an exponent of the previous generation and a bomber himself, laments the fact that he did not go to the Polytechnic in order to render his solid theoretical knowledge of revolutionary insurrections and his practical possession of explosives to the service of the students. Like most of the people involved in the armed struggle, Katsaros was diffident of the mass movement’s dynamics and its obsessive rejection of the use of violence. This line of thought is imprinted in his autobiographical account through the voice of an anonymous comrade of his, who moreover reproaches them for serious distortions in their Marxist way of thinking:

972 Accordingly, despite the fact that the Polytechnic laboratories reportedly contained a lot of explosives that could be used against the tanks, the students did not make use of them.
973 Thai students had in fact made extensive use of cocktail bombs and even gun fire, after having raided several gunshops, against army attacks.
"These brats", he said, 'think of us elderly ones as cowards, but they themselves have nothing to do with the revolutionary left. They are disembarked, pretending to be revolutionaries. Their aim is to become leaders of the working class.'

Maro Douka also belongs to the previous generation and she too expresses her discontent through her fictional character, Myrsini, invoking the omnipresent shadow of the civil strife:

Out in the courtyard we were asking for petrol from the labs to make Molotov cocktails, we're like sitting ducks here under fire, and we haven't even sticks for kindling. But the committees said no, they wouldn't endorse such tactics, we weren't to start another civil war.

Douka adds sarcastically, referring to a standard phrase concerning the period of Ottoman rule and the servility of Orthodox religious zealots and implying that bravery is not necessarily a characteristic Greek feature:

Either way it was bound to end in violence. Morale among us was running high, we were on course of eternity - thy murderous hand, oh Pasha, sends me to Heaven straight, the chorus swelled, thy murderous hand, like an old rebetiko song of the city poor, Pasha oh Pasha send me to the Pearly Gate, in full cry, like a dithyramb, thy murderous hand, thy murderous hand.

The exact opposite of that is when Douka presents people as praising the barricaded students by shouting 'bravely done lads, well done you strugglers, like the heroes of 1821', arguing for a historical continuity in self-sacrifice. In a documentary of the 1980s, Lambros Papadimitrakis, one of the three radio announcers, also argues for a certain continuity, by paralleling the occupation to the recollections of students' parents from Nazi occupation:

They were reminiscent of the stories from the National Resistance, the ones that our fathers were telling us.

---

974 Stergios Katsaros, I the Provocateur..., op.cit., p. 223.
978 In the documentary of D. Iatropoulos There is Polytechnic speaking.
As utopian frames were conceived within the context of collective imaginary resources, the people's movement of the '40s is placed once again in an imaginary connecting lineage that was in later days verbally consolidated by the slogan 'EAM-ELAS, Polytechnic'. In this way, as Mazower points out, the wartime resistance against the Germans became an inescapable analogue to the campaign against the junta. Also national-religious symbols were promptly used and appropriated by the students. As had happened with the candles in the Law School occupation earlier on, this time most testimonies report that the church bells were ringing during the night of the tanks' raid. Certainly, this feature is connected in people's imaginary to a legendary song of the period by Theodorakis *The Bells will Ring*, in which Ritsos's verses announce a sort of apocalyptic revolutionary arrival, using a strongly Orthodox wording. In fact, Panos Geramanis maintains that at the very moment that 'the tanks broke into the grounds and attacked the people [...], Bithikotsis' voice was singing *Be silent, the bells will ring any moment now*... Michael Herzfeld's claim of a common imaginary connection of a national insurrection with an orthodox 'resurrection' in Greece is valid in this case.

Another symbol that was widely used was the Greek flag, which people were waving at the gate. The Polytechnic's Principal Konofagos recalls with an evident sense of pride that

*Over the Polytechnic gate at Patision Street the blue and white flag was waving. No other flag stood by its side. The blue and white flag remained the only symbol of the uprising for all four days. The Greek symbol of freedom.*

---


981 See M. Herzfeld, *Ours Once More..., op.cit.*, pp. 22-23. In fact, as the coup had taken place in late April, around the usual time of Orthodox Easter, the Colonels, throughout the Junta period, stressed the parallel between 'Revolution' and 'Resurrection'. In a similar way, anti-regime figures, like the old Papandreou shortly before his death, also played with those terms.

982 K. Konofagos, *The Polytechnic Uprising..., op.cit.*, p. 32. In a conversation among protagonists of the movement a year after the return of democracy, it was stated that the flag was placed as a counterweight to anarchism. See the special issue by *Eleftherotypia*, 23-29/11/77. This conversation was registered before the evidence to the Prosecutor Tsevas, prior to the Polytechnic trials, in V. Angelis & O. Dafermos (eds), *It was only a dream..., op.cit.*, p. 144. Interestingly, Thai students also waved the country's flag while protesting, as a sign of loyalty to the nation and its symbols. See Ruth-Inge Heinze, 'Ten Days in October...', *op.cit.*, p. 498.
The national anthem was yet another element reappropriated by students. Chatzisokratis’s description of a man on a stretcher, with his foot torn by a bullet, is illuminating:

His foot was hanging by a thread and he was singing the National Anthem and raising his arm, making the sign of victory. These are unrepeatable things. To be like this, with your blood flowing like a river, while you are watching it, raising your arm like that and singing the national anthem is a scene that I shall never forget. 983

As with tradition, rather than rejecting national symbols, students, and the Left in general, were defending an authentic form of Greekness and patriotism. The climax to this, was when after a number of tanks lined up, thus making it obvious that they were going to enter the Polytechnic, Papachristos, the last radio announcer, started to declaim the national anthem in its full version with pomp and emotion. Vanos sustains in his recollection that he was the only one to stay in his position when the armoured vehicle prepared to enter:

Everybody was on the floor. I said, what’s the difference between up and down, at least I will see what’s going to happen. The tank turned, I see the soldier, the soldier sees me, I was staring him, everybody down, I’m standing.

This is recorded as the most dramatic and traumatic moments of the Polytechnic thriller: the flashing of a huge searchlight over the barricaded ones, the brief moment of uncertainty, the hasty negotiation between two student reps and a General and the final entry. The CC had asked that the students evacuate the building at 6.30 in the morning, in the presence of the Red Cross and of representatives of Foreign Embassies, a probably unrealistic scenario that was rejected on the ground that ‘the Army does not negotiate’. Thanasis Gaifilias, a well-known musician of the time, was barricaded inside the Polytechnic and argues that most people laughed at what the General said, as he spoke with a heavy peasant accent. This tragic-comic story demonstrates the thin boundaries between tragedy and its flipside in moments of tension but it also underlines the sense of superiority young people felt towards the peasant and uncultivated militaries and their subordinates. 984 Long before the end of the ten minutes that were

983 V. Angelis & O. Dafermos (eds), It was only a dream..., op.cit., p. 178.
offered by the Army officers, the tank smashed the gate and the Dean’s limousine that was placed behind it and entered the Polytechnic. It was followed by the Marines who entered with their bayonets pointed at the students, while a large number of policemen waiting outside arrested over a thousand of those who were leaving the Polytechnic en masse. Policemen and gendarmes hit the demonstrators on the head with beams containing nails. An industrial School student testified in the trials, using the already mentioned filmic parameter:

What happened can only be seen in movies. They were hitting me with clubbs and with their feet on my head, on the stomach, wherever they could.

Lionarakis is one of the few who remembers a funny incident, a distinct element in his narrative strategy, typically placed in the most striking moments, including the Polytechnic, his arrests and detention period. He himself argues that he always does this in interviews and discussions since in the end these are the most interesting stories, whereas the rest is dull. Like Liakos’s espousal of Brancaleone as his alter ego, Lionarakis also adopts a ‘heroic-comic’ register in order to narrate dramatic events. Self-irony acts as a means of distancing oneself from the lived experience and looking at things from outside, with a certain detachment. Accordingly, the most vivid memory of the exit from the building evacuation that he recalls is when he grabbed the tins and money which had been collected for the barricaded students:

Endless food, endless tins, you know, and I left with some 500,000 thousand drachmas in my pockets, which was our money, the money that the people was giving us, you know. And I bagged several tins inside my coat and I had them in there.

His tone changes, however, as he recalls as utterly shocking the fact that when he found shelter in a basement upon his exit from the building, soldiers sang victory marches after their triumphant intervention:

---

983 Kavvadias cites a pro-government testimony that he collected: ‘If it were during the first days the policemen would not have harmed the students, they would not have beaten up the kids, they had nothing against them... But so many days, they got enraged as well, they were human too, they were out of themselves, they didn’t know what to do... It was a sudden chaos!’ [F. Kavvadias, This is Polytechnic speaking..., op.cit, pp.131-132].

986 Vassilis Papadias, Industrial School student, in S. Karatzaferis, The Polytechnic Slaughter..., op.cit., p.239.

After the evacuation operation, what was terrible was how the trucks were going away with the soldiers, who were singing in a style ‘we fucked them’, you know, by singing songs, which is very frightening, in the middle of the night to listen to such songs now, we didn’t know how many were killed, didn’t know anything at that point.

Although this is in accordance with other testimonies, a great number of people remember the soldiers as scared and sympathetic adolescents, who in fact helped them get out unharmed, in contrast to the enraged and vulgar policemen. During the students’ frantic search for a shelter, a striking issue that is often repeated is people’s aid, as many doors were opened in order to briefly accommodate those who were persecuted by the police. Damofli likens these moment to a western movie, in what Portelli would connect to the fact that this was the first generation to experience mass culture and television series of the kind:

And that night, what do you think, Athens was like a western, bam-boom, you know. And in this condition that man opened up his door and said ‘guys, come in’... Why did the rest of them not open up their doors? And he gave us blankets, there, they covered us, everything in the dark of course, right? Opposite the Polytechnic. It was, I don’t know, at least for me, I’m telling you, I felt this feeling of gratitude for many people, I’m telling you, I felt gratitude.

The Salonicean copycat

The student mobilizations of mid-November were not confined to Athens alone. The students of Patras also occupied the city’s university right after, while Ioannina and the Salonica students followed, mimicking, as was often the case, what took place in the capital’s universities. The most important of the three events was the one in Salonica, also due to the fact that there too the students set up a radio station. While during the previous days the students had gathered in order to protest for the expulsion of four of their colleagues, after the Athens occupation started they adopted a resolution in which they expressed their solidarity with their counterparts.

---

988 The testimony of Laliotis agrees with it, as quoted by S. Karatzafiris, *The Polytechnic Slaughter…*, op.cit., p. 298. Darveris, himself a soldier at the time, also comments that most soldiers felt a deep rage for the students.
990 The protest was against the committal and *in absentia* condemnation to a 3-month expulsion of four Architecture students by the disciplinary council.
991 The same resolution asked for a limited military service, more funds for education, free student elections, the abolition of undemocratic decrees concerning the students, and the abolition of the government commissioner’s post. See Chrysafis Iordanoglou’s comprehensive account on Salonica’s movement in ‘The anti-dictatorship student movement of Salonica…’, op.cit., p. 268.
It was not before Friday, however, that the Salonicean students decided to act, mainly due to great hesitation on the part of Rigas and mainly A-EFEE, who thought that the whole venture would backfire and would have a negative impact on the movement. Both Smyrnis and Papageorgiou remember that these organizations initially attempted to postpone the assembly until Monday, thus playing for time, in contrast to the Maoists who were in favour of direct action. Oikonomou, a Rigas member and one of the students who had been arrested in the past, acquiring a sort of symbolic status, explains why his organization was against this occupation, because it considered it to be ‘suicidal’:

We didn’t have the luxury of remaining out of it and of denouncing it. It would have been stupid on our side because we would dissolve the student movement, we would cause fragmentation. Surely, we realized how wrong the tactic was and where it leads to and whose game it plays. Naturally, we didn’t know Ioannidis then, who was an element of discordance inside [the Junta], but we knew that he played the game of the tough ones in the whole story. I remember, we had an assembly before entering the Polytechnic, the team in which I participated, the clandestine one, and the conclusion we arrived at was that we were going to ‘commit suicide’. (Oikonomou)

At this point, the Maoists took the issue into their hands and undertook the initiative for an occupation, ‘being closer to the feeling of the moment’. The spontaneous entry of more students led to a gathering of around 2,500 students inside the School of Architecture. Later on, a 14-member Coordinating Committee was set up, which soon declared that ‘today, the 16th of November, we students of Salonica have occupied the building of the Polytechnic in order to express our opposition to the Junta’. Smyrnis points out that he and several of his companions preferred to stay out of the CC in order to ‘better guide’ the occupation from outside. ‘If we had been inside, we wouldn’t have been lucid enough’.

Unlike in Athens, the slogans that were written were not filtered by any sort of scrutiny. These included typical incitements to an alliance with the workers (‘Workers and Farmers Unite’), which never materialized, and anti-American ones like in Athens (‘Americans out’, ‘NATO out’), but also quite direct anti-imperialist ones: ‘People, Strike the lackeys of the Colonizers!’ Other slogans referred to the mythical Greek people who were finally going to act (‘The People has awakened’ ‘Freedom is not donated, it is conquered’, ‘Long live People’s Power’), while a slogan anticipated the

---

992 Ibid.
arrival of the policemen and the pro-regime forces: ‘Informers, rub in order to expunge them [the slogans]’. In his account of the events, Iordanoglou, himself a member of the CC and a Rigas leader, expresses his bitterness at the fact that no control was allowed, nor was the possibility of a police raid discussed.

There are many who sincerely believe that they can overthrow the Junta here and now. Maybe the capitalist system too.993

Oikonomou shares this perception and castigates the extremist tendency that characterized the younger members of the movement as follows:

Until the evening everyone was inside, everyone, even the little kids who were saying for the first time that ‘we are going to fight against the Junta’, you know, who on the top were the most dangerous ones. Certainly as they were thinking that they were beginning the Civil War.

The statement that came out of the CC was that the takeover was an act in order ‘to express our antithesis to the Junta’.994 Here, as well, an ad hoc first aid centre point, a press room and a refectory were created.995 A radio-station was set up as well, though its frequency was much weaker than the one in Athens. In-between playing Theodorakis songs, the station denounced ‘Stayer’ and ‘Esso Papas’, two prominent representatives of local and foreign ‘capital’, as seeking to control university research through their funded programs. It further called for people’s solidarity, which was never expressed as it was in Athens. Tsaousidis, who alongside Thomas Vasileiadis was one of the ‘grandfathers’ in the movement, delineates the distance between past and present in calling the demands immature:

What we all say during the developments looks afterwards a bit stupid and immature. Alright. Namely, when we invited people to come and express solidarity with us we knew that they wouldn’t come. Of course in Athens people went out. Here they didn’t, also considering where we were. Yet another tragic mistake. How could people come over there? However, we showed our willingness to where we wanted this thing to go, we wanted popular participation. (Tsaousidis)

994 F. Kavvadias, This is Polytechnic speaking..., op.cit, p. 111.
995 Christos N. Zafeiris, ‘Μια παράνομη ανταπόκριση για το δικό μας Πολυτεχνείο’ [A clandestine correspondence about our own Polytechnic], in C.N. Zafeiris, The memory of the city..., op.cit., p. 28.
It was often argued at the time but also today that the radio station in Salonica was often extreme in the articulation of the demands, something not very surprising as Kleopatra Papageorgiou, who was the main speaker at the station, was a radical. Vanos argues that at the time no one expressed reservations to those who had the guts to act:

> Whoever had the guts took the microphone at the Polytechnic and this is what made up the radio station, period. No one has ever doubted this. That when she said 'I am going to do it'... They knew Kleopatra, she was a pretty dynamic woman, she took the microphone and made a mess. (Vanos)

The texts that were announced were not approved by the CC and by and large the speakers broadcasted all texts that they were given. Papageorgiou recalls:

> We were saying everything, there was no censorship in our station, there was much freedom. You know what we were saying, all being Communists. Of course in the station we didn't say for example 'Down with capitalism' and stuff like that. We were saying more anti-Junta and anti-imperialist things.

Despite the fact that she boasts about the fact that everything was announced, Papageorgiou confesses a sort of self-censorship in order to reach a wider consensus:

> Well, OK, these slogans were a bit in confinement because we wanted to preserve the mass form, not to chase away the more conservative ones, there were many of them inside, not at that moment to even clash with A-EFEE for example, which was entirely contrary. These had entered and were throwing leaflets saying 'get out of here, these are provocations', 'who brought you together?'; 'you are playing the game of reaction with this action', say, this kind of crap. We didn't want to clash with them, by saying overly extreme slogans on the station, we tried to express all streams in order to keep them inside too. (Papageorgiou)

Here too, therefore, the sloganeering was conditioned by the specific affiliation. She further notes that

> Back then, we were distinguished from each other by subtle nuances. If, for example, you said 'Down with the Junta', you were from KKE Int. If you said 'Death to Fascism and to Imperialism' you were a Maoist. (laughter). It was obvious.
Iordanoglou, in contrast to all this, argues that although the first program started in a moderate way, it soon downgraded into an anti-imperialist frenzy ("the foreign enslaved fascist dictatorship", 'struggle against the foreign capital and the American-European imperialists') and an argumentation against the 'system', as it concluded that only with the final victory of the Greek people and the death of imperialism would the country be free again. To this end, it declared 'let's struggle by all means'. As a climax of its appeal to the Greek people the station proposed:

Greek intellectuals, enlighten the new struggles of our people with your spirit, express in your words the new struggles of our people. Communicate a faith for a better life. Stand next to the worker, the farmer the student!

Tsaousidis says that after midnight the station’s programme was effectively controlled by a committee.

All texts passed through a particular committee and were filtered. There were no other things such as 'down with the state' etc., that is the stuff that would worry petty bourgeois people, at times also the democratic left-winger. From 12 o'clock onwards there was much filtering. Only the moment when the evacuation started and in which the kids from that particular radical left group were controlling things did [Kleopatra] take back the microphone and say some hyper-combative things which did not help at that moment. They were just irritating the cops even more and they just beat us more.

While the students decided to have a rest in the hours after midnight news started coming about the Athens bloodshed.

The night in which the Athens Polytechnic got hit we got to know about it, before we got encircled, that is the Coordination Committee got informed about it. And there it was decided not to tell anyone, in some way say, alright, the tanks appeared, let’s not talk about the dead, so as not to let the people panic. But people had transistors which were transmitting foreign stations, right. Despite this the people didn’t break. (Vourekas)

---

996 'We find ourselves inside the third bastion of New Free Greece. We’re transmitting to you the fighting palm of thousand [of thousands of?] students of Salonica. At this moment we are proving the tradition that wants us always to be in the first line of the struggle for popular sovereignty [...] We demonstrate our opposition to the dictatorial regime that has repressed any sense of freedom, justice and national sovereignty'. Quoted by Christos N. Zafeiris, 'A clandestine correspondence...', op.cit., p. 28.
998 F. Kavvadias, This is Polytechnic speaking..., op.cit., p.112.
From 3.30am onwards the Polytechnic of Salonica too was encircled by army vehicles. The COO members were given half an hour in order to evacuate the building. At 4.30 on Saturday morning, 17 November, three armed vehicles and two commando/marine troops were standing by outside the Polytechnic. A little later the student CC negotiated with the university and military authorities for the possibility of an evacuation which would be without conditions, contrary to the students’ wish. The last announcement by the radio station went

We are talking to you from the radio station of the free University of Salonica. If the army strikes at us, if even one bullet gets fired, no one can be irresponsible for it... We ask of the soldiers to understand that we are brothers, our enemy is a common one... We address to the Greek people and to the entire free world an appeal to take a position. We ask the soldiers not to obey an order to shoot. We ask you to take a position. Don’t turn it off. This is the last moment. The people want to listen...999

Within half an hour the students had started to come out. Descriptions of their exodus stress the savagery of the beatings and the immediate arrest of about two hundred people. Iordanoglou feels very proud that there were no fatalities,1000 on the Committee’s responsibility, while a Maoist comrade of his expresses a quite different opinion:

If ex post facto no one was killed, this is among the pros during a peaceful period. During a revolutionary period it is a con. In a revolutionary period you do not feel sorry for the dead people, you hate the ones who killed them. (Smyrnis)

There is a great distance between these two attitudes, largely reflecting different points of view on the past, a moderate and a radical one. Furthermore, the jacobinist analysis by Smyrnis bears great similarities to the prevailing view at the time, that is the conviction that this was a ‘revolutionary period’, with specific characteristics and needs. The student revolt of November 1973 was effectively interpreted by Maoist and Trotskyite groups, such as EDE, as a ‘revolutionary situation’. However, they lamented not having the necessary organizational structures to take advantage of this moment. According to an official document, ‘revolution has arrived and we have got very little

999 Quoted by Christos N. Zafeiris, ‘A clandestine correspondence about our own Polytechnic’, op.cit., p. 28.
1000 C. Iordanoglou, ‘The anti-dictatorship student movement...’, op. cit.
Interestingly, Smynis expresses a sort of resentment at not having suffered any casualties, for not having struggled to the last drop of blood. This is strongly reminiscent of Simon, the protagonist of Stuart Hagman’s cult film ‘The Strawberry Statement’, declaring: ‘If there’s blood, I hope there are massive casualties. I don’t want to be part of moderate casualties.’

Many people in Salonica too went into hiding. Vourekas retains the sense of fear:

And I remember that feeling of fear, I remember noises out of sheet metal, because there were roofs made out of sheet metal, and every now and then I woke up in a nightmarish way, feeling that, well, because after [the occupation] the suppression was total.

Vourekas was arrested shortly after and retains very intense memories of the feeling of panic that possessed him towards the unknown, a situation that was repeated for many, despite the fact that he thought that he had ‘mastered’ fear. Apart from graphic descriptions of the ways he was tortured, Vourekas tells a story of how his imprisoned colleagues got to know the news about Ioannidis’s coup, which again reflects the constant borrowings from cinematographic images:

Dimitra Liodaki had gone up and had found a journal, *Ellinikos Vorras*, when they brought her up for interrogation. And he took it and hid it in her bodice and then she went and put it behind the lavatory and she was saying to the rest ‘System Godfather’, in which there was a gun behind the lavatory.

---

Chapter Five

After the Revolution

The Aftermath

Anarchist elements, aiming at the overthrow of any law and order and by exploiting the ingeniousness of persons with their heads in the clouds as well as the selfishness of political figures unfortunately created a dangerously explosive situation. The events of the last days have proven the existence of a conspiracy by the enemies of democracy.

Papadopoulos's announcement, 17.11.73

Although, up to the Polytechnic, state violence was instrumentalised by the movement in order to uncover the regime's liberalisation, this time the regime went too far without even keeping up appearances. Consequently, although the movement and democratic civil society won a moral advantage, by and large the tactical battle that the student movement set itself to win was lost. Immediately after the morning of 18 November, decree 798)1971 'In a situation of Siege' was put into action. According to a later governmental announcement Prime Minister Markezinis had assumed responsibility for the bloody suppression of the popular uprising by the Army in his speech to the General Staff on 20 November 1973. One of the first things that the government did was to talk about huge damage to the Polytechnic premises, just as was reported in Salonica. According to the authorities the damage was estimated at several billions of drachmas. In Salonica, O Foititis reported the events in a way that reflects how regime-friendly or apolitical students regarded the entire incident. The pictures and their commentaries express indignation about the disastrous state of the Polytechnic buildings: 'A sight of

1001 Παπαδόπουλος. Αποφασισμένος να λάβει όλα τα μέτρα δια την παγίωση της τάξεως καθώς εκφραζόμενως του πολιτικού κόσμου να αναλάβει τις ευθύνες των' [G. Papadopoulos. Firm to take all necessary measures for the restoration of order I call on all representatives of the political world to reconsider their responsibilities], Eleftheros Kosmos, 18/11/73. The governmental announcement went: 'Enemies of the nation are unrepentant and they do not want elections [...] This was an image of December events [...] The Ministry of Public Order asked for the operation of the Army [...] This aid gave the result of the BLOODLESS evacuation of the Polytechnic [...] The further disturbance of the people's order and quiet will not be allowed. Those who demonstrated solidarity should think about their responsibilities regarding the Nation [...] The press conference about the governmental policy regarding the conduct of unimpeachable elections is postponed.' Eleftheros Kosmos, op. cit. and Kavvadias, This is Polytechnic..., op.cit., pp. 138-139.
filthiness and misery. And then they tell you that they struggle for a better world, for beauty...’ In an article called ‘They left the cars and made the proletariat’, the paper castigated the ‘anarchist minority’ that did not show proper respect to the people who paid for their education and expressed outrage about the anti-Western slogans written on the walls. Ironic comments were made about the misspellings and content of slogans used at the time, such as ‘People combat, they’re sucking up your blood!’:

The Polytechnic is ravaged. The hordes of the defenders of academic freedom and popular sovereignty piled up in the auditoria and the labs of the buildings, mounted on the benches, broke the glass, tore down documents and drawings, turned the furniture upside down and covered the walls with misspelled slogans which they took from other epochs. Parading the walls of the Polytechnic were Allende, Thailand, bread, the farmers, the Americans, ‘the People, whose blood has been sucked up’. The ‘proletarians of all countries unite’. Nothing remained intact. And why did all this happen? Not because no solution was given to student demands, but, on the contrary, because no considerable student problems have remained unsolved.

Interestingly, the main accusation is that students of left-wing sensitivities were the wealthier ones, who were driving their own cars, a definite luxury at the time, and therefore were considered utterly hypocritical. The article reproduces the usual polemic argumentation that the so-called ‘appointed ones’ had used on several occasions concerning left-wing rhetoric.

And who were among the ones who ‘gave battle’? Those who leave their cars in the courtyard and enter the Polytechnic with their pockets full of banknote matches, in order to pose as contestatory proletarians. These people, whose future is guaranteed. These people, to whom it does not make a difference whether free education exists or not. But the provocation of the ‘bourgeois proletarians’ did not remain without a response. The wave of indignation from the rest of the students - regardless of faculty and social origins - resulted in their expulsion from the premises of the University of Salónica. And then, ruins. The image of a biblical disaster, composed by the modern vandals. Who are they? It is the ones who were sent here in order to learn how to build, construct, create beauty...

However, most of this damage was perpetrated by the Junta itself in its attempt to present the savageries inflicted by the nihilist vandals. In contrast to the Sorbonne in

1002 ‘Αφησαν τα αυτοκίνητα και έκαναν προλεταριάτο!...’ [They left their cars and made a proletariat], O Foititis, 19/11/73.
May '68, which was left in a terrible state, the Polytechnic in Athens, and to a lesser extent the Salonica Polytechnic, were preserved as clean and tidy as possible, as again the Greek students played with the rules in order not to be smeared as 'anarchists'. Nevertheless, by a governmental decree 28 local societies were disbanded in Athens, Salonica and Ioannina, while their properties were confiscated according to the decree 2636/1940 on 'expropriation of enemy assets', created in the conditions of the Greek-Italian War, in other words regarding the student associations as an internal enemy.

In a dramatic manner, the Polytechnic occupation was the point at which the movement reached the highest peak, by managing to mobilize for the first time Greek society, degenerating soon after, due to the cataclysm of events that followed, including the overthrow of Papadopoulos by a group of hawks inside the Junta. A week later (25N), Papadopoulos and his constitutional construct collapsed under the weight of another coup by yet another group of militaries that was about to rule the country with complete arbitrariness and martial law in full operation. In many ways, the Polytechnic events discredited the ‘liberalisation experiment’ that would probably lead to a long-lasting authoritarianism with a democratic façade. For Poulantzas, the fact that the dictatorship was by and large dependent on violence in order to block dissent made it impossible for it ‘to direct its own transformation’. ‘Controlled liberalisation on the part of the state’ created ‘a gaping hole through which the popular movement rushed in’, as the Colonels failed to secure the ‘neutrality of the intelligentsia and the youth’.

Although Generals Zoitakis and Bonanos were seen as the masterminds behind the overthrow of Papadopoulos, the person who was pulling the strings behind the scene was Brigadier Ioannidis, head of ESA, nicknamed therefore ‘the invisible dictator’. This was the passage of the regime from a ‘personal’ to an ‘impersonal’ phase, as Ioannidis was hardly ever to be seen, having instead let the President of the

---

1004 'Διαλύονται 28 φοιτητικοί σύλλογοι και οργανώσεις' [28 student societies and organizations are dissolved], *Eleftheros Kosmos*, 22/11/73.
1005 Recently, it has been argued that contrary to the conclusion, also stated above, that the student movement delegitimised the whole normalization experiment, it aggravated the crisis within Junta circles that ultimately led to the Cyprus coup and subsequent Turkish invasion of the island. According to this theory, if the civil society had reacted in a different and more 'mature' way, complying in a way with liberalisation, there would have been a smooth transition *alla spagnola* to democracy, sparing the 'national tragedy' of Cyprus. See in this respect I. Tzortzis, *The Metapolitefsi...*, op. cit.
Republic, General Gizikis, do the job for him. Ioannidis, a hardliner, decided to take the Junta back to the days of the iron fist and genuine authoritarianism. The December 1973 coup engineered by Ioannidis was prescheduled and did not take place because of the Polytechnic uprising. As was mentioned before, some analysts sustain that he might even have allowed the Polytechnic to ‘happen’ in order to gain support from the hardliners in terms of the bankruptcy of Papadopoulos’s experiment. Consequently, Ioannidis period was characterised by complete stagnation and denouement as far as civil society was concerned. During the eight months of its existence, there was no recorded open action, many student militants remained incarcerated, while others went into hiding. Most testimonies represent this phase as the darkest of all:

After the Polytechnic these were the worst days, the worse days, and psychologically also the worse days. A very tough Junta had arrived, and by looking at the facts those who had common sense were asking themselves whether we did well by pushing it so far. It’s another thing that no one goes out to tell now. Now everyone is happy that we took it that far. But at that point the … were very intense. (Bistis)

Xydi remembers the disillusionment that she experienced when she got out of prison and tried to find some new contacts in the university with no success. Even so, she is quick to note that the movement had gained respect thanks to its militant pedigree:

I remember that when I left ESA and went back to the university in order to talk inside the lecture rooms I experienced a grotesque moment, because… I went in to Paparigopoulou in order to say that we must react because the Junta continues and is tough etc and that people died during the Polytechnic, and I said a number, x, I don’t remember now, what did we know back then, maybe forty, maybe fifty, I heard from the front seats someone nudging her friend, telling her ‘what is she talking about now? The other one, the other day, had told us that they were sixty’. Namely there was distance, we shouldn’t have the illusion that the student movement touched and sensitized everyone, far from it. All right, people were not hostile to us, I don’t think that they had the room to do it actually, from a moral and political point of view, because I believe that the people that got mobilized then had a very high status, that is they enjoyed a certain appreciation from the rest, be it the rest of the students or be it the teachers. (Xydi)

1088 In his article ‘The Greek Lesson’, New Statesman, 14/12/73, Christopher Hitchens makes a very interesting classification of three internal divisions within the ranks of the Colonels: the gangsters, the Puritans, the Quadafis. The first were like Papadopoulos and Pattakos and were only really interested in power, the second, like Ioannidis and Colonel Ladas were fanatical believers in martial virtue and social discipline, and the third were lower-rank officers who were for the independence of Greece above all.
The new regime decided to deal with student activism in a radical way. Authoritarianism in its fullest form, as fantasized and practiced by Ioannidis, did not allow for any sort of mobility. However, a social movement needs constant mobilisation in order to evolve and stay alive. When the capacity to handle a crisis and react is weakened, this causes the dissolution of the movement and therefore the main threat for the latter is stagnation. Not only did the Greek student movement suffer the terrible blow of the night of the tanks in the Polytechnic, but it also experienced a dramatic regime change. To make things worse, the legacy of the Polytechnic divisions left the student movement as divided and fragmented as ever. Not long after the events, KNE’s mouthpiece, *Panspoudastiki*, castigated the 300 students who incited the revolt as *agents provocateurs*, while in the very aftermath of the uprising the General Secretary of KKE Int, Drakopoulos, talked about ‘dark forces’ who infiltrated the students, trying to lead the occupation to a dangerous path. Among those, was, supposedly, the Maoist leader Dionysis Mavrogenis:

> When Mavrogenis was labelled a stool pigeon I differentiated myself entirely from the group, I said that's it. I didn't say to anybody but I thought that these people were ... I knew Mavrogenis, I have seen him being beaten, we started off together. I said no way it is him because one knows some things, you cannot believe that someone who has been beaten up next to you, you have been scared together, you have been through ... Stool pigeons are not like this. (Kouloglou)

People did not know the characteristics of the new regime, nor could they foresee for how long it would last, in its attempt to revive the true spirit of the ‘Revolution’. By February 1974 the main operational figures of *A-EFEE* and *EKKE* were identified and arrested. The blow was great, and therefore the initiatives undertaken by remaining cadres who aspired to a massive demonstration or a general student strike were never realised. The movement had reached an impasse. A great number of students involved in mass actions under Papadopoulos continued to stay in strict clandestinity, passing their time in the houses of friends and relatives. Sabatakakis recalls changing a dozen hideouts and the police making dramatic raids into his home.

> I changed 22-23 houses during the 9 months from the Polytechnic to the Metapolitefsi. For a long time ESA was going to my place with rifles. (Sabatakakis)

---

Damofli remembers that she frequently changed hideouts and slept in all sort of places. At present, all this seems to have an amusing backside: ‘Alright, it was fun too...’ She argues that students who provided accommodation were often people who had not participated actively in the movement and were thus paying a tribute. In this example the seriousness of their act is juxtaposed with the frivolity of the flat’s main feature, that is comics. Damofli introduces this comic element, also counterbalancing her dramatic and charged description of the Polytechnic evacuation that preceded it.

I remember another house that was full of comics (laughters). A very beautiful flat, a student one too. These guys, you know, were at the fringes [of the movement]. They would come along sometimes too but they hadn’t come forward. And this was a flat with its bookshelves full of Mickey Mouse, you know, Lucky Luke, if it existed back then, I don’t remember. And it was so nice, and they brought us roasted gourd-seed too. These are the images, you know. It was very beautiful. I didn’t know them either, it was there that I met them. And they were entrusting you their house, these people. They left you at home and they were going out. (Damofli)

Alavanou describes these days of imprisonment and clandestinity as a regression. She brings out contradictory elements too, however, as she describes this period as a very tough one, but also beautiful, thus idealizing, in a sense, her past experience:

Then martial law was declared, we went into hiding, we got caught, then we went to ESA, we stayed there forty days or so, at Christmas they gave us an amnesty and we got out from ESA and then it started all over again... Illegal material, we found ourselves back in the conditions of ’71, you know, in some way. Much tougher, much tougher. We were hiding, we were summoned, these things. The usual but also nice ones. It wasn’t bad, alright.

During this period, several students who were persecuted by the regime tried to make their way abroad, mainly to Great Britain. This was not always successful, nor was the often attempted pursuit of a postgraduate grant. John Spraos, a Greek Professor of Economics at University College London, was an intermediary in these attempts, as he headed the London based ‘Greek Committee against the Dictatorship’. Looking at his correspondence with several British Professors one can discern that Greek students were often denied entrance and grants due to their low marks, a fact that is in contrast to Xydi’s earlier assertion about excellence. A Greek Professor contacting Spraos on Tzanetis was quick to explain that:
Mr Tzanetis was actively involved in the student movement of recent years. Because of the persecutions that his family suffered, an inevitability after his involvement, this led to a fall in his performance, which is reflected in his marks.1010

Sprao's typically hinted at marks saying 'his record is not brilliant', trying to stress instead other things, such as the 'trials and tribulations' that the students had 'undergone in the hands of the Greek regime'. As Spraqo notes in a letter to an English Professor concerning Vernikos's anti-Junta activities, 'this was a full time occupation'. Accordingly, 'marks interpreted in the light of all this seem very creditable - even a genius could not be expected to have high examination marks in these circumstances.'1011 After the Polytechnic it is often reported that students involved in the movement were harassed, intimidated and not allowed to sit have exams. Tzanetis' sister Evi, an Architecture student, was reportedly warned after her release from EAT/ESA that 'this academic year was lost. If you want to miss another one keep on being involved in student issues'.1012 Still Sprao's made it clear, in another letter, that 'I only agree to intercede in cases for which I am satisfied a) that the difficulties which they are having are really substantial and genuine and b) that their academic record suggests that they are capable of meeting the standards of the academic institutions to which they want to apply.' 1013 Eventually Vernikos made it out of Greece to Switzerland, though he never acquired postgraduate status.

