IF I TALK TO YOU IN FABLES AND PARABLES: REPRESENTATIONS OF THE GREEK 1940s IN GREEK FICTION FOR YOUNG READERS (1974-2014)

by

ELISSAVET EVANGELIDOU



A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Arts and Law
School of History and Cultures
Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology
Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies
University of Birmingham
April 2020

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This study explores the representation of the Greek 1940s in the fiction for young readers published between 1974 and 2014. This is a subject that has remained completely unexplored until now, despite the existence of a vast body of literature on the relationship between history, memory and cultural representations of the turbulent Greek 1940s.

Covering the period from the restoration of democracy in 1974 until 2014, the corpus of literary texts under scrutiny comprises forty one novels and short story collections written for a young audience. The study is divided into three Parts, each of which examines the representation of certain aspects of the 1940s (foreign occupation, wartime collaboration, Resistance and Civil War) in the narratives published during 1974-1981, 1982-1989 and 1990-2014, respectively. The last chapter explores the construction of the literary image of the Jew and the representation of the Greek Jewish experience of the Holocaust. I argue that young people's fiction has served as a privileged site for the perpetuation of official national (re)interpretations and changing popular perceptions of this turbulent period. Consequently, I go on to demonstrate that the authors' decision to include or exclude certain material from their fictional representations of the 1940s is linked to the prevailing politics of memory during the particular periods under study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following people without whom I would not have been able to complete this project.

First, I would like to thank the A. G. Leventis Foundation for funding my doctoral studies at the University of Birmingham.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Dimitris Tziovas, for his continuous support and guidance through each stage of the process.

I also owe a great debt of gratitude to Vicky Kaisidou, Ph.D. candidate at the University of Birmingham, for reading every single chapter of my thesis. Her insightful feedback and hard questions have incented me to widen my research from various perspectives. My grateful thanks are also extended to Dr Katerina Krikos-Davis for her insightful comments on the last chapter.

I am forever indebted to my parents for their unconditional support throughout this journey. To my sister, who has always been my biggest cheerleader, thank you for keeping my spirits high and making me feel *ευ-πο* even when the road got tough.

A very special word of thanks goes for my dear *Birminghamιώτισσες*, my larger-than-life co-protagonists in the behind-the-scenes drama of my life as a Ph.D. student.

I cannot begin to describe how much I owe to Dimitra Maravelaki for her friendship, support and uplifting–albeit slightly inappropriate–comments on my work.

The last word goes for my partner, Christos Doukas and his unique talent for–pretending to be–falling asleep every time I tried to read some of my work to him. For his wicked sense of humour, bottomless patience and unconditional support, I am eternally grateful.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I 11

The Greek 1940s And The Politics Of Memory: 1974-1981 11
Modern Bogeymen: The Germans 28
'Io Soldato, Ma Non Fascista': The Italians 42
'Une Poignée De Misérables Et D' Indignes': Collaboration 51
Exceptional Heroes: The Resistance 65
Happy Ever After?: The Civil War 75

PART II 84

The Greek 1940s And The Politics Of Memory: 1982-1989 84
Ordinary Men: The Germans And German Nazis 101
'Joining The Nazis Would Be Unthinkable!': The Austrians 116
'Heil Puccini!': The Italians 123
The Enemy Within The Walls: Collaboration 134
'Not The Allies. It Was The Resistance!' 142
They Made Us Fight Against Each Other: The Civil War 156

PART III 177

The Greek 1940s And The Politics Of Memory: 1990-2014 177
'People Are Good At Heart': The Germans 205
A Nation Of Bravi: The Italians 220
More Skeletons In The Closet: Collaboration 225
The Many Faces Of The Resistance 236
Brother Against Brother: The Civil War 258

IMAGES OF JEWS AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE HOLOCAUST IN GREEK FICTION FOR YOUNG READERS (1974-2014) 285

CONCLUSIONS 329

BIBLIOGRAPHY 333

ABBREVIATIONS

EAM: **E**thniko **A**peleftherotiko **M**etopo/National Liberation Front

ELAS: **E**llinikos **L**aikos **A**peleftherotikos **S**tratos/Greek People's Liberation Army