*Katerina preserves a very bleak image of this period, which she likens to a second German occupation, interestingly using a well-known register of left-wingers according to which the dictators were actually not real Greeks, but foreign lackeys:

I remember being spied on, many of my friends were being spied on. There were many friends of mine who were not in the Polytechnic who did not salute me when they saw me because they were afraid that I possibly knew someone... It was in general a period of German occupation. Then the great blow of KNE happened and I think of the Political Bureau of the KKE in February '74 and the only activity we had were some contacts with the Deutsche Welle, with the BBC, with

1010 Dr Ioannis Fikioris to John Sprao, Athens 26 June 1974. Fikioris requested in his letter that Sprao burn this recommendation 'right after reading it'. Universities (Placing Junta Refugees) in 'Greek Committee Againsts the Dictatorship Archive', League for Democracy in Greece Archive, London.
1012 K.Tzanetis letter to Sprao, in which he argues about his son's record, M.Tzanetis. S.D. Ibid. In similar letters to Sprao by relatives of students, references are made to the University as the modern 'Secret School', a recurrent theme as has already been mentioned.
1013 John Sprao to Prof Brown, Imperial College, London 11 July 1974. Ibid.
broadcasters abroad in order to learn about the news of the prisoners, to see if they died or if they were still alive and who else did they arrest, who else were they going to catch.

The only optimistic incident that she recalls during Ioannidis's period is the anti-colonial wars that preceded the Revolution of Carnations in Portugal.

The sole stimulating injections were Portugal, Angola, Guinea Bissau.

In the meanwhile, the precarious phase in which the regime entered, when Ioannidis masterminded a Greek coup in Cyprus (15/7) and the Turkish Army invaded the island thereafter, was completely unexpected. The inner struggles between the hardliners and the evolutionists and the Cypriot adventure had brought the Junta to a stalemate. O'Donnel and Schmitter's assertion that a transition's beginning is the direct or indirect consequence 'of important divisions within the authoritarian regime itself' is therefore accurate. It was the military themselves who decided that their regime had become dispensable and that it should be handed over to civilians, in order to lead the country out of the crisis. With a demoralized Army and a complete absence of co-ordination, the Greek military machine was not in a position to respond to what was considered to be a 'casus belli', and despite the general mobilization that the 'President of the Republic', General Gizikis ordered (20/7). It was Gizikis himself, accompanied by the three heads of Staff, who asked the exiled Karamanlis to come and lead a civilian government. An interesting metaphysical association between nature and political developments is provided by Damofli, when she tries to recall the day the Junta 'fell':

And I think it hailed the previous day in Athens, though it was July. Crack-crack-crack... I was hidden in a basement back then. 'What the hell is going on?' And yes, the Junta fell. It was terrific to go out in the streets. Surely, the Police was chasing that day too, there was a panic, it was mad. On the one hand, the cars were beeping, on the other hand, people were dancing and jumping in the streets. It was very beautiful. And of course, even people who didn't give a damn were celebrating. (laughter) But anyway, better to be without than with a Junta.

Xydi remembers that during these days of crisis and transformation she was on holiday.

---

I was on holiday in Anafi. For the very reason because life had everything, it had vacations too. (laughter) And I took urgently the first caique that was leaving for Naxos in order to take the first boat to Athens, and there I found myself some days later under some balcony shouting ‘2 Ks and one E equals KKE’ Dot, dot, dot... (Xydi)

**Metapolitefsi and beyond**

When on 24 July the military decided to hand over power to the politicians the period of the so-called *Metapolitefsi*, namely regime change, started. Although the vast majority of the people were ecstatic about this unexpected change, precipitated by a Greek inspired coup in Cyprus and the subsequent Turkish invasion, the hard core of the Left, including most students, remained sceptical. Most of them thought of the return of Karamanlis to power as a ‘change of Natoist guard’, in Andreas Papandreou’s terms, stressing the element of continuity between the Junta and the political government that succeeded it. This was not seen as the fulfilment of the hopes and desires for a radical socio-political change, which had partly fuelled the political motivations and ideology of the anti-dictatorship student movement. Panagiotis Xanthopoulos saw it as a major setback:

This was the least that could result from what we were experiencing as a movement all these years.

The sudden collapse of the Utopia created a vast disillusionment, as it all looked like a return to the pre-1963 state of affairs instead of a step forward. Many students felt disoriented and frustrated. Dafermos recalls watching a televised version of the transition inside a coffee-shop in his Cretan village. His distress was such that he fell into a heavy depression.

1015 Giannis Voulgaris rightly observes that it is an awkward fact that an instantaneous change labelled a longer period. In his view, this happened because of the profound meaning that this ‘break’ had for the consciousness and the historical experience of the people of the time. See Giannis Voulgaris, ‘Η δημοκρατική Ελλάδα 1974-2004’ [Democratic Greece, 1974-2004], pp. 9-50, in Ιστορία του Νέου Ελληνισμού 1770-2000 [History of Modern Hellenism, Athens 2003, p. 9. The vagueness of the term, meaning not a restoration but the passage to an entirely new political regime leads to people still referring to the present as part of this ever-ending process. The same author argues about the uniqueness of the Greek term, which also shows an instantaneous political change, as compared to the Spanish or Latin American experience of long transitions. See his seminal work Η Ελλάδα της Μεταπολίτευσης, 1974-1990. Σταθερή Δημοκρατία Σημαδεμένη από τη Μεταπολεμική Ιστορία [Greece of the Metapolitefsi. Stable Democracy, Marked by Post-War History of the Metapolitefsi], Athens 2002, p. 25.
I was not in Athens, I was in Axios, my village, where I watched the *Metapolitefsi* from the television and I saw thousands of people welcoming Karamanlis, where I fell into depression, I left the coffee-shop and I went home and because I was playing the macho as I was young, I didn’t cry, now I would, I would let myself cry, because I said ‘so much blood, so many sacrifices, so many struggles, in order to have Karamanlis back?’ From that point onwards I fell into a long depression, very long depression. (Dafermos)

Condensed events, extraordinary experiences and high hopes which were never fulfilled led to this emotional breakdown. Ioanna Karystiani gives her own version of what she calls ‘a mind disorder’:

This explosion with everything that it triggered, you don’t have the time and the preparation and the maturity to seriously .... it. This explosion is like a mind disorder, it has the elements of a disorder, you see? All of a sudden you feel that many things are exploding around you and inside you, do you understand? Because everything happened fast and the hopes for the country were too many, that it could gain the lost ground, that it would eradicate old wounds, different things could take place, all of which in the end were unfinished. Afterwards, everything was measured and very petit-bourgeois and far away from the dreams that had nourished the 20-year old kids. (Karistiani)

For *Katerina a major problem was the fact that the ‘movement’ did not have enough strength to give a lead to the exponents of the ‘old’ and discredited political cast:

The Junta collapsed, it was not overthrown. And this predetermined what followed. On the other hand there emerged the most intense wave of politicization, I believe, in post-war history, which created possibilities of intervention from below. So, the people had self-confidence, even though the change took place from the top, there was self-confidence in the youth and the people in general that ‘we can shape a new culture, different political correlations’. Still, the so-called ‘old political world’ proved to be more powerful. To this I add of course the KKE, and the Right and the Centre. It mutated, of course, especially the Right and the Centre, but it proved to be, I believe, much stronger than the new one which could be born. (*Katerina)

These feelings were shared to the same or even to a greater extent by exponents of the previous generation, as ‘centrist and conservative politicians from the pre-dictatorial regime directed the founding of the new democracy and then occupied its most important offices’.\(^{1016}\) Vervenioti was so shattered by the arrival in power of

Karamanlis, the symbol of the pre-1967 Right, that she remembers herself bursting into tears.

The day that I heard that Karamanlis was coming back, I remember, we were all at the Saint Paraskevi Square, many people, many, many, and all of us left-wingers, and I, who do not let myself cry easily, was in tears, because I considered it a defeat, that Karamanlis was coming back after so many sacrifices. Who? Karamanlis. For us Karamanlis was the one who won the elections of ’61 with violence and fraud, he didn’t have a good reputation for us. [...] We might not have had a political consciousness exactly then, we might have been extremists. I don’t know. But I cried. I said ‘Is it possible? Is it possible?’ After so many years the one coming as a liberator is him?’, this is how I saw it. And when after this, Rigas and the Interior were saying ‘it is either Karamanlis or tanks’, I saw it as contrary to the things I believed in, the things I wanted.

In a sense, at this point, exponents of the anti-dictatorship student movement, from voicing popular dissent ended up being out of tune with society as a whole. In fact, the vast majority of people expressed joy about the political change, even if it was a conditioned one, imposed ‘from above’ and without a popular uprising as its origin. An even greater disappointment followed the consolidation of Karamanlis after the 1974 elections, with a landslide 54% majority. The elections, symbolically placed on the 17 November, the first anniversary of the Polytechnic, a fact that was rejected as political exploitation by the Right of a left-wing symbol, saw a miserable electoral turnout concerning the recently legalised Communist parties.

I had an illusion about real political correlations in society [...] I had great illusions. Just to make you understand how lost in space I was, I believed that the Left would win around 25-30% of the vote. (Vourekas)

The slogan adopted by leftist groups and parties alike was ‘People, Shame on You For your Vote’ [Δακ, Νηπιά σου, για την εκλογή σου], thus practically canceling the left-wing myth of the idealised People as bearer of ‘authentic’ revolutionism.

The whole period of the Metapolitefsi was in fact characterised by growing disenchantment, mainly due to the fact that the future transcendence, encapsulated in the Polytechnic’s Utopia, never took place, whether in one form or another.1017 Despite

1017 At this point Claudio Magris’s Utopia e Disincanto (Milan 1999), a study of the ransom, rape and disenchantment of Utopia is a very interesting companion piece. I owe this observation to Luisa Passerini’s ‘‘Utopia’ and Desire’, Thesis Eleven, 68, 1, pp. 11-30, p. 7.
spectacular moves by Karamanlis, such as the quick legalisation of the Communist Party and the retreat of Greece from the military arm of NATO, for many people of this generation, this period signalled a traumatic return to reality.\textsuperscript{1018}

It is entirely different for the people who might have been 50 years old, let’s say, and for the ones who were 20. What we knew were the eight black years of Karamanlis, that was the only thing that we listened to back then, the accursed Right of this period and so on. The arrival of Karamanlis was of course an end to dictatorship, it was good that the dictatorship was over, but on the other hand we might have imagined that a ‘Government of National Unity’ would be newer faces, more imperishable, whom you could trust because you wouldn’t know about their past, their heavily charged criminal record. (Karystiani)

Antonis Liakos recalls in his writings that with the \textit{Metapolitefsi} most people of his generation who had participated in the anti-dictatorship resistance ‘returned to their jobs and were sunk in psychological crises of varying depth and intensity’:

There was a diffused feeling that the expected revolution had not come and its time had passed. The social hierarchies were restored. Our own efforts and plans had failed.\textsuperscript{1019}

Kleopatra Papageorgiou has bad memories of this era too, which she attributes to the frustration that hard-line Communists felt in terms of their millenarian expectations:

It was a very ugly period, very much so, probably because we Communists had believed that it was natural determinism that capitalism would collapse and things like that.

In contrast to parliamentary elections, however, student elections favoured the anti-dictatorship student organizations and rendered them the absolute protagonists of student unionism for over a decade. Vourekas remembers the endless discussion that started taking place, capitalizing on the new feeling of the freedom of speech. Topics surpassed Greece and touched the Third World, the Soviet Union and Spain:

Long, endless, marathon-like student assemblies. We woke up at 9 in the morning and finished at 12 in the evening. This took place for days, [talking] about everything. (Vourekas)

\textsuperscript{1018} This anti-climax is a standard feature which is also to be found in the '68 student movements. A traumatic ‘retour a la normale’, which was accompanied by depression and sometimes suicides, marks one of the dark sides of the movement’s aftermath.

Vourekas adds an interesting comment on the relativity of time, and argues for a great density of events after the Junta:

Within my consciousness these years had a great length man, seems to me, no, I think now, was it all just 2 years? It looks as if these two years were centuries. It was a great difference from political action under the Junta and when was it, in '74, I was still in university for another one and a half years and this seemed to me a huge period, that is, time was vast. This is how it has remained in my consciousness. (Vourekas)

A fervent process that united the students for a little while was that of cleansing the universities of the main pro-Junta Professors, the so-called de-Juntification. All of a sudden, the persecuted students became persecutors, often exaggerating the role of the avenger due to their revolutionary fervour. Giorgos Smyrnis underlines that ‘EKKE followed the line of People’s Courts for Professors who collaborated.’ Significant steps were also taken toward updating the university system, including the abolition of double forms of the language and reforming measures in order to tackle Education’s practical problems. Eliou argues, however, that the government of the day left out the social dimension ‘which would form the foundation of a bold attempt at reform.’

However, the Metapolitefsi was an era marked by extreme fragmentation and internal confrontations, facilitated by the lack of a common objective and the anchoring of students to rival political formations. By that time, politics had become the daily bread of most of them. Student radicalism was reinforced by a general societal impetus, an organisational explosion, and a growing mobilisation and political participation that is typical of moments of transition and regime change.

After '74 I got organized in AASPE together with Mavrogenis; alright, Mavrogenis had been ‘tainted’ from before [...] I think that this happened quite soon, because everyone was entering something then, one organisation. You couldn't not, it was a period of a great politicization. [...] Our conflict, from one point onwards as AASPE, was mainly with the official parties of the Left, because this was where the game was played [...] Namely the battle was given for the primacy, who was going to take the lead in the area of the Left. That is, we took it for granted that Karamanlis did what he did; the issue was what would the Left do in order to face Karamanlis.

(Kouloglou)

1021 Giannis Voulgaris, ‘Democratic Greece…’, op. cit., p. 15.
Dimitris Fyssas asserted in the early 1990s that

without the Party (each of us on his own) life was inconceivable. And this too sounds mad at present. 1

For those, however, who were and remained unaffiliated this was not an option and the over politicisation caused a feeling of marginalisation from the central political scene. Dafermos was one of them:

In *Metapolitefsi* I did not have answers, I did not have opinions, I was confused. Because whereas we used to be the rulers of the game we ended up being nothing. (Dafermos)

**Mounting Factionalism**

People often face difficulties in clearly distinguishing specific attitudes belonging to the actual dictatorship period from the attitudes that were bred during its aftermath. Extra-temporality characterizes these frequent memory lapses that reveal a chronotopic confusion in ex-militants’ minds between subsequent events. This confirms Van Boeschoten’s point that when a vivid event is followed by a period which might have had an equal or even stronger emotional impact, memory tends to cause overlaps between the two, usually favouring the predominance of the later period over the earlier one in terms of cognition. 2 In fact, lapses tend to be reinforced when the memory layer in question includes strenuous events. 3 The *Metapolitefsi* falls into this category, being a period marked by fragmentation, disillusionment and lack of vision, which led to the gradual disintegration of what had come to be the anti-dictatorship student movement. Many people conclude that the sudden lack of a common goal was a trigger of growing friction. Lionarakis sustains, however, that splits were mainly reinforced by radical newcomers in the movement, whom he calls ‘janissaries’. In contrast to them, he claims, students of the Junta period could not reach high levels of hostility, as they shared a strong bond which derived from common action in the recent past:

As we had been together through thick and thin you couldn’t say to the other ‘you’re an asshole’.

---

1 Dimitris Fyssas, p. 19
3 Ibid, p. 222.
Katerina rejects the frequently lamented loss of unity as sheer sentimentalism and argues for the appearance of new forms of solidarity, born from new alliances:

This kind of trust collapses. Look, if everyone judges it on a narrow sentimental level, this sort of unity collapsed. On the other hand, however, a different unity emerged in different battlefields. So, some old unities collapsed but new ones were being built, so that someone must be blind, in order to be nostalgic about the comradeship of the dictatorship period and not see the comradeship that was being developed, that developed then, even if not on a Pan-Hellenic level. Alright, the logic of ‘my little shop’ existed, it still exists, it’s an old sin of the Left, but at the same time new forms of unity were being bred and sometimes they can be deeper still.

The extreme side of hyper-politicisation was the embracing of armed struggle for reasons dictated by the conviction that the Third Greek Republic was in reality the prolongation of the dictatorship. ‘Change of guard’ was the term Andreas Papandreou had used to designate both Ioannidis’s coup on 25 November 1973 and the Metapolitefsi, as both were regarded as nothing more than variations of the neocolonial US occupation. Papageorgiou claims that the deeply authoritarian state remained intact for some time, while purges against the left-wingers continued. Capitalising on this feeling, shared by many at the time, Andreas Papandreou expressed the opinion that the dilemma ‘Karamanlis or tanks’ was fake, since the designed outcome was ‘Karamanlis and tanks’. According to this line of thought, as supposedly nothing had changed, it is not very surprising that some extreme left-wingers decided to continue the ‘armed struggle’ against the artificial transition that was imposed ‘from above’. If terrorism was a perverse continuation of the ’68 movements ‘by other means’, with political violence being embraced by their most radicalised wings, the opposite had taken place in Greece during the military dictatorship; here, armed resistance had been replaced by the anti-dictatorship student movement of the early 1970s. Still, the post-1974 generation of radicalized Greek youth, in combination with older radicals, flirted with terrorism and placed themselves within the framework of the

---

1026 This was a famous rhetorical question posed by Mikis Theodorakis shortly before the 1974 elections, which was stressing the fact that an overwhelming left-wing victory could lead to a quick revival of authoritarianism.
1027 S. Zouboulakis, ‘From one night…’, op.cit.
1028 Ibid. Zouboulakis quotes some passages from the contestatory journal Antipliroforisi, circulated by the terrorist group ELA as soon as in 1975, which highlights this line of thinking.
1029 Ronald Fraser, 1968. A Student Generation in Revolt..., op. cit., p. 337.
so-called ‘anti-authoritarian struggle’ as the ultimate abrogation of radicalism. The fact that, apart from the ring leaders of the coup, most Junta officers and the most notorious torturers received low sentences (1975), also acted as a trigger for this decision. Papageorgiou’s great dilemma became whether to opt for the armed struggle under democratic conditions or not.

I believed that violence could only be dealt with through violence. It did not fit me as a person. And this is why I had ended up later on having an enormous dilemma. Because on one hand I saw that only through violence could something be done, and not just with blablabla, on the other as a person violence did not suit me. Nor did I want to militarise my life and dedicate it to a specific cause. I wanted to have a private life too, other joys... I did not want to become like that Palestinian high-jacker, Haile. (laughter) (Papageorgiou)

In the end Papageorgiou opted for non-violence. She says so by using Savvopoulos already mentioned ironic verse: *The best kids got tired and went back home*. The contradictions that are to be discerned in her discourse are characteristic of the distance between a holistic theoretical approach concerning violence and the practical difficulties that this involved. Kouloglou, on the other hand, is firm in his conviction that the ‘Polytechnic Generation’ did not follow such practices as it had already ‘fulfilled’ its aim. Dafermos shares this view; interestingly, his discourse is emotionally charged by the arrests of the terrorist group 17N members and the mediatic hysteria that took place shortly before our interview:

We, as a generation, did not generate terrorist, armed struggle, you know. Because we won, we succeeded in our aim that we had put together with the mass movement. And therefore there had never been a serious possibility to take up arms. But the ones who were either Lambrakides or the following generation, like Koufodinas, who did not spring out of the mass movement, they followed that path, in some way. (Kouloglou)

If we started beating or torturing or I don’t know what wouldn’t we become shitty persons? We would become 17N. And what did these wankers do? Now, they killed 20, 30 people, how many did they kill, what did they achieve? What did they achieve? But we were doing things, that is, I believe that we were doing things. At least we saved the dignity of the Greek people, right? (Dafermos)
As soon as the Communist Party was legalized, after the ban that lasted for a bit less than thirty years was lifted, it started re-publishing its historical newspaper, *Rizospastis* (Radical). Kleopatra Papageorgiou recalls the immense symbolic exaltation that a left-winger felt at this very fact. Although she was a fierce critic of the Party she liked exhibiting the *Rizospastis* for the very reason that the new political situation allowed her to be even more provocative:

I remember that once we were with some friends in the train to Florina, these areas were harshly suppressed, very much so, because they were at the frontiers too, you know. And these people had experienced terrible purges since the Civil War, that is they did not even dare to speak their dialect, they spoke it in secret, indoors. And I remember that while in the train to Florina we were holding the *Rizospastis*, like that, just in order to have the *Rizospastis* (laughter). Although we had no relation to KKE whatsoever. But we did all these things symbolically and we celebrated that one could finally take out and read *Rizospastis* in Florina. (Papageorgiou)

In terms of the university, the *Metapolitefsi* was characterised by a quick folkorisation of the student struggle and an institutionalisation of the student movement and of the student activist as a landmark of revolutionism. Periklis Korovesis sarcastically notes that ‘the mass resistance against the Junta appeared during the *Metapolitefsi*’. Similar to the Spanish *Transición*’s slogan ‘freedom-amnesty-status of autonomy’, the Greek triptych of demands was ‘amnesty to political prisoners-punishment of perpetrators-new departure’.

As Fyssas notes, by that time the word ‘student’ had acquired not only a social but also a political significance, meaning a left-winger, the non-right-winger *par excellence*. Student groupings increased their numbers but soon lost their supposedly independent character; for instance, *Rigas* became the formal student section of KKE Int. Leftists received a mass following that was translated into even more hostility towards the hegemonic *Panspoudastiki*, A-EFEE’s continuation. Smyrnis conveys the levels of ideological obsession among students, who tended to read the political into everything. Interestingly, his story uses football as a privileged site for drawing anthropological conclusions, thus marking a clear rupture with the Junta period, in which this sport used to be a non place for left-wingers, as it was associated with the regime.

---

1030 Periklis Korovesis, *Oi anerropofilaikez* [The guards of the humans], Athens 1997, p. 17.
1032 Dimitris Fyssas, op.cit., p. 19.
A Chinese football team came to Kaftantzoglio Stadium in '75. We saw the way it played football and we saw it from an ideological point of view. It didn’t make fouls; it tried to score with technique. Always to the benefit of the game and the team. It did not have the antagonism of the sports under capitalism.

Similarly, in her present narrative, Kleopatra Papageorgiou, yet another Maoist, used several football terms, such as ‘foul’, ‘stopper’ and ‘offside’ in order to stress her points, demonstrating a clear-cut shift in terms of the signifiers connected to such a discourse if compared to the past.

Soon new tendencies were born out of the growing radicalization of vast segments of the population, but mainly among the new generation of students, who not having the ‘heroic mission’ of combating against a dictatorial regime needed to express a much greater intransigence than their legendary predecessors. The new trends mainly included radical leftism, anarchism -a newcomer in Greek left-wing politics, and to a lesser extent feminism. ‘Between 1974 and 1979, the Greek experiences of the dictatorship, the euphoria of the return to democracy, the rise of the leftist protest, the development of a liberated logos, and the spread of women’s struggles abroad, all contributed to the formation of a women’s movement’. Among young women, however, a left-wing political identity against dogmatism and totalitarianism, in favour of democracy, freedom, justice and social change prevailed over a more specific female identity. Accordingly, ‘left-wing parties stated that gender equality could be obtained only as a by-product of class exploitation’. A few large organizations formed after the end of the military dictatorship played a significant role in the movement’s history. Nonetheless, the new habits which were connected to the appearance of feminism were never really translated into independent or solid action.

---


1034 Ibid, p. 22.

1035 The organizational structure of the largest part of the women’s movement during its first phase of existence was modeled after the traditional political organizations. The typical organization had a constitution, a centralized and hierarchical leadership, an electoral system, a spreading network of branches and it processed its work through committees,’ *Ibid*, p.34. According to Efi Kalliga, in the late Seventies the total number of active members of the twenty most important women’s organizations was estimated to range between 50,000 and 120,000, that is 1.4 and 3.6% of the total female population. See Efi Kalliga, ‘Women’s Organized Efforts’ (in Greek) in *Neoi Orizontes*, vol.203-204, 1982, pp. 49-52, quoted by della Porta et al, op.cit., p. 34.
At the same time modernization was taking place at vast paces. The spirit of the Metapolitefsi, similar to that of the Spanish Transición gave the opportunity for tracing new limits, in which the counter-cultural was often de-politicised or absorbed by the anarchist tendency. Overall, these antithetical poles of the student movements reached a peak by 1978-79, with the great occupations which resisted the new Educational Law, inspired by Karamanlis’s second elected government. The new movement, cultivated within the great occupation of the Faculty of Chemistry in 1979, to a great extent mimicked the old one and re-enacted '68 in a very direct manner, in terms of open sexuality and a situationist-anarchist combative mood. However, contrary to the concept of Fyssas’s biographical index of the, Polytechnic Generation, post-1974 students did not feel themselves members of that ‘blessed’ group. In Viky Charisopoulou’s words, they believed that their generation ‘did not change the route of Greek history’, and therefore they developed an inferiority complex: ‘we always come second’. Accordingly, ‘they were the real rebels and we were the fake ones, partisans with dad’s money’.

As far as the ritual commemoration of the Polytechnic was concerned, on each 17th of November left-wingers organised massive demonstrations in order to celebrate this day which symbolised insurrection. By the late 1970s, demonstrations often resulted in violent clashes with policemen, some of whom had remained the same ones who operated under the Junta. For Kourmoulakis, the deadline concerning political activity was 1980, when he realized that he could no longer stomach political persecution and the tension of frequent clashes with police. The turning point was a notorious 17 November demonstration during which two youths, Koumis and Angelopoulou, were shot dead by the police. For him consciousness of the danger made him change attitude, plus the fact that the age difference would at that point favour the young policemen who were not coetaneous anymore with the old guard of activists:

In 1980 there was a march to the American Embassy when Kanellopoulou was killed, we were sitting at the corner of Fileliffinon and Othonos Street and saw the people who were getting beaten there and I left. I didn’t want to get into trouble anymore. There I realised that I had become mature, I became conscious of the danger. Whereas up to that point I wasn’t conscious of the danger. So, we were saying ‘let’s go, what are they going to do to us?, we were hunting each other

---

1036 Vicky Charisopoulou’s Της μεταπολίτευσης χαμένη γενιά [The lost generation of the Metapolitefsi], Athens 2001, pp.20-21. The title of her book and some of its punch-lines paraphrase verses from a song by the rock-group Fatme (‘There is a serious reason why’, 1985), which rejected the over-revolutionism of the post-Junta youth as essentially false, while also lamenting the fact that ‘History has given nothing to us’.

1037 Ibid.
with the cops at the Museum, we were nineteen years old, the cops were twenty, twenty-one years old. (Kourmoulakis)

Leaders

McAdam argued that 'framing efforts can be thought of as cultural appropriation, with movement leaders seeking to tap highly resonant ideational strains in mainstream society (or in a particular target subculture) as a way of galvanizing activism.'

Although several charismatic leaders appeared in the movement, exercising such influence, however, no personalization on one sole figure took place. Maybe the sole exception is Ioanna Karystiani, the absolute reference of all students, regardless of political affiliation. In her account Karystiani, who is remembered as someone with the charisma of articulating the collective sentiment in an exceptional way and who after the Junta systematically avoided any public mention of the period, takes pains not to differentiate herself from the rest:

I did not have the feeling that I was more special than the other kids. I did not have that sense at all. If you ask me about the volunteering and the availability of most people, not only of those who were in the Law School Committee or in the Polytechnic committee, I could tell you about tens and hundreds of other kids who are unknown but who were stars. I do not think that I have done something for which I should be admired, we were all together then, we didn’t think like that. I am telling you, it was not only me who was not looking forward to a political career or something else. And who would think like that back then? The Junta could have lasted, say ...

How long did the one of Salazar last, 42 years, and 40 the one of Franco.

She further stresses that everyone was equal in this story, as no one knew when entering the movements whether he or she would spend years in prison or not.

From the moment that you run the risk of dying or getting imprisoned and you remain there. All in a way are equal in this story. (Karystiani)

Xydi’s impression too is one of a full equality, although she adds that she was probably unaware of her role and the impact she exercised on her companions:

Dimitris Fyssas wrote a book - catalogue of the Polytechnic generation - that said that Angeliki Xydi was a person with a great power. He might have realized this but I didn’t. I was living my

---

life. It was to me very warm and moving that two years ago in the student and pupil mobilization-demonstration at Kanningos Square where many cocktail bombs were thrown and they [the cops] hit fast, I bumped into a woman of my age, who there was no way that I could remember, and she embraced me... ‘Oh, my dear Angeliki...’, she was one of that time. And she looked at me like that ... and she told me ‘So, you are here too’. ‘Well’, I said, ‘yes, I am here too’. [laughter] ‘Well’, she told me, ‘you have no idea what you meant for us back then’. Probably I don’t. And I’m not interested in knowing. Terrifying...

Not everyone, however, was so theoretically endowed as to draw abstract conclusions out of the events, as the leaders tried to do. In that sense, Alivizatos prefers to single out individuals according to their different roles:

There is no doubt [that there were leaders]. Each one in his own way. With a vast mass following was Makis Paraskewopoulos, Valden was the one of the clandestine mechanisms, the ideologist intellectual was Myrsini Zorba.

Papachristos is more lyrical and compares the movement’s dynamics to that of an uncontrollable river that carries along everything in its passage. His comment on the passive students who in the end joined the movement or were seduced by it is a valid one and reflects to a great extent the massive size that the movement acquired after the fall of the Junta. In this context, in his opinion, several individuals are singled out by society itself for their leadership skills or for their self-sacrifice and commitment:

When a movement becomes a river, it carries along everyone, it doesn’t leave anyone indifferent and even the indifferent students, who were the majority, since we were a pitiful minority, were affected from that point onwards, by what they were doing in their everyday life. Hence, the society itself and the struggles single out people either on a level of leadership or on a heroic level if this is needed. (Papachristos)

In her view Metapolitefsi was the period in which the various leaderships got stabilised and consolidated, often disregarding the real, anonymous heroes.

They became during the Metapolitefsi. The cadres, the well-known ones, the heroes. I, for example, had in the cell opposite to mine a woman whom I never saw, I don’t know her face, who was pregnant. And she was there with me. She was at the Polytechnic and later on she was there. Why isn’t she a hero? Who knows her? Who was she? This does not mean making it all equal.

[... ] There always exist and will always exist people who play a more decisive role in the course

---

1039 Gilcher Holtey, 'Die Phantasie an die Macht...', op.cit.
of events, but this is a different thing from the construction ... ex post facto of great cadres. And mainly it's the ones who cashed in their positions too... I think that in conditions of a real movement, and I consider the anti-dictatorship movement as a real movement in the full meaning of the word, in conditions of a real movement the limits are natural. That is, there are some people in front, but they are connected to the rest in a natural way. There is no artificial divide and this is why a movement is a movement. (Xydi)

For Vanos, there are few people who took an initiative at a crucial moment and in the collective consciousness they remained the ones recorded as leaders, even if they did not perform such heroic deeds as others. At this point he quotes Koumandaros, a Maoist leader, who allegedly was instrumental in pushing things towards an occupation at the Polytechnic, although the rest of the students were against.

Perhaps de facto or ex post facto they did not have ... other people might have done more important things, but somehow in people’s consciousness, but also these very people undertook leading [initiatives], for example somewhere there is chaos going on, and one says 'I should stand up at this point and raise my hand'. At this moment s/he undertakes the responsibility and becomes in a sense a leader, someone that takes an initiative in this sense. Leaders, small leaders, not in a pejorative sense, are created all the time. Some might have even greater capacities and become leaders. They might take a terrific initiative and say 'hey guys, let's occupy the Polytechnic'. About Koumandaros, for example, this was an entirely leading ... If this was not a leader’s initiative, what else can we say? Namely, the occupation had been voted against and he says 'we don’t give a damn, the ones who want should follow, even the few ones, and we go and occupy it'. At that point he acted as a leader. There are... This was a leader's act. And there are small leaders' acts. (Vanos)

*Katerina draws a distinction with the Metapolitefsi period in terms of leading members of political organizations before and after the junta, with the latter era seeing a pejorative characterization, that of ‘party-animal’:

Our theoretical equipment was relatively poor. The first thing that counted was how much an organization had a presence, fought against the dictatorship, and the small letters did not bother us much, namely you were obliged to respect the ringleaders. And those who suffered most persecutions, the ones who went to the forefront, and it is no coincidence that they are normally the most pioneering and charismatic people in each microcosm, in each School, each Faculty, the kids with the greatest restlessness, who read more, who were more anxious, who were less egocentric, who cared for what was happening in China, in Russia, in America, for the theoretical streams, for art. The sense of the ‘party-animal’ in inverted commas did not exist as it was pejoratively called during the Metapolitefsi here in Greece. (*Katerina)
She further argues that the real ‘heroes’ of the Polytechnic were not those who became well-known:

The real generation of the Polytechnic, namely the ones who are the salt of a society and have kept something are not the celebrities, Damanaki, Laliotis etc. But can have become a teacher in this moment, in Pyrgos of Ilia or in Etolookamania.

A belated ’68?

‘I learn now of the shooting of Dutschke in Berlin and of Martin Luther King in America. I knew Martin Luther King, and I passed precious hours with him. I knew this boy who is lying gravely wounded in Berlin. I know what is happening in the world; the world is burning! [...] I feel more for the Vietnamese or for the Negroes in America. I am less egocentric about Greece because everything is like that...’ She joins her little fingers: ‘Everything links’

The Observer, Interview with Melina Merkouri, April 1968.

As ’68 is a constant socio-political point of reference, its significance could be summarized as an explosion of imagination and desire. Greater freedom was re-vindicated, ranging from the intellectual to the sexual realm and a release of energy, which was hitherto suppressed by institutions, ranging from the family to the State, took place. Libertarian utopianism intermingled with Freudianism and romanticism, producing a ‘utopian realism’ against technical and scientific rationalism. ‘Anti-productivism’ was set against an economy-driven market society, ‘sovereignty of desire’ against repressive social norms and ‘an alternative view on politics’ against the ‘bureaucratisation of the Revolution’. From this perspective, the ’68 vision of

communal life and social extremism could be placed itself among the great utopian visions, such as Christianity and Communism.\textsuperscript{1043} As Mariuccia Salvati points out, it was the evocation of values against material interests, of openness against family microcosms, of a \textit{koinon} based on friendship and solidarity against petit-bourgeois virtues.\textsuperscript{1044} In that sense, and as individuals acquired a new autonomy from political organizations, '68 helped modern life enrich itself in various ways. On the opposite side of the spectrum, it was often seen as the death of this very utopian vision that it was professing, a futile attempt to fulfil an unrealizable dream.\textsuperscript{1045}

Even though '68 became a great source of narratives, as one of the fundamental historical moments in which national identities collided with and became subsumed by international ones, it was far from being a homogeneous experience. The representation of '68 as a unified experience is only an \textit{ex post facto} construction regarding this '\textit{annus mirabilis}' or 'horribilis', depending on which perspective you view it from. While the movement in France was an anti-authoritarian revolt with strong anarchist undercurrents in search of a new \textit{Weltanschauung}, in Italy the New Left aimed at seizing power rather than abolishing it and in West Germany the radical Leninist movement stressed the generational component in terms of its disgust for the \textit{Kriegsgeneration}, that is the generation of the parents who had sustained Nazism and fought in the Second World War. In the backdrop of all this, the US Civil Rights movement was followed by an encounter between the anti-war political youth with hippy counterculture, following C.Wright Mills's praise of the role of young revolutionary intellectuals. Evidently, these movements communicated with each other through various relational or non-relational channels, whereby specific cultural traditions and distinct social and political circumstances acted as filters.\textsuperscript{1046}

\textsuperscript{1043} Paul Ginsborg, "Il '68 e la modernità", pp. 21-29, in Pier Paolo Poggio (ed.), \textit{Il Sessantotto...}, op.cit., p. 21.
\textsuperscript{1044} Mariuccia Salvati, \textit{Il regime e gli impiegati. La nazionalizzazione piccolo-borghese nel ventennio fascista}, Rome 1992.
\textsuperscript{1045} Paul Ginsborg, "Il '68...", op. cit. Aristide Zolberg's conclusion that the 'protest of 68 was a big wave that carried along almost everything but which left behind alluvial deposits', is a telling example of this line of thought, in 'Moments of Madness', in \textit{Politics and Society}, 1972, 2, p. 206. For a contemporary critique of '68 as a movement without past or future see Daniel Bell, \textit{The coming of post-industrial society}, London 1973. For the issue of dying Utopia see Giovanni Statera's homonymous work, \textit{Death of a Utopia. The Development and Decline of Student Movements in Europe}, Oxford 1975. For a comprehensive critique of the above see Luisa Passerini, "Utopia' and Desire", \textit{Thesis Eleven}, 68, 1, 2002, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{1046} Donatella della Porta, '1968. Zwischennationale Diffusion...', op.cit., p. 141.
But is it correct to argue that the Polytechnic was a ‘Greek’ or ‘belated 68’? As Nicole Janigro argues about the Yugoslav experience, in Greece too the absence of democracy made an institutional crisis of political parties and mechanisms of representation and a ‘long march through the institutions’ (Dutschke) impossible. What is more, Janigro’s point that ‘the system was more rigid and inclined for a more brutal rendering of accounts with its adversaries’, could well be an accurate description of the Greek situation. Nevertheless, mimicry of international models and transnational diffusion of protest culture played a major role in the making of the student movement and the shaping of new cultural identities. To narrow our focus on this subject, we shall examine three temporal sequences, as Passerini suggests: the relatively brief time span of the events, the medium-length period of the social movements, and the still lengthier period of cultural changes.

1a. Events: The Context

On a structural basis, the anti-technocratic objectives, which for Touraine were crucial to the French May and Bourdieu’s description of those events as a sign of crisis in social reproduction, cannot be easily applied to Greece. This was not a ‘new social movement’, being bred by the post-industrial era, having ‘broken with the traditional values of capitalist society and seeking a different relationship to nature, to one’s own body, to the opposite sex, to work and to consumption’. In addition, the economic conditions were different to those in France, Italy or West Germany, as in general was the country’s post-World War development, which in the other countries was in some ways the root of the subsequent social agitation. Robert Inglehart’s influential thesis which argues that the 68 movements were the product of a post-materialist culture of protest does not apply to the Greek student movement, as it lacked the fully developed consumerist society that this theory presupposes. In other words, in Greece,
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1049 Luisa Passerini, ‘Utopia and Desire…’, op.cit., p. 12.
1050 See the classic Alain Touraine, Le communisme utopique. Le mouvement de mai 1968, Paris 1968.
1053 Robert Inglehart, The Silent Revolution, Princeton 1977. While Habermas attributes ‘new social movements’ to late modernity, Inglehart accounts for their appearance on the grounds of a post-industrial welfare and feeling of safety. Inglehart’s theory about post-material values, ascribes the rise of new social movements to changed values. See Klandermans, op.cit., p. 27.
the 'consumer culture' was not strong enough to spark an anti-consumerist youth frenzy.

Moreover, the fact that Western countries were experiencing a crisis of parliamentarism, at the same time that Greece had been put in a 'plaster cast' renders a direct comparison difficult. The Greek Communist Party had been outlawed since 1947 and the country's democracy was weak even during the mid-1960s. Years after the end of the Civil War people were still fighting for individual freedom and basic political rights. Therefore Western students' slogans such as *imagination au pouvoir* often seemed out of place. Being confronted with a grotesque, arbitrary and brutal adversary, such as the Junta, protest activity of a situationist character could not be easily grasped; that was partly the reason why the few anarchists inside the Polytechnic occupation were marginalised and suspected. Lygeros underlines the distinct conditions that led to different demands:

It has the specificity that it finds itself in an extraordinary situation, a dictatorship, it puts forward a demand that is further back, it does not say 'imagination au pouvoir', as May does, it says 'down with the Junta'. In the first phase it does not say it directly, because it wants to override fear, it says, for example, 'free student elections'. (Lygeros)

A Greek female student in Munich, who left the movement in Greece to pursue postgraduate studies and found herself demonstrating in her adoptive country, conveys the feeling that her German counterparts had far too many rights. In a letter to Papachristos in February 1972 she says:

I felt an immense shame [...] participating in the demonstrations of the students here - who struggle in order to acquire even more rights, next to all their vested ones.\(^\text{1054}\)

Zorba’s view on '68ers illustrates this issue further:

I too believed that they were some thugs, who, OK, made a painless revolt, you know, while... while the issue down here was a dictatorship. (Zorba)

Just like the '68ers, Greek students were the first generation to grow up under 'less burdensome economic conditions and therefore were less subject psychologically to the

\(^{1054}\) Dimitris Papachristos, *Ζούοε τη ζωή σα να τη θυμάσαι* [He lived life as if he was remembering it], Athens 2003, p. 85.
disciplinary compulsion of the labour market’ and ‘more sensitive towards the economisation of life and individual costs of competitive society’. They dissociated themselves from the traditionalist home model and traditional social formations but not from the political ones.

Furthermore, as in other underdeveloped countries, in Greece too the students served as a catalyst for political change. Contrary to the experience of Western students-, who had ‘no experience of political terror, economic crises, real political alternatives to the established order and organised opposition’, they had considerable familiarity with these phenomena. Violence and counter-violence was a daily reality for ‘68ers, but as a provocation, rather than as a necessity. In Greece the conflicts were too acute and conspicuous, reflecting the particular conflicts of a divided nation.

\textit{1b. The Uprising}

Over 310 new slogans have been written [on the walls], all without exception of anarchist and subversive character, but with special characteristics, namely superseding in delirious formulation even those very slogans that were used during the upheaval of May 1968 in Paris.

\textit{Greek State Communication Bureau, 19/11/73}

The Polytechnic occupation resembled May ’68 in as far as it was led by the spirit of an uprising. One should point out, however, that evidently the Polytechnic and the student movement as a whole is not as messy and unresolved as the other movements of the Sixties. Accordingly, the controversial wisecrack that ’68 was ‘an interpretation in search of an event’ could not be easily applied to the student movement in Greece, or Spain for that matter. While the primary ideology of ’68 was ‘contestation’ with no precise contents, objectives or enemies, the huge weight of the military dictatorship and the special significance that acts of defiance such as at the Polytechnic acquired within this context rendered it unconditionally an event with clear interpretational cues.

\textsuperscript{1055} Bert Klandermans, op.cit.
\textsuperscript{1056} J. Habermas, \textit{Toward a Rational...}, op.cit, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{1057} Isabelle Sommier, \textit{Le ’68 et son deuil...}, op.cit, p. 37.
A rebellion against a dictatorship seems much more straightforward than the middle-class radicalism with the often ambivalent motivations of the western movements of the late 1960s.

Despite the fact that the self-organising structure of Greek students (FEA) prior to '73 was very close to the '68 spirit, the Polytechnic occupation broke the direct democracy precedent and representativity was introduced in its extreme form. For instance, whoever was not a member of the occupation's Coordinating Committee could not enter the room where the latter held its assemblies. Another interesting feature is the role played by the media. The student radio station in Athens was a very direct way of spreading influence and accessing a wider range of people. Konofagos, ex-Principal of the Athens Polytechnic, argues correctly that this was something that the students in Paris in 1968 did not achieve,\textsuperscript{1058} most probably because they did not want to. However, the Greek students did not employ radical tactics. Contrary to the '68 movements, which relied heavily on the use of confrontational events, in Greece the movement's repertoire was strictly non-violent, although perhaps equally disruptive, as was the case with the Law School and the Polytechnic occupations.

Still, a semiological study of '68 results in similar findings about the anti-Junta student movement in terms of cultural significations (gestures, language, symbols) which formed an identity code and became a menace to the established order and incomprehensible for outsiders.\textsuperscript{1059} Elements of '68 were present, even if in disguise, including a common theoretical background, patterns of behaviour and the placing of oneself in an imaginary chain of events in a global contestatory movement. What is more, the Greek student movement was reacting against the pressure of a military dictatorship, but was also strongly, albeit indirectly, influenced by the general movement generated in '68.

\begin{quote}
In the discussions about political matters etc, May '68 was not absent, not at all. On the contrary it seemed very close. Now think, the student movement starts acquiring momentum in '72, it has a four year difference, it is not much. It was a great revolt... (Vourekas)
\end{quote}

The political conscience of the student movement was also shaped by a set of cultural models and prototypes of resistance that originated abroad. 'Foreign' models were quite subversive as they included elements of defiance and linked the student

\textsuperscript{1058} K. Konofagos, \textit{The Polytechnic Uprising}, op.cit., p. 51.

\textsuperscript{1059} Isabelle Sommier, \textit{Le '68...}, op.cit, p. 40.
movements' imaginary, experiences and style together. This matches the observation that 'the rash of student movements that flourished around the globe [...] in 1968 were clearly attuned to and influenced by one another, resulting in the development and diffusion of a 'student left master frame'. It is important to note that contrary to the previous age group, this generation had experienced and learned from '68 as a past model, a past experience, and not a simultaneous event:

Towards the end of 1969 we had heard about 'May' '68, the hippies of America, the Italian autumn and Jan Palach who had set himself on fire in Prague. (Papachristos)

So, Greek students had '68, and in particular the French experience, in the back of their minds. Therefore, solidarity, imagination, vitality, adrenaline, subversiveness and eroticism were constant themes. In addition, the distinct characteristics and ultimate demands of the Greek movement - a locally defined case - were determined not only by internal politics but also by a broader influx of information and semantic codes, such as dress, taste in music and literature, rhetoric and slogans and the awareness that there were parallel student movements operating abroad. In this way, student mentalities, marked by both their domestic situation and an adversary as concrete as a military Junta, were nevertheless enhanced by an awareness of student movements abroad. This evokes Gilcher Holtey's comment on '68, that 'it was the mimesis of all possible revolutions that united the students who were in revolt'. In this respect, Greek students managed to accumulate many elements of the international protest movement, alongside their distinct characteristics, and despite structural incongruence. In a way, the general wave of '68 infiltrated Greece and was modified according to the existing standards, conditions and needs.

However, in both the '68 and post-'68 movements the revolutionary imaginary was shaped by foreign experiences, including the international circulation of information about the student revolts and the strong influence of the liberation struggles in the Third World. Cross-national diffusion of protest led to the adoption of similar
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1062 Gilcher-Holtey, 'Die Phantasie an die Macht', op.cit., p. 49.
strategies concerning organization, action forms and ideological frames. In that sense, the fallout from '68 had a ‘colonial’ cultural impact, a fact that continued after the fall of the dictatorship through a series of French trained Greek scholars, some of whom arrived from Vincennes. Still, despite this idea of ‘sender’ and ‘receiver’ country, one could argue that a mutual influence took place. The tiersmondiste tendency of Western students included identification with the Greek ‘underdog’ and the sensitivization campaigns that took place in terms of the Colonels’ regime had rendered Theodorakis, Melina Merkouri and Panagoulis parts of the pantheon of revolutionary folklore.

Anti-regime Greek students also shared the utopian vision of the '68 movements, which was far removed from the celebration of the Sixties as a cultural era. Greek students could be described as visionary protesters but with very different views on how to combat the regime and how to transform Greek society. Evidently none of them wanted to go back to the pre-1967 state of affairs. They did not, however, share the post-'68 Utopias but neither did they believe in aphorisms, such as the famous dictum that ‘the bourgeois state should be smashed instead of changed’. Accordingly, the self-identification with the privileged ‘other’ proves that the Junta’s grip was not a static and impenetrable barrier. Instead it was a sort of prism, which often privileged biased distortions instead of a clear viewpoint. For example, the violence in the rhetoric and actions of western protesters was translated into the peacefulness of Polytechnic riots, while social values and consumption, rejected by the rebelling West, remained an ardent desire.

The public demonstrations of Greek students were more serious and less irreverent and provocative then those organised by their Western counterparts, largely because they targeted the whole nation. Accordingly, although the Greek '73 was by definition anti-authoritarian, as it dealt with an authoritarian regime, it did not aspire to throw off authority and its inherited convictions. While Greek students wanted to change things, alienated as they were both by the authoritarian regime and by Greek society and its value system in general, they did not appear willing to be violently disruptive, perhaps because they did not enjoy the conceptual and physical space to do so. Instead, they sought to create a national insurrection, by appealing to ordinary people. Chatzisokratis, for instance, stresses with pride, that the biggest victory of the
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Polytechnic was that it managed to isolate leftist radicalism and that it promoted slogans that could be accepted and digested by most Greeks at that point. This was not a concern of '68 protesters, who could allow themselves to be as libertarian and anarchic as they wished. An interesting testimony is provided by Professor Konofagos, in a book published some years after the democratic transition in Greece. As he had been to Paris shortly after May '68, Konofagos had a first hand opinion of what had happened during the événements and was therefore in a position to compare this with the Greek case. Surprising as it might sound, as uttered by a Greek academic with no pedigree of radicalism, his comments are nevertheless accurate and enlightening:

I compared the slogans of Paris with the ones in Athens. Much less humour in our people. But all the rest was equally multifarious. The anarchist slogans over here were fewer too.1066

So, even if playfulness and hedonism were present, they only occurred on a strictly private level. As Claudie Weil has argued, there is a great difference between a joyous culture of revolt and a serious one,1067 and these cases reflect this division. The strict guidance by the organisations and the patrolling for 'provocateurs' and out of line slogans in the Polytechnic, betray the seriousness which accompanied the movement from the very beginning.1068

2. Medium-length: Utopias and outcomes

According to Giovanni Statera there is a lag between Utopia and ideology and an instantaneous conflict between the two in a movement.1069 At a certain moment in the '68 movements ideology superseded Utopia and the student movements 'succumbed to reality as it was'.1070 In the Greek case it seems that the two were inextricably linked, whereby, apart from a few cases, ideology held paramount importance. Only in the Polytechnic uprising did the utopian feeling acquire a status of its own, aided by the circumstances. At that point, one could argue, paraphrasing Stedman Jones, that the
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1067 Discussion in terms of the paper ‘Fête ou révolution ? Les perceptions diverses de mai 68 par les étudiants grecs’, presented by the author within the framework of the Groupe d'études et de recherche sur les mouvements étudiants (GERME), Science Po, Paris 17/12/2003.
1068 The seriousness of the Polytechnic Generation is reflected in the song by poète-chansonnier Moutsis' 'weird aged children', see Fyssas, op.cit., p. 18. Also the poet Kostoula Mitropoulou refers to 'all those smoked faces that have suddenly aged', in *The Chronicle of the Three Days*, op.cit., p. 11.
1070 Luisa Passerini, "Utopia' and Desire...", op.cit.
Greek student movement became both 'expressive' and 'structural'. The instantaneous void, the spontaneous character of the revolt and the feeling that everything was possible allowed for the creation of momentary Utopias, which were quickly dissolved when the movement was crushed under the tanks.

What is more, romantic utopianism, based on the ambivalence between radical Humanism and cold structuralism, was a common experience with '68. Up to a certain point there was a short period of complete freedom of imagination, drawing on a vast scale of resources. The students' desires, their beliefs and their rational expectations got intertwined for a moment, in which the movement was not filtered through the prerogatives of ideology alone. The semantic content of their intentions and actions was dictated by the very rational pre-conditions set by the struggle, a fact that intentionally curtailed the space of the imaginary as the movement required cold and lucid thinking. On the other hand, ideological aspects were omnipresent: just the fact that the given conditions were judged to be a 'revolutionary situation' was a frame that would make people act in a specific way, proving its performative effect. Framings acquired a real basis, following Breton's dictum that 'l'imaginaire est ce qui tend à devenir réel'. Another point of reference was the imaginary link with old socialism, whereby ‘student-worker unity’ was a constantly reiterated idea. Thinking of themselves as linked to the workers, even if there was an enormous lag between the two, also influenced the students’ action repertoire.

Another defining factor was Greek political culture, which in many ways determined the claims that the Greek students did and did not make. This ‘ultimately provide[d] the logic of revolutionary action’, by supplying most of the ‘discourses, values and implicit rules that express[ed] and shape[ed] collective action and intentions.’ In terms of left-wing politics, even though the Greek students split into groupings, their attachment to Communist Orthodoxy remained intact. Interestingly, however, despite the fact that the Communist Party itself did naturally condemn the '68 uprisings as a purely opportunistic circus, the students were very much attracted by it. Still, their allegiance to basic Communist principles, and even more so to the
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1073 Lynn Hunt and Keith Barker, quoted by J. Wasserstrom, Student Protest..., op.cit., pp. 10-11. Wasserstrom also brings forward the merits of the analyses made by Francois Furet and Mona Ozouf on the fluid nature and creative possibilities of a revolutionary political culture.
Communist parties as exponents of the only legitimate/authoritative alternative to Greek authoritarianism, remained unchallenged.

In contrast to the climate of the French May, on which characteristically Daniel Cohn Bendit was commenting during the greatest demonstration that ‘I had the chance to be the head of a huge march, at the end of which were the Stalinist pigs’. This is not the climate of the anti-dictatorship student movement. The role of the protagonist within the anti-dictatorship student movement is that of the students who belonged to KKE Int and to KKE. (Sabatakakis)

To many of these people, nurtured with the teachings of the traditional Greek Left, it was quite puzzling that Communist Parties were in many ways excluded from and ridiculed by most ’68 movements.

The radicalization that took place in Europe arrived in Greece with a certain delay. It acquired those contradictory characteristics, that is the military jacket, the beards, the long hair, the ‘kids with the long hair and the black clothes’. And it is impressive how a large part of these people belonged to KKE; that is, although it had all the qualifications for going elsewhere. Because the reality here was entirely different and more backward, this is the truth... Namely, ’68 was the period of contestation of the traditional Left. In Greece this contestation could only emerge from within the very party mechanisms, that is KKE Interior versus KKE, while the young people who were joining threw themselves into it again, that is searching to find their path. (Bistis)

A common element with the movements abroad, as was mentioned before, was the appearance of the leftists. Although they shared the radicalism and flamboyance of their counterparts in rhetoric and action, Greek leftists did not aim at the ‘immediate mobilisation of many individuals for the sake of mobilisation itself’, to use Habermas’s phrase. Maoists and Trotskyites were immersed into new actionism inspired by Mao and Castro\textsuperscript{1074} and therefore sought mobilisation at all costs, but not for its own sake. Moreover, although these people were the closest to ’68 radicalism and internationalism, they were often the ones who rejected references to the international situation, opting for a more rigid focus on the Greek case and its special characteristics. Another interesting discrepancy, which partly derives from the above, is that while in the ’68 movements a certain neo-anarchist tendency was born, in Greece the word anarchy continued to bear negative connotations not only for the ruling classes and the Junta but also for most sections of the Left, including the radicals.

\textsuperscript{1074} J. Habermas, \textit{Toward a Rational...}, op.cit, p. 26.
Despite these anti-Moscow components, to which one could also add the Eurocommunists, the Greek student movement, did not lead to a changing focus of opposition 'from economic exploitation to social and cultural alienation', nor did it 'prepare the rejection of Stalinist authoritarianism in the new social movements' in Greece. Greek students did it their own way, by incorporating the Communist Party as a leading player in contestatory action. Therefore, as 'traditional values and forms of behaviour limit the actors' views on what is possible', the hegemonic Communist ideology did not allow for major break-throughs given the imprinted traumatic memory of the Civil War adventure. The students' colourful cultural activism expressed indirectly 'the demand for a different political rhetoric' which, however, did not 'put in doubt [...] the dominant left-wing ideology and practice', as Aris Marangopoulos maintains.

'68 was a revolt against bourgeois society, which felt the need to represent the working class and act in its name. In Greece it was a revolt against a tangible, skin felt oppression, which, at the same time happened to share some of 68's tenets and points of departure: a general Marxist background that venerated the working classes and workers, the conviction that the ruling class in Greece was backing the dictators - as did the Right, the Church and the Americans - and a rejection of Greek society's bigotry. Here, however, the absence of a trade-unionist worker movement in Greece is striking. It is however important to note that the workers in France did not have clear-cut ideological prerogatives either but were constructed in the imaginary of the protesters as their mythical leaders. Cohn Bendit conveys this extreme workerism when stating that '[the workers] were so present in our minds that we definitely had to get together some day'.

Workers apart, however, May '68 posed the problem of defining the subjects of History. As the role of the individual in the historical procedure shifted, students considered themselves for the first time as vehicles of historicity and the individual as a factor of social change. This shift had an impact on Greek students too. Alkis Rigos stresses the fact that they also believed in their capacity to change the world, even

1076 Ibid.
1077 Aris Marangopoulos, 'Children of Marx...', op.cit., p. 22.
though he uses a formulation that is in stark contrast to the very diffused certitude of the time that the US were to blame for everything:

A thing into which we didn't fall as a generation was the mythology that the Great Powers do everything and therefore you are weak. Somewhere out there some foreigners decide, and you are weak. We believed that you could change the world. (Rigos)

This could also be seen as a moment of collective madness, where traditional barriers are broken and the perception of activists that they could intervene in History is changed. The Polytechnic shares a characteristic of '68, the perception that they could change the world, producing a type of account which explains how the world order was perceived by activists. Vernikos opts for a more limited version of this in the title of his book: 'Once upon a time, when we wanted to change Greece'. It is significant that it is Greece, not the world, that is to be changed and this lexical cautiousness, juxtaposed with the hyperbole of the western slogan 'we want the world', encapsulates to a great extent the awareness of the limitations that the Greek students were facing. Even so, the conviction that they could change Greece coupled with their certainty that they were part of a wider, universal struggle was enough to place them within this wider context of avant-garde protest. Sabatakakis describes it as a conviction that capitalism was in recoil at a global level:

I believe that the main characteristic, experienced by the young people in Europe, and the young people in Greece, is a feeling that capitalism is being replaced. Namely this was the period of Vietnam, of movements of liberation in the whole world, Che Guevara, Chile. This is therefore a period in which the feeling was that capitalism was retreating, being replaced by a revolutionary movement.

Despite all its particularities, the anti-dictatorship student movement shared many elements of the anti-hierarchical and anti-authoritarian character of the '68 revolts and was in many ways a 'revolt' (Touraine), a 'quasi-revolution' (Morin) and a 'cultural break' (Crozier). However, the divergences are many. In Greece part of the bourgeois establishment backed the student struggle, including the 'old' politicians and intellectuals and also those people that belonged to the old bourgeoisie and could not
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abide the coarseness of the dictators and their obscurantism. And this was partly because it was not a 'tear-it-all-apart' fight, but one which vindicated traditional values, and thus was not intrinsically provocative. It is interesting that even during the trial of the Polytechnic massacre, that is a year after the Junta's fall, the students still refused to recognise several facts, probably in order not to provide the other side with arguments that they wanted to stage an anarchist revolution.1082 They were 'good kids', venerated by many people, because they shared healthy attitudes, even if Communist, or often for that very reason. In the end, they were iconoclastic only in terms of everyday life: easier sexual relations, hippie appearance, declared beliefs. It was after all, 'far out' and radical to be both bourgeois and Communist.

3. **Future’s past: The cultural changes**

In the words of Carl E. Shorske, there is a passage of student revolt from politics to culture, due to 'a gap that open[s] between generations in both moral and intellectual culture' which is 'wider than in politics'.1083 Cultural projections play a catalyst role as they remodel the imaginary and historical conscience of a generation.1084 Greek students mixed the 'high' and 'low' registers of culture, the 'elite' and 'popular' ones, as they appropriated both. They matched the characteristics of a contestatory countercultural movement (defiance) with highly sophisticated book-learning, and they immersed into forms of culture not only as producers/consumers of artifacts but also through their lived practices. In the end, ideology, supposedly the main characteristic of the time, went hand in hand with a deeper form of culture that was emerging; a culture that differentiated this generation from any previous one and that created a very strong sense of unity. It was a synthetical form of culture, which had accumulated the international paradigm of youth radicalism as the *Zeitgeist* of the era, and translated it into something new through the filter of the Greek cultural tradition and politics.1085

However, the general anti-authoritarianism directed against all institutions (school, family, party, politics), which was closer to the original spirit of '68 than
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1082 See Οι δίκες της Χώντας. Πλήρη πρακτικά. Η Δίκη του Πολυτεχνείου [The trials of the Junta. The Full Minutes. The Polytechnic trial], Athens, 1975.
1085 For an elaboration of the notion of the fusion between the paradigm of the international movement and national cultural tradition see Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey, 'Mai 68 in Frankreich' pp. 131-150 in Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (ed.), *1968 - Vom Ereignis zum Gegenstand der Geschichtswissenschaft*, Goettingen 1998.
Marxism,\textsuperscript{1086} was more implicit than explicit in the Greek case. Similarly, there was a striking absence of a feminist, ecologist, homosexual or other component in the movement and its successors after the restoration of democracy. Overall, Greek students lay between innovation and tradition, reflected in their reluctance to attack the way in which power was being exercised in society at large. Still, in Greece, as in Spain, the uneven development ‘exacerbated the experience of modernity as contradiction and crisis’ producing a more characteristic avant-garde than in the ‘more advanced capitalist nations where modernity was less problematic.’\textsuperscript{1087}

This generation of Greek students was an \textit{avant-garde}, both in terms of its self-perception and action repertoire. It accelerated the modernization processes that took place at break-neck speed in the years following the Junta’s collapse, by linking in some ways political radicalism with everyday life practices. In this way, the student movement acted as incubator of new ideas and future behaviours, carving out new boundaries between the ‘public’ and the ‘private’.\textsuperscript{1088} After all, student circles were a privileged site, since this was the only space where mass culture and alternative politics were discussed, experimented with and exercised. Overall, their relation to modernization, ‘68, democracy, Communism and Europe were crucial in forging these students into a new elite that would accelerate and legitimise the transitional process.

\textsuperscript{1086} Isabelle Sommier, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{1088} J. Habermas, \textit{Toward a Rational...}, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 29.
Chapter Six

Student Protest Culture in 'late' Francoist Spain: A Comparison

The first ruptures

In Spain the University was comprised of a male-dominated and socially elitist student body, much more so than in Greece. In addition, a large number of left-wing students were directly or indirectly excluded from the university, since their families had been involved in the Civil War on the losers' side. Universities were conditioned by the outcome of the civil strife and became propagators of the official ideology. At the same time as Greek education promoted the 'Greek-Christian civilisation', in Spain the control of the Catholic Church in the universities and the transmission of nationalist Catholicism (nacional-Catolicismo) to all students was guaranteed by a Ley de Ordenación. José Álvarez Junco, a Law and later on Politics student in the early 1960s, recalls that his consciousness was

Nationalist, spangiolist, catholic, naturally, and strongly conservative. Which was what we have been taught. And the scholasticism, the political philosophy of scholasticism, of course, too. [...] The Law Faculty was a very conservative place. There were teachers and professors who started the classes with prayers, 'Salve', 'Padre Nuestro', whatever it was, and concluded the course praying ... an absurdity. Even to us, who were of conservative origins, this seemed ridiculously antiquated. (Junco)

The generations that were born during the Civil War were clearly marked by the aftermath, the divisions and the bitterness of this conflict which acted as a formative element in their imaginary and their memory. Paloma Aguilar Fernández observes that 'this generation preserves in its memory, alongside an inherited and narrated war trauma, the lived experience of the post-war, vivid images of the post-war period, the

---

1089 I would like to thank Professors Miguel Ángel Ruiz Carnicer, Paloma Aguilar Fernández and Dimitri Sotiropoulos, as well as Dr Javier Rodrigo for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this chapter. Thanks also go to Professor Paul Preston for his useful suggestions.
1090 According to an enquiry conducted by the daily Madrid up to 1967 only 0.2% of the student body was comprised of students of working-class origins. Trini de León-Sotelo, 'Polémica social sobre la reforma educativa', 4/4/1970.
1091 José María Maravall, Dictatorship and Political Dissent. Workers and Students in Franco's Spain, Cambridge 1978, p. 99.
1092 Luis Box remembers the hymn that school-kids were obliged to sing in school in the late 1950s: 'There was a hymn, I remember, called 'Catholic Youths of Spain', [...] [which] concluded: 'Spain, glorious Spain victorious Spain, which discovered America and will be imperial once again'.
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divided families of a country in ruins, the oppression, the silences, the historical deformations and the fears in the family environment, up to the point of mentally associating the terrible conflict with the, not less terrible, post-war period'.

In the 1950s the first signs of unrest took place on a nationalist platform and with a common target: Great Britain. While from 1951 onwards Greek students mobilised for unification with Cyprus, still a British colony, in 1954 Spanish students demanded the ‘return’ of Gibraltar, following the ‘provocative’ visit of Queen Elizabeth. These mobilizations, often boosted by the university authorities, were, however, the first signs of defiance from the student population and a step towards political emancipation. It was the first time that students acted as a political collective and student initiatives constituted an initial stage towards more effective and organised action. Gradually, the university became a locus of protest. Theorising the image of the university within Spanish society after '56, José María Modehano wrote:

The average Spaniard did not think of the University as a place where cancer was studied or where business administration was taught, but rather it was identified with strikes, demonstrations and permanent protest.

A key date for the Spanish case is 1956, and not so much for the minor repercussions that the Soviet invasion of Hungary had on the exiled PCE and its followers. February 1956 marked the first mobilizations with an anti-authoritarian character in the University of Madrid. The mobilizations sparked the first harsh reprisals from the authorities, which in turn acted as a catalyst for the further politicisation of the student body. It is noteworthy that the first demonstrations took place on the occasion of the funeral of Ortega y Gasset, a major intellectual figure, a fact that strongly recalls what happened in Greece several years later on the occasion of Seferis’s funeral. The events of 1956, therefore, initiated a ‘cycle of protest’ in this part of the Iberian peninsula, by a new generation comprised of the youths born during the civil conflict.

The manifesto issued by the students in Spain in 1956 talked about ‘us, kids of the winners and losers of the Civil War’. In contraposition to their parents, they represented themselves as a ‘reconstructed moral subject’ opposing the politics of

---

1093 Paloma Aguilar Fernández, op.cit., p. 15.
1094 Pablo Lizcano, La Generación del 56. La universidad contra Franco, Barcelona 1981, p. 95.
1095 José María Modehano, ‘Una década de lucha en la universidad’ José María Modehano, in Diario16: Historia del Franquismo, 2nd part.
revenge and to what Prieto called the ‘fratricide generation’. Thus, according to Santos Juliá, 56 was the year in which the first signs of reconciliation among the descendants of the two dividing sides are to be found: there is a shift from a viewpoint regarding the civil conflict as a ‘guerra contra el invasor’ (Communism) to a new vision that regarded it as a ‘guerra fratricida’. The young intellectuals, former supporters of Franco and witnesses of the civil rift, who changed sides in 1956 and started criticising the ‘Movimiento’, were about to transform themselves into intellectual guides and points of reference for future students. These included notably the poet Dionisio Ridruejo and Lafín Entralgo, the Dean of the University of Madrid, who switched from being fervent supporters of the Movimiento to emblematic figures of the opposition. This type of political ‘defection’ to the side of the resistance is a typical Spanish phenomenon.

Nevertheless, the strong imprint of civil conflict is also to be found in Greece among the ‘historical generation’ of the 1960s student movement. As was seen before, in Greece this generation often presents itself as one that ‘did not experience a youth’ due to a continuous climate of fear and repression. In addition to that, the generation of the Resistance was glorified as the heroic generation of the 1940s. On the contrary, in Spain the generation of the ‘vencidos’ of the Civil War did not play an archetypical role in the youths’ imaginary, as it was regarded as a defeatist and discredited generation. Possible exceptions were the legendary anarchists and the Trotskyites of POUM, but also the fact that, as in the Greek case, youths in the 1960s re-appropriated the symbols of the Republic in terms of their own socialization. ‘¡Ay Carmela!’ was actually a cult song for youths in France and Italy as well around '68. Junco stresses that apart from venerating their symbols, he viewed the actual generation of the ’30s as one that did not manage to adjust to the political context and therefore was a bit out of place:

Back then we venerated the symbols of the Republic, the war songs, the republican flag, these things... But the key figures, our contact with them, or mine at least, my personal one, was never very intense, because I had the feeling that they were not aware of what was really happening at that moment. (Junco)

---

1098 Both Ridruejo, Minister of Education at the time, Lafín and the Dean of Salamanca were sacked, following the 1956 unrest.
Nonetheless, in both Spain and Greece, there had been censorship on a public level and self-censorship in the private sphere concerning the issue of the civil strife. In both cases the term ‘Civil War’ was taboo on the winners’ side which had labelled it a ‘crusade’ in the Spanish case and ‘bandit war’ in the Greek one. However, in post-1949 Greece and despite the persecution of the Left and the banning of Communist activities, there was a public space that was conquered and retained for the prolongation of the memory of the conflict, as a sort of counter-history, through EDA. In Spain, on the contrary, there was no forum that could adopt the mission of keeping the Republic’s virtues ‘alive’.

Maravall has argued that the university conflicts of 1956 in Spain took place, partly, when ‘the first age group born during the Civil War gained access to the University’, a pattern that is also to be found in Greece several years later. As well as in 1956, most students who got involved in anti-regime activities of the mid-1960s were sons and daughters of the winners. Carles Carreras i Verdaguer, an active anti-regime Economics student in Barcelona in the 1960s, is a typical case:

I came from a fully Francoist family with a close uncle assassinated during the first days of the War for being the President of the Carlist party in Menorca. Explicitly Francoist.

(Carreras i Verdaguer)

Luz Casasnovas, daughter of a military officer in Catalonia, recalls that ‘silence’ is the only way to describe her parents’ attitude to politics. She saw university as an escape from the claustrophobic, conservative and religious environment of her family.

---

1099 See for example various specials on EAM in EDA’s newspaper Avgi. In Greece, acts of commemoration were also taking place, even if boycotted by extreme right-wingers, as was the case of the 22nd anniversary of the blowing up of the Gorgopotamos viaduct in 1964. In Spain this was not possible.

1100 Another aspect of the memory of these conflicts that constitutes a common denominator for the two cases is the fact that left-wingers learned about their recent history from foreign historians or Spanish and Greek scholars based abroad: Anglo-Saxon historians in the case of Spain (Stanley Payne, Edward Malefakis, later on Paul Preston), Francophone intellectuals (Meynaud, Eudes) and Greeks based abroad (Svoronos, Tsoukalas) in the Greek instance. However, in the 1960s in Spain there was growing interest among young academics in researching the history of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Spain, mostly in Marxist terms. See, for instance, Enric Ucelay de Cal, 'Η ιστοριογραφία στην Καταλονία (1960-1980). Μαρξισμός, Εθνικισμός και Πολιτισμική Αγορά [Marxism, Nationalism and the Cultural Market], pp. 207-244, in Σύγχρονη Ισπανική Ιστοριογραφία. Τομές της φραγκικής και μεταφραγκικής εποχής [Contemporary Spanish Historiography. Ruptures of the Francoist and Post-Francoist Period], Athens 2001. Álvarez Junco himself followed this trend writing a thesis on Spanish anarchism in order to recuperate these ‘occult and stolen’, as he puts it, facets of Spanish History.