EPON: **E**niaia **P**anelladiki **O**rganosi **N**eon/United Panhellenic Organisation of Youth

ELAN: **E**lliniko **L**aiko **A**peleftherotiko **N**aftiko/Greek People's Liberation Navy

PEEA: **P**olitiki **E**pitropi **E**thnikis **A**peleftherosis/Political Committee of National Liberation

EDES: **E**thnikos **D**imokratikos **E**llinikos **S**yndesmos/National Republican Greek League

EKKA: **E**thniki **K**ai **K**oinoniki **A**peleftherosis/National and Social Liberation

DSE: **D**imokratikos **S**tratos **E**lladas/Democratic Army of Greece

OPLA: **O**rganosi **P**erifrourisis **L**aikou **A**gona/Organisation for the Protection of the People's Struggle

ND: **N**ea **Demokratia**/New Democracy

PASOK: **PA**nellinio **SO**sialistiko **K**inima/Panhellenic Socialist Movement

KKE: **K**ommounistiko **K**omma **E**lladas/Communist Party of Greece

KKE Interior: Communist Party of Greece, Interior

SYRIZA: **SY**naspismos **RIZ**ospastikis **A**risteras/Coalition of the Radical Left

ANEL: **AN**exartitoi **EL**lines/Independent Greeks

INTRODUCTION

And if I talk to you in fables and parables
it's because it's more gentle for you that way; and horror
really can't be talked about because it's alive,
because it's mute and goes on growing:
memory-wounding pain
drips by day drips in sleep
[transl. by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard]

The above stanza, which lends its first verse to the title of this study, is from 'Τελευταίος Σταθμός' (Last Stop), a poem written by Greek poet and diplomat George Seferis in Cava dei Tirreni in early October 1944, while awaiting his return to Greece after four years in exile with the Greek government. A few days later, on 12 October 1944, the German troops retreated from Athens, signalling the end of Greece's three-and-a-half-year occupation by the Axis powers.[1]

As several critics have pointed out, in 'Last Stop' Seferis conveyed a sense of hopelessness and apprehension of civil war to come.[2] His fears were confirmed in December 1944. Merely two months after Liberation, Athens was ravaged by the so-called *Dekemvriana*, a bloody, thirty-three-day power struggle that broke out between the communist-dominated EAM/ELAS, the main resistance movement in occupied Greece, and the British-backed Greek government/monarchist camp. The battle of Athens ended in January 1945 with the defeat of EAM/ELAS, followed by the signing of the Varkiza Peace

1 The Axis occupation of Greece began in late April 1941, following the end of the Greco-Italian War and the Nazi invasion of Greece. Greece was subsequently divided into three occupation zones: Italian (1941-1943), German (1941-1944) and Bulgarian (1941-1944).
2 See Beaton 2003: 249. Also, Maronitis 1976: 83. For an in-depth analysis of the poem see Paschalis 2014: 111-31.

Agreement between the two warring parties. The Varkiza Agreement, however, did little to ease the situation and a few months later Greece descended into full-scale civil war which ended in 1949 with the military defeat of the communists. The Communist Party was outlawed, while its surviving fighters were sent to prison, exile camps or fled to the Eastern Bloc.

The 1950s saw the establishment of a deeply oppressive, ultra-nationalistic and anti-communist regime by the victors of the Civil War. Anti-communism and 'national-mindedness' (εθνικοφροσύνη) became the official state ideology, endorsed by the parties of the Right and Centre that succeeded one another in power from the early 1950s on. Following a progressive break in 1963-1965 under the premiership of Georgios Papandreou, Greece witnessed widespread social unrest and a prolonged political crisis which led to the establishment of a far-right military Junta in 1967.[3] A direct result of the Civil War, the Junta embodied the anti-communist and nationalist ideologies of the rightist post-war state in its most extreme form. The regime collapsed in July 1974, following its involvement in the events that led to the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. After a brief period of transition to civilian rule, democracy was fully restored in Greece in November 1974.[4]

The collapse of the Junta signalled the decline of the anti-communist narrative about the 1940s that had dominated official political, historiographical and cultural discourses since the end of the Civil War. Consequently, the restoration of democracy and the legalisation of the Left in

3 For more on this see Close 1993: 214-25 and Close 2002: 83-113.
4 In November 1974 Greece held its first parliamentary elections after the end of the Junta.