1101 José María Maravall, Dictadura y disentimiento político. Obreros y estudiantes bajo el Franquismo, Madrid 1978, p. 164.
Casasnovas’s description of herself as a ‘born rebel’ is strongly reminiscent of the self-representation of women activists of the '70s in Italy as ‘Amazons’: 1102

I went to Barcelona in '66. To me to go to Barcelona meant liberation, right? That is, I went through an absolutely critical period of adolescence, opposed to my parents, horrified by the religious ambience. Their rigid morals were sickening me. All this meant that going to Barcelona was like discovering the world. I registered in the University and after an initial year of limited contact with left-wingers, I passed absolutely to the Left in such a radical way as I lived my infancy. I recognize that I am a ‘rebel’. 1103

The fact that stern and repeated parental admonitions ‘not to meddle in politics’ 1104 coloured these young people’s upbringing is often echoed in present testimonies, like the one of Manuel Pérez Ledesma, a Political Science student at the University of Salamanca:

Such was the advice that was given at home: ‘you shall not get involved in politics’. That was the advice that my mother gave me. (Manuel Pérez Ledesma)

If silence was the main characteristic of Spanish people who stood on the winning side, the Civil War was an even greater taboo for the defeated. Luis Box, a Medical student and Communist militant, vividly remembers that any conversation that touched on politics was immediately silenced:

One of my first memories as an 8-9-10 year old child, one of my first impressions, is the fear people had of talking. When a talk was raised, immediately someone said: ‘Silence, silence. No, no.’ Well, either that or they tried to change the conversation. The fear that existed, one could feel it, the fear, the panic that one could not talk about this or that because somebody might overhear, and so on. (Box)

Box, however, also preserves rare reminiscences of his Republican parents and relatives discussing Franco and current politics, always ‘in a very low voice’. Student leader Jaime Pastor, on the other hand, laments that apart from the ‘silent majority’, some people on the Left used the memory of the Civil War disaster as a deterrent

1103 Fernanda Romeu Alfaro, El Silencio Roto... Mujeres contra el Franquismo, Madrid 1994, p. 203.
against revolutionary action. He stresses, however, that the new generation, to which he belonged were not discouraged by the threat of more violence.

Civil war memories, nevertheless, were not a dominant factor in the shaping of a separate youth identity in the late 1950s. Carlos Saura in his film *Los golfos* (1959), heralded the arrival of *New Spanish Cinema* by depicting a male teenage gang. The film portrays a bleak and pessimistic view of feckless youth and of urban social life as dark and decadent, similar to Greek films on the same issue such as *The downhill* (1961). Evidently, this perspective appropriated the image created by well known US films such as *The Wild One* and *Rebel without a Cause* and contradicted the official image of the youth that was propagated by Franco’s regime.¹⁰⁵ The unprecedented urbanization that the country experienced in the late 1950s was accompanied by a rising concentration of youth in big cities such as Madrid, which received people from the poor and underdeveloped areas of Extremadura and Castilla La Mancha, and Barcelona mainly from Andalusia and Murcia. These two phenomena enhanced the perception of the youth as a separate social category. Changed demographics and social dislocation boosted the youths’ ‘awareness of constituting a distinct community with particular interests’.¹⁰⁶ Soon thereafter, articles concerned with the appearance and social pastimes of the new urban youths became a common feature in all newspapers.¹¹⁰⁷

Despite these changes, premarital relations between the two sexes were still unthinkable. Trias, a graduate already in 1960, laments the fact that his female fellow-students were so distant:

My fellow students were some very bourgeois women, in the conservative sense, students of nun schools, and, well, our relations were very distant and, well, you couldn’t think at all of having sexual relations with them or anything. (Trias)

Alberto Reig Tapia, a Political Science student, gives a graphic description of the male perception of ‘sexual expansion’ of this generation, which bears striking


¹¹⁰⁷ See for example the column in the daily *Madrid* with the semi-invidious, semi-condescending title ‘Ellos son Jovenes’ (‘These are Young’).
similarities with the one in Greece, including the discourse, but also the practice of ‘sexploitation’ of domestic servants and receiving ‘instruction’ from prostitutes:

The generation immediately prior to mine continued to be a generation which was a bit fond of whorehouses, to put it this way, as the only possibilities of sexual expansion was through seamstress, domestic service women, or prostitution. First, because there were still no women in university, or very few, and the ones that were there knew that the preservation of their virginity was in some way a guarantee for marriage. (Tapia)

Interestingly, tourism acted as a counterweight and eventually started exercising a considerable social impact. Spain, just like Greece, became a tourist resort on a massive scale in the early 1960s, which coincided with the development of commercial air travel. With a promotional campaign focusing on the ambiguous message ‘Spain is different’, the influx of tourists increased from 2 million in 1956 Spain to 6,11 in 1960, 14 in 1964, 17 in 1966 and the historical maximum of 35 in 1973. The following account of the American writer James Morris eloquently describes the astonishment occasioned by tourist behaviour in the early 1960s:

[People were] stunned by the spectacle of women in trousers drinking whiskey, French plumbers driving luxury caravans, women of an advanced age with lipstick on their lips, secretaries hitchhiking in the highways and lovers kissing each other in public in the beaches.

As was the case with Matala in Greece, Ibiza became the hippy ‘headquarters’ in Spain, with much more liberal habits in terms of clothing and sexual behaviour. Soon, the regime started complaining about the ‘wave of eroticism that is invading us’. The hippies also introduced drugs to Spain since Ibiza became a sort of a de facto free zone. Box directly links this contact with the outside world via tourism, with a shift in the morals and the advent of rock n’roll.

---

1109 Rafael Torres’s, _El amor en tiempos de Franco_, Madrid 2002, p. 187.
1111 _Ibid_, p. 184. For a contemporary humorous account on how both men and women were influenced by this ‘wave of eroticism’ see Evaristo Acevedo, _Cartas a los celíberos desposados_, Madrid 1970.
1112 An interesting depiction of this can be found in Barbet Schroeder’s cult hippy movie _More_, which was filmed in Ibiza (1965) and featured a soundtrack by the early Pink Floyd.
Foreigners arrived with new habits, with ideas, etc etc. But the foreigners did not only [bring] new habits, they also introduced new discourses, they also carried commentaries, they also left a strong impression on the people to whom they talked. But apart from that, a series of fashions arrived, as for example the knowledge of how the United States, or France, or England were; rock n'roll, which is the music that culturally breaks with everything, came through. Namely, here the difference between youth and no-youth was delineated through rock n'roll and its products. (Box)

From mass university to mass politics

The 1960s signalled a change in the composition and numbers of the student body, with a strikingly similar process of massification to that of Greece. In Spain a certain 'late modernisation' had started taking place as a result of the country's 'economic miracle' and Opus Dei's initiatives towards a more technocratic mode of governance. Economic improvement had a dramatic impact on the youth's possibilities to access institutions of higher education. Accordingly, in the country's higher institutions, which maintained tuition fees up to 1970, the student population was enhanced by middle class students and increased from 84,542 in 1960-61 to 132,012 in 1965-66. In the late 1960s the Universidad Autonoma was created in Madrid, alongside Complutense, in order to deal with this expansion. However, in 1968 the newspaper Madrid was still reporting the fact that 'the immense majority of our university students originate from the upper classes'. More spectacular was the change instigated by the introduction of the Educational Reform in 1970 that abolished tuition and brought the numbers up to 292,131 by 1971-72.

---

1113 Following US aid after 1953, in exchange for American military presence, a 'stabilisation plan' was put into effect in 1959. By the early 1960s, Spain had achieved the highest development rates internationally, alongside Japan, as a consequence of this belated but complete integration into the world economy. Relative prosperity, especially compared to the years of isolation, was a natural outcome.


Anti-regime activity was boosted by this increase in student power. Up to that point, and apart from the 1956 Madrid incidents, the late 1950s and early 1960s student movements were defined by a prevailing cautious approach, in which the recruitment processes in the various student organisations were inefficient. Therefore, the nuclei of clandestine action were tiny and the visibility of the movement almost non-existent. Francisco Fernández Buey, a Humanities student in Barcelona, suggests in his self-representation that the political opposition was nothing more than an isolated minority:

Of course, you have to keep in mind, that at this moment all that was politically organised was clandestine and very much a minority movement. The initial relation of a university student who was starting his studies with a professor or various professors of those who could be considered to be of an anti-Francoist orientation [...] was difficult. [...] The calculation that I can make is that at this point at the University of Barcelona there were altogether no more than forty organised persons. (Fernández Buey)

The total failure of this strategy, combined with the growing numbers and the new political opportunities offered by the tardofranquismo brought about the need to go public, which signalled the radicalisation of the movement from its first phase (1960-65) to the second (1965-69). In his own version of the reasons behind anti-regime activities, Reig Tapia, who entered the Department of Politics in 1966, favours wider cultural explanation rather than strictly political criteria. The fact that the regime's ghastly aesthetical standards are presented as another reason behind youthful discontent, is strongly reminiscent of Damofli's view of the Greek Junta:

1117 J. Maravall, Dictatorship..., op. cit., p. 110.
I believe that I was involved in politics primarily for being anti-Francoist, for the absolute rejection I felt for the present situation, not yet politically but culturally. The regime, apart from being repressive and violent and illegitimate was the product of civil war and an illegitimate rebellion, it seemed to me old, mediocre, and then, this to me... even in aesthetic terms it seemed to me that it was something that had to end. (Tapia)

Again, as would happen in Greece a decade later, a new generation in Spain came to the fore and acquired visibility, contrary to the strict Leninist principles of clandestinity that dominated anti-regime circles up to that point. By the mid 1960s the situation in Spanish universities was already quite explosive, with student claims focusing on a more democratic functioning of the SEU, the state-controlled Falangist student union. Reig Tapia maintains that student agitation was enhanced by the fact that there was no direct experience of the war and by an inherent envy vis-à-vis university students abroad:

I entered university at a very politicised moment. In the end, the new generations, already sons of the era of development, who did not experience war and did not have the trauma and the fear of war, were more politicised and wanted very strongly to be like the rest of their European counterparts, the French, the Italian, in short, the Germans, or whoever; well, a democratic regime where one could do things, express one's self, do what one wanted. Therefore, the amalgam of all of us was anti-Francoism. (Tapia)

The movement acquired momentum by attacking the SEU and demanding the creation of an independent, representative union. Anti-regime students infiltrated the SEU and from within its ranks came to a confrontation with the Francoist ones. This battle culminated in spring 1965, when the regime eventually decided to dissolve the union and promulgate a Ley de Educación, introducing ‘radical changes’ in the university. The official union’s collapse is of crucial importance, not least since this was the only Francoist institution ever to be brought down by a social group or movement during Franco’s reign. Junco remembers this moment with emotion, as the first indication of a rising student power: ‘we were much stronger than we thought’. In the memory of

---

1118 R. Carr & J.P. Fusi Aizpuruia, Spain..., op.cit., p. 149.
Jaime Pastor, a leading leftist figure, the February 1965 demonstrations and the ‘free assemblies’ that followed are imprinted as a major rupture with the past.  

According to a British report, however, although the anti-regime students ended up having the only effective, even if unofficial, students' union, it ‘does not pursue a consistent political line since in the delegations in the various Faculties there are people with views ranging from centre-left to far left’. In fact, a major role in this initial phase was played by the PCE, which preserved a clandestine mechanism and was quick to organize people. According to Luis Box, the ‘Party’ was an absolute point of reference, an affirmation also shared by Tapia:

The Communist Party was not called Communist Party in those years, it was simply called ‘The Party’. It was ‘The Party’, and it was implied that ‘The Party’ meant the Communists, since there were no other people struggling. (Box)

The only party which was really organized was the Communist party, which was what everyone called the Party, in a tautological way. (Tapia)

According to a militant, ‘to enter the PCE seemed natural for any anti-Francoist student, of a Catholic and bourgeois family, who decided to commit himself seriously to the struggle against the dictatorship.’ This fact was strikingly exposed in spring 1964, when an arrested Communist student militant turned out to be the son of General José Lacalle Larrage, the Minister of Aviation. This issue demonstrated not only the scale of the opposition but also ‘the artificiality of the regime's division of Spaniards into victors and vanquished’.  

A major grouping controlled by the Communists was FUDE (Federación Universitaria Democrática Española), a name resurrected from the '30s, as it was the Republican student union dissolved by the Falangists. Here again a re-appropriation of past symbols and names may be observed as in the case of the old EFEE union in Greece.

---

1120 Following the dissolution of SEU, the regime attempted to replace it with another similar body (APE - Asociaciones Profesionales de Estudiantes), with no apparent success. However, anti-regime students were quick to introduce their own unofficial representative structures, under the name SDEU (Sindicato Democrático de Estudiantes Universitarios), as usual playing with the official name.


1122 José María Modehano, 'Recuerdos de mi generación' in Diario16: Historia del Franquismo, 2nd part, p. 698.

1123 P. Preston, cit., p. 716.
After the students’ initial victory, and as would happen in Greece in 1971-72, free student elections became the main demand. In particular the Young Communist League repeatedly argued in early 1967 that ‘it has been demonstrated in practice that elections are the milestone of the socio-political organization of the students.’ ^1124 The pragmatic thinking that can be discerned in the discourse of organized students is yet another common trait between Spanish and Greek ‘orthodox’ Communists. ^1125 Elections were regarded as a tangible objective, realizable and understood by the masses and one that would render continuity to the movement. Contrary to that, the young Communists argued, if elections did not become the epicentre of student action, all sort of spontaneous mobilizations that took place would not be able to provide a necessary feedback and would eventually lead to the ‘disorganization and the disorientation of the movement.’ ^1126 Despite all this, Communist students never ceased flirting with ‘real’ student issues:

It is an error to despise the academic demands and consider them as not sufficiently political or professional.[...] The very elevated political demands are accompanied and are closely linked to small demands, secondary from a political point of view, but of interest to a more general public. ^1127

In stark contrast to the Greek case, the part played by a supporting and equally rebellious young professorship in the movement was quite important in terms of the student revolt. The so-called Profesores No Numerarios (PNN), namely non professional staff, who were badly paid and suffered poor social conditions, were among the first to mobilize. ^1128 After a frontal attack with the police in the universities, the PNN sided with the student movement. In addition to this, in the ‘free assemblies’ of 1965 five catedráticos sided with the students and denounced the fascist structures of the Francoist political system. Professors Calvan and Aranguren in Madrid, as well as Sacristan and Calvo in Barcelona, started meeting each other in the same spaces as
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^1124 PCE leaflet, 31-1-67. PCE Archive.
^1125 Ibid. It seems, however, that contrary to the Greek case, the results of ’68 were quite influential for PCE followers in terms of the desired mobilization practices also. Accordingly, a less severe line was introduced from October-November 1968 onwards, with leaflets advocating the necessity of spontaneity, always in combination with a minimum of organization, as part of the linkage between the students and the working classes and their struggle.
^1126 PCE
^1127 Archivo del PCE, s.d.
the people of the opposition, and gradually became major bearers of the spirit of revolt. Their prompt sacking as suspicious elements, allegedly affiliated to the PCE, gave an even greater impetus to student unrest. According to Fernández Buey, it soon became obvious that student radicalism went further than the SEU since its long term aim was the democratization of Spanish society.\(^{1129}\)

The student movement considered itself as part of a wider movement in favour of the democratization of Spanish society, not only in University, and was conscious that it was not possible to democratize the University without the democratization of the whole society. (Fernández Buey)

In the post-SEU era, students became more radicalized and protest was diffused. From '67-'68 onwards clashes moved away from the university area and the internal student disputes. Confrontations with the police became a common phenomenon and could by sparked by apparently routine issues, such as the failure to obtain permission for an assembly. These often developed into violent clashes and a further radicalization of the students who at the same time started expanding their action repertoire: smashing the canteen, blocking traffic around the campus and throwing stones at policemen became standard practices. A British report talks about the ‘acratas’, anarchist students who were ‘active in smashing furniture etc. with the aim of provoking clashes with the police’.\(^{1130}\) In response, campuses often remained closed for extended periods of time,\(^{1131}\) followed in turn by student strikes. However, Junco, delineates in his writings the differences between the 1936 ‘acratas’ and the post-1960s ones, as the former were convinced trade-unionists whereas the latter had very little interest in unionism and were rather fond of music festivals and personal liberation through the rejection of social taboos.\(^{1132}\) Despite their informal and non-continuous character, these mobilizations were a step away from the rigidity and the hierarchical nature of the clandestine cells upon which the old Left depended and to

\(^{1131}\) See, for example, ‘Suspensión por tres días de las actividades académicas en la Universidad y en las Escuelas Técnicas. Cierre indefinido de la Facultad de Económicas’, *Madrid*, 31/1/1967.
which the Francoist police were accustomed. What is more, occupations and ‘expressive action’ were often more effective than strikes as means of pressure.\textsuperscript{1133}

Similarities with Greece are to be found in the day-to-day clashes between the democratic students and pro-Franco militants in the University. Right-wing entities included the \textit{Defensa Universitaria}, a Law based group whose sole \textit{raison d’être} was to combat left-wingers. These were mostly well-off sons of regime officials, usually using violent methods to break up meetings. According to a British report they gave the Fascist salute, were ‘protected by the police’ but were ‘believed to include a high proportion of police agents’.\textsuperscript{1134} Pastor remembers occasional clashes:

Man, we clashed with them, we had quarrels, but they were clearly minoritarian. Yes, I remember that once they came to our Faculty, but we stopped them. In any case, their feud was with the Law Faculty and there things were tense indeed. [...] Well, it led to the situation in which in our groups too there were people concerned about this, about being alert, ‘listen, these are coming’, people especially dedicated to this. But sometimes they came at the end of an assembly intending to boycott it. But I don’t remember them as a significant force. (Pastor)

A Falange group, mostly in Economics, was \textit{Frente Universitario Nacional Sindicalista}, the main activity of which was to produce posters and pamphlets attacking FUDE and other left-wing groups, while another group such as the \textit{Frente de Estudiantes Sindicalistas} was so radically Falangist that it even attacked Franco’s regime for having sold out to bourgeois capitalism.\textsuperscript{1135} Later in Madrid the so-called \textit{Guerilleros de Cristo Rey} (Warriors of Christ the King) appeared which were armed terror squads of militant Falangists, affiliated to the neo-Nazi political group \textit{Fuerza Nueva}.\textsuperscript{1136}

\textbf{‘Gauche divine’ versus mass culture}

Moving away from Madrid, Barcelona was a more open place with a greater facility for absorbing intellectual streams from abroad. The liberal Catalan background, the city’s geographical and linguistic proximity to France and the fact that it became a target place of Latin American intellectuals, including Vargas Llosa and Garcia

\textsuperscript{1133}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1135}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1136}Paul Preston 1993, cit., p. 737.
Márquez, contributed to the creation of a widespread progressive movement endorsing disobedience: the *gauche divine*. Juan Trias, a young professor at the time and later a renowned political scientist, draws a clear dividing line between Barcelona and Madrid in terms of the intellectuality characterising the Catalan capital:

There was no movement like that of the ‘gauche divine’ in Barcelona, which affected the people from the publishing world, the university, architects and so on, it seems to me that this did not have a parallel in Madrid. (Trias)

From within this intellectual and cultural climate, which Vargas Llosa labelled ‘new sentimentalism’, the first visible act of mass protest sprang. In March 1966, 500 students demanding more democratisation shut themselves in protest together with 30 professors in the Capuchin convent of Sarriá, in what came to be known as the *Capuxinada*. The students proceeded in establishing their own democratic student union (SDEUB). Alongside this faction of the university community, all of the monks remained barricaded there for 3 days, until the police evacuated the place.

This action, dressed up as it was with a certain catholic element, as the symbolic place chosen was not the city’s university, as in the Greek case, but a distant monastery, enjoyed strong support on the side of the people.1137 Interestingly, as was the case with the ‘July events’ in Greece, this incident also received the *ex post facto* label of an early ’68.1138 Still, the presence of the priests in resistance activities is a very distinct Spanish trait, since part of the clergy had developed anti-regime reflexes, especially in the ethnically sensitive and culturally suppressed areas of Catalonia and the Basque Country.1139 In 1970 too, a cathedral was chosen as the symbolic place for protesting against the imminent execution of six members of ETA, in order to stress the universal and humanistic side of the demand and with the aim of appealing to the Roman Catholic impulse of the authorities.1140 In Greece, however, there are no

---

1137 Diario16 Historia del Franquismo, p. 699.
1140 The sit-ins in Spanish churches for anti-regime protests became so diffused, that at a certain point Madrid’s Falangists staged a counter sit-in to protest against the use of churches for political propaganda. PRO, FC09/982, Restricted, British Embassy Madrid to the Foreign Office, A.L.S. Colman to A.E.Palmer, ‘Anti-Régime Activities in Spain and their Repression’, 22 January 1969. The Spanish Church’s disenchantment with Franco was reinforced after the latter’s clash with Montini, the reformist Cardinal of Milan, who later on became Pope Paul VI. This was to become a factor of great
recorded incidents of clerics being involved in anti-regime activities or going against the official line of the Church, which similarly to the Spanish case, had been a major accomplice and ideological bastion of the Junta.\footnote{Two exceptions were Father Georgios Pirounakis and the deacon Timotheos Lagoudakis, who supported student activities in Athens and were therefore persecuted. On the contrary however, a telling example of the higher clergy’s attitude is given by the testimony of the former Bishop of Dimitrias, Christodoulos, senior archimandrite of Archbishop Ieronymos at the time of the Junta and himself Archbishop of the Church of Greece at present. Christodoulos claimed that as he was studying Theology during those years he never actually realized that a military regime was ruling the country by employing violent measures.}

A striking feature in pictures of the Caputxinada is that the rebelling students were smartly dressed in ties, jackets and dresses. In 1966 the looks and attitudes of the politicised students had not yet changed, and by and large they continued to follow the Communist model of the austere struggler. The external appearance of the politicised segments of this generation had not yet been affected by its radicalization, as would be the case of the following one. In contrast to this, in a 1967 enquiry on the yé-yé, carefree youths are presented as very much in favour of a ‘new’ way of dressing and living.\footnote{Franco who boasted that his crusade had saved Spain from atheism. He routinely attributed this to the influence of Freemasons.} Articles such as ‘The happy reality of the ‘ye-ye’ girls’ commented on the strange phenomenon taking place in clubs which involved frenetically screaming girls, wearing mini-skirts and adoring loud guitar and percussion music:

They don’t have a boyfriend, they are platonically in love with their preferred singer, but deep inside they are completely normal. Sometimes, quite rarely, cases of hysteria are produced and for them it means the supreme delirium of happiness.\footnote{Manuel María, ‘La alegre realidad de las chicas ‘ye-ye’’, Madrid, 30/3/1967.}

Yé-yé is characterized as a phenomenon of extravagance and a real invasion as ‘whether we want it or not it actually reigns in the principal ‘boites’ of the capital’.\footnote{Juby Bustamante, ‘Lo cuenta Iñigo’, Madrid, 19/10/1968.} Musical singers such as the young Marisol and Masiel boasted about this phenomenon in movies that were characterized by pop aesthetics and triviality. Youthfulness was exalted and the most popular disc-jockey of the time Iñigo attested that ‘to be old is one of the gravest sins that one can commit in this world’.\footnote{‘Auténtica noche ‘ye-ye’. Casacas azules, minipantalones y un desfile de la nueva moda a la una de la madrugada’, Madrid, 31/3/1967.} The world of the young is presented as one that is decorated with posters, dances beat or soul, wears mini or maxi, military clothes, bell-bottoms and Beatles-like moustaches and which
communicates through music. An article laments the fact that there was a whole universe produced around the youth as 'one of the worse racisms in the universe'. Progressively, it was through these channels that youth culture smoothened cultural rigidities. Yé-yé was a counter-feature to the rigid Catholic morality but also a serious counterweight to the seriousness of left-wing ethics. However, as had happened in Greece, the penetration of yé-yé style and rock n’roll into Spanish culture was initially quite superficial, as it was deprived of any social content and subversiveness, only to be discovered and re-appropriated by a later generation as a cultural identity statement of defiance.

With reference to the photographs of the ‘organised’ youths, the fact that most of the male students were wearing ties was also a means of being like the rest of the students so as not to raise too many suspicions. In addition, Buey claims that ties were black in order to express protest and mourning. Another feature of the Caputxinada, similar also to the Lambrakis Youth, was the degree to which the occupation was male dominated. Fernández Buey, the northern star of the Catalan movement and the main leader behind the Caputxinada, argues that even the few women present in the movement often reproduced a domestic and ‘motherly’ female role, since they were mainly attributed the task of maintenance. Commenting on a photo exhibition with images from the Caputxinada in Barcelona in 2001, Buey points out:

When women appear, you look at the bottom of the picture and it says ‘group of female students, organizing food of the barricaded in Caputxinos’, and so on. Which meant maintenance works, this was the reproduction within the movement of what was going on in their families, in their households. (Fernández Buey)

The limited presence of women in the movement was also reported by the press, since demonstrations were usually ‘male-stream’. In certain cases, however, women’s combativeness was presented in a particular fashion and with evident surprise. According to an article on the unrest in the Barcelona campus

A functionary of the General Police Corps who found himself isolated, was brutally attacked by some students, among whom were various señoritas, who also assaulted him with their bags, in which they were carrying stones.

1145 Ibid.  
When in 1967 four female students were detained in Madrid and Barcelona for riots, it was an unprecedented phenomenon, equally stressed by documents of the time. Fernández Buey stresses through a personal anecdote how paternalistic the male gaze was, including among left-wing militants, and himself also:

I met my wife right in '66. We were both students, we are still living together. The first relation that we had was in one of these clandestine meetings to plan an act in which some pamphlets had to be thrown from a place in order to let them fall into the atrium, etc, etc. And there were two women, the rest were men. And I remember myself saying: 'We are going to do this thing'. And I recall my wife, who back then was something like 19 years old, saying 'why not us?' And I remember myself saying: 'Because this is an act that involves risks and this is a man’s thing'.

And all this despite the fact that Barcelona was supposed to be more liberal, an idea echoed by Pastor in his idealised exposé:

I believe that there was a greater liberalisation of habits in Barcelona. Because, besides, in Barcelona the preceding generation had been more liberalised, what was pejoratively called 'la gauche divine'. Well, of course, there were people who, in some way, had come in contact with the existentialism of Simone de Beauvoir, Jean Paul Sartre...

Fernández Buey is quick, however, in clarifying that in his view things were not necessarily better in Western countries. He recalls a repertory image from an assembly during May '68 in which women were constantly interrupted, thus arguing for a standard feature in student movements during the '60s:

You can see Cohn Bendit, Souvageaut and the rest; we don’t know the women’s names, of course. And this is symptomatic, every time a woman says something, two, three men jump down her throat, etc, etc, and this was May '68 in Paris... (Fernández Buey)

Spanish women were nevertheless more advanced and conscious than their Greek counterparts in terms of feminist politics. Accordingly, in 1965 and parallel to the great demonstrations of students and professors in the centre of the capital, the Democratic Womens’ Movement (MDM) was created, close to the PCE and with demands both in the sphere of current politics as well as in terms of female

1147 See the Communist paper Mundo Obrero, May 1967.
emancipation. It followed the strategy of infiltration in official womens’ unions and produced documents on symbolic dates, such as the 8 March, namely the international day of the mother and the woman.1148

However, as was also the case in Greece, in late '60s Spain maternity control was still sought by women,1149 while abortion and female adultery were criminal offences.1150 Social conservatism permeated the left-wing universe too, most often at the expense of women, as for instance, it was thought to be natural that the girl-friend of an imprisoned Communist would remain virtuous and faithful by force, whether or not her partner would come out of jail after decades. In addition, female contraception was still prohibited.1151 It remained a social taboo and penalized practice, and in this way one of the major preconditions of sexual liberation in Western Europe was still desired. Rosalía Sénider, a PCE and MDM militant in Valencia, stresses the envy of Spanish women for the emancipation of their French ‘sisters’. She recalls that ‘long live the pill’ became a popular slogan among militant women ‘because this is what we were searching for’.1152

As far as men were concerned, Buey recalls a book that was of paramount importance for young Spaniards in the early 60s and which demonstrates the extent of the difficulties that they were facing in terms of interpersonal experiences:

A widely diffused text at the time was entitled Modern Sexual Techniques, by a North American author who became quite famous and which I jokingly ended up qualifying as ‘button sex’, a guiding conception which consisted of the following: ‘touch your partner on this point and then this is produced, then she touches you on this point which produces that’ and so on. I always say that despite everything, this was a positive step in such a negative environment from this point of view as was Francoist Spain. At least we knew what a penis was and what a vagina, right. Apart from this, clearly, the negative consequence was to get lost in the so-called ‘button sex’ and to assume that naturally when you touched the spot that the book indicated this would produce the desired effect that was described in it. Which, obviously, could create many traumas on the

1148 Fernanda Romeu Alfaro, El Silencio Roto..., op.cit. One such publication was the clandestine journal Las mujeres y la lucha [Women and Struggle] in Madrid. Franco’s regime Female Section was up to that point praising the women for calming down their husbands and raising their children.
1149 Ibid, p. 91.
1151 Ibid. Eventually, contraception became liberalized in Spain in 1978 and in Greece in the early 1980s. Abortion, however, was legalized in Greece only in 1986 and in Spain in 1985, though restricted to cases of preventing medical emergencies.
1152 F. Romeu Alfaro, El Silencio Roto..., op.cit., p. 222.
normality of the proper sexuality, yours and your partner's, since everything, of course, was so structured. (Fernández Buey)

Naturally, going to university also meant graduating from the segregated world of the high-school years to a mixed reality. Still, the university residences were unsurprisingly separated, which was a fact that caused considerable distress. Women normally resided in Catholic Residences supervised by nuns and men in Colegios Mayores, where, curiously enough, a considerable cinematic culture developed thanks to the creation of the first cine-clubs. What Rosa Pereda remembers most vividly from residences, however, is deprivation. Her comment reflects the hygienic standards of that period:

In student residences, in the residence of the nuns where I went when I started my studies at Deusto, in the monthly fees for accommodation and food, a weekly bath was also included. A weekly bath... Which means that if you wanted to shower every day you had to pay separately. (Pereda)

‘Opening up’: the Spanish apertura

When in April 1967 the Colonels abolished democracy in Greece, Spain was already experiencing its phase of ‘opening’, an attempt to liberalize the system from within. The liberalization experiment, the so-called apertura (opening), took place under the dynamic Minister of Tourism and Information Manuel Fraga Iribane, who favoured a series of antiauthoritarian measures. With the insertion of the technocrats and an ongoing inner struggle between aperturistas within the regime, namely people prepared to contemplate some ‘opening up’, over the so-called inmovilistas, namely the intransigent conservatories, on whether the regime needed to make some democratic concessions in order to guarantee support from the changing Spanish society, the Francoist power system was no longer a monolithical block. Growing disturbances, including workers strikes in 1962 and the university turmoil in Madrid and Barcelona in spring 1965, involving both students and professors, had greatly contributed to a certain primacy of the group of the evolutionists over the hard core elements, the so-called bunkers. The reluctant orientation of the regime towards a

1153 Paul Preston, Franco, op. cit., p. 718.
limited reform would offer new political opportunities to the anti-regime forces and would prove to be of significant importance in terms of social mobilisation.\footnote{José Álvarez Junco, ‘Movimientos Sociales...’, op.cit.}

In 1966, an already ailing Franco proclaimed the \textit{Ley de Prensa e Imprenta}, which came to substitute the legislation on press, still active since the Civil War (1938).\footnote{Later on in the same year the \textit{Ley Orgánica del Estado}, which confirmed the state's succession to the monarchy, was ratified by a rigged referendum (December 1966) which acquired an 88\% 'yes' vote.} The old \textit{Servicio de Inspección de Libros} was abolished and gave way to a new body called \textit{Ministerio de Información y Turismo} (MIT). The latter went on to create a sort of cultural politics, which would improve the bad image that the arbitrary censorship had given to the regime.\footnote{Georgina Cisquella, José Luis Erviti, José A. Sorolla, \textit{La represión cultural en el franquismo. Diez años de censura de libros durante la Ley de Prensa (1966-1976)}, Barcelona 1977 (2002), p. 20} Censorship, from that point on, would no longer precede but would follow publication, leaving publishers, newspaper editors and journalists 'to guess what they could get away with'.\footnote{P.Preston, \textit{Franco}, op. cit., p. 727. Of course, issues such as the \textit{Movimiento} and the Church were supposed to be untouchable. Franco also insisted that 'liberty should not become the libertinaje (licentiousness) which he saw in democratic countries'. \textit{Ibid.}} One of the first to exploit the new situation was the liberal daily \textit{Madrid}, with bold analysis of the internal crisis and the foreign news and often with thinly veiled attacks on governmental policies. Not surprisingly, the newspaper was repeatedly fined and ultimately closed down in early 1972, after the regime’s backlash on liberalization. Throughout these years, however, \textit{Madrid} was a major point of reference of anti-regime students:

\begin{quote}
In fact, the \textit{Diario de Madrid} was the daily that all of us students were buying. (Reig Tapia)
\end{quote}

Widely read by student circles were the editions \textit{Cuadernos para el Diálogo}, which touched on issues such as the evolution of Franco's regime, the future of the monarchy, the dynamics of \textit{PCE} and the new social movements.\footnote{Published by Joaquín Ruiz Giménez, Franco's one-time Minister of Education and later on student hero after the 1956 events, the journal became extremely influential for left-wing students despite its Catholic background.} Similar subjects were treated by the editions \textit{Ruedo Ibérico}, which were published and sold by the homonymous bookshop in Paris.\footnote{The bookshop, owned by the anarchist Pepe Martínez, was a standard point of reference among left-wingers in Paris alongside Masperó, and suffered a bomb attack by pro-Franco elements in the early 1970s.} Even more popular were \textit{Cambio 16} and the satirical \textit{La Codorniz} and \textit{Hermano Lobo}.\footnote{Juan Pablo Fusi, \textit{Un siglo de España. La cultura}, Madrid 1999, pp. 146-147.} Jaime Pastor argues that information dissemination and satire gave his age group a considerable advantage compared to the
generation of '56 and the intermediate cohort of the early 60s that initiated the battle against the SEU:

It was a new phase, that in the mid-60s witnessed a new leap forward in terms of the opening up of the universities and within the context of the Asturias strikes, with the workers’ movement, with a certain cultural tolerance concerning journals, with the Triunfo, I suppose you have seen it, right? Cuadernos para el diálogo, publishing houses... So, in this context, evidently, our struggle was much easier. (Pastor)

The dictatorship’s liberalization experiment proved to be crucial in the development of the student movements as the regime’s opening also favoured a spectacular increase in domestic cultural output. Soon, the emergence of a politicized publishing sector surprised the Francoist authorities as it included ‘previously unthinkable works of social comment, history, politics, even translations of Karl Marx which caught the regime’s censors on the hop’, by showing up ‘their ‘cosmetic attempts at apertura [...] as window dressing.’ Junco stresses the fact that censors habitually searched for direct references, which obviously they did not find in treatises of Psychoanalysis:

If a book talked about capitalism in general, it did not say anything about Franco’s regime, and therefore did not have a reason for... Or if it talked about Marx and Freud, about Eros and Thanatos, obviously Franco had nothing to do with Eros and Thanatos. So, no, these books circulated. (Junco)

As Psychoanalysis was a new trend among students, Freud and Reich were widely diffused, mainly in Latin American editions. Moreover, through a series of new publishing houses, specializing in the new trends in Marxism (Marcuse, Gortz, Mandel, Deutscher, Naville), including the Catalan Anagrama, Nova Terra, Edició de Materials or Fontanella, Spanish students came into contact with international intellectual streams as well as the kind of Marxist thinking that had long been demonised.

---

1162 In 1969 Anagrama published Student Power by Gareth Stedman Jones’s et al; the publication was immediately given the label desaconsejado [not recommended], in other words it was prohibited. Mikis Theodorakis’s Journals of Resistance was subject to the same treatment when published by the publisher Laia in 1972, but was later allowed. For a detailed list of all banned and censored books from 1966 to 1974 see Georgina Cisquella, José Luis Erviti, José A. Sorolla, op. cit, pp. 180-217.
The relative opening of censorship in this period permitted the appearance of a great number of publishing houses to publish all kinds of ‘red’ texts. The first was Ciencia nueva, a publishing house with militant distributors in the largest part of the important cities of Spain. And this was a publishing house of a clearly Marxist orientation, but then between 67 and 69 many more appeared. I think that if [you] counted them, probably an average of 10 would come out, which competed with each other in publishing texts of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Guevara, Jean-Paul Sartre, Bloch, Lukács etc. (Fernández Buey)

Thus, ‘the world of books came into conflict with the regime, in a direct political way’. As Maravall notes ‘it was possible to find publications of all varieties of Marxism and the degree of ideological sophistication that existed within the Spanish Left, within the universities, within intellectual and political groups, was easily comparable with any other European society.’ Trias remembers being personally involved in publishing the basic Leninist Texts.

I remember that the complete Lenin was being published in the ’70s. I remember that I wrote, I do not remember the date, a prologue for some texts of Lenin before Franco’s death. (Juan Trias)

He also recalls which strands of Marxism were more fashionable and more translated among Spanish students at the time.

In short, Gramsci, was very much in fashion in Spanish Universities in the 60s and 70s, and he was translated. And then there was the period in which an Althusserian version was very much in fashion and that book by Martin Heidegger ‘Fundamental Concepts of Historic Materialism’ was the bomb. And then also Italian Marxism, in other words Gramsci, but also Ceroni, Colletti, della Volpe. This on one side, and then French Marxism, structuralists, Althusser and his disciples, later on this Greek guy, Nikos Poulantzas, and then was Martin Heidegger. This sort of Marxism entered more in Spain. Because there were the English Marxists too, but I believe that this was later still and more in more reduced circles. (Trias)

Still, being a young professor and a translator himself, Trias, like most Political Science students, must have been more sophisticated in terms of his readings than the average student. Apart from Italian Marxism, however, the strong anarchist tradition in Spain also played an important role in students’ preferences. The latter discovered Kropotkin, Bakunin, Malatesta and Lafargue and in general the ‘degenerate’ sort of Marxism,

\[1163\] Ibid.
which, according to their ‘orthodox’ counterparts, favoured idleness to workers’ liberation.  

An interesting parallel with Greece was the fact that the majority of bookshops distributing these books provided specific meeting places for like-minded individuals. Box recalls that there existed an almost codified way of asking for a particular book, in this case a publication on the minutes from the Spanish Communist Party’s 8th Congress:

You stood there, you approached and said: ‘The 8th’. You always said this out of the corner of your mouth. (Box)

Such bookshops, like Fuente Roja, Antonio Machado and Rafael Alberti in Madrid, were often assaulted by extreme right-wingers, who were often irritated by the presence of Neruda’s poems or Picasso’s drawings exposed in the shop-windows.

At present, the apertura is often contemptuously rejected by illustrious anti-regime figures of the time, such as Nicolás Sartorius, who presents censorship as a bulldozer that ruined culture. Sartorius, a prominent member of the CCOOs, attacks the ‘obsessive need’ to demonstrate that in Francoist Spain ‘a certain thinking and literature, cinema and theatre was possible under the weight of the Censura’. Despite all its incoherence, however, the apertura did indeed favour the greater dissemination of information and an enhanced cultural alertness that was crucial in reinforcing the sophistication of the anti-regime audiences and ultimately of the protest movement. Junco, by the late 1960s a postgraduate student at Berkeley, remembers Marcuse’s own astonishment at the fact that his books had a distribution in Spain:

Herbert Marcuse was asking me ‘how is it possible that in Franco’s Spain so many books of mine are sold?’ And it was one of the places in the world where Marcuse’s books were sold the most. Of course, they were theoretical books and they had nothing against the institutions of the Francoist Regime. (Junco)

---

1165 It has to be stressed at this point that Spain had a long tradition in terms of anarchist thinking and practices, including the embracing of Bakunin by socialist circles in the late nineteenth century, the Catalan terrorism of the 1890s, the CNT trade-union and the explosion of anarchist action in 1917-20 and 1931-37 with the libertarian collectivities. See José Álvarez Junco, op.cit.

Still, Marcuse’s abstractions such as his thesis that the origins of student movements lie with the raised active political consciousness of intellectuals and a workers’ revisionism, were often regarded with suspicion and were criticised for their focus on industrialised societies. In fact, in the aftermath of ’68, and on the occasion of Mexico’s student movement and its violent suppression, various Spanish analysts were focused on the similarities and differences between student revolts in developed and underdeveloped national contexts. The search for similar origins in these movements that derived from entirely distinct structural conditions was often seen as absurd, as ‘existential stress or cosmic fear and disorientation vis-à-vis the technical era’ play little role in countries under oligarchic systems. José Luis Souto in an editorial in Madrid stressed how false it was, in his mind, to interpret the global student movement in terms of one sole model. In contrast to this he indirectly placed the Spanish case within the Latin American paradigm of underdevelopment and the struggle against oligarchy as the main incentives behind student action.

In the mid-1960s and alongside the ‘apertura’, Franco was also making an attempt to be more appealing to the average Spaniard by facilitating the acquisition of certain goods, such as the SEAT 600 or small immobile properties. Rosa Pereda, although herself of a bourgeois family of the Basque Country, argues that in the mid-1960s poverty was still extreme and that a ‘consumer society’ was an unheard of concept.

There was no consumer society. It was a very poor country. It really was, it’s entirely sure. Even the rich ones were poor, in the sense that there were no things, there was a different concept of society. And perhaps there existed fewer necessities.

However, the consumerist trend that included TV, washing-machine, fridge and car, unknown before the 1960s, became standard commodities by the middle of the decade

1167 Mainly the abandonment of their ‘revolutionary role’.
1168 José Luis Souto, ‘Movimientos estudiantiles por la reforma universitaria’, Madrid, 1/10/68
1169 Ibid. See also in the same issue J.M., ‘¿Quién hará la Revolución?’
1170 In fact, the ‘desarrollismo’, a developmental trend fashioned by this second phase of Franco’s regime, coincided with the introduction of the lower minimum wage in January 1963. Paul Preston, Franco, London 1993, p. 706. Whereas in 1950 only 100,000 cars existed in Spain, by 1975 this had increased to 5 million. In Greece the figure of 10,000 cars in 1954 increased to 156,210 by 1968, a figure that would triple during the Junta period. See Vassilis Karapostolis, Consumerist behavior..., op.cit.
and were widely propagated by Franco’s regime. Luis Box describes this transition:

Of course, until then the Spanish, up to '65-'66, they did not have money for common expenses. This is to say that television had started to be broadcast, but very few families had a television-set in the year 1963-64. Back then there was the 600, which was like a FIAT, a tiny car, indeed, but it was the national car, but still, it was a luxury to have a 600, and so on... This was the decade of the take off.

Contrary to Greece, however, television in the 1960s became a popular and widely diffused item, a ‘star’, as Ruiz Carnicer puts it. Whereas only 250,000 television-sets existed in Spain in 1960, a decade later the figure had increased to almost six million, which was still, however, quite low compared to Western European standards. TV, as a new mass medium helped to end the news isolation. Rosa Pereda writes that the images she remembers from this period are always in black and white, partly because of the photos but mainly because of television. Pereda recalls the images from the barricades in Paris, a fact that contributes to the illusion that she actually ‘was there too’.

There were the demonstrations, the barricades, the films, there were... What we knew, we knew from letters, from informers, because newspapers were arriving, but obviously they were saying ‘the revolution in France’, ‘the mess in France’, ‘look at the mess that’s taking place in France’. A bit like that... And in black and white, because television was like that. Yes, that’s it. And there was also a feeling of a certain ‘I was there too’!

Contrary to that, Carreras recalls that television was cut off from international developments, with the exception of international football matches and pop cultural events such as the Eurovision song contest. The latter, however, became an important moment as Spain was placed first in 1968 with a song written by the poète-chansonnier Serrat, which was however prohibited at the last minute from being sung in Catalan:

```plaintext
The only international television that we watched was the Festival of Eurovision and the New Year’s Day concert in Vienna. In Menorca I watched RAI, because we could receive RAI, and
```

---

1172 Ibid, p. 296.
there were some girls who were better-looking than the Spanish ones, but none of this meant anything.

In fact, as television was becoming the standard means through which Spaniards were provided their daily audiovisual helping, a less inhibited attitude concerning nudity was transmitted through this medium, profiting from Fraga’s opening. Carreras adds that students of his generation were less influenced and defined by images, something that seems quite plausible as in addition to TV, cinema exercised a major impact, as will be analysed later on. This is also obvious from his own argumentation, as he indirectly refers to a movie, paraphrasing a recurrent theme in Greek testimonies on Marx and Coca Cola. The obsessive repetition that a specific generation, regardless if Spanish or Greek, did not belong to a mass cultural trend raises doubts as to whether this almost Pavlovian negation constitutes an affirmation in Freudian terms.

The culture of the image came after Coca Cola picked up Che Guevara and converted him into a poster. We were rather the opposite.

A homogenised culture was encouraged by Caudillo’s endorsement of folkloric spectacle, such as the corridas, and football, whereby matches were often seen in terms of a racial but also ideological superiority. Contrary to Carreras’s affirmation, however, mass culture, even if characterised by different signifiers, was to become the common denominator among those who opposed the regime. In effect, the apertura and the attempt to construct a new consensus would prove to be a political boomerang. ‘The social modernization of the country produced a new culture of urban consumerism with new demands from the State and a reshaping of collective identities’. Soon, the desire to reform the state would be replaced by the desire to change it.

Cinema and music

Cinema and popular music are of great importance when mapping out the cultural landscape that shaped student mentalities in Spain in the late ’60s and early ’70s. These provided a channel through which demands for freedom of expression could be voiced. Protest song was expressed mainly through the Nuova Canço [New Song], in

---

1174 Thus the popular motto at the time ‘con Fraga hasta la bragas’ [with Fraga down to the underpants].
1175 José Álvarez Junco, ‘Movimientos Sociales...’, op.cit.
1176 Ibid.
which folk and localism played a major role. Prominent among the various cantautores were the Catalan 16 Judges, with Serrat being their leading singer. In Spain, as in Greece, the influence of American artists who became known through the Free Speech and Peace Movements, such as Bob Dylan and Joan Baez, themselves instrumental in the revival of folk music in the United States,\textsuperscript{1177} was notable. Referring to the local traditions and using their respective languages, in this case Catalan, was considered to be a major form of resistance against the integralist and centralist regime of Franco. For the regime local nationalisms were questioning one of the sacred principles of the Movimiento, namely the ‘unity of Spain’.\textsuperscript{1178} Junco actually sustains that many people of his generation learned Catalan as it was regarded as the idiom of defiance, underlying the need to provoke:

The mere fact of singing in Catalan made the Francoists frantic, to listen to it. So, we were putting songs in Catalan, simply to annoy them and to provoke them, of course. And many of us learned some Catalan, or quite a lot, in order to follow the Nova Cançó and to be able to sing in Catalan and provoke. [...] Francoism was very funny. Because it seemed a very solid regime, but it was also very fragile, because within the closed Francoist universe, in which there were explanations for everything, everything was inserted; the moment you made something fall, everything fell apart, the entire cultural world collapsed. Then, the mere fact of singing in Catalan made the Francoist world fall apart. (Junco)

What is more, musicians used to set music to favourite verses by poets, associated with the Left or the Republic, such as Machado, Alberti, Hernández and Blas de Otero, a practice that definitely echoes Theodorakis in Greece. In fact, Box remembers that in this sort of ‘progressive music’, the tune did not matter as much ‘as the text’:

If I have lost my voice in the wild weeds -words are the only thing left to me

\textit{Si he perdido la voz en la maleza - me queda la palabra} \textsuperscript{1179}

Xavier Ribalta used to sing a song on the exploitation of workers by the ‘bosses’ dedicating it to the miners of Asturias and causing great emotion amongst the audience.\textsuperscript{1180} Raimon’s concerts more than often turned into demonstrations by youths

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1177} Ron Eyerman, Andrew Jamison, \textit{Music and Social Movements Mobilizing Traditions in the Twentieth Century}, Cambridge 1998, p. 118.  \\
\textsuperscript{1178} José Álvarez Junco, ‘Movimientos Sociales….,’ op.cit.  \\
\textsuperscript{1179} Based on Blas de Otero’s poem \textit{Me queda la palabra}, sung by Paco Ibáñez (1969).  \\
\textsuperscript{1180} See the Mundo Obrero, 7/1/1969.
\end{flushright}
who were moved by the songs’ subtle criticism of oppression and the exaltation of freedom. His lyrics were often directly critical of the Francoist establishment and were easily turned into slogans:

No,
I say no,
we say no,
we don’t belong to this world.  

Lluis Llach, himself an Economics student at the University of Barcelona, stated clearly that he would not sing in Castilian unless the issues raised through the *Nova Cançó* concerning cultural and linguistic diversity were tackled. Interestingly, in a sort of manifesto, the 22-year old Llach referred to a united Europe, probably echoing the Spanish petition to enter the EEC (1962), at a time, however, in which this was still a distant possibility due to Franco’s fiercely negative stance on democracy:

By singing in Catalan I intend to attract the attention of people in the whole country to the issue of cultural problems. We cannot allow our regions to lose their character. I believe that in a united Europe one has to first secure the culture of every one of the regions that compose the European countries, and second to secure the very countries themselves.

Llach’s most popular song *L’estaca* [The stake] became a hymn of the anti-regime youth:

If I pull it strongly from here
And you pull it strongly from there
It is sure that it’s going to fall
And we’re going to liberate ourselves!

---

1181 *Diguem no* by Raimon, cited by Eduardo Galeano in *Cuadernos de Ruedo Ibérico*, December-January 1967.

1182 For Franco, who was not too enthusiastic about this technocratic project, the EEC was comprised of a bunch of freemasons, liberals and Christian-Democrats who sooner or later would blackmail Spain into introducing measures of political liberalization. See Paul Preston, *Franco*, London 1993, p. 700. According to British sources of the period, however, the most important barrier to Spain’s entry into the Common Market was its retarded industrial development. FCO9/1590, Confidential, British Embassy Madrid to the Foreign Office, Her Majesty’s Ambassador at Madrid to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, ‘Whither Spain?’, 17/2/72.

Eduardo Galeano claimed, as early as 1967, that in the end such verses ended up being considered by the authorities as 'more dangerous than certain classical works of Marxism or the heresies of Freud or the French existentialists, already published or forthcoming in Barcelona'.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, most Raimon songs were banned by the Ministry of Information.

Alongside this, cinema and theatre became extremely significant in terms of form, content, symbolism and reception, as people were keen to read the political in everything. Although films were often indiscriminately censored, 'censorship was counterproductive in that it produced a hyper-politicization of culture, with censors, artists, and public keen to read the political into everything.' Foucault's aforementioned assertion that censorship can be enabling is valid for the Spanish case too. Preceding the New Greek Cinema by a decade, exponents of the New Spanish Cinema were already communicating between the lines, by using a symbolic and cryptic visual language:

I remember “La prima Angélica”, a film by Carlos Saura, in which Fernando Delgado appeared in the role of a Falangist with his hand in plaster. Therefore, of course, he appeared with the arm more raised than normally, as if he was making a fascist salute, and he naturally provoked hilariousness. This, of course, cannot be detected in the script. [...] This made the young left-wingers in the cine hall laugh and caused great anger to those linked to the regime and the extreme Right, who were launching tins of red paint against this type of film. (Tapia)

Pastor remembers having personal relations with film directors as well as the possibility of free entrance to watch films, again similar to the Greek experience of the students being treated in a preferential way. Saura’s La Caza [The Hunting], which he refers to, was one of the most direct references to the Civil War up to that period:

We even had a personal contact... Elías Querejeta, well, a person, this producer, we knew him and we were invited to the premiere. I remember El Cazador [sic], they gave us free tickets to watch the movie. (Pastor)

---

1184 Eduardo Galeano, op.cit.
1186 Mainly around Saura and including Ricardo Muñoz Suay, Elías Querejeta, Víctor Erice, the Italian Marco Ferreri, but also the revived veterans Bardem, Berlanga and most prominently Buñuel with *Viridiana*.
According to John Hopwell, this film as well as *La prima Angélica* is a clear indication that 'post-Francoism had started while the dictator was still alive'. At the same time producers and creators alike discovered that 'going liberal' could attract a new group of spectators to the cine halls, which were suffering from the already triumphant TV. Consequently, repertory cinemas such as the so-called *Arte y Ensayo* [Art and Debate], which up to that point had attracted only minority audiences, were soon switched to main-stream meeting and communication points of the alternative artistic and political circuits of the major cities. Apart from the new Spanish tendencies, projections included a series of formerly banned international films, screened in original version with subtitles, a fact that guaranteed lesser control by the authorities in charge. The standard repertoire comprised *Nouvelle Vague* films and Soviet Cinema, including Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible*, the advertisement for which in *Madrid* posed the question: '30,000 spectators already know the real Russian cinema. What about you?' Carreras at present despises the political criteria that were used in order to project and watch a movie. By referring to Eisenstein's *opus* as 'terrible' and to Gavras's political thrillers as utterly 'boring' Carreras delineates the distance between past and present and the immense remoteness concerning his own aesthetic criteria in relation to his politicisation over time. What is more, his comment comes into stark contrast with a previous affirmation of his that 'cine clubs were places of absolute formation':

> We were all going to watch Eisenstein and other terrible films of that time by Costa Gavras, well, all very boring. But we all went as if going to a congregation. (Carles Carreras)

Alberto Reig Tapia remembers the controversy created among the fervent Catholics by Norman Jewison's *Jesus Christ Superstar*, a hippy representation of Jesus and the Apostles, the effect of which was that the film was quickly brought down.

> Obviously it was not very orthodox to see Jesus Christ and his disciples dressed more like San Francisco hippies, "if you’re going to San Francisco, keep some flowers in your hair", right? More, you know, typical films of those years and of the orthodoxy up to that point included Pasolini's *Gospel according to Mathew*, or films which were more common to watch, *King of the Kings*, *The Ten Commandments* etc. But above all it was with rock music, which was the perverse

---

1188 Ibid, p. 53.
1189 *Madrid*, 1.10.70.
music of degenerate youths on drugs, right? Who were infecting the good habits of Catholic countries, particularly in Italy, France, Spain and the rest. (Tapia)

As would happen later on with Woodstock in Greece, Antonio Ferros remembers being thrilled by yet another musical documentary, Pennebaker’s film on the Monterey Pop Festival. However, he also recalls that his Maoist friends found it ‘cannibalistic’ and ‘hideous’. Interestingly, similarly to the Greek case, differences and demarcations within the student movement derive from the fact that leftists tended to be more integralist in terms of culture. Despite conflicting views, however, the mere fact that the film screenings were regularly followed by discussion constituted, in Fernández Buey’s words, ‘the first step for organising a wider militant activity’:

[They were] converted to a place of meeting and contact whereby apart from talking about a movie, there was a time lapse during which general discussion ensued that was often particularly focused on politics.

Accordingly, as cinema was the necessary companion of politicized students, its symbolic power and the importance attributed to it were such that cinema students often had a privileged position alongside the politicized faculty delegates. In fact, the Cinema Academy was among the five faculties that constituted the democratic Sindicato of Madrid, alongside Politics and Economics, Sciences, Philosophy and Drama.

University unrest

In a survey on youth condition conducted by the paper Madrid in February 1967, a male student stressed that ‘I like my epoch and I wouldn’t change it for anything. We can exploit things that our grandfathers could never dream of’. At the same time, a female student argued that ‘I think that it is an age that gave us the possibility to live better and with more commodities’. Less than a year later the great disturbances of the Madrid campus demonstrated that commodification was less than enough for some politically motivated students. As was the case with their counterparts in other places, middle and upper class Spanish students, alongside numerous kids from Francoist or military family backgrounds, started to become increasingly radicalized. Not surprisingly, the PCE expressed the view that regretfully ‘in the university there is no

reflection of the class struggle'. The fact that the majority of youths came from the respected bourgeois establishment and at the same time were entering the anti-Franco movement, marked a clear generational rupture with their parents' beliefs. Accordingly, Politics student Ramon Ramos identifies elements of the 'killing of the father' in this break that was inflicted by the bourgeois radicals. In a way they attacked ‘the Fascist glorification of the patriarchal family and its idealization', but also Franco's own promotion as the absolute father figure:

We were the kids of the Civil War winners who betrayed their parents in this sort of Oedipal drama. (Ramon Ramos)

A British diplomat from the Embassy in Madrid seems to agree with this point:

These students, who all belong to the bourgeoisie were not, after all, unlike the Spanish working-class, smashed in the Civil War. They seem to be showing that they are not to be cowed by police truncheons and imprisonment.

In addition, Reig Tapia claims that anti-Francoist rage and a strong drive to minimize the distance from their counterparts elsewhere was the common denominator in the osmosis between students of a left-wing background and those of a right-wing one. This practical co-existence could be seen as a cancellation of the Marxist presupposition that collective action is based on individuals with common class origins and interests.

We did not give a damn whether this friend was a child of a general or, I don't know what... if he was born in exile and had come here in order to study or if he was the son of a worker. What united us was being against the regime, or being anti-Francoist, not your own cultural origins, right? The rest was diluted, at least in those years. None of us was interested in whether our friend's father had fought for or against the Republic. What mattered was what united us not what could hypothetically separate us. And the magma, as I tell you, of the union was anti-Francoism, the rage, as it could be graphically described, against the fact of being different. Besides, this slogan was used by Fraga as a Minister of Information and Tourism: 'Spain is different'. And

1192 María Delgado, op.cit., p. 42.
1193 Saving Telegram No. 5, Madrid to Foreign Office, A.L.S. Coltman, 'Student Disturbances in Spain', 29/1/68.
1194 José Álvarez Junco, 'Movimientos Sociales...', op.cit.
precisely, what we wanted was to cease to be different for one bloody time, what we wanted was to resemble as much as possible, at least from a point of view of rights and freedoms, the rest of European youth, who had the freedom to militate, who enjoyed sexual freedom, who could leave, etc.

His final assertion brings to mind Samuel Huntington’s conclusion that in underdeveloped countries students ‘become ashamed of and alienated from their own society’, while they are ‘filled with the desire to reconstruct it completely [...]’. 1195

This generation immersed itself within a system of ideas already established by the regime, which it then exploited to greater effect than their predecessors. As the ’68ers were the generation which had not experienced the Civil War, they felt more and more alienated and became increasingly critical of the regime due to better information on world affairs and the decline of traditional religious values. What is more, they did not feel particularly connected to previous generations, neither that of ’56 nor even that of the early ’60s. Rosa Pereda, who entered the university in 1967, argues that it was the former who actually made the student movement, while she and her contemporaries made something else, different and probably bigger: ‘Theirs was the student movement, ours was a different thing, in some way, right?’

A common trait of great interest between Spanish and Greek students are their constant references to the ‘technocratisation’ of higher studies and ‘technical scientific revolution as part of the march of state monopoly capitalism’. At the same time professors wrote articles on the future and desired role of the students as ‘professionals’, connected to the job market, ignoring the fact that in countries such as West Germany the average age of students was 28 years.1196 Another reform, placed within the context of the Planes de Desarrollo, was the creation of autonomous universities and of CEU during the late Sixties, in order to reduce the great concentration of students and PNN in the Complutense of Madrid and Central in Barcelona and make the access to the University significantly easier via the introduction of more student places. It is noteworthy that in this way, exactly as was the case in Greece, the regime tried to respond to the student problem through reformist projects of a technical character whilst others aimed at a better professional training. In later years, the reform introduced by Education Minister Vilar Palasí was

---

greeted with enthusiasm as it talked about an ‘authentic representation’ of students in terms of the University administration, before being frustrated by the course of events. However, this created a strange blend, as these important paces towards modernization were coupled with even greater police repression.1198

Protest policing became even more violent as the police started habitually violating asylum and entering university campuses to remove anti-Regime placards and posters or prevent students from blocking the faculty entrances with tables and benches. An analysis made some years later by the British Ambassador in Madrid offers a very valuable approach of how things actually worked in terms of police authorization from above. In fact, his analysis would fit perfectly to the Colonels’ incoherence in terms of measures and practices:

The régime is frequently and rightly accused of having recourse to arbitrary administrative measures to neutralize political opponents. The police and civil authorities often overstep the mark; and despite the régime’s claims for a ‘state of law’ (estado de derecho) the idea and practices of rule by Government decree and ad hoc administrative decision permeate the whole state machine. Although the Government go to great lengths to provide a legal umbrella under which the police can operate, their public order legislation is in reality an attempt to square the circle of a police force given a completely free rein in handling dissidents with the need to vindicate the claim that everything is done according to due process of law.1199

The common experiences between Greek and Spanish students also stem from the authoritarian character of the respective regimes and the high price that protest participation implied, including long-term imprisonment and torture. Fernández Liria describes succintly the torture he went through as ‘monstruous’.1200 He immediately proceeds to use irony in the account of his arrest, following a typical strategy of de-dramatization:

When the policemen came to get me in the house my grandmother thought that there were the Falangists who had come for my grandfather.

1200 The equivalent of the Greek falanga was the parrilla, that is, the passing of a direct electric current into the handcuffs, which caused terrible shakings and left no traces.
His account of his brief release, shortly before being re-arrested, is peppered with
details about the beautiful French girlfriend waiting for him and a particular brand of
cognac that she had brought in order to celebrate the occasion: 'I remember it because
it was so good'.

Regime violence and detentions were, as in Greece, counterproductive and often
became a means of reinforcing solidarity and new demonstrations. An interesting
feature, however, in terms of Spanish journals, is that the captured, tried and convicted
persons often went un-named. A special page was dedicated to this issue, with names
often appearing only as initials; in addition, no pictures were published. This contrasts
starkly with the Greek papers which printed the trials and names in the first page, thus
creating willingly or unwillingly popular media heroes out of the resistance
organizations. So, whereas the Greek press demonized the various resistance
groupings and offered through the published pleas precious publicity to their members
and their ideological underpinnings, in Spain a small section was devoted to the trials,
called Tribunales.\footnote{1201} In contrast to that, however, Spanish papers made extensive
reports on the university clashes.

**Spain within a wider paradigm**

Before May '68, Vietnam had already been a major element of 'internationalism' in
Spain. A British report of March '68 refers to a thousand students at the University of
Madrid holding

> A tumultuous Viet-nam protest meeting for which the main hall in the Faculty of Sciences had
been decked with North Vietnamese flags, portraits of Ho Chi Minh and slogans in favour of the
Viet Cong. Police broke up the ensuing demonstration and managed to prevent a group of
students from publicly burning the American flag.\footnote{1202}

According to a leaflet circulated by the Young Communist League:

\footnote{1201}{This referred to the trials of the notorious Tribunales del Orden Público, which routinely gave
extremely harsh sentences.}

\footnote{1202}{FCO9/526A, Restricted, British Embassy Madrid to Foreign Office, L. S. Coltman to G.
Fitzherbert, 'Student Agitation', 27 March 1968.}
The Spanish student movement, just like the movement of all countries, reveals a great sensibility in the solidarity for the Vietnamese people. [...] This is about mobilizing the broadest sectors in solidarity with Vietnam and against the Americans.\textsuperscript{1203}

For Alvarez Junco, the fact that Americans were suffering such terrible setbacks in Vietnam was an indication that imperialism was a 'paper tiger', as the Maoist dictum of the time went. In his view, however, there were two Americas: that which produced counterculture and that which employed an imperialist strategy; it was important not to confuse the two. Solidarity and a feeling of identification with US youth is evident in his testimony:

The United States was the place where Berkeley and the student revolts were being produced. The United States also had a positive aspect. What was very important was Vietnam, the war in Vietnam. Crucial. But I believe that it was very clear to us that there existed two United States. Well, at least it was very clear to me. One was the government of the United States and yankee imperialism, which was fighting... Che Guevara was fighting against that, Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh fought against it. And the other was the liberal American world, the American Left, who were our allies. And the young Americans were thought to be on our side.

Interestingly, a British report on the students of Santiago de Compostela who staged a sit-in at the Rectorate in early 1968, stresses that they passed the whole night singing 'a Galician's version of 'We shall overcome'', thus directly linking this movement with its American counterparts.\textsuperscript{1204}

For many Spanish students the United States was also a serious factor behind Franco's survival, at the same time in which it was 'playing dirty' all over Cold War Europe; the theory followed that this was in part orchestrated via the secret services. Neo-colonial theories on the existence of US bases in Spain ever since 1953 and the fact that the former could make use of the Spanish airways became influential. These were, in fact, very similar to the Greek polemics concerning the US air force and the use of the 5th Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Arab-Israeli wars (1967, 1973). In later years in Spain, anti-American discourse with tiersmondist undertones

\textsuperscript{1203} Organización universitaria del PCE, 'Comité universitario estatal - informes', 1968-69, Archivo Histórico del PCE, caja 123, carpeta 1/1.
\textsuperscript{1204} PRO, FCO9/526A, Restricted, British Embassy Madrid to Foreign Office, L. S. Coltman to G. Fitzherbert, 'Student Agitation', 27 March 1968.
was coupled with militant nationalism concerning these national sovereignty issues.\textsuperscript{1204} Jaime Pastor explains that his group did not agree with this sort of colonial analysis and uses instead the classic placement of Spain within the semi-periphery:

The Maoists, the PCML, who promoted the reinforcement of anti-imperialism against the United States, this group was saying that Spain was a colony of the United States. This conclusion did not convince the majority of us, look, no, this country is not any African country, this is a country which is, we said, in the periphery of the centre, it is semi-peripheral. But the conclusion that it was a colony and therefore what was needed was an anti-colonial, anti-imperialist revolution, to us was a very simplistic analysis.

As was briefly seen in the example of Lluis Llach before, another pole was Europe. When in spring 1968 the French journalist and politician Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, actually responsible for Theodorakis's ‘kidnap’ to Paris some time later, came to visit things were quite explosive in Spanish campuses. In an interview with Madrid Schreiber responded to the question of what he would say to a new generation of Spaniards, which was searching for a ‘new consciousness’ and was highly alert:

That we are following with confidence and interest your patriotic battle for a democratic integration of Spain to Europe. That they are not alone. That the entire European youth is like that, just like them!\textsuperscript{1205}

His reply prophetically places the Spanish youth alongside the rest, precipitating the Spanish riots of May '68, but also repudiating their legendary ‘difference’. Pastor remembers Schreiber's visit and recalls being irritated by his European alternative, as

\textsuperscript{1204} In two leaflets circulated by the Young Communist League in 1970 on the occasion of the renewal of the 1953 agreement on US bases in Spain and an imminent visit by President Nixon, we read: ‘Recently the Minister -Mateo López Bravo signed the so-called Spanish-American agreements, through which the Yankees have at their disposal our skies and can establish military and naval bases in order to use our country as a platform in order to control the Mediterranean and endanger European security.’ ‘The University of Madrid, which on many occasions has demonstrated its opposition to the presence of US bases in our country has to develop now and for the time to come a strong anti-imperialist struggle, has to support the national liberation struggle of the Palestinian people and the withdrawal of the Israelis from occupied Arab territories. One of the most efficient contributions that we students can make to the anti-imperialist struggle is to struggle for the expulsion of the Americans and their bases from our country, for national independence and for putting an end to Franco’s dictatorship and re-establishing democracy and liberty in our country. For National Independence! Solidarity to the Arab, Palestinian and Indochine people! Out with the Yankee bases from our ground. NIXON OUT OF SPAIN!’ Organización universitaria del PCE en Madrid, Comité Universitario, Informes, Archivo del PCE, Caja 123, carp 2/1,2, ‘Contra la llegada de Nixon’, 1970.

leftist students did not consider Western Europe as an ideal place either since they 'saw that students in Italy and other places were maltreated too':

Servant Schreiber came here. This was another significant event because we didn't like what he was saying either: 'Europe is the alternative to the United States'. But, of course, he was talking about a Europe, which we used to call, back then, neo-capitalist. [...] We were searching for something different.

Contrary to Pastor’s suspicious view of Europe, Tapia presents himself as a Europeanist, both in his past and present condition and expresses an ironic stance in terms of the radical left-wing orientations as somehow grotesque in their fundamentalism. The terms he uses are often anachronistic as he projects current terminology, such as 'European integration', onto the past:

I understood that Spain was in Europe and that positions of radical third-world socialism did not make any sense, that our future was part of European integration, and therefore within some ideological and political schemata more in tune with this structure. That here there was no sense in being a Maoist, a Sandinista, in short, a Guevarist, or something like that; this was not the Third World. They were in a more radical position.

Finally, despite their left-wing instruction and the brief fascination that was exercised by the Prague Spring, the model for anti-regime students was provided by their western counterparts. Despite his being an exponent of the previous generation and a leftist, Junco’s words, nevertheless, bluntly demonstrate the unattractiveness of Eastern Europe as an alternative:

The year '69, I remember, a Venezuelan guy passed by Madrid, who went to study... A left-winger, quite an 'orthodox' Communist, who was going to study in Poland, my God. And I remember the sadness that possessed me to see... Besides, he was going there with a very beautiful woman and it caused me such sadness to see them going to Poland. I was thinking, how sad must the Polish world be. No, for us it wasn’t attractive... The Communist world was not attractive either. The so-called existing socialism had been a flop, we believed, it was necessary to go much further than that.

A 'peripheral' '68

What the Spanish students were looking for instead, would be expressed at the same time as the international '68, when the university asylum was violated by police forces.
The situation, described here by the British Embassy in Madrid is a mirror image of what was going on in Greece throughout 1973, showing how things between university authorities and the military governments were often strikingly similar.

Resentment among the university authorities in Madrid has been mounting, since their authority within the university is now almost non-existent. Their suggestions and proposals are ignored by the police who give them curt orders as to what measures they should take. The Rector and several Deans have been publicly insulted by police officers. The Governing Council of the University in these circumstances has informed the government that they will resign unless their powers are restored.1207

Similarities with the ‘little Polytechnic’ increased when on 29 March in a very violent clash Professors protected the students on their way out, while after the Dean was struck to the ground and other Professors beaten the entire academic authorities of Madrid University resigned en bloc. The University was temporarily shut down and classes were suspended, giving rise to a wave of solidarity by technical college students who went on strike. Interestingly, the daily Nuevo Diario published pictures of the clashes between police and demonstrators, despite the prohibition of such practices.

Interestingly, in both cases the regimes regarded the disturbances as public order issues and attempted to deal with them as such.1208 What is more, Franco, as well as Papadopoulos, believed in conspiracy theories concerning the origins of the student movement: the first was convinced that it was ‘the work of foreign agitators’,1209 whereas the second attempted to find connections with previous generations and the exiled Communists. Box remembers that the return to classes after the closure was a traumatic moment as it signalled the permanent presence of policemen on campus:

That thing kept the university closed down for a month and a half, two months. And from that point onwards, when it reopened, I don’t remember for how long, but the police were inside. Namely, policemen were inside and stood at the door, when you entered you had to show your I.D., this is, you couldn’t go from the Faculty of Medicine to Pharmacy, or from Pharmacy you couldn’t enter in Biology, and so on.