1974 opened the floodgates to hitherto suppressed memories. From literature and cinema to the wide-scale publication of veterans' memoirs and from political discourses to historical research, the post-1974 period saw an upsurge of interest in the Greek 1940s and its legacies. As I will go on to show in subsequent chapters, throughout the period 1974-2014 the Greek 1940s became a battlefield of memory, sparking numerous heated debates among politicians, historians, intellectuals and the general public.

It can reasonably be argued that the 1940s is one of the most widely studied and written-about periods of modern Greek history. Since 1974 the subject has attracted continuous interest from historians, political scientists, sociologists, memory studies experts and scholars from various other disciplines who have contributed to the creation of a vast literature on the period.[5] This study explores the representation of the Greek 1940s in the fiction for young readers published between 1974 and 2014. This is a subject that has remained completely unexplored until now, despite the existence of a voluminous body of scholarly literature on the relationship between history, memory and cultural representations of the Greek 1940s. I shall argue that young people's fiction has served as a privileged site for the perpetuation of official national (re)interpretations and changing popular perceptions of this turbulent period. Consequently, I go on to demonstrate that the authors' decision to include or exclude certain material from their fictional

5 See further Antoniou and Marantzidis 2008: 28-45.

representations of the 1940s is linked to the prevailing politics of memory of the time.

The corpus of literary texts under scrutiny comprises forty one novels and short story collections published between 1974 and 2014. Although understandably not exhaustive, this corpus offers a fairly representative sample of young people's literature dealing with the Greek 1940s. In selecting my material I have chosen to limit myself to the discussion of fiction. This means that I have excluded diaries, autobiographies, memoirs and other overt forms of life writing from my analysis. However, I do discuss books in which authors have injected their stories with fictionalised elements from their personal experience of the historical events narrated. Lastly, I do not discuss works that were originally published in foreign languages and later translated into Greek.

In claiming that this study examines the representation of the Greek 1940s in fiction written for young readers I immediately invite a crucial methodological question, i.e., what has been the main criterion by which I assessed whether or not the texts under examination were in fact intended for a young audience? With the traditional boundaries between literature for young readers and literature for adults becoming less and less tangible, if not non-existent,[6] most Greek publishing houses have created special literary series marketed for young readers still at school. These books are typically marked with the indication 'from age x and up', usually found on the back

6 See, for example, Kokkola 2003: 7.

cover. This has been my primary criterion for selecting my source material. For books that came out before publishing houses started to adopt this practice, I consulted resource guides, thematic catalogues and monographs on the history of Greek Children's Literature.[7] Moreover, many of the books examined here contain forewords in which the authors explicitly state that their stories are intended for a young audience.

This corpus includes some of the most popular and most critically acclaimed books for young readers alongside works that were initially less well-received or are now forgotten. I am not discussing these texts in terms of their literary merit. Rather, I view them as cultural products and explore how they respond to the changing memory politics of the 1940s.

As mentioned above, this study covers the period 1974-2014. I have already explained the significance of 1974 as a major turning point that profoundly affected all aspects of Greek political, social and cultural life, and opened a new chapter in national encounters with the 1940s.

Moreover, 1974 also inaugurated a period that has been described as the 'Springtime of Greek Children's Literature'.[8] As literary production started to increase and improve in quality during this time, scholarly interest also grew alongside it. In 1977 Dimitris Giakos published the first *History of Greek Children's Literature* for which he received the Athens Academy Award.

---

7 More specifically, Sakellariou 1982, Delonis 1986, Sakellariou and Karagiannis 1986, Sakellariou and Karagiannis 1987, Sakellariou and Bartzis 1988, Sakellariou, Bartzis and Karagiannis 1989, Angelopoulou and Valasi 1989, Anagnostopoulos 1996, Angelopoulou 1998 and Karagiannis 1999.
8 Delonis ibid.: 24-5.