1207 PRO, FCO 9/526, Sir A. Williams to Foreign Office, telegram No. 13, 1 April 1968. From a certain point onwards the Minister of Education, Vilar Pallast, formally in charge of the university campuses and reported to have sympathized with the academic authorities, and the Minister of the Interior, General Alonso Vega, were no longer on speaking terms.
1209 P. Preston, Franco, op. cit., p. 735.
In terms of women’s participation, in March 1968 in an assembly organized at the University of Barcelona an MDM text was read that urged the continuation of the struggle for the disappearance ‘of all the anachronistic discriminations [...] that marginalised today the women and prevent them from being incorporated in social life in full equality’. At the same time, a text approved by 903 women who participated in an assembly in Madrid stressed their support for the struggle for a free University and their profound repulsion for the violence inflicted by the state, instead of a free dialogue ‘with the authentic student representatives’. Pastor argues that the few women who were at the front ran the additional risk of becoming too visible, because of their limited presence and therefore were liable to be expelled; ‘burnt out’ as the term of the period was. He recalls with impression a female leader, Emper Pineda:

[She] was one of the first feminists too, she was precisely ... She belonged to the first split of ETA, ETA Berri as it was called (New ETA), which later became Movimiento Comunista, the MC. And she was a red woman of Philosophy in my times. And was the first one to demonstrate in public as a lesbian, later of course, in the eighties. But she is a woman of that period.

In the 1970s these tendencies were reinforced, as female participation in student and worker initiatives for amnesty were enhanced. Rosa Pereda, however, recalls that she was not a fervent feminist and she rather believed in a package of revolutionary change, based on Marxist beliefs that included women’s rights too.

You know, from 68 onwards, as these radical political movements were formed, gender movements started to appear, about this, about that. I really thought that the cause of the women could only be resolved together with cause of the entire humanity, the working class and so on. And I was not a feminist.

Coming to the May '68 events, the Spanish case is less complex than the Greek one, since there was a certain synchronic experience in Spain, though with somewhat less

---

1210 Ibid.  
1211 In 1970 even an 'International Female Congress' was organised in Madrid, boosted by the Association of Housewives (AAC). In December 1975, shortly after Franco’s death (20/11), the first 'Day of Female Liberation' was celebrated. ‘The (still illegal) meeting, attended by representatives of very different groups and individual feminists, ended up with the approval of a Resolución política de las primeras Jornadas Nacionales para la Liberación de la Mujer.’ This point signaled the creation of the feminist movement as an 'organised social movement'. D. Della Porta et al, cit., p. 32. See also Pilar Escorio, Inés Alberdi, Ana Inés López-Accotto, Lo personal es político: el movimiento feminista en la Transición, Madrid 1996, pp. 215-224.
intensity and impact. The Paris events and in general growing student agitation abroad themselves played a significant role, as there was a full reporting of events, acquiring a legendary status and reinforcing student combativeness. Spanish students were closely linked to what happened in France, also due to the geographical proximity which provided a channel of communication.\textsuperscript{1212} Pereda, a Trotskyite at the time, reports Communist Party militants bringing over '68 propaganda material, among which she places Picasso's \textit{Quernica}. In particular, students of the University of Barcelona had a privileged access to the French border, which they exploited variously. In fact, they identified themselves with what was happening in France and other countries and often tried to imitate it. In the retrospective view of a former Spanish student, the '68 rupture appears in a standardized way, as a signal that everyone was waiting for:

Then May 1968 happened in France and people thought 'this is it!' \textsuperscript{1213}

Box too argues that the importance of the images of the \textit{événements} lies in the fact that they made Spanish students place their own clashes within a wider context:

Then, obviously, the images of the occupied Odeon, all these things, exerted a great impact on Spain, because, right, what was happening in Spain, which seemed to be just some hubbub, good heavens, then became part of a much wider movement. Then the regime saw it with great fear for the contamination that this could bring over. (Box)

Parallel to what was happening abroad, the recital of the Valencian singer Raimon on 18 May in the Faculty of Political Science, Economics and Commerce of the Complutense University in Madrid turned into an unofficial assembly and gave rise to a demonstration, which was dispersed by the police. A bolder attitude in sloganeering characterised Spanish students, compared to their Greek counterparts some time later, at least concerning the pre-Polytechnic era. According to the newspaper \textit{Ibérica} 6,000 students attempted to walk to the city centres carrying banners on which was written 'Workers and Students against oligarchy!', 'Popular Democracy' and 'Socialist Spain'. There followed violent clashes with the police that lasted at least two hours.\textsuperscript{1214} Álvarez Junco has very strong memories of this incident, which is marked in his mind

\textsuperscript{1212} Della Porta, 1998, op.cit., p. 138.
\textsuperscript{1213} Interview no. 47. Quoted by J.Maravall, \textit{Dictatorship and Political Dissent...}, p. 147.
as an unforgettable night. After being chased by police at the university campus he remembers ‘liberating’ a whole district for some hours:

Before May '68, well, the most important thing that happened in Madrid in May '68 was the festival by Raimon, which took place in our Faculty, that of Political Science and Economics. And there we were 6,000 or 8,000 people, and we went out of there afterwards heading for the quarter of Argüelles, a bit further away. And we practically controlled the quarter for a couple of hours. The sense of joy was immense. And Raimon was singing in Catalan, certainly, and here in Madrid, and, nevertheless, it was an enormous success. [...] In Argüelles we formed groups and shouted on the corners, in the streets and the police cars were running all over Argüelles without being able to track us down... This was an impressive night!

Pastor conceived this concert as an authentic moment of '68. He adds that this event marked a major collaboration between students and workers under the influence of Guevarism, apparently a personal reading that offers, however, insights into the ideological schemata of the time:

Raimon’s act was the one of 18 May, I mean, it reflects the impact of the French May, of what was taking place in France. (Pastor)

By that time, SDEU had circulated some documents of Cohn Bendit’s 22 March Movement and the French Committees of Action in a gesture of solidarity. As French was still the lingua franca at the time, most students could easily understand it, in contrast to English. Still, people like Liria, himself an anarchist, were involved in translation endeavours:

We were translating many things from the French. We translated many things from the Situationist International and this group of anarchists in May '68, and Cohn-Bendit and all these guys.’ (Alberto Fernández Liria)

Pastor explains how they tried to emulate the major traits of May:

The Faculty where I was, which was that of Political Science, was also for all its proper characteristics a bit the ‘avant-garde’, in inverted commas, of the movement. Of course, what you have is an increasing identification with what the student revolt is, with what the step towards the general strike is and evidently what had an impact on us was the students' defiance of the regime,

---

their capacity to provoke a workers’ mobilization, and then also the fact, evidently, that they not only questioned a determined regime but capitalism as well, consumer society... That is, new cultural elements appeared too.

Trias, however, appears quite critical in terms of Spanish students’ attempts to embrace the cause of the French événements, identify themselves with their counterparts in Paris and their attempts to mimic the latter in terms of demands. Constructing a discourse very similar to that of Greek students in ’68, such as Mitafidis, he stresses that in his view many of the exigencies of French students were the demand and not the counter-demand, including the rejection of consumerism and the Communist party:

But of course, at times it seemed a bit... there were people claiming that they took the slogans of ’68, and in the Spanish University, in the Spanish society, it was a bit artificial. Because how were we going to react against a Party that was still outlawed, against a consumerist culture that we were just starting to have?

Spain was indeed ‘different’ as it was still ruled by an authoritarian regime, ready to employ vast levels of violence in order to silence protest. As a British diplomat noted:

With the evident intention of reminding students that Spain was different from France, the Supreme Court had earlier issued a statement drawing attention to decrees of 1938 and 1939 which outlawed Communism and imposed heavy prison sentences on those who indulged in Communist activities.1217

Nevertheless, emulation reached a peak from autumn 1968 onwards, with anti-regime students boycotting exams, proclaiming ‘communes’, paying homage to Che Guevara, occupying the Dean’s Office and smashing Franco’s portraits inside university premises. Lain Entralgo pointed out around that time that ‘only today, this very morning, did the universal condition become a living and spontaneous consciousness of human history, and nothing demonstrates it better than the rebellious and aggressive attitude of almost all students of the planet’.1218 Wavering between a positive and negative evaluation of this phenomenon, Lain in the end opts for the latter calling this tendency contemptuously ‘TomSawyerism’ (el tomsawyerismo).

1218 P. Lain Entralgo, El problema de la Universidad, Madrid 1968, pp. 146-147.
As in the Greek case, however, the emulation of the European and American models, a new revolutionary consciousness or pedagogical issues are not sufficient to account for student mobilisation. The rigidity of the political system and its value system, as well as its brief opening and subsequent intolerance were defining factors for the radicalisation of students, who saw themselves as bearers of modernization. As was the case in Greece, in Spain too the university revolt had a great communication impact, while its subversive potential was overexposed, as it was embraced by the press and, significantly, the professorship alike. ¹²¹⁸

**Reporting the 'French Revolution'**

As far as the press coverage of the événements is concerned, pro-regime papers, such as *ABC*, followed, as could be expected, a demonising and rejecting stance, strongly resembling the Greek one. The main source of alternative information was, alongside *Madrid*, the youth journal *Triunfo*, a harsh critic of the American involvement in Vietnam in the previous years, with Vázquez Montalbán among its regular collaborators. In an identical fashion to the Greek daily *Thessaloniki*, whose director was constantly warned or fined, *Madrid* presented the unrest in other places with large headlines, extensive photographic material and direct allusions to the Spanish situation. In October 1968, for example, a half-page image showed militias beating protesting students under the tiny title 'The Peruvian students protest against the Junta'. ¹²¹⁹

Moreover, in an unprecedented move, the *Opus Dei* intellectual Calvo Serer called De Gaulle's France a 'more or less authoritarian regime' and drew direct analogies between the different cases saying that the French crisis showed 'the incompatibility of a personal or authoritarian government with the structures of industrial society and with the democratic mentality of our epoch in the context of a free world'. ¹²²⁰ Reig Tapia vividly remembers the great impression that this article made on him, even though his reading is somewhat more emotional than its actual content:

¹²¹⁸ J. Álvarez Junco, 'Movimientos Sociales...', op.cit.
¹²¹⁹ PP, 'Los estudiantes peruanos protestan contra la Junta', 9/10/1968. As can be seen, such articles were usually signed with the journalists' initials, in order to avoid any potential repercussions involving the authorities.
Madrid published an editorial which I remember, called ‘No to General De Gaulle. To Retire on Time’, in those years, the explosion of ’68. And one read this article, and where there was De Gaulle, one substituted Franco, and where there was France one thought instead of Spain, and the reading was precise. It went like, ‘General, you are old, you sleep well already, you have cleansed Spain from the masons and the reds, the times are changing, do retire, do permit an opening and an evolution’.

For good measure, right after this article Madrid was closed down for the first time for two months, Calvo Serer was tried and the paper’s director Fontán was fined. Here again, one can see that despite the greater flexibility created by the Ley de Prensa of 1966 which had opened some space for criticism, the regime reacted with intransigence each time an individual or collective action was perceived to transgress the limits.

During the actual events of the Parisian ’68, Peter Weiss’s theatrical play The persecution and the murder of Jean Paul Marat, otherwise known as Marat-Sade, was staged, provoking a heated debate in the Spanish press. A polemic article in Madrid drew a direct link between the play and what was going on in the streets arguing that ‘revolution’, personified by Marat, and ‘liberty’, by Sade, were both present in the student movement. In fact, as the author wrote, this debate was not academic but ‘it is in the streets’:

The young students of Paris, Prague, Rome and Warsaw or Madrid -if we deny various sophisms- coincide with the vertebral subjects of socialism: equality, justice, solidarity. These are the words of Marat. But in Madrid, Rome, Warsaw, Prague -departing from very different situations, if not conflicting ones-, these youths also shout -and at the same time- the word of Sade: liberty.\footnote{Isaac Montero, ‘El debate Marat-Sade en la calle’, Madrid, 29/5/1968.}

Pastor recalls this moment as an emblematic one. Interestingly, Alfonso Sastre, the theatrical director that he refers to, bears some similarities with young theatre people in Greece and especially the ‘Berliner’ Bistis and Free Theatre in terms of their being both influential artists and leftist militants at the same time.

Another emblematic act, I think it was in October ’68, was the first night of ‘Marat-Sade’ by Peter Weiss. This became an event because Alfonso Sastre had participated in it, signing with a pseudonym; Peter Weiss was a man of the Left, a respected man and an emblematic author, and
during this play we distributed leaflets... These actions remain in the memory of those who experienced them.

In many ways the '68 movements reinforced people's questioning about the phenomenon of youthful rebelliousness. Analyses were made at the time attempting to offer a psychological, social or political explanation. In addition, for the first time there were attempts to look at the phenomenon in a cross-national way. Jesus Saiz and Luca de Tena, for example, stress the fact that this was a first generation with a common generational consciousness:

Race, nationality, ideologies don't matter. This is a generation that, within its variety, has a common way of living, from the way of dressing to the way of singing. It is enough to listen to some of these songs, in order to realize the existence of a universal youth language. \[122\]

Often the editorials exceeded the rejectionist and moralist tone and at times even demonstrated compliance. An editorial of late '68 even gave advice to students on how to prevent 'sterile trade-unionism' in order not to become 'neutralized, for ideological advances'. Instead, they should always keep in mind that their demands are part of a much wider social problem. \[123\] As youth restlessness was becoming a sociological phenomenon under constant scrutiny, film promos, like the following featuring Sidney Poitier, capitalized on this selling feature. In the post-'68 period, advertisements concerning films that dealt with youth were regularly given paramount importance, both in terms of critique and promotion:

Serious gestures. Attitudes of meditation. They are normal guys, they are the same in all countries. But something is bothering them inside and is making them rebel. Why? Where is the problem? In the family? In the Universities? \[124\]

Concurrently, Bertolucci's *Prima della Rivoluzione* and Elio Petri's *La classe operaia va in Paradiso*, became great hits which reinforced a certain *Italomania* of Spanish
left-wingers in terms of political stimuli, despite their sense of disillusionment. The first was presented as ‘the film that best represents a generation that did not make the war, no war at all; but it aspires to forge the revolution’. The advert contains a phrase taken from the film which would apparently be appealing: ‘Me and the bourgeoisie are incompatible’.

The cultural and information autarky imposed by the regime was broken by press, cinema and music. Initially, Franco boasted about the liberalising effects. ‘In Spain’, he said, ‘there have never existed the freedoms that exist today.’ Adding:

Every Spaniard does what he feels like and thinks as he pleases, being able to participate in public life through syndical elections, municipal elections and those for the elected section for the Cortes. The press today has freedom of speech and no Spaniard is punished for having ideas different from those of the regime or even for defending such ideas in the company of his friends.

This, however, would not last long, nor was the relative permissiveness that was created by the apertura tolerated for any significant period. The cultural opening and the turbulence that accompanied it encouraged the regime’s hard-liners to strike hard. In addition they exploited some of Fraga’s pitfalls. In a report to Franco in 1969, his right-hand man and fervent Catholic Carrero Blanco precipitated a recurrence of repression by complaining about the country’s decadence and the growing influence of the press, which presented Spain as ‘politically stagnant, economically monopolistic and socially unjust’:

The press exploits pornography as a commercial instrument. In literature, the theatre and the cinema, the situation is equally serious in political and moral terms. Bookshops are full of Communist and atheist propaganda; theatres put on works which prevent decent families attending; cinemas are plagued with pornography. To encourage cheap tourism, streap-tesse [sic] is protected by play-boy [sic] clubs.

---

1225 The rest of the commentary says that the film is about the ‘incarnation of the youth; with its dynamism, its creaking dissonances, its still virgin coolness, its crushing impulses, its desire to live ... and also a bit of its sadness’. Insert in Madrid, 5/1/1970.
1226 Labanyi and Graham: 265
The appearance of the progre

Cinema was not only a means of political instruction: films such as Mike Nichols’s *The Graduate* also represented and contained elements of sexual initiation. Accordingly, films became a means of projection of repressed desire and a semiological guide in terms of new attitudes and behaviors. Rosa Pereda recalls in her writings the impression that a film by Buñuel made upon her, making her reflect on and conceptualize her sexual inexperience in an entirely different way:

That phrase from Buñuel’s *The Exterminating Angel*, ‘virginity causes cancer’, which gave so much laughter to boys and girls, almost all of whom were virgins in that *arte y ensayo* cine hall, was converted into a slogan and the virginity in question into a heavy burden of which one would better get rid of quickly. ¹²²⁹

Contrary to Pereda’s assertion, Tapia sustains that virginity was not a problem for this generation:

As for my generation, virginity was already of minor importance and we had an egalitarian sense in the relations between men and women, and they [women] understood that this feeling was sincere, relations between men and women began to be much more natural, egalitarian and normal. And I think that this is the generation of the ’60s. Without any doubt, I believe, the hippy movement had a bit of an impact; the rock movement, music and all this stuff influenced the liberalisation of habits.

An absolute sexual fantasy was Bertolucci’s *Last Tango in Paris*, recalled by most male students as the ultimate cult movie of the early 1970s. As people could only watch it by passing the borders to Perpignan, at the eastern part of the Pyrenees in France, a weird brand of cinematic tourism was created, with students at the spearhead. ¹²³⁰

In the post-1968 era, morals also seem to have changed for good in terms of interpersonal relations. Liria’s description of a sexual orgy, a ‘sexual First of May’ as he calls it, brings to mind young people barricaded within a house doing their own sort of sensual revolt in Gilbert Adair’s literary representation of the French ’68 *The Holy

¹²³⁰ The journal *Time* expressed its surprise for the fact that in a city of 100,000 inhabitants, 110,000 tickets were sold for this specific film. See Agustín Sánchez Vidal, *El cine español y la transición*, pp. 85-98, in José B. Monleón (ed.), *Del Franquismo a la Posmodernidad. Cultura española 1975-1990*, Madrid 1995, p. 89.
Innocents. In Liria’s account, the Parisian ambience seems to have been directly transferred to the home:

We then decided to organize the sexual 1st of May, we got into the house of a friend of mine in Vallecas with people of the same group and people who were illegally there and others who had come from France.

Carles Carreras speaks in similar terms, describing a new way of understanding inside couples, accompanied by a sort of sexual frenzy:

We assaulted everything. This was the moment of the rupture of the family model, and, for example, we lacked a new vocabulary... People were saying ‘my partner’, but anyway... The model was ruptured, even the communes tried to work out without models and that was the moment when ... ‘Follem, follem, que el món s’acaba!’ [Let’s get fucked because it’s the end of the world], which I don’t know to translate in Greek.

Junco is more cautious in his depiction, as he belongs to the previous generation. Still, he re-vindicates for his closed circle a pioneering stance in this context too. Here too, public exposure and provocation, a major element in liberation abroad, is lacking. In his words, sexual revolution took place

only in certain circles. And in circles which were quiet clandestine. We started practicing sexual freedom but we couldn’t tell it to our parents, we couldn’t... Everything was very... And we were very few. For Spanish society altogether we were not representative. Later on it was extended. [...] And within some hundreds of people, who later became thousands of persons, and it resulted that we were very exemplary, very important. In the end, everybody ended up doing the same, but in the beginning we were very few.

By further arguing that women were feeling obliged to participate in all this, Junco highlights the fact that alternative identities often include a strong element of enforcement but also echoes a macho discourse of the time, according to which women suffer while men enjoy:

In a certain way, it was an act of militancy, because I believe that above all the women, they were rather doing it out of a bit of obligation, you know. You had to demonstrate that you were free, you had to demonstrate that if you were really left-wing, you had to go to bed with men. And men were generally delighted, of course. But for women it was more a question of obligation.
In contrast to that, Merche Comabella, already a convinced feminist in the early 1970s, recalls the difficult time she had in attempting to promote theoretical treatises on sexuality, as she was seen with contempt by her comrades:

I remember in 1972 a very important deed that I want to describe to you, in order to give you an idea of how we functioned. After having made many speeches on the issue of sexuality, we realized the tremendous oppression that women were experiencing and this made us publish a leaflet about W. Reich’s book ‘Sexual Revolution’. We made 2,000 copies and started to distribute them with all our nerve in houses, streets, among the militants of MDM. Needless to tell you what a fuss we made, because, certainly, talking about free sexuality cost us insults from puta upwards; from PCE militants we were told that we were whores, bitches, that our aims were not feminism, nor politics, nor anything.\textsuperscript{1221}

Comabella’s story reveals the puritanism that characterised several left-wing organizations and the chastity code that they tried to impose on their cadres, which strongly resembles the situation in Greece. Pereda stresses the differences according to the organizational affiliation and stresses that Maoists were the most austere, a factor encouraged by their theorizing their stance:

They were above all moral differences. For example, in the issue of sex, Communists were devoted followers of marriage. They were criticizing ... [...] There was a sort of puritanism which was mainly to be found among the Communists and by means of heritage among the Chinese, the Maoists. Besides, the Maoists in some way theorized it too because the ones of the Communist Party didn’t.

Maoist rigidity is yet another element reminiscent of the Greek case. An interesting element here is the organised Catholic past of some of these Marxist-Leninist militants, for example of ORT, which resembles the origins of some of the early Red Brigades members\textsuperscript{1222} and could lead to some preliminary conclusions in terms of an almost religious militancy and ethical rigidity of leftists.\textsuperscript{1223} At the opposite end of the spectrum, Junco, although belonging to the previous generation, stresses the fact that a

\textsuperscript{1221} Fernanda Romeu Alfaro, cit., p. 217. An interesting book that provides insights into Spain’s puritanism in this period is Rafael Torres’s, \textit{El amor en tiempos de Franco}, Madrid 2002.

\textsuperscript{1222} For instance Renato Curcio and Margherita Cagol.

\textsuperscript{1223} Kondylis also makes this point when talking about ‘grotesque forms of aestheticism’ in several left-wing political ‘heresies’ in \textit{Η παραχώρηση του Αττικού Πολιτισμού. Από τη μοντέρνα στη μεταμοντέρνα εποχή και από το φιλελεύθερο στη μεγάλη δημοκρατία [The decadence of Bourgeois Civilization. From Modernism to Post-Modernism and from Liberalism to Mass Democracy]}, Athens 2000, p. 271.
new socialization was a main factor behind young militancy, a communal sense of living:

We were doing everything together. Everything. We read the same books, then we commented on them. We went to the cinema together and after the film discussed what we had seen. We went to buy, we went to bookshops and we went together to buy books … or to steal books, together. In short, we were… we were frequently living together, in the same flats, in the same zones. Yes, yes, a kind of very intense socialization, of course.

Nevertheless, new experimentations on sexuality along with long hair (los melenudos) and an alternative style of dressing, led to the appearance of a new type of student: the progre, in many ways the equivalent of the Greek arty-farty (koulouriaris). These alternative aesthetics were used as codified elements of a rebelling identity and, in the words of a Spanish student, dress marked the ideal border of the community. In a way, it functioned as a code of inclusion, by drawing the distinction between ‘ourselves’ and ‘others’:

We were uniform. [...] It was a way of saying ‘this is us’, a constitution of group identity. After all in terms of age groups the definition of ‘us’ had a lot to do with external appearance. Through the dress style I differentiate myself from the other but I also identify myself with something else. (Ramon Ramos)

Since re-vindications included free love and aesthetic provocation, a hedonist and aesthetising human type was promoted.¹²³⁴ The former Principal of the University of Madrid and ex-supporter of the regime, Lain Entralgo, pointed out that ‘the limitlessness and the courageous chromatic appearance -exaggerated in its minoritarian ‘hippy’ form- demonstrate the will of the youths to be picturesque’.¹²³⁵ All this broke the fear and began to be considered as normal, even by the parents:

The fear and panic associated with talking decreased more and more. Which is to say, as time passed the progre began to walk in the streets in a normal way, but also people started accepting more and more that it was normal if their kid turned out to be a progre. Which is to say that all these things began to be accepted. (Box)

¹²³⁴ J. Álvarez Junco, ‘Movimientos Sociales…’, op.cit.
¹²³⁵ P. Lain Entralgo, El problema de la Universidad..., op.cit., p. 47.
Imagining Paris

A striking feature of Spanish interviews is the contrast between being at ‘home’ and ‘abroad’, with the latter’s strong connection to freedom in people’s imaginary. According to Manuel Perez Ledesma, a young lecturer of the time, however, Paris became a sort of mythical place, leading people to exaggerate its real status and also their actual relation to it. Since Ledesma was jailed for a period of time and as he was not allowed to leave the country, his sarcastic comment also bears the signs of a personal remorse:

Everyone of my age says that s/he has been to Paris in May ’68, all the people from the *Isquierda Unida* claim that they were in Paris. Not me, I wasn’t there. (Pérez Ledesma)

For Spanish students Paris was the absolute fantasy:

It is amazing to remember what the journey to Paris meant to a lot of people... walking into bookshops...

It was a mixture of things. It was political liberty, trade-unionist liberty, you saw the trade-unionists and the workers defended by them, sexual freedom, you saw all those couples kissing in the streets, a completely unthinkable thing in Spain... Cultural richness, fantastic bookshops, with all sorts of books, music, one could also find records and so on... It was an ensemble of things. Then the beauty of the city and its cosmopolitanism, but above all it was this freedom, cultural richness, sexual life, which in Spain was so depressing. (Junco)

You see, whenever one went to Paris, one came back loaded with books... One entered Maspero, le Globe, every Paris bookshop full of enthusiasm.

Reig Tapia and Trias remember Paris as the point of their intellectual recharge, including the frantic consumption of banned books and films:

When I went to Paris, which was for political reasons, for political contacts and stuff, during our free time we went to the movies. We went to the movies and some days I ended up watching maybe seven or eight in a day. (Trias)

---

It was obligatory, when you had a vacation or some bank holiday or in holy week, you escaped to Paris in order to buy banned books: ‘El ruedo ibérico’, ‘El gizoma de la guerra civil española’, or in the end, Stanley Payne’s ‘Falange e historia del fascismo español. (Tapia)

Apart from the anarchist *Ruedo Ibérico*, the left-wing bookshop of François Maspero was the key meeting point for Spanish people. Whereas Pereda says that students went there to buy books, in reality most of the Spaniards stole them, in what was considered to be a revolutionary act. Maspero, himself a convicted left-winger and anti-Francoist, did nothing to prevent this.\(^{1238}\) Tria theorizes this point:

> What could a left-winger like Masperó do? Who was the editor of Althusser and of Poulantzas and so on. What could he do? ‘I’ll call the police if...?’ (Trias)

In fact, some years later the legendary book-shop closed down because of bad finances, attributed also to the Spaniards’ expensive ‘hobby’. Junco’s evident nostalgia underlines the fact that this missing point of reference is traumatic at present and idealizing in terms of the past:

> Of course, Maspero no longer exists, nothing of this sort exists any longer. This Paris does not exist. But, well, this Paris was fantastic.

Jaime Pastor, who had moved to Paris because of his imminent arrest stresses the intellectually stimulating element of Parisian life too, as he tried to follow the ‘saints’ of the time, including Poulantzas, Bethelem and Foucault:

> The university of Vincennes was the pilot experience afterwards and then I was there studying Sociology with Nikos Poulantzas, and as a student I sometimes went to other big shots, Michel Foucault; I went to the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes for Charles Bethelem, too.

Paris, and in particular the experimental university of Vincennes, which had become a sort of ‘alternative institution’, was also a meeting place for political refugees.\(^{1239}\) Apart


\(^{1239}\) Kostas Zouraris, a young Greek lecturer at Vincennes at the time, calls it a little ‘wonderland’. For detailed descriptions of the alternative tastes of students and professors at Vincennes, within the context of the post-’68 experimentations in terms of university instruction, see Anna Chatzigiannaki, ‘Paris May ’68. Cliques…’, op.cit.
from the Greeks, Spaniards also came to know the Portuguese, who up to this point had been completely unfamiliar:

Yes, in Vincennes I met some [Greeks] [...] There in Vincennes we were groups of refugees of different sides: there started to be quite a few Brasilians then, and there were Portuguese too. We started to have a contact with the Portuguese too.

In terms of common action, it is worth noting that the 1968 occupation of the Greek Pavilion at the Cité Universitaire was made in the company of a dozen Spanish and a few Portuguese students. Accordingly, the communiqué issued by the students committee read:

We, Greek students and workers of Paris, believe in the struggle of the French people and participate in it with brotherly ties, alongside our comrades, the students and workers of Spain and Portugal.

This form of solidarity is also expressed today, as students tend to stress the warm feelings they shared for their counterparts in the Parisian ‘exile’. The philosopher Lorenzo Peña, an active Maoist in Paris at that time, writes with emotion about the need of Spanish and Greeks to identify common elements with each other. He goes on to use a discourse which reveals the imaginary of his co-nationals at the time, whereby the Greek presence was placed in a sort of continuity with their ancient ‘heritage’, and that is how it was conceptualized and evaluated:

The 60s were tough years but they carry with them memories charged with nostalgia. Among them were my brief contacts with Greek comrades in Paris who published a journal called 'Anti-imperialists'. [...] Greece was something very intense for us all, even if to analyse why would not be easy at all. We experienced what was going on in Greece as if it were taking place just next to us, as if our languages were very close, as if our historical experiences were charged with common junctures, whereas, if seen rigorously, it has not been like that in the past centuries, or if it has barely so. What surprised me the most is that all the Greeks I met (well, at least many of them) felt something reciprocal, which was even more strange for me, as in the end Greece is Greece and is situated deeply in the universal collective memory, the universal culture wrongly named ‘Western’, while the role of Spain is much more modest.\textsuperscript{1240}

\textsuperscript{1240} Letter to the author, 30/7/03.
May '68 and the occupation of the Greek House, assisted by the Spanish students, acted as springboards for the creation of clandestine organizations with the aim of pursuing ‘dynamic resistance’ in Greece. The headquarters of the exiled PCE were also in the French capital, where a substantial émigré Spanish community had resided since the late 1930s. However, the contact with the mythical generation of the 1930s was for many a great disappointment. Junco, already researching the history of the anarchist movement, was disillusioned by his real life contact with his legends, while Pastor, ideologically close to the aereaos was frustrated by the old militants’ fixation with their own past:

In Paris I met Cipriano Mera, in Toulouse I met Federica Montseny, in Madrid, after Franco’s death, I came to know Abad de Santillán, another great anarchist... And they were people who were out of this world, out of reality, and one did not venerate them because one saw them... They continued with some very old questions. Then there was no way for us to understand each other, I didn’t see them with great veneration. Not much.

With the exception of García Calvo we had little to do with the old generation. We were particularly related to members of the POUM. We came into contact with people from POUM, they had a place in Paris and we started going there. But, for instance, they wanted us to reconstruct POUM and we were saying ‘man, we’ve gotta make something new’. So, in terms of the people who could be more attractive to us politically there was a significant generational distance. (Pastor)

Still, a significant part of leftist resistance organizations originated in Paris and given that even the PCE had its headquarters in the French capital, it was often from there that Spanish underground activities were co-ordinated. One of these organizations was the militant Maoist group PC (m-l) and its armed branch FRAP. Pío Moa, a member of the latter, argues in his writings that Iberian militant identity exercised a great fascination over the French at the time. To illustrate his point he quotes a comrade of his as saying that ‘in those times it was enough to say that one was Spanish in order to bed any French woman’.  

\[1241\] Pío Moa, ‘De un tiempo y de un país’. La izquierda violenta (1968-1978), Madrid 2002, p. 21. This is an interesting, albeit controversial, account of Spanish extreme left-wing groups originating in Paris during the late 1960s.
Working Class Heroes

[Spain’s student youth] are advancing in the struggle side by side with the workers and peasants in a joint effort to open the way to a democratic and Socialist Spain.

*Dolores Ibarruri (La Pasionaria), August 1969*

Back in Spain proper, a crucial issue in terms of the Spanish student movement was workerism, this time not only as a fantasy but also as a lived practice. The appearance of a strong trade-unionist movement already from the early 1960s, with the semi-legal and Communist-led Comisiones Obreras (CCOEs) and the Catholic (HOAC) and (JOC) created some of the major signs of unrest and organized opposition to Franco. In contrast to the great strikes, which started in 1962 in Asturias, Greece’s state controlled trade-unions were unwilling to organise strikes, despite occasional active moments. ‘At first, labour disputes were not overtly political, but tended to focus on demands for improvement in wages or working conditions. However, one of the effects of the repressive nature of Francoist labour legislation was to give a political dimension to mobilizations which had not originally been conceived as such. In this sense, and as the country’s industrialization was reinforced throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Spain would move closer to the Marxist principle of industrial proletariat and labour mobilisation as a major means of pressure against state violence and social injustice. However, in the early 1960s there was still little connection between old and new social movements. Junco recalls:

I only remember one meeting of ours where one worker came, one. And evidently we did not even have a common language either. Still... (Junco)

Junco’s statement is not entirely true, however, as by 1965 the students had started attempts to mimic a workerist discourse and way of life. The SUT (Servicio Universitario de Trabajo), for example, was an organization through which students worked as miners, fishermen, peasants and industrial workers during the long vacation

*1242* ‘Franco’s king-making can only weaken his position’, *Morning Star*, 12/8/69.
period. Giner argues that this ‘was a dangerous experiment, which made many students politically sensitive, whilst others used it to ‘spread the word’ among the workers.’ By the late 1960s, moreover, it had become a fashion for students to participate in workers assemblies and vice versa, with interventions of dirigentes of constructions and metal industries and in general tried to stage big demonstrations either alongside the workers or on workerist occasions, such as on Labour Day. Accordingly, from 1967 onwards the meetings between the delegates of anti-Francoist students and Inter, the directing organ of CCOOs, became a frequent phenomenon. Groups of student militants often gathered outside factory gates and before major strikes and staged assemblies, whereby they tried to explain to the workers the priorities of the student struggle. Consequently a major difference between the two student movements was the fact that the Spanish were strongly in favour of creating a bond with the workers, as the Communist labour federations had managed to mobilize a considerable part of people.

Occasional injuries or even deaths of workers in clashes with the police (1968 and 1969) reinforced student radicalization. In her analysis in 1970, Communist militant Ester Blanco stresses the fact that the student movement profited a great deal from the workers’ experiences as ‘it did not isolate itself in its own problems’. Blanco talked about the ‘consciousness of broad avant-guards’, both in the student movement, workers movement, peasants movement and the consequent collaboration of each of these. Soon, the slogan “Obreros y estudiantes unidos frente a la dictadura” became one of the most popular. This was to be found in Greece at only a very limited level, as the only point of convergence was the Polytechnic with the often ludicrous ‘workers committees’, which were in part contested by the serious ‘reformists’ themselves as too ‘revolutionary’ and therefore dangerous.

From the early 1970s onwards, the student movement was overridden by the workers movement. The SEAT strikes in Barcelona and the new conflicts in Asturias among mine workers, metallurgists, construction workers and the police, became a daily phenomenon. 1970 was the year that signalled the explosion of demands on a working as well as on a political level, as workers were gradually adopting a much more pragmatic attitude, focusing on workers re-vindication concerning salaries and

\[1245\] ‘La crisis de la universidad bajo el franquismo y el surgimiento del movimiento estudiantil’, 1970, Archivo PCE.
\[1246\] Ibid, p. 6.
better working conditions. Workers’ demands were often interpreted by anti-regime people as political, although they were not such, even if the workers’ consciousness was identified with anti-fascism, a fact that reinforced their political engagement.\textsuperscript{1247} In the first years of the 1970s the strikes in Spain reached such intensity that they almost justified ETA’s and PCE’s optimism that they would lead to revolutionary results.\textsuperscript{1248} A certain trend developed among the most radical students to go and work in factories as part of an authentic proletarian militantism. Antonio Ferros, a History student in Madrid and a Communist militant, got expelled from university and decided to join a factory. Also Clara Parramón recalls this activity and her itinerary from the Catalan SDE, through PCI to the workers:

From ’65 onwards I participated at the University of Barcelona, at the Democratic Sindicato of the Students. Although I was not a militant member of any political party, already in ’68 I entered a political organization which was called something like Acción Comunista, which was of a more or less Trotskyite inspiration and from there I went on to become a militant at the PCI. I continued at the University even if my participation decreased consistently, in the end I left the Faculty and I went to work to a factory and some months later was detained in a \textit{caída} of the year ’69. I assumed and obeyed all the orders that my party gave me, and as they decided that I had to go back to the University I left the factory and re-joined the student struggle.\textsuperscript{1249}

The creation of the juvenile sectors of CCOOs, which were much more radical than the real ones, reinforced these links. However, students tried to ideologically control and lead the CCOOs, even though they were often regarded by the workers as spoiled bourgeois kids. Their patronizing attempts had often disastrous effects.

Well, we had meetings, at least as I remember, yes, under the direction of the Sindicato Democrático we had meetings with the direction of the CCOOs, with Marcelino Camacho, Nicolás Sartorius. Evidently, we were a bit insolent and wanted to tell them what they had to do and stuff like that, but well, you know, youthful insolence and the idea that we had some power... Well, of course, we had a sensation of great power because it is true that the regime regarded us as a challenge, but of course, then we wanted workers communions to launch themselves into a general strike too and this and that, but evidently the conditions of the student movement were different from those of the workers movement. (Pastor)

\textsuperscript{1247} José Álvarez Junco, ‘Movimientos sociales...’, op.cit.
\textsuperscript{1248} Paul Preston, \textit{El triunfo de la democracia en España}, Barcelona 2001, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{1249} F. Rome Alfaro, \textit{El silencio roto...}, op.cit., p. 221.
In general, however, the fact that the workers aligned with bourgeois modernizing elements such as the students on an anti-authoritarian, anti-capitalist platform played a major role in terms of social mobilization and reinforced the imaginary revolutionary identity of student militants themselves.

**Orthodoxy versus radicalism**

The state of emergency (estado de excepción) of January 1969 and the suspension of the *habeas corpus* in the wake of growing university agitation and ETA’s trial at Burgos, signalled some of the most vicious attacks on civic liberties in Spain since the late 1940s. These phenomena demonstrated how obsolete the structures of the regime had become; in turn, these started to clash with the modernizing tendencies in Spanish society and its desire to integrate into the European environment, and proved unable to confront new forms of social mobilization. Part of the latter included the advent of leftism.

As Fusi and Carr point out, in Spain too, with the whole educational structure of Francoism in crisis, ‘the student movement was becoming increasingly ideologically radical’. At the same time, the traditional Left, despite its theoretical objections, could not oversee the strength and efficiency of leftist initiatives which resulted in daily conflicts with the regime. ‘Ageing, machismo and centralism’ characterising the old Communist cadres facilitated the creation of independent organizations of ‘new activists’. Lucia González stresses the over-activity of her own group:

> In ’67, at the University of Madrid there was a significant series of arrests of people who participated in the FUDE. The group of the ‘Trotskyites’ remained safe. I joined this group and I was put in charge of reconstructing it. In ’68 this group suffered another serious series of arrests. We were promoting social revolution at all costs, the workers and farmers alliance, and we also called for an occupation of the Faculties. We had a very high level of activity, we published a journal, distributed it in faculties and factories. We were a group of young people belonging to that combative and revolutionary generation. In ’68, almost everyone got caught. Fortunately, I was not. The groups’ activity ceased and I went to France, where I gained the Status of a Political

---

1251 Ibid.
1252 R. Carr & J.P. Fusi Aizpurua, Spain..., op.cit., p. 148.
1253 José Álvarez Junco, op.cit.
1254 Ibid.
Refugee. In February '72 I returned to Madrid in order to join the head and the activities of the Revolutionary Communist League.\textsuperscript{1256}

In fact, this came to cast doubt over that which the PCE had long maintained, namely that in Spain the student movement was ‘a solid socio-political formation, not divided by diverse political tendencies’, which would have led ‘to atomization and disunity as happened in other countries’.\textsuperscript{1257} A new sect of ultras, including the reinforcement of the Trotskyites and the spectacular rise of Maoists was bred through constant mobilisation and contact with the international element.\textsuperscript{1258} The former, alongside the anarcho-syndicalists, were designated with the more or less derogatory term ‘izquierdistas’ (leftists).

Those groups often endorsed contradictory elements, such as Guevarism with anarchism, Catholicism with Trotskyism, nationalism with communism and so on. In most cases they were hostile towards each other despite their ideological affinities. \textit{People’s Liberation Front} (FLP), known as ‘Felipe’, was a major group which originated in the late 1950s. Originally radical Catholic, then Marxist and ultimately Trotskyist (Mandelist), the group became ‘Castro-Guevarist’ in its final phase. A British report expressed its surprise that FLP ‘although Marxist cooperates with left-wing Catholics, as does the P.C.E.’ Jaime Pastor, a leading figure of this organisation, argues that its transformation was due to the major impact of a new generation of militants:

In '67-'68 what we did was to join a new group of youths mainly in Barcelona and Madrid, as we were already going left-ways in this international context of 68 and we were more Marxist, say, or we thought we were more Marxist, and at the same time another kind of Left started to attract us which was already appearing in Europe; this consisted of those groups closer to Trotskyism, mainly in France, but always with a very eclectic view, that is, we read Andrés Goroff, we also read Ernest Mandel and Althusser. That is, it was an eclectic search, which explains why later under the shake of '68 the FLP was not dissolved in '69, because you have had a majority youth sector that had opted for a more Mandelist line.

\textsuperscript{1256} F. Romeu Alfaro, \textit{El silencio...}, op. cit., p. 218.
\textsuperscript{1257} \textit{Archivo del PCE}, 31/1/67.
\textsuperscript{1258} R. Carr & J.P. Fusi Aizpurua, \textit{Spain...}, op.cit.
A student belonging to FLP, Enrique Ruano became the Spanish equivalent of the emblematic status of the dead Petroulas. He was killed by the police during a demonstration at the University of Madrid in 1969. Ruano’s death often emerges as a flashbulb memory among Spanish students of the period. Rosa Pereda remembers with emotion and a romanticising spirit that apart from anything else Ruano was a poet, just like another student killed in later years, the etarra Txabi Etxebarrieta.

As in the Greek case, derivations of the Communist Party included the Marxist Leninists (‘m-l’), somewhere in-between the PCE and China, the pro-Albanian factions and so on. The strongest groups were the Trotskyite Liga Comunista Revolucionaria in Madrid, while PCI (Partido Comunista Internacional), linked to French groups, and the Catalan Bandiera Roja, sharing a similar political orientation. These student agitators who believed ‘in revolutionary action’ rather than democratic reform, were considered by the authorities as the most dangerous section among anti-regime students, also because their influence was extending. The militants of the seventies represented the extremist Left that had emerged in Europe with May 1968. ‘Maoists, anarchists and Trotskyites were concerned less with political issues than with a cultural revolution, a rejection of all the moral values of contemporary society.’ In Fernández Buey’s perception the groups that were formed from ’68 onwards were ‘the mimetic reflection of the student groups of France, Italy and Germany.’ Accordingly, among their aims was the establishment of a ‘people’s university’ with ‘self-management’. However, whereas Greek leftists were largely responsible for extending the student action repertoire, the constant mobilization of Spanish leftists did not lead them to any substantial collective outbreak, apart from the ones that took place in 1968.

These groupings were cooperating but did not have the same perceptions on how to combat the regime. A clear dividing line, however, separated them from the representatives of the Communist Party; the latter was traditionally more cautious while ‘leftists’ favoured direct confrontation. Communists regarded the leftist agitators as people with little capacity for aiding the concrete and everyday development of the

---

1259 The Spanish police implied that Ruano was a psychopath and homosexual, who had previously shown suicidal tendencies. Interestingly, this is surprisingly similar to the Greek authorities’ reaction after the death of the Greek student Kostas Georgakis in Genova and despite the entirely different circumstances.


1261 R. Carr & J.P. Fusi Aizpurua, *Spain...*, op.cit.
movement and as harmful because of their extreme tactics and utopianism. Pastor explains the main divergences from the PCE, which was still the main point of reference of the movement:

We did indeed criticise quite a lot the methods of control on the part of the Communist Party quite significantly, as well as the trade-unionist structures, we criticised the approach of the PC, we believed that an anticapitalist dimension should also be introduced in the movement [...] Well, in the critique of the USSR too, but the PC then started to distance itself from the Soviet Union. But for us, despite everything, it was a party that only criticised specific repressive sides of the USSR, but not the model.

Reig Tapia explains his dislike for the Communist Party in terms of its non-democratic way of functioning and to its references to the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’.

I didn’t like this thing about the dictatorship [of the proletariat], as I was already living inside one.

However, having surpassed their traditional conception about the need for clandestinity, leftists embraced mass action not only as a legitimate but also as a strategic mode of action. In these terms, as Ester Blanco boasts, they ‘accept [ed] in a natural way the determining weight of the [Communist] Party in the struggle’. In fact, the leftist groups synchronized their action with the PCE on more than one occasion, including the attack on the ‘Ley General de Educación’. What is more, the student PCE was much less monolithic and dogmatic than the KKE, having taken some distance from Moscow. Communist students went so far as to demand more freedom of action and discussion freed from taboos. A leaflet which was circulated by young ‘orthodox’ students in spring 1973 would be unthinkable for the Greek KNE in the same period:

We consider it our right to discuss and have opinions at all levels over events such as the Revolution of May-68 in France, the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the repression of the Polish workers, the revolutionary process in Chile, the Chinese-Soviet aid to Vietnam etc.
It is no surprise, therefore, that the dogmatism and scorn of the ‘orthodox’ students vis-à-vis the revolutionary leftists in Greece had no equivalent in Spain. Instead, the ‘politica unitaria’ is reflected in the interviews, even though at times some pathos against the PCE can be discerned from the opposite side, which, it should be noted, is much less articulate than in the Greek case. In terms of her past perceptions, Rosa Pereda brings out the traumatic POUM affair and the fact that this legendary Trotskyite-leaning group was ‘liquidated’ by Stalinist Party cadres during the Civil War for deviation from the basic revolutionary principles. However, Pereda presents herself as reconciled with these aspects and she appears much more benevolent towards ‘orthodox’ Communists than the average Trotskyite:

Of course, you listen to what happened to POUM, you listen to what happened to I don’t know what, and of course, you say, ‘help!’ Now, never ever, and I’m telling you seriously, I never ever thought of a Communist as a Fascist, or that the one thing equals the other. Never! I mean, they are my brothers, my friends...

Strongly reminiscent of the Greek case and, in fact, Kleopatra Papageorgiou’s comments, is Pereda’s assertion that she preferred Trotskyism to Maoism for aesthetic and philosophical reasons:

In my view, without having anything against the Maoists or something like that, nor against the thinking of Mao Tse Tung, or anything, I believe that Trotskyism is much more thoroughly rationalist, more scientific, and maybe more aesthetising too. Then, there was a Trotskyite aesthetics too. Perhaps it is rather petit bourgeois or whatever you want but I was attracted by that too, by the aesthetic side and for the, say, more rationalist side.

Junco, instead, accuses the Communists of aesthetic conservatism.

I had friends within the Communist Party, but they were by far the most conservative ones. We didn’t wear ties and at times we wore beards and long hair and they were dressed up with ties, they were very conservative people also in formal way.

His scorn for the conservatism of the PCE in those years is presented here in juxtaposition to his contempt for US anti-Communism.

The Communist Party was very conservative for us. It was the Right. We despised it enormously. The first time I went to the United States in '68, the police asked me, of course, in that
interrogation 'Do you belong or have ever belonged to the Communist Party?' ‘Of course not, how disgusting!', right? I was much more to the left than the Communist Party, naturally.

Both Pereda and Junco, however, demonstrate that the PCE was always a solid point of reference, even if a negative one. It was, however, the way in which the rest of the organizations would measure their efficiency or amount of militancy. Junco shares this view too:

The Spanish left always looked at the Communist Party in order to criticise the system in a different way, I don't know how to tell you. And with more or less radicalism, and with more or less spite, but yes, there is always a certain hostility. Which in my case is not against persons, it is against determined practices. Man, being a Trotskyite was not unusual either. (Pereda)

It was a reference for all of us and for everything. We all defined ourselves in relation to the strategy of the Communist Party, as more left-wing than the Party etc, closer to the Party or not close to it. (Junco)

**Spanish Jacobins**

The most radical faction of leftism was the one that not only succumbed to the allure of political violence but actually exercised it. First and foremost, the clandestine Basque organization ETA made its first steps operating on the premise of conducting an anti-colonial struggle. When the 'armed struggle' was making its first steps in Spain in the mid-1960s, Jorge Semprún accurately observed that this phenomenon was due to

a certain temptation on the side of the youth, who no longer have faith in the effectiveness of mass action and believe that they have to change the route of destiny and evoke the examples of Algiers and Cuba, which are absolutely valid but cannot be transferred in a mechanical way to present day Spain. 1264

Interestingly, ETA likened Euskadi to a 'Cuban Europe'. 1265 Fernández Buey faithfully renders this way of thinking:

---

1264 'Entretien avec Jorge Semprún', *Positif*, 79, October 1966 [my translation].
Within the organised avant-garde, violence was considered as a necessary means against structural violence. We were in a dictatorship, the police conduct was brutal, prisons were full of political prisoners, detentions were a constant phenomenon. [...] It was always at the back of our minds that there no regime disappears benevolently. [...] Those more influenced by Guevarism were the ones who shared, you know, the armed way, that is what the Latin American guerilla represented in those days. (Fernández Buey)

Junco argues, however, that for leftists, like himself, who were attracted by tiersmondisme, the takeover of the armed struggle by local nationalists was somehow disappointing:

We had considerable veneration for Fidel's Cuba and for the image of Che, of course. And that what Che was doing in Latin America, the idea of creating other guerrilla focus seemed to us an adequate tactic, yes. And I considered that the revolutionary armed struggle was going to start in Spain, of course, at a certain moment. And in fact it did start, but it was undertaken by ETA, the armed struggle started, but it was nationalist. I believed that the proletarian armed struggle was going to start, the revolutionary one.

The militant groups GRAPO and FRAP followed in the late 1960s and were soon both infiltrated by police agents. Juan Luis Cebrián calls them 'weird embryos of Marxist urban guerrillas, prone to manipulation'. The Partido Obrero Revolucionario and the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias, the latter subsidised by Italian Maoists, were two more groupings, mainly comprised by students, close to the FUDE and involved in student actions such as the on-campus protest but equally oriented towards the 'armed struggle'. Similarly to the Greek case, the tendency towards the 'armed struggle' was enhanced by '68 and the aspiration of some groups to copy the French 'comités d' action'. Liria, a member of a small anarchist group,

---

1266 Both FRAP [Frente Revolucionario Antifascista y Patriota] and GRAPO [Grupos Revolucionarios Antifascistas Primero de Octubre] were of Maoist inclinations. The first one was the military branch of the PC (marxista-leninista) and the second of PC(r), namely the Partido Comunista de España Reconstituido. The semiotics involved in these respective labels concerning the troubled relationship to the oficial PCE is strongly reminiscent of similar tendencies in the Greek case. The narrow bibliography on these groupings includes José Manuel Roca (ed), El proyecto radical: auge y declive de la izquierda revolucionaria en España (1964-1992), Madrid 1994, Alejandro Diz, La sombra del FRAP, Barcelona 1977, Consuelo Laiz, La lucha final. Los partidos de la izquierda radical durante la transición española, Madrid 1995, Juan García Martín, Historia del PCE (r) y los GRAPO, Madrid 1984, Rafael Gómez Parra, GRAPO, los hijos de Mao, Madrid 1991 and Lorenzo Castro, PCE (r) –GRAPO, análisis de un proceso, Bilbao 1990. I would like to thank Eduardo González Calleja for helping me locating these writings.

talks in a very direct way about his own group’s practices, which involved bank robberies in order to sustain itself, the famous ‘expropriations’:

We were making a relatively innocuous use of violence, which means -as was the case for the greatest part of the groups of the extreme Left back then- that we used it in order to get money and to attract attention. I mean we burnt many things, because when there were demonstrations and such things, we defended the demonstrations with fire... Stories like that and this kind of thing. We attacked banks, we attacked petrol stations, we stole everything, but we never did harm to a person... (laughter)

ETA, on the other hand, regarded Francoism as a monolithic block and its philosophy of action was influenced by the theories of Netchayev and Marighella and was summarised in the maxim ‘action-repression-conscientiousness-action’. Typically, the idea was that violence against the State would reinforce state sponsored repression, which, in turn, would awaken people’s animosity against the regime. Determined, as they were, to be connected to the workers movement, the etarras had reached the conclusion that dynamic action should be the continuation of trade-unionism by other means, when strikes came to a dead end. All this would supposedly cause rifts and centrifugal tendencies within the Francoist system. ETA was different from the rest of the groups in as far as its action aimed not only to attack ‘fascism’, but also envisioned a separate socialist Basque nation state, which would include the Basque regions of France.

Whereas clandestinity and ‘armed propaganda’ were also the terrains in which the Greek resistance groups operated upon the imposition of the Colonels’ coup in April 1967, the major difference, however, was that apart from the fact that the Greek groups did not have a hidden agenda - whereas the Basque groups apparently did-, no assassination was carried out during the seven years of the Junta. Instead, ETA began by killing the police chief and torturer Melitón Manzanas in 1968 and proceeded with the assassination of several Civil Guard members in the Basque Country.

---

1269 Ibid, p. 99. In fact, there was antagonism between the Opus Dei-oriented administration and the old guard Falangists who in 1969 would be the principal victims of Franco’s changes, a fact, however, that had little to do with anti-regime activities.
Man, I would lie if I said, like other left-wing people in those years, that while ETA carried out attacks, for example like the one of Melitón Manzano [sic], the Commissar of San Sebastián...

We all knew in the university that Melitón Manzano was a torturer, and we believed in democracy, in human rights, in the state of guarantees. [...] Melitón Manzano was a victim of the terrorism of ETA, of course, but in a situation of dictatorship, in a situation without guarantees for human rights and this gentleman was torturing in police stations. And although ETA terrorists hardly seemed exactly like angels, it seemed to us, for a matter of principles, and for the same reasons for which we stood against state terrorism under the socialist government, well, that was evidently wrong, but it could not be hailed either. Then again, obviously, we didn't really cry when ETA executed Melitón Manzano. (Tapia)

During this time the group achieved great popularity among anti-regime people and was considered to be a major player in the Resistance, not only by Spanish anti-Francoists but also abroad. Buey stresses the fact that ETA was embraced as a major ally in the anti-Franco struggle by the PSUC, the Catalan Communist Party, without serious objections in as far as their tactics were concerned. Here again, we see a significant divergence from the Greek case, where the 'orthodox' Communists remained very sceptical of the 'armed struggle' throughout the seven years.1271

This was also a moment of inflexion because one had to define himself vis-à-vis what ETA altogether represented. It is true that in general lines and for the entire vanguard, ETA was seen, at least up to the '70s, as a revolutionary organization which was prioritising the armed struggle. And we over here helped the people of ETA that came to Barcelona fleeing the Basque Country. When I say 'we' I mean the PSUC and other organizations. I insist this was done without difficulty. There was no serious discussion either on whether the methods of ETA were better or worse. (Fernández Buey)

We did not support the actions but we were far from considering that, in the end, they were playing the game of the regime and these things. We knew that it was a youth nationalist radical organization that dealt with the armed struggle... And this yes, we considered that under the dictatorship, although we didn't share this strategy, it seemed legitimate to us. (Pastor)

Groups like the FLP had by that time endorsed semi-clandestinity and an open action in the universities as a more efficient strategy than underground militancy. Rosa Pereda, although herself a militant member of the radical Liga Comunista

---

1271 In fact, Solé Barberá, one of the dirigeants of PSUC, was among the principal defenders of ETA in the Burgos trials.
Revolucionaria which was fused with the VI Assembly of ETA, makes a dubious distinction between mass violence and ‘armed struggle’:

No to the violence but yes to the armed struggle as they were promoting it. This is to say, we understood that violence of the masses is one thing and the violence of a terrorist group is another. And in my case, from the beginning, I always had a visceral disgust for violence. Individual violence and killings, this kind of thing, I don't refer to the violence of pressure. This kind of violence, I believe in, I believe that you have to do it and that there is no other way. Mass violence of pressure, the violent pressure, is a different thing.

The Burgos trials of thirteen etarras, among whom were two priests, and the scheduled execution of six of its members, three men and three women, reportedly ruthlessly tortured in prison, led to the internationalization of the Basque case. In December 1970, 300 intellectuals gathered in Montserrat Cathedral in order to protest and pressurize for the safety of the ETA fighters. It is noteworthy that this event and the popularity of the ‘Basque patriots’, as they were habitually called by the Left, led to a strongly worded solidarity statement by Greek intellectuals and artists, while Theodorakis in Paris linked and condemned the crimes of the dictatorships in both Spain and Greece. Apart from protests abroad, including even a plea by the Pope, in Spain proper large scale uprisings, including strikes, shipping boycotts, demonstrations and petitions led Franco’s cabinet to persuade him to eventually commute the death penalties to prison sentences. Accordingly, ETA’s statement that ‘the comrades who are tried will be saved only through the mobilisation of the masses’, in a sort of millenarian levée en masse, was not entirely frustrated. Thereafter, the government was criticised by the extreme Right and Falangist circles for lack of resolution in the face of dissidence and subversion. The Burgos trials had managed to unite left-wing opposition as never before, adding to it the radical elements of the Church and progressive Francoists.

---

1272 Fernanda Romeu Alfaro, El silencio roto..., op. cit., p. 107. Apparently this decision was taken as the result of pressure from the growing influence of the hardliners and the so-called generales azules in the regime.
1273 See Ареоло Партіону Атістанізіка Ентіпіон. ΚΚΕ Εσωτερικοί, ΕΔΑ, ΠΛΑΜ, Ρήγας Φεραίος [Archive of Clandestine Resistance Journals. KKE Interio, EDA, PAM, Rigas Ferais], Athens 1974, p. 126.
1274 ‘Κρίσημη η σημαντική μέρα στην Ισπανία’ [Today is going to be a crucial day for Spain], Thessaloniki, 3.12.1970.
1275 Paul Preston, Franco, op. cit., p. 754.
A month after the Polytechnic events in Greece, ETA was reaching the peak of its activity with the assassination of Prime Minister Carrero Blanco on 20 December 1973. As Carrero was the Caudillo’s right-hand man and heir apparent, his elimination left the regime without successor and made the project of the prolongation of the Movimiento after Francos’s death more complex. The Prime Minister’s death came 15 minutes before the start of a trial, the so-called ‘number 1001’, involving ten of CCOOs’ leading members, one of them a Roman Catholic priest. Their arrest in a Madrid Church in 1972 under the accusation of staging an unlawful assembly, gave rise to a series of demonstrations and clashes with the police. The assassination of Carrero, known as ‘Operation Ogre’, took place through the digging of an underground tunnel underneath the Admiral’s armoured car, where one ton of explosives was placed. The immensity of the explosion catapulted the limousine over the church where Carrero had just attended a service and onto the roof of a neighbouring building. Anti-regime people at the time were excited and thrilled by this unexpected incident. Juan Luis Cebrián, the latter day founder of the daily El Pais, captures the atmosphere of the time:

Beyond the asphalt roads one could sense the fear. But in many Spanish households, champagne bottles were opened: thousands of youths, people opposed to the regime, were toasting the tyrannicide. Many democrats, enemies of violence and of ETA’s terrorism, had no other alternative than to recognise -prudently, that should not be misunderstood- that, in the end, the assassins had completed a historical destiny and their action had nullified any possibility of Francoist continuism.1

Enthusiasm was not that privately expressed, however. Newsreel images show young people dancing in the streets and singing ‘Carrero has flown’, while according to a widely diffused popular joke of the time Carrero was the first Spaniard to go to the moon.1 Rosa Pereda recalls, somehow irritated, that this act was seen as a heroic

---

1 Carrero was vice-premier from 1967 to 1973, when he became PM after Franco separated the duties of chief of state and head of government. As Carrero was a monarchist, his ascension was regarded as a step towards the planned restoration of monarchy.

1J.L.Cebrián, La agonía del Franquismo..., op. cit., p. 16.

1See Julen Agirre, Operation Ogre. The Execution of Admiral Luis Carrero Blanco, Madrid s.d. Present views about this act, however, often tend to reject the use of excessive violence or speculate on the presence of the US secret services in the venture. The difference in the perception of political assassinations over time is also to be seen in terms of Greek terrorism and especially the early Metapolitefsi period, as the assassinations of the American stationer of the CIA in Greece and of a couple of Junta-time torturers who had received only minor sentences, were quite welcomed. Recent surveys on these acts, however, reveal a dramatic shift in the attitudes of those involved at the time, while most of
deed and that people from the Left were impressed by ETA’s act, saying, in her words, ‘these etarras have got real balls’. Fernández Liria, however, was terrified and felt obliged to disguise himself, in order to remain unnoticed, as he was a ‘usual suspect’:

I had an American jacket which I had bought only in order to disguise myself, obviously, and a decent coat. Normally I wore a sort of poncho, or some kind of things which were more or less horrible. [...] My mother was saying that every time I wore the coat after a very short time I was detained by the police. It was a really good observation because sooner or later this happened. Every time I wanted to pass unnoticed I shaved myself. In the picture of the day Franco died I am shaved. I shaved and got my hair cut. Of course. [...] The only way to avoid detention was to cut your hair and shave. [...] Exactly the same happened the day they killed Carrero.

For good measure, the bombs put in a coffee-shop at El Correo in 1973 signalled a moment of crisis. Even so, in later years ETA continued to capitalize on feelings of injustice during the early period of the transición. Since ‘national reconciliation’ was based on the amnesty of all ‘political’ offences on both sides, Basque terrorists became the willing executioners of members of the Civil Guard and former pro-Franco figures. In due time, a part of ETA –the so-called ‘VI Assembly’– distanced itself from the organization’s growingly nationalist discourse and indiscriminate violence.

**Spanish-Greek cross-references**

- Country of Western Europe with a socialist government, 5 letters.
- Spain?

*From Roviros Mathoulis’s film ‘Face to Face’ (1966)*

Upon the imposition of the dictatorship in April 1967 the ideological proximity of the respective authoritarian regimes -based on fierce anti-Communism and the triptych family, religion, nation- became striking. Not surprisingly, Admiral Carrero Blanco, Franco’s right-hand man, argued that Greece and Spain were two countries with many things ‘in common spiritually’. First of all fierce and uncompromising anti-Communism which was expressed with several concrete measures but also through overemphasising the conspiratorial activities of the outlawed Communists. What is

the active anti-junta students who suffered imprisonment and torture argue that they never authorized anyone to become their avenger. See the interviews with Kanellakis and Paraskevopoulos, highly active in EKIN and the Law School occupations and repeatedly tortured, to the TV program *The Protagonists*, ERT, February 2003.

more, the two regimes shared a firm conviction that their respective ‘Nations’ were far superior in moral, cultural and political terms to the rest of the globe. As they were supposedly carrying out a providential historical ‘mission’ they ought to be held in awe and respected.\textsuperscript{1280}

Spiritual affinity, however, was a line that was equally stressed by the Left. The Spanish case, from ETA to Carrillo’s experiment, was a point of reference in Greece. Apart from references to the past, with the Spanish Republicans being symbolic figures and Picasso’s \textit{Guernica} the absolute favourite poster in Greek student rooms, next to Che Guevara, the current political situation was conceptualised in common terms too. The respective slogan went ‘Greece, Spain, Chile, Portugal, let’s fight together for democracy’. Anti-regime papers reported on a daily basis the turmoil in Spanish campuses and made frequent indirect references to the triplet of authoritarianism in Southern Europe. In addition, in a series of anti-junta journals, followed by numerous translations of basic texts on student uprisings abroad, the Spanish model was evoked as similar to the Greek case and as a prototype to be followed:

The Spanish students succeeded. They created reaction in the illiberal regime of the Caudillo, proving that the student forces can act under conditions of fierce repression.\textsuperscript{1281}

Vignettes including Franco appeared frequently in the press, with the Basque autonomists habitually portrayed as ‘democrats’ and with direct allusions to the Greek political situation: ‘when the students dare, the dictatorship gets shaken’.\textsuperscript{1282} On top of that, \textit{Thessaloniki} dedicated a special extra to the well known Spanish cartoonist Chumy Chúmez, in which the latter included some of his sharpest political satire, which could be easily applied to the Greek case. Last, but not least, in the anti-regime publication \textit{Nea Keimena 2} the diplomat and writer Rodis Roufos referred to the book

\textsuperscript{1280} Interestingly, the Colonels were also all veterans of the anti-Communist ‘crusade’ after the Civil War in Greece. Apparently, the only thing that Franco feared equally with the Communists was Freemasonry and occasionally Jewish conspiracies, both neglected by the Colonels.


\textsuperscript{1282} \textit{Thessaloniki}, 27/1/72. An article which clearly demonstrates an attempt to draw parallels with the existing situation is an article entitled ‘The Shame of Europe’, which concluded that ‘in Spain two things work perfectly: the police force and the football league’, \textit{Thessaloniki}, 15/12/70.
Strike! by Isabel Alvarez Toledo, which had cost her a six-month imprisonment. Roufos propagated the virtues of the book which he called explosive.\textsuperscript{1283}

In terms of left-wing politics, the Spanish Communist Party had also suffered a division in 1964 with the expulsion of some illustrious members, among whom figured Jorge Semprúin and Fernando Claudín. In 1968 there was a second round of this split, partly because several prominent activists left the Party in disagreement with the new line set out in Carrillo’s book ‘New focus on problems of today’. A breakaway faction was founded by Enrique Lister in the early 1970s [‘Spanish Workers Communist Party’]. The division did not, however, reach the levels of KKE’s crisis in 1968. One of the reasons why and the actual difference with the Greek KKE was that 90 out of the 110 members of its Coordinating Committee lived in Spain and therefore did not undergo the alienation that the Greek exiles did.

What is more, in contrast to the latter, PCE’s General Secretary Santiago Carrillo proved to be quite open to Euro-Communism and kept his distance from Moscow, especially after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. This was one of the reasons why in early 1970 he met Drakopoulos, the then leader of the breakaway faction of the KKE, in order ‘to strengthen efforts to isolate fascism on an international level’.\textsuperscript{1284} Although Spanish Communists were also hegemonic in terms of resistance, probably more so in actual terms than in Greece, Carrillo’s line was to cooperate with all anti-dictatorship forces, a line similar to that of KKE Int and Rigas. Accordingly, he defended a revolutionary party ready to co-operate with all anti-Francoist groupings, including segments of the Church, and condemned the rest as admirers of the 1920s and supporters of a ‘dogmatic, sectarianist party’.\textsuperscript{1285}

Anti-imperialistic theories too linked Greece and Spain in an alleged common struggle. Andreas Papandreou \textit{par excellence} argued about ‘imperialism being the common enemy’ of Greece and Spain.\textsuperscript{1286} Interestingly, an ‘exclusive’ article by Papandreou on the best way to revive democracy was published by the anti-regime daily \textit{Madrid}. In his article, apart from analysing how the low cast Colonels outflanked

\textsuperscript{1283} \textit{Nea Keimenà}, 1, autumn 1970, p. 158. In \textit{Nea Keimenà} 2, the same author makes an analysis of the nature of military regimes, where he classifies Spain and Portugal among the oldest and most ‘sincere’ in their authoritarianism regimes, compared to the more recent ones which pretended to be ‘democracies’, like Indonesia, Pakistan, Paraguay and Santo Domingo. Rodis Roufos, ‘

\textsuperscript{1284} \textit{Arxio Parávuxon Antriptapakókó Entótopo. KKE Eserpistikó, EDA, ΠΑΜ, Ρήγας Φεραίος} [Archive of Clandestine Resistance Journals. KKE Interio, EDA, PAM, Rigas Ferais], Athens 1974, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{1285} \textit{Ibid.}

the Generals and once in power reproduced the dominant ideology of *ethnikofrosyni*,\textsuperscript{1287} Papandreou asked the self-exiled King Constantine to proceed to concrete action in terms of rejecting the regime. Interestingly, in this ‘exclusive article’ in *Madrid,* he coined his theory about a colonial relationship between Greece and the US but also called the Greek youth to conduct armed struggle of a *maquis* type:

The Greek people, the youth above all, is systematically organizing the long struggle against the Military Junta; this would mean a maquis or a resistance movement. Its enemy is the Junta. And it would not be odd if the majority of the officials, the simple soldiers alike, would sympathize with it.\textsuperscript{1288}

One cannot but think that such pleas did have an impact on Spanish students and intellectuals, including the fascination of Papandreou’s classic *tiersmondiste* treatise, as they could easily project their own realities onto them. In fact, several reports of this sort concerning the Greek political situation can be read in the Spanish press and especially *Madrid.*\textsuperscript{1289} Much less so in the conservative daily *ABC,* which, however, inserted an advert for *Le Monde*’s correspondent Marceau’s controversial book on the Colonels. This promotion, which is very misleading in as far as its content is concerned, shows an endless crowd of policemen, the robot-like appearance of whom cannot but evoke associations with the *CRS* and pictures from May ‘68.

In later years *Madrid* closely followed the developments in Greece, dedicating a page to the statement of protest that was made by the ‘18’ against the use of their writings by the regime without their consent. This event, which precipitated the publication of the ‘18 Texts’, was interpreted by Spanish journalists as a clear indication that apart from censorship, basic intellectual rights of the creators were violated.\textsuperscript{1290} *Madrid* also reported extensively on trials and covered Greece’s expulsion from the Council of Europe. The journal proceeded with a series of special editions on Greece, with the last one enthusiastically reviewing the police novel ‘Z’ by Vassilis

\textsuperscript{1287} ‘National-mindedness’ or *ethnikofrosyni* was the main ideology of the post-Civil War Greek State, in juxtaposition to the supposed unpatriotic Left. See in this respect Angelos Elefantis, ‘Εθνικοφροσύνη: Η υδατολογία του τρόμου και της ενοχοποίησης’ [*Ethnikofrosyni: The ideology of terror and incrimination*], pp. 645–654 in Sakis Karagiorgas Institute, Η ελληνική κοινωνία κατά την πρώτη μεταπολεμική περίοδο 1945-67 [The Greek society during the first post-war period, 1945-67], scientific conference, Athens 1994.

\textsuperscript{1288} Andreas Papandreou, ‘Cómo puede Grecia conquistar la democracia’, *Madrid,* 22/2/1968.

\textsuperscript{1289} Actually, *Madrid* dedicated an article to the ‘delicate political situation in Greece’ quite early on (31/3/67), but similarly to much of the international press, on 21 April it gave the false information that ‘the King gives power to the Army’.