Giakos's study stimulated further interest in the field and was followed by a number of historical and theoretical contributions from other scholars over subsequent years.[9] Two other important factors that fostered the systematisation of scholarly engagement with this field during the 1980s were the introduction of children's literature into the curriculum of university Education Departments and the establishment of journals dedicated exclusively to theory and criticism relating to children's literature.[10] At the same time, recent developments in the fields of psychology and pedagogy drastically affected how authors of books for young readers viewed their audience. As one of the most prominent scholars of Greek children's literature noted, 'the child is no longer viewed as a *homunculus*, a miniature adult, that we can manipulate, but as an autonomous person in whom we ought to instil a sense of responsibility by gradually bringing him into contact with the surrounding social, ideological and political reality.'[11]

The new ideological circumstances that emerged after the restoration of democracy encouraged the introduction of new themes and topics in literature for young readers.[12] Not surprisingly, the Greek 1940s was one of the main subjects to attract widespread interest from authors in the post-1974 period. The 1940s remained a popular topic in young people's fiction throughout the period 1974-2014.

---

9 See further Sandis 2008: 306-20.
10 More specifically, the journals *Επιθεώρηση Παιδικής Λογοτεχνίας* and *Διαδρομές*, both established in 1986.
11 Kallergis 1995: 92.
12 See Delonis op. cit. and Anagnostopoulos op. cit.

Although by no means comparable to 1974, 2014 can also be seen as the year that marked the end of an era in Greece's modern political history. With Greek society almost completely torn apart by a prolonged, multi-dimensional crisis, Parliament's failure to elect a new President on December 29, 2014, was followed by the decision to hold a snap election the following month. Forty years after the legalisation of the Left in 1974, the radical left-wing SYRIZA party won the election, making its main slogan 'For the first time, the Left in government' a historic reality.

According to some, this development marked the 'end of the end of the *metapolitefsi*'.[13] So far I have deliberately avoided using the word *metapolitefsi*, a term known to anyone even slightly familiar with Greece's post-war political history. My reluctance to introduce this word is because *metapolitefsi* is a rather ambiguous concept that requires some clarification.

Literally meaning regime change, the term *metapolitefsi* was originally used to describe the period of transition to democracy after the collapse of the Junta. Over the years, however, it has ended up lending its name to the entire forty-year period that followed the restoration of democracy. The limits of the *metapolitefsi*, its periodisation and multiple legacies have recently become points of contention among journalists, political scientists and historians,

13 See Kalyvas 2015 and Dinas and Fouka 2019. Available at https://www.kathimerini.gr/828941/opinion/epikairothta/politikh/to-metewro-vhma-ths-metapoliteyshs and https://www.kathimerini.gr/1012817/opinion/epikairothta/politikh/to-telos-toy-teloys-ths-metapoliteyshs.

with some asking sarcastically whether it will ever be possible to make the *metapolitefsi* history.[14]

With no intention of entering this debate, in this study I use the term 'early *metapolitefsi*' to refer to the period 1974-1981 which I examine in Part I.[15] Part II covers the period 1982-1989, which is generally accepted as representing the second phase of the *metapolitefsi.*[16] In addition to their significance at the political level, the above chronologies were also chosen for another reason. Both 1982 and 1989 were years that saw a paradigm shift in the official national commemoration and interpretation of the 1940s, as I will go on to show in subsequent chapters. Lastly, Part III covers the period 1990-2014.

All three Parts begin with an introductory chapter discussing the politics of memory prevailing in each period under study. More specifically, in these chapters I examine the commemoration, exploration and representation of the Greek 1940s in the discourses of the main political parties, in academic historiography, school history textbooks and other cultural products or events that brought the memory of the 1940s into the limelight. Naturally, these chapters do not attempt to offer comprehensive coverage of all these areas, but only to provide an overview of the prevailing memory culture and politics,

14 Giannakopoulos 2013: 137. On the above issues see also Avgeridis, Gazi and Kornetis (eds.) 2015, Karamanolakis, Nikolakopoulos and Sakellaropoulos (eds.) 2016 and Kallivretakis 2017.
15 Starting with the restoration of democracy, the end of this period is conventionally seen as 1981, when PASOK formed the first socialist government in post-dictatorship Greece.
16 See Vamvakas and Panagiotopoulos 2010: xxxv-xxxviii. Also, Voulgaris 2001.

thereby allowing us to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the texts under examination and the general climate that produced them.

Chapters 2 and 3 look at the representation of the German and Italian occupiers respectively. It will be apparent that the Bulgarian occupiers are not discussed at all. This is because the subject of the Bulgarian occupation of Greece goes completely unrepresented in all of the books under examination. The first obvious explanation for this has to do with the fact that all the stories are set either in German-occupied Athens or in the Italian-held provinces that passed into German control following the Italian Armistice in September 1943. Venturing a different explanation, it could also be suggested that the absence of Bulgarians from the group of represented occupiers can be perceived as an indication that the subject 'Bulgarians as national enemies' is mainly associated with literary themes and settings that take us back to the Greek-Bulgarian conflicts of 1904-1918.[17] Lastly, one could argue that the reasons for this absence are chiefly ideological. From the end of the Civil War onwards anti-communism and anti-Bulgarianism went hand in hand with successive post-Civil War regimes presenting former left-wing fighters as national enemies (*eamovoulgaroi*), who had a secret plan to cede part of Northern

17 Here we should mention the influence of Penelope Delta, the so-called 'First Lady of Greek Children's Literature' (1874-1941). Many of Delta's historical novels are set during this period and have proved extremely popular with readers of all ages ever since they were first published. Commenting on the influence of her novels, Peter Mackridge has observed that 'generations of Greeks have been brought up to view Greek history and identity–and particularly the history and identity of Macedonia–through the lens of Penelope Delta's novels.' Mackridge 2001: 41. Delta's negative representation of Bulgarians has been criticised in recent years, with some scholars accusing her of an anti-Bulgarian obsession. See Sakellariou 1997 and Spanaki 2004.

Greece to the Slavs. This narrative was completely delegitimised after the restoration of democracy and this might also be why authors shied away from this subject.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 discuss the representation of some of the most controversial, repressed and contested aspects of the Greek 1940s, that is to say, wartime collaboration, the Resistance and the Civil War. My analysis ends with a stand-alone chapter exploring the construction of the literary image of the Jew and the representation of the Greek Jewish experience of the Holocaust in books for young readers published between 1974 and 2014 (i.e., the whole period covered by this thesis). With this subject having remained almost completely unexplored until now, this chapter could also be viewed as the first comprehensive Greek contribution to the ongoing international discussion about the representation of the Holocaust in various national literatures for young readers.

PART I

THE GREEK 1940S AND THE POLITICS OF MEMORY: 1974-1981

The 1940s was one of the most turbulent periods of modern Greek history with a long-lasting impact on the post-war political, social and intellectual life. After the end of the Civil War in 1949, both the victorious Right and the defeated and outlawed Left sought to manipulate the collective memory of the 1940s for the promotion of their post-war political agendas. One of the most far-reaching implications of the manipulation and opportunistic exploitation of the collective memory of the 1940s by the post-war political elites is that the Greek people were denied the opportunity to engage in a national consensus-building effort that would allow them to process and, eventually, come to terms with the traumatic past. The Civil War divided the Greek people into two rival ideological-political camps and had an enduring effect on voting behaviours and party alignments over subsequent decades.

The restoration of democracy in 1974 marked a turning point in all aspects of Greek political, social, intellectual and public life. A turning point of this magnitude led the people to 'look back' at the traumatic events of the past and reprocess them in the new ideological context of the *metapolitefsi*. The political parties were the main mass institutions through which this new 'self-awareness' was achieved. All parties participated in this process and all parties were subjected to it.[18]

---

18 Voulgaris 2001: 21.

Nea Demokratia[19] was founded on October 4, 1974, by the first Prime Minister of the Third Hellenic Republic, Konstantinos Karamanlis. An immediate result of the fall of the Colonel's regime was that the political system was re-established on a new basis. The ideological doctrines of national-mindedness (εθνικοφροσύνη) and anti-communism that had legitimised thirty years of political apartheid against the Left collapsed almost overnight. As Angelos Elefantis has put it, after 1974 no one could boast that their father or grandfather fought the 'communist bandits' (κομμουνιστοσυμμορίτες) in Grammos.[20]