Vassilikos, which alongside its filmic adaptation 'unleashed the fury of the Colonels'.\footnote{1291} Finally, in an article published a year later, the newspaper compared a misspelled Papadopoulos to Rojas Pinilla and Juan Bosch, ex-dictators of Colombia and the Dominican Republic respectively. The affinity is that all three autocrats followed a 'popular' program, based on benefits and tax reductions which were quite appealing to the masses. In the case of Papadopoulos the article reads:

You have to keep in mind that the Colonels have brought about a 'popular revolution', which appealed to some marginal sectors of the country, which however, are quite numerous. They cancelled the poor farmers' debts to Banks and other credit institutions; they authorized taxi drivers to work without some relatively expensive plates which they had to hire from the town councils; they adopted fiscal dispositions intended to lower the living costs and, above all, they abolished certain privileges of the bourgeoisie in a resolutely indiscriminate and demagogical manner. This translates to their claim to be friends of the 'poor' and fiscally severe towards the 'rich'.\footnote{1292}

At a time in which the technocrats in Franco's cabinet aimed to buy off political dissent through prosperity, a tactic that would be doomed some years later because of the energy crisis, referring to these tactics as a trait of foreign and quite decadent dictators was an indirect but obvious attack on the regime itself.

Towards the Transición

The mid-1970s and Franco's death constitute in a way the regime's decadence and the beginning of the long, slow transitional process that would only end with Tejero's abortive coup on 23 February 1981. Shortly before he died, in late August, early September 1975, Franco ratified the execution of three members of FRAP and two of ETA. This, alongside the execution of an activist of the radical Catalan group MIL some months earlier, gave rise to large riots at home and a new wave of international protest.\footnote{1293} It should be stressed that a great difference between the Colonels and

\footnote{1291} Miguel Dolc, 'La hora siempre actual de Grecia. De la época helenística ... a la novela 'Z', una bomba', Madrid, August 1969.
\footnote{1292} 'Rojas Pinilla, Juan Bosch y Papadopoulos', Madrid 25/4/1970. This part of the article is actually quoted from an extensive commentary in the French weekly L'Express.
\footnote{1293} The anarchist Puig Antich, its executed member, acquired heroic status among militant leftists of the time. See T. Tajuelo, El MIL, Puig Antich y los GARI; teoría y práctica, 1969-1976, Paris 1977. The same happened with the etarras Txiki and Otaegi and FRAP members Sánchez Bravo; García Sanz y Humberto Baena Bravo as can be discerned from various leaflets of the time. It is interesting to note that they were all in their twenties and that some of the greatest protest demonstrations against their imminent execution took place in post-Junta Athens.
Franco was that whereas the former restrained from passing death sentences, which was presented as a gesture of sublime clemency by pro-regime papers, the Caudillo continued to ratify executions in the mid-70s. Preston speculates that what contributed to this was a sense of revenge for Carrero's assassination. However, Franco and the hardliners were also deeply disturbed by the Portuguese Revolution in April 1974, which they saw as 'a pointless destruction of the achievements of Salazar'. Oddly enough, up to that point Portugal did not constitute a point of reference for anti-regime forces. No networks were created and no information exchange took place during these decades, despite the similarity of the political situations and the geographical proximity. Carreras's ironic remarks are representative of this attitude:

We knew nothing about Portugal. We knew nothing [...] The liaison started after the 25th of April of '74. We found out that Portugal was a country. The tourist announcement that Portugal issued at that point went 'So close, yet so far'. (Carreras)

The only ones who mention the Portuguese case as influential, up to that moment, are those who lived in Paris and therefore came into contact with their Portuguese counterparts. Still, the bloodless 'Revolution of Carnations' of 25 April 1974 became a major influence. As it was coupled with the fall of the Colonels some months later it boosted the protest actions and reinforced the regime's isolation. What is more, left-wing intellectuals started to reconsider their grand theories on 'revolutionary situations' and who was to be the bearer of a revolt, as the decomposed Portuguese army that turned revolutionary after fighting a colonial war, had shifted traditional views:

The Portuguese Revolution appeared to be an exceptional point of reference, without thinking that it could be reproduced here, but yes, one could at least say that a dictatorship could fall. I suppose this happened in Greece too. You can have the fall of a dictatorship which would permit the emergence of a, say, pre-revolutionary situation and in this pre-revolutionary situation you can have a self-organizing element and the expansion of the democratic struggle to the struggle for the nationalizations and issues beyond that, particularly on the national issue, that of the Basque question. It was an idea of the expansion of the process. And the Army, clearly, was an important variable. (Pastor)

---

1294 Famously Panagoulis's case but also the one of Professor Karagiorgas. See Maria Komninou, From the Market to the Spectacle..., op.cit., p. 124.
Trias, a PNN at the time went to watch the Revolution and remembers meeting all progre members of his faculty, and he describes as a sort ‘revolutionary tourism’:

The Portuguese thing happened, and of course, there were pilgrimages there. We went to Lisbon for a pilgrimage. Obviously, besides, they could not legally prevent you from going to Portugal because it was a non-Soviet country. As in the passports it was written that it was prohibited to travel to the Soviet Union and the satellite countries. But to Portugal, no. So, during Holy Week, on 25 April, I don’t know if it was before. Yes, yes, it must have been before Holy Week. Well, I remember that I met the whole Faculty. Well, the whole Faculty, all the progre Professors and all the mobilized students, you could meet them, it was, Lisbon was like... And people came from all over Europe, buses were coming.

Junco went as well, and stresses the difference with the pre-revolutionary period, which he describes as utterly sad:

I was then already at the point at which I was about to get married and turn to a bit more conservative a person, but I went to Portugal, of course, the following month. I had been to Portugal before, once I think, and I remember it as a very sad country. Salazar’s dictatorship, in times of Caetano, rather, was very sad, it was a repressed thing, the highways of Portugal were full of a skull with two bones saying ‘drugs kill’, and it was horrible. A sad and repressed country. And out of the sudden the revolution was an explosion of happiness and carnations, and the people embracing each other in the streets, and the porn cinemas etc, etc, well, all that. And yes, we went to Portugal, all started travelling to Portugal, many times.

After Franco’s death in November 1975, great demonstrations started taking place in the country, aiming at ‘liberty, amnesty and autonomy’, the latter referring to ethnic regions. Some of the most violent clashes with the police forces took place, which, as in the Greek case, were the last to be democratised. In fact, 1976 was the year that was marked by the greatest wave of strikes that jeopardised any attempt of ‘continuism’ of the regime. In subsequent years also workers’ mobilisation and the numbers of strikes increased in a spectacular way. What is more, as had happened with the ’68 movements, new social movements including a stronger feminist,

---

1296 For an excellent study of the mobilisations following Franco’s death, the political amnesty and the memory of this period see Paloma Aguilar, ‘Collective Memory of the Spanish Civil War: The Case of the Political Amnesty in the Spanish Transition to Democracy’, Instituto Juan March, Working Paper 1996/85, December 1996.
1297 J. Álvarez Junco, ‘Movimientos Sociales...’, op.cit.
ecologist and homosexual militancy but also quartier movements would rise out of the anti-Francoist forces. All these movements, however, were dominated by anti-Francoist culture, which in a way obstructed new forms of thinking and action:  

We, the students of that period, were shouting ‘freedom, amnesty and status of autonomy’, which was a way to recognise the pluralism of the Spanish state and the logical demands, as it seemed to us, the linguistic, cultural, political included, of the Basques and Catalans. (Tapia)

Still, this process, which as Fusi notes, was a reform and not a rupture, including the secret pacts signed by the Communist Party and the Right for national reconciliation, left the majority of the left-wing students frustrated. As had happened in Greece, this was mainly regarded as a solution ‘imposed’ from above. In fact, it is still contested whether this Transición pactada, as it came to be known, was indeed exemplary or not, as it left ‘much of the old order intact’. Some still stress that in their view it was only made possible through secret pacts with obscure motives and aims, motivated by certain epigones of Francoism and a part of the Left who longed to become institutionalised and have a share in the new power relations. Rather than revolutionary change, it was the result of PCE’s pragmatism and Carrillo’s decision to drop maximalist demands and align with the ‘bourgeois politicians’ in order to promote democratic reforms. The utopian conception of the political battle as a means to achieve immediate socialism was utterly frustrated. Pastor stresses this feeling of disillusionment which followed the de-mobilization of anti-Francoist forces or their transformation to institutionalised entities:

It was frustrating […] In some way the point at which the cycle was closed was, I believe, with the Moncloa pacts in October '77, when the mobilization stopped and the de-mobilization started, what is called ‘the disenchantment’. (Pastor)

1299 Ibid.
1300 Juan Pablo Fusi in Julio Medem’s documentary La pelota basca. La piel contra la piedra, 2004.
1301 As Bermeo points out in her thorough analysis of the economic implications involved in an elite-driven transition to democracy, current scholarship also supports this point. See Nancy Bermeo, 1994, op.cit, p. 603. See Nancy Bermeo, “Sacrifice, Sequence, and Strength…”, op.cit, p. 603.
1303 This interpretation was widely shared by the extreme Left and ETA. See Jesús Cebrián, Recuperar la Memoria, pp. 9-10, in Santos Juliá, Javier Pradera, Joaquín Prieto (eds), Memoria de la Transición, Madrid 1996, p. 9.
Desencanto in reality meant ‘disenchantment with party politics and political participation in general’, involving ‘a 10% drop in voter turnout by 1979 and a rapid drop in party identification.’ Rosa Pereda is one of the few who do not express bitterness and disappointment about what happened:

Honestly, I personally did not expect anything more from the transición than what it offered. Of course, I would have liked it more if things had been different. But, you know what happens, things are experienced week by week, day by day, month by month, and they are little targets, then it was a passionate epoch, and a very intense one [...] So, this was really happening, namely laws appeared, there were elections ... The people, I don’t know how to tell you, could live in a different way, could talk, could write, could tell things, censorship disappeared, everything disappeared... That is, we were conquering freedom for real, to me this seemed amazing.

She further skips references to the desencanto, only to arrive at the issue of the movida, ‘a brilliant period, very entertaining and marvellous’. This countercultural movement of the outskirts of Madrid was, nevertheless, organically connected to the above mentioned lack of need for political engagement. This is a great difference from the Greek case, where the democratic transition and its aftermath rather produced a hyper-politicised generation. In fact, youth radicalism only started to decrease in the mid-1980s.

Junco portrays himself as not disillusioned, as he saw it as the end of an era. He believed, however, that Carrillo’s decision to adopt moderate tones significantly damaged the Communist Party, which was otherwise strong and prestigious, in terms of anti-Francoist credentials, Communist Party.

No, I was not disillusioned. Let’s say that it was an important step in my life. I believe that we really wanted things that were impossible, which were crazy, which were Utopias of perfect societies. I am much more pessimistic at present, I don’t believe that a perfect society is possible. [...] Obviously, of course, we wanted to establish a perfect society, free and happy. Egalitarian, free and happy, of course. We made fun of the Communists because all they wanted was the fall of the regime, we wanted much more. There was a quatrain that was chanted to Carrillo, saying: ‘Carrillo, where are you going, Carrillo, with the reconciliation? Grab the sickle and the hammer and make the revolution, not just against the Caudillo’. In other words, ‘look further ahead, make a complete revolution’.

---

1304 Nancy Bermeo, ‘Sacrifice, Sequence...’, op. cit, p. 619.
The same Junco writes that the ambivalence between Euro-Communism and good-old Stalinism as well as between revolutionism and moderation were important elements that account for PCE’s failure to obtain more than 10% in the 1977 elections. He further proceeds to argue that the major divisions came after the regime’s end, a statement that is strongly reminiscent of similar conclusions drawn by Greek militants during the Metapolitefsi period. Tapia shares this view, but presents himself as the moderate of the group compared to other more intransigent and millenarian colleagues, and further presents himself as justified at present:

What united us was the magma. Later on with the recovery of democratic freedoms came the divisions, but back then anti-Francoism had made us drink at the same table with people of various and very diverse backgrounds. I had many friends with quite radical positions and very leftist ones, we used to talk in a very lively way... Man, within the heat of friendship and of common experiences, but at times with hard-ons who ended up calling me a ‘social-democratic pig’. And later on, as we continued being friends, when we meet each other sometimes, we go to have dinner together and we discuss, and they, who have, say, become more moderate politically and have social democratic or liberal positions, well, many times they tell me jokingly about the patience I had, how could I stand them and didn’t send them to hell for the stupid positions that they held...

He further differentiates himself from the militants who opted for more ‘revolutionary’ ways after ‘77 in order to achieve their objectives:

Yes, progressive ideas, advanced ones, of social transformation, all this seemed to me very nice and I supported it and I believed in it, but in the pursuit of democratic forces. The first thing was to conquer democracy, at all costs, with the union of forces of the opposition, and then search the thing, in a free game, of the political forces.

Shortly after the abortive coup by Tejero in February 1981, the Socialists came to power. Similarly to the Greek PASOK, PSOE capitalised on people’s need for change, as well the Suarez government’s fatigue after carrying the weight of normalisation. It also profited from its anti-regime stance in previous years, despite the marginality of its actions and following, to the extent that it won over the votes of traditional left-wingers, including workers, despite its gradual move towards the political centre. From 1982 onwards, democratic consolidation and economic reform also led to a

considerable decrease in social movements. The mobilisations against the country’s imminent entry to NATO (1986) were a brief moment of collective action, but without any signs of continuation. As for university protest, it disappeared for a good ten years before reappearing in order to react against the frequent unaccountability of the anti-Francoist generation that had come into power.
Conclusions

This thesis intended to trace the reasons behind the upsurge in student activity in Greece during the Colonels' dictatorship which culminated in the expression of the main public action against the Junta: the Polytechnic uprising. Being the only form of social upheaval that took place during the dictatorship, the student movement exploited a series of cultural and ideological elements in order to disrupt the consensus created after five years of dictatorial rule. Expressing those parts of civil society that felt an ever greater discontent as the years were passing, students demanded radical changes and ultimately created new meaning. By exploring the subjective element in their discourse and the identity of the so-called Polytechnic Generation, I attempted to look not only at how new collective identities shaped student mentalities but also the ways in which the latter have been changed over time.

Starting off with the student body from the early 1960s onwards, the thesis attempted to demonstrate the evolution in terms of contentious politics in Greek university life in the 'long Sixties', including the emergence of two distinct generational groups, and to trace the continuities and ruptures in patterns and cultures of protest. Having already participated in the events of the first years of the 1960s, the "Z" Generation was a force of change, even if it retained and reproduced many antiquated elements of old social life and aged militantism. Despite their excellent organizational capacities which included a wide infrastructure covering most of the country, however, the Lambrakides proved unable to respond to the oncoming authoritarianism and did not manage to retain a character or a structure once the coup was established. These students did not manage to react to the dictatorship in an efficient way, following the disarray of political parties, and losing a great part of their rank and file due to their immediate detention. In general, the "Z" Generation was largely conditioned by the past; it did not adapt to the new conditions created by the Junta nor did it organise popular and successful forms of struggle, as it had already exhausted its creativity in previous years. All in all, the daring ventures of these groupings proved to be largely unsuccessful as they failed to produce any results or attract followers.

In terms of the groupings which originated abroad, violence was often theorised, bearing the clear marks of the tiersmondiste discourse of the time and the intransigent
tradition of the '68 movements. As we might expect, for those in Greece, '68 came to symbolise the all-desired insurrection and their counterparts abroad acquired in their eyes a legendary status. This view came into contrast, however, with many Greek émigrés who regarded '68 as bizarre and grotesque. Often, the seriousness of the Greek 'revolutionaries' in France and Italy made them suspicious of any sort of mass protest, as they envisaged armed struggle instead, a fact that epitomizes this awkward ‘in’ and ‘out’ relationship.

By promoting a dialogue between private micro-history and public events, the thesis further explored both the political side of the events as well as the everyday experiences of people, following Norbert Elias' invitation ‘to challenge the conventional antinomy between the study of social structures and that of the emotional ones but, at the same time, research and consider them together, dialectically.’ In terms of memory and self-representation, recurrent patterns were discerned, for instance, concerning a mythical left-wing background. By analysing the discourse and action of some of the first anti-regime student groupings, which exercised restricted levels of political violence, the thesis further attempted to demonstrate the aspirations and imaginary resources of these students, but also their limited outcomes and often difficult self-representation at present. Most often the narrative strategies chosen by protagonists when dealing with ‘dynamic’ resistance were either to stress their ‘heroic deeds’ or more often to avoid the core of the subject, through euphemism and negation of the realities of violence.

Moving on to the 1970s, and with the above mentioned generation out of the way, new collective identities were shaped by the very experience of the dictatorship, which in turn further politicised the members of a new generation, often in conflict with their class or ideological backgrounds. The fact that these youths were not the clones of the post-Civil War period, as various generations before them, including the Lambrakides, was partly the reason why the Junta did not succeed in either classifying or integrating them. In this time of crisis and transformation, new individual and collective behaviours, bred by a set of subversive everyday practices, greatly influenced the course of events. As in most dictatorial regimes the private spaces that were preserved proved more significant than bombs set off since they served as the necessary

springboard for an initial ‘silent revolution’ that would ultimately lead to a direct clash with the regime.

Furthermore, the regime’s gradual liberalisation offered the necessary political opportunities for the reinforcement of the mobilizing structures of this new generation. Collective platforms such as EKIN and the regional societies became points of reference and helped the anti-regime segments of the student body acquire the coherence they were lacking. Whereas in the years of the regime’s harsher repression, persecution and censorship, resistance was oriented towards violent actions, in the years following 1971 the first massive initiatives of the student body occurred. Student strategy consisted of confronting the regime by using a legal platform regarding university issues, with a parallel transformation of their everyday realities, drawing on cultural items that were charged with symbolic meaning.

The thesis further traced the particular culture which was developed by Greek students which bore its own stigma and was marked by a reappropriation of folk and popular elements in a succinct and subversive way. There was a renewal, enabled by the softening of censorship and provided by new readings, symbols, foreign prototypes of protest and the confidence that a breakaway from the past was possible. A syncretic culture, made out of music, literature, common political readings, cinema and style acted as a means of unity and recognition and as a coherent counterweight to large ideological rifts. At this point, the thesis concludes that a certain re-appropriation of tradition became the linchpin in the collective student imaginary and practices against the regime’s own conceptualization and promotion of Hellenic-Christian civilization.

These elements provided the means for the students’ micro-resistances in everyday life, which eventually bred a fully-fledged confrontation with the regime. In addition, given the tough conditions, male students regarded their female companions as equal a priori. This was also connected both to the increased numbers of females in Greek universities, the structural needs of the movement, but also a growing sexual emancipation and consciousness of equality. Even so, however, the battle of sexes and gender prejudices remained a major issue, especially concerning the leading positions within the movement and despite the presence of several charismatic female leaders.

What is more, the Greek student movement was seen not only within the scope of internal politics, but also inside the context of an ongoing radicalisation of youth culture internationally. My analysis suggested that the Polytechnic Generation was avant-gardistic in terms of Greek society in general, and to a certain extent accelerated
its modernization which took place at break-neck speed in the years following the Junta’s collapse, through a certain merging of political radicalism with everyday life. In contrast to that, the ‘Polytechnic Generation’ was not subversive and rejectionist, rebellious and contestatory enough: it cannot be said to have been iconoclastic as were its counterparts in other countries. The poetics of their politics were rather epic and were dictated by the romanticised Communist past but also by the overtly repressive context. The bloody conclusion of the Polytechnic underlines its resemblance to the experiences of Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Thailand and Chile. In addition, despite the political rationalism and the general pragmatism that characterised the leadership of the mainstream student groups, the dream of a utopian transformation of the political environment was envisaged but was utterly frustrated by the experience of the Metapolitefsi, which is often recorded as a traumatic moment.

In terms of memory and subjectivity, the testimonies were characterised by a constant interplay between strategy and spontaneity and by a certain homogenisation concerning the aforementioned age-groups. So, while the first one stresses the continuity in suffering, the second presents itself as signalling a total rupture with the past. As far as the rivalry between the different components of the mass movement is concerned, interesting features were revealed, such as the ‘hardening’ of subjectivity, as ex-militants often continue to use the analytical categories and to echo the ideological divisions of the past. Others, on the other hand, present a rather idealised image of student collaboration during the Junta years, as an outcome of having a common target. As Ronald Fraser argues, we cannot know exactly what happened, but the people we interview give us ‘their truth’ on the argument, since ‘what people thought, or what they th[ink] that they thought, also constitutes a historical fact’. 1308

The thesis further tried to demonstrate the common experiences of Greek and Spanish students, concerning repression and suffering from authoritarianism in the past, in both the public and private sphere, and similar ways of self-representation in the present. The veneration or rejection of the Civil War generation led to the same sort of generational conflict and a frequent move against family background. Still, this background, be it social or political, was not to account for the creation of the movement, as a left-wing tradition could be a contributing factor but also an obstacle. As far as the evolution of the movements is concerned, common trajectories are visible; an early generation influenced by tiersmondisme and the conceptualization of

anti-dictatorial activities as a liberation struggle contrasted with a subsequent generation which distanced itself from the most violent groupings, condemning the glorification of violence, without, however, rejecting its utilitarian value. This transnational comparison brought functional similarities in mobilisation tactics and common experiences between these two different cases, such as the appearance of two figures that would be hegemonic in later years: the Spanish progre and the Greek koulouriaris. A-synchronous as it might have been, the lifting of censorship which was a major factor for the evolution of the movements, had the same impact: it provided a space for action and allowed for the import of similar intellectual stimuli as in France, Italy and Germany.

With '68, a mimetic tendency was diffused among the students, in an attempt to re-enact the international protest movements. Finally, the influence of foreign and home-grown counter-culture, facilitated by the opening of the two regimes, led to greater political but also personal emancipation. The special student culture that was developed was marked not only by Greek and Spanish internal politics, but also by a strong international current of radical youth culture. Changes were not only to be seen in terms of aesthetics and intellectual currents but also in the norms of social behaviour. In addition, a certain mass consumerist youth culture was coupled with political engagement, thus bringing these students closer to the ‘Marx and Coca Cola’ model, even though most often protagonists reject this label with fury.

It is not a given that the student movements in Greece and Spain took place because of the dictatorships or that without them the students would not have been radicalised as in the rest of the world. ‘Judging by what happened in France, Germany and Italy [...] there would have been student troubles, with or without Franco’, 1309 or the Colonels. In other words, despite the fact that the repressive regimes reinforced activism it was not they that generated it, but it was part of a whole era, which a priori regarded the students as its spearhead. The student movements which developed in Greece and Spain in the late 1960s and early 1970s did not only constitute a reaction against the pressure of a military dictatorship, but were also widely determined by the general wave generated in 1968. As an old Principal of the University of Madrid pointed out in 1968, the ever stronger contact with the international element, in fact with el mundo llamado ‘occidental’, 1310 was a key factor concerning student

1309 R. Carr & J.P. Fusi Aizpurua, Spain..., op.cit., p. 149.
radicalisation. However, the geographical proximity and the working-class participation brings Spain closer and more in tune with international developments and the movements which emerged in the Western world. In addition, Spanish students were bolder than the Greeks in their criticism, even though they were born under Franco, without ever experiencing anything else. The fact that major intellectual figures who used to boost the regime sided with them, was a catalysing factor for their subversive turn.

Nevertheless, it was the response of the authoritarian regimes that deepened the crises and reinforced the students’ combativeness and coherence. It further conveyed the conviction that this was a battle of life and death, as was the case in Mexico, Thailand and Prague. Moreover, it was the student movements, bearers of the message and radicalism of the international protest movement that discredited the respective attempts of the regimes to liberalize from within. The processes of controlled liberalization although they took place at different times - late-1960s Spain and post-1970 Greece - had similar traits, both in terms of intentionality as well as of incoherence in which cultural politics were applied by the dictators. The respective openings failed miserably because apart from helping to 'educate' a new generation of students, these small concessions led to demands for still greater freedom of information, political pluralism and democratization. This complex web of references ‘interpellated’ the students, to use Althusser’s phrase and to paraphrase Delgado, ‘through the social practices in which they engage[d] into an ideology which they actively [...] promote[d]’. Both movements developed common traits: they were inspired by the parallel experiences of international incitement to protest and became a major source of pressure on the respective regimes.

Finally, it has to be stressed that this thesis makes no claim to being a comprehensive analysis of the entire periods under question, nor did it aspire to cover the whole spectrum of student life in the years under research. The focus here was, instead, on the element of contestation and on the analysis of its various parameters. The history of pro-regime and passive students, who were the overwhelming majority in both countries, still remains to be researched. The fact, nevertheless, that the thesis

\[^{1311}\text{In the Spanish case also, this goes against a certain Western-phobic bibliographical tendency which often looks at ‘foreign imported models of life’ as factors of paralysis. In Spain student unrest was commonly attributed to the bad will and machinations of external influences (‘los forasteros’), alien to the good Spanish ‘buenas costumbres tradicionales’.}\text{Ibid, p. 13.}\]

\[^{1312}\text{M. Delgado, ‘Saura’s Los Golfo...’, op. cit., p. 49.}\]
draws several conclusions in terms of student self-representation, including the memory and the view of the 'other', suggests that these could be applied also to this largely unexplored field for future research.
Appendix

Greek Questionnaire

1. When and where were you born?
2. What was your family's social situation? What political beliefs did they have?
3. How do you remember the political climate of the post-war period? Do you remember any changes introduced by the Centre Union while in power? [Educational Reform etc]
4. Which are the memories that you have from the mobilisations of the 114 generation, the Lambrakides and the July events?
5. When did you enter University? What was the atmosphere? Which was the political stance of your colleagues?
6. How did you perceive the regime? Which were your feelings towards it?
7. How did you acquire a political consciousness? Did you participate in a political organization and if yes how/when did you enter? Why did you choose that particular organization? What did you think of the traditional Left and what position did you take regarding the KKE split?
8. What did you know about May '68 and the other youth movements abroad? Did they in some way influence you?
9. Can you describe the ideological positions and the way of action of your organization?
10. Which theories were more attractive to you? Did you have theoretical discussions?
11. What was the role of women in the movement?
12. How did you experience the rifts between the different coordinates of the movement? What could have been done differently? What was the attitude in terms of collective action?
13. Who were your idols/models of yours? Did you feel as a continuation of the Lambrakis generation?
14. In which ways did you think that the Junta could fall? Did you consider that feasible? Did you face the dilemma mass action or armed struggle? What was your opinion about the opposition between spontaneous and organised action?
15. How did you deal with the danger of your being arrested? How did your family react to that?
16. Did you have any connections with the anti-dictatorship student movement abroad?

17. What was the role of theatre, music and cinema in the shaping of a common consciousness? Was there some sort of tension between politics and culture? How were these two combined?

18. What was the nature of relations (friendship/sexual) under these conditions? Was there a ‘sexual revolution’ in Greece?

19. What was in your view the impact of the period of ‘controlled liberalisation’ of the Junta on the movement?

20. Which were the most vivid moments that you can remember from the Law School and the Polytechnic occupations?

21. How did you experience the Ioannidis period?

22. How did you regard Karamanlis’s return? Did you welcome it with joy or scepticism?

23. What was your itinerary in the years following 1974?

24. Were there any leaders in the movement?

25. Did the movement aim at the fall of the Junta or at a general restructuring of society and the political system?

26. What do you regard as the greatest contribution of the movement and what was its major failure?

27. Do you keep contacts with your old colleagues?

---

**Spanish Questionnaire**

1. ¿Cuándo nació?

2. ¿Cómo era su situación familiar?

3. ¿Qué tipo de relación tenía su familia con los partidos políticos de preguerra y qué tipo de memoria de la guerra recibió usted en casa?

4. ¿Cómo recuerda la situación en general antes de sus años en la universidad? (clima político, enseñanza, etc)

5. ¿Cuándo ingresó en la universidad? ¿En qué facultad? ¿Cómo encontró el ambiente, las clases, los profesores, etc?
6. ¿Cómo se vinculó políticamente, con quién y por qué?
7. ¿Cómo recuerda el `68 internacional y francés en particular? ¿Cómo le afectó el `68 y qué efecto tuvo en su círculo personal?
8. ¿Tuvo usted contacto con material de cualquier tipo traído del extranjero bien por amigos militantes o exiliados?
9. ¿Qué relación había entre su grupo y otros? ¿Qué tipo de socialización existía? (también entre diferentes tendencias políticas)
10. ¿El movimiento de que usted formaba parte era principalmente contra Franco o tenía un objetivo más radical y más amplio?
11. ¿Cuál era la relación entre movimiento estudiantil y movimiento obrero?
12. ¿Cuáles son las raíces intelectuales de su conciencia política?
13. ¿Qué papel tuvieron la música, el cine y otros tipos de cultura (española e internacional) en la formación de una conciencia común en su tiempo?
14. ¿Existía una relación entre el movimiento estudiantil y el movimiento nacionalista? ¿Cómo se articulaba? ¿Y los movimientos católicos?
15. ¿Cómo veía la lucha violenta entonces? ¿La consideraba usted un medio justificable para la obtención de objetivos político-sociales?
16. ¿Qué relación cree que tenía el movimiento estudiantil de su tiempo y el anterior (al `56)? ¿Se podría hablar de continuidad en algún aspecto?
17. ¿La generación vencida, y los exiliados de la guerra civil, formaban parte de los modelos de su generación (desde el punto de vista simbólico, referencial, etc)? ¿Quiénes eran estos modelos?
18. ¿Qué parte tenía el antiamericanismo en el movimiento? ¿Qué papel cabe asignar a las mujeres en la lucha política de su tiempo?
19. ¿Cómo recuerda usted la aparición de una nueva estética (pelo largo, barbas) en los años setenta?
20. ¿Se podría hablar de una revolución sexual análoga a la de Europa occidental en España?
21. ¿Cómo recuerda el llamado `periodo aperturista` del régimen?
22. ¿Cómo recuerda la muerte de Franco y el periodo de la transición? ¿Usted se sintió decepcionado? ¿Por qué?
23. ¿Usted tiene todavía relación con la política y con sus compañeros del movimiento?
Sources

Interviews

Greece
Alivizatos Nikos, October 2002
Athanasiou Thanasis, October 2002
Bistis Nikos, March 2003
Chronaki Zogia, September 2003
Dafermos Olympios, October 2002
Damofli Vera, February 2001
Davanelos Antonis, October 2002
Detsika Katerina, January 2002
Felekis Giannis, January 2002
Grimbas Alekos, March 2001
Iordanoglou Chrysafis, January 2001
Kalfakakou Rea, March 2001
Kalimeris Kostas, January 2002
Kaplanis Nikos, September 2002
Karagiorgas Christos October 2002
Karambelias Giorgos, October 2002
Kargoudis Vangelis, September 2002
Karkagianni-Karabelia Vasia, December 2003
Karystiani Ioanna, March 2003
Kotanidis Giorgos, March 2003
Kouloglou Stelios, January 2004
Kourmoulakis Giannis, February 2002
Lionarakis Nikitas, November 2003
Lygeros Stavros, March 2003
Mandelou Anna, February 2002
Mavragani Maria, March 2002
Mitafidis Triantafyllos, January 2001
Oikonomou Petros, September 2002
Papachristos Dimitris, February 2002
Papageorgiou Kleopatra, February 2002
Psilopoulou Alkmini, March 2003
Rigos Alkis, February 2001
Sabatakakis Michalis, February 2003
Saketa Keti, January 2003
Savvopoulos Dionysis, January 2004
Skamnakis Thanasis, February 2002
Smyrnis Giorgos, March 2003
Spyridakis Michalis, March 2001
Theodosiou Nikos, January 2002
Theologidou Rena, March 2003
Triantafyllopoulos Ilias, February 2002
Tsaousidis Klearchos, January 2001
Tsaras Agis, March 2003
Tzortzopoulou Maria & Skyrianos Michalis, February 2002
Valden Sotiris, September 2002
Vanos Andrianos, March 2001
Verveniotou Christina, January 2002
Vourekas Thodoros, February 2002
Xanthopoulos Panagiotis, September 2002
Xydi Angeliki, February 2001
Zorba Myrsini, January 2004
* Katerina, February 2003

Spain
Álvarez Junco José, July 2003
Box Perez Luis, July 2003
Carreras i Verdaguer Carles & Suárez María, July 2002
De Aguila Juan José, July 2003
Fernández Buey Francisco, July 2002
Fernández Liria Alberto, July 2002
Feros Antonio, December 2001
Marzal Antonio, July 2002
Pastor Jaime, July 2003
Pereda Rosa, July 2003
Pérez Ledesma Manuel, July 2002
Ramos Ramon, May 2003
Reig Tapia Alberto, July 2003
Trias Juan, May 2003

**Informants**

Antoniadi-Bibikou Eleni, December 2003
Antoniou Eirini, March 2005
Chatzopoulos Giorgos, October 2002
Mavrogenis Dionysis, January 2003
Sanchez Alex, June 2001
Thomopoulou Marilena, December 2000
Verveniotou Tasoula, April 2002
Zafeiris Christos, February 2004
* Dafni, July 2001
* Georgia, January 2002
* Sofia, January 2001

**Archives**

*Archivo Histórico del PCE, Madrid*
*Organización Universitaria del PCE. Comité Univ. Estatal. Informes*

BDIC, Paris

*Contemporary Social History Archives (ASKL), Athens*
*Clandestine Resistance Material*

*Fondation Hellénique Archive, Paris*

*Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ELIA), Athens*
*Anastasiadis Archive*

*League of Democracy Archive, King’s College London*
*Greek Committee against the Dictatorship files.*
*Info III - Info XVI, Correspondence Files I- VII, Chronological Files VI - IX*
*Press Cuttings, Circulars*

*Public Records Office, London*
*FCO9 GREECE, 1968-1972*
*FCO9 SPAIN, 1967-1972*
Princeton Special Collections, Princeton
Solaro, Simitis, Polis Collections

Society for the Safeguarding of Historical Archives (EDIA), Athens
Dafermos Archive, Vardinogiannis Archive

United States National Archives, Washington DC
NAR. Rg 59 General Records Of The Department Of State
Central Foreign Policy Files, 1967-1973. Political And Defense POL 2-1 to POL 23

Newspapers

ABC
Elefheros Kosmos
La Vanguardia
Le Monde
Makedonia
Madrid
Morning Star
Ta Nea
Thessaloniki
The Guardian
The New York Times
The Times
To Vima

Journals

Anoichto Theatro
El Ruedo Ibérico
Neoi Stochoi
Prosamatalismoi
Tachydromos
The Economist

Youth Journals

Anti
Fantasio
O Foititis
Protoporia
Xasteria

Clandestine Press

Antistasi
Kinima
Kommounistis
Odigitis
Printed Documentation


EKKE, Βασικά Πολιτικά Κείμενα [EKKE, Basic Political Documents], Athens 1974.

Ντουκόμπιντα του ΠΑΚ [Documents of PAK], Athens 1977.


Οι δίκες της Χούντας. Πλήρη πρακτικά. Η Δίκη του Πολυτεχνείου [The trials of the Junta. The Full Minutes. The Polytechnic trial], Athens, 1975.

To Αεόκωμα του Ρήγα Φεραίου [The Rigas Feraios Album], Athens 1974.


Film

Newsreels & Screenplays

Greek State Television Archive (ERT), years 1967-74

Fiction


Face to Face, by Roviros Manthoulis, 1966.

Documentaries
The 100 hours of May, by Dimos Theos & Fotos Lambrinos, 1963.
Berkeley in the '60s by Mark Kitchell, 1998.

Television Documentaries
We have decided and we order, by Eva Vernardou, Nikos Sarlis, ERT Archive
Here is Polytechnic speaking, by D. Iatropoulos, ERT Archive
The Radio-Station of the Polytechnic, by Lambros Papadimitrakis, ERT1, 17/11/1984.
‘Behind the facts’, 16/11/87.
The Children of Che in Greece, by Stelios Kouloglou, NET.
History: Speech and Image, ET1, 19/07/2005.

Music

LP Τα Μικροαστικά [Petty Bourgeois Songs], by Loukianos Kilaidonis (music) and Giannis Negropontis (lyrics), 1973.


LP Collection Savvopoulos at Lyra, 1998.

LP Els Èuits de Lluis Llach, 1968.
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