That being so, Nea Demokratia introduced itself as a modern conservative-liberal party with no ideological ties to the post-war Right, a party that promised to safeguard the consolidation of the newly established democracy and fulfill what Karamanlis himself called 'Greece's European Destiny'. During the 1974 election campaign, the first parliamentary elections to take place after the fall of the Junta, the primary concern of Nea Demokratia was to establish a new political identity that would work cohesively in bringing voters together. The views that people expressed about the past were strongly correlated with current party alignments and, in 1974, these were largely based on retrospective attitudes to the Civil War and its legacies. Thus, any reference to past divisions could be detrimental to ND's efforts to appeal to a broad electorate and win the elections. Moreover, in 1974 the fear was still strong that the reawakening of Civil War memories could lead to the rekindling

19 Usually abbreviated as ND.
20 Elefantis 2002: 106.

of old rivalries. On these grounds, Karamanlis went on to impose a policy of oblivion in regard to the divisive events of the 1940s. Although these were not doomed completely into oblivion, they were thrust into the sidelines of official national memory.[21] As Giorgos Antoniou has put it, regime change in Greece was not followed by a serious consensus on the divisive past but by 'an underground debate which, using the excuse that the Resistance was above suspicion, addressed the unresolved issues of the Civil War, without the latter ever explicitly occupying the limelight.'[22]

In September 1974 Karamanlis legalised the Communist Party, taking the first decisive step towards democratisation and putting an end to three decades of socio-political discrimination against left-wing citizens. Karamanlis's efforts gave his party a massive parliamentary majority in the 1974 elections. ND's campaign rhetoric in the 1977 elections was of the same style; any references to troubling memories of the 1940s were avoided as the party was continuing its efforts to disassociate itself from the ultra-conservative post-war Right.

ND's policy of oblivion was abandoned on the eve of the 1981 legislative elections when PASOK's increasing appeal to the electorate threatened to put the party out of power. Under the leadership of Georgios Rallis, Nea Demokratia recalled the divisive past in an attempt to rally conservative voters against socialist PASOK.[23] However, this divisive rhetoric was a brief

21 See also Voulgaris op. cit.: 57-61 and Paschaloudi 2013: 117-22.
22 Antoniou 2013: 229.
23 Paschaloudi op. cit.: 121.

parenthesis in ND's political discourse, which remained moderate and directed at the centre of the political spectrum throughout the early *metapolitefsi*.

The Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) was founded on September 3, 1974, by Andreas Papandreou, son of the so-called 'old Man of Democracy', Georgios Papandreou. PASOK presented itself as a radical socialist movement, with national independence, popular sovereignty, social emancipation and democratic process among its declared ideals. Despite its purely socialist declarations, much of the party's popular support came primarily from the traditional pre-dictatorship Centre. However, it was not long before PASOK dominated the Centre-Left spectrum at the expense of the communist Left.

One of the things that PASOK's charismatic leader managed to achieve was to replace the traditional Left/Right divide with a new Right/anti-Right polarisation and to present his party as the legitimate heir to and sole political representative of the anti-Right faction. It has been pointed out that PASOK's self-claimed genealogy was 'historically inaccurate and ideologically contradictory'.[24] With anti-Rightism (αντιδεξιμός) as one of its main principles, PASOK traced its ideological origins in the major 'anti-Right' events and social movements of the 20th century; in the political traditions of Venizelism, EAM and the Unyielding Struggle (Ανένδοτος), the radicalism of the Greek 1960s, the anti-Junta movement and the 1973 Athens Polytechnic uprising. Giannis Voulgaris notes characteristically that PASOK's leader

24 Voulgaris op. cit.: 94.

became furious when he found out that one of his party associates attempted to replace Eleftherios Venizelos's portrait with a picture of Aris Velouchiotis. As Voulgaris comments, 'it was not so much a matter of preference as it was a matter of preserving ambiguity.'[25] In presenting itself as heir to the anti-Right tradition, PASOK managed to expand its voter base among leftists and Left-sympathisers–many of whom had a first-hand experience of post-war political oppression–as well as among youngsters of the so-called generation of the Polytechnic.

Depending on the electoral conjecture of the time, PASOK conjured up memories of different periods and political events from the past. From its founding until the 1981 elections, the party brought forward the memory of the Unyielding Struggle in an attempt to appropriate the political heritage of the Centre Union.[26] PASOK's references to the 1940s, on the other hand, were made in an indirect and allusive manner, targeting voters who had suffered decades of political and social discrimination under the right-wing rule. During the early *metapolitefsi* PASOK evoked the past wartime Resistance/collaboration division in an effort to equate its main political opponent, Nea Demokratia, with the forces that had collaborated with the occupation authorities during the Axis occupation of Greece as well as with the post-war oppressive Right.[27]

25 Ibid.
26 Paschaloudi op. cit.: 159.
27 Ibid.: 122-3.

Although PASOK's direct references to the divisions of the 1940s were scarce during this period, its promises for full political reparation of the Left were not. In his 1981 manifesto entitled 'Contract with the People', PASOK's leader announced his intention to put forward a series of measures aimed at offering full rehabilitation to leftist citizens and veterans of the left-wing Resistance, should his party win the upcoming elections.[28] As I will go on to discuss in Part II, PASOK won the elections and fulfilled its promises, opening a new chapter in the national commemoration and memorialisation of the 1940s.

The communist Left entered the post-dictatorship political scene split into two parties; the traditional pro-Soviet Communist Party of Greece (KKE) and the Eurocommunist Party of the Interior (KKE Interior).[29] Contrary to ND and PASOK, the 1940s was a frequently addressed topic in the political discourse of the two Communist Parties in the early *metapolitefsi*. The restoration of democracy and the legalisation of the Left terminated a long period of persecution, political isolation and social discrimination against left-wing citizens. At long last, the Left was legitimised to narrate its past. This past, however, was particularly controversial and had a profound effect on voting behaviors and current party alignments.

On this ground, the two Communist Parties sought to highlight certain memories of the 1940s that would work in favour of promoting a victimised

28 Ibid.: 125. Also, Rori 2008: 296.
29 KKE Interior was formed in 1968, following its split from KKE.

image of the Left, as 'ever resisting and persecuted'.[30] These memories centred on EAM/ELAS's wartime resistance to Greece's occupiers as well as on the frantic persecution of thousands of veterans and supporters of the left-wing Resistance by the post-war Right.[31] As Voulgaris has noted, after 1974 'the memory of Grammos was eclipsed by the memory of Makronisos'[32] and the memory of the Left's involvement in the Civil War was largely sidelined.

It has been argued that the narrative of the Resistance became the 'purifying' filter through which the post-dictatorship Left recalled the events of the 1940s, banishing, at the same time, the troubling memories of its involvement in the Civil War.[33] With most of the former DSE fighters who survived the 1949 defeat still in exile, the narrative of the Resistance was the only way for the Left to communicate its traumatic experience of the Civil War and its aftermath. The highlighting of the leading role played by the Communist Party in the 1941-1944 resistance movement contributed hugely to the historical vindication of the Left. The latter was no longer viewed as a threat to the country's national integrity but as a patriotic force that had played a central role in Greece's liberation from the foreign occupation, only to be condemned to three decades of political and social isolation by the victors of the Civil War. In the narrative of the Left, the communist guerrillas were portrayed as martyrs in the struggle for national liberation and victims of the post-war oppressive regime. Consequently, the political refugees, who had fled

30 Voglis 2008: 78.
31 Ibid.
32 Voulgaris op. cit.: 29.
33 Paschaloudi op. cit.: 159.

the country after KKE's military defeat in the Civil War, were deliberately disassociated from the divisive past. Instead, they were portrayed as patriots of the Resistance who were forced into exile following the campaign of terror launched by the post-war Right.[34]

In the early *metapolitefsi* no party wished to recall the divisive past, least of all the party of the defeated whose aim was to establish and expand its political influence in the new context of democratic normality. Moreover, its involvement in the Civil War tied the Left to a past that the post-dictatorship Greek society was struggling to overcome.[35] Faced with the political stakes and challenges of the *metapolitefsi*, the Left was trying to carve out a new path. It stands to reason that the appeal to past divisions could by no means serve this objective.

Giorgos Mavrogordatos has famously argued that the *metapolitefsi* brought about the '*revanche* of the defeated'.[36] This '*revanche*' found particular expression in cultural representations of the Greek experience of the 1940s, especially in cinema. Following the fall of the Junta and the loosening of censorship regulations, the filmmakers of the so-called 'New Greek Cinema' committed themselves to a socially and politically charged cinema. Engaging largely with the 1940s and its legacies, this generation of directors and screenwriters re-wrote the events of modern political history from the perspective of the self-victimising narrative of the Left.[37] The critically

34 Ibid.: 132.
35 Voulgaris op. cit.: 105.
36 Mavrogordatos 1999.
37 Papadogiannis 2015: 89.

acclaimed *Ο Θίασος* (The Travelling Players, 1975) and *Οι κυνηγοί* (The Hunters, 1977) by Theo Angelopoulos, *Happy Day* (1977) by Pantelis Voulgaris and *Ο άνθρωπος με το γαρύφαλλο* (The Man with the Carnation, 1980) by Nikos Tzimas are some of these films that went on to offer, to borrow Elli Lemonidou's words, 'an epic leftist cinematic version of the history of the 1940s.'[38]

In addition to their high artistic value, the commercial success of these films reflects the new ideological currents that gained prominence after regime change.[39] The generation of the *metapolitefsi* was seeking to find out more about these events, to sort out their own jumbled memories as well as to restore the memory of the previous generation that had participated in the left-wing Resistance.[40] It is not without interest or significance, however, that although these films engaged extensively with the Civil War and its aftermath, they also shied away from the question of the communists' share of responsibility for the fratricidal war.

It may well be argued that the restoration of democracy signalled a paradigm shift in scholarly research into the Greek 1940s. The collapse of the Junta was followed by the decline of the traditional interpretative frameworks that had dominated Greek scholarship on the 1940s for nearly thirty years. The post-war narrative, which was encapsulated in the theory of the 'three rounds' of the quasi-deliberate communist attempt to seize power by force in

38 Lemonidou 2013: 230.
39 See also Papadogiannis 2012: 286-308.
40 Flitouris 2008: 397.

1943-1944, in December 1944 and in 1946-1949, lost its dominance after the *metapolitefsi*, as political conditions became favourable to an academic study of the 1940s free of the ideological constraints and anti-communist biases of the previous decades.[41]

The 1970s saw the emergence of a new generation of scholars who introduced the so-called 'revisionist' school of thought. This generation, which continued to dominate the field until the end of the Cold War, dismissed old historiographical certainties and raised new questions regarding the role played by Great Britain and the US in Greece's post-war internal affairs. Working primarily with the now available wartime British and American archives, these scholars focused on the international, political and diplomatic aspects of the Greek 1940s. One of the most important contributions of the 'revisionists' to the historiography of the Greek 1940s was the highlighting of the relationship between domestic political developments and the international balance of power in the late 1940s. In other words, the 'revisionist school' put forward a combined examination of the 'major history' of the Second World War and the Cold War along with the 'minor history' of the Greek 1940s.[42]

This approach was epitomised in the proceedings of the first academic conference on the Greek 1940s entitled 'Greece in the 1940s: A Nation in

41 This periodisation was essentially revived in the mid-2000s with the so-called post-revisionist school, as I will go on to show in Part III.
42 See also Marantzidis and Antoniou 2004: 223-31, Antoniou and Marantzidis 2008: 11-52 and Sakkas 2013: 425-39.

Crisis', which took place in Washington in 1978.[43] That same year, London also organised a conference with the title 'Greece: From Resistance to Civil War'.[44] Greece, on the other hand, would have to wait until the socialist 1980s before it could host its own conference on this 'sensitive' topic. Moreover, the fact that throughout the early *metapolitefsi* most of the scholarly studies on the Greek 1940s were published in languages other than Greek[45] adds to the argument that the absence of serious post-dictatorship consensus on the 'sensitive' past significantly delayed the development of domestic academic scholarship on this period.

'Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past' was one of the Party's slogans in George Orwell's novel *1984*. Since the founding of the modern Greek state, school history has become subject to the political aims and expediencies of whoever happens to be in power.[46] History textbooks have traditionally been regarded as carriers of the nation's 'official' history, playing an instrumental role in shaping collective perceptions of the past.[47]

After the restoration of democracy, the need for a profound reform of Greece's educational system became urgent. One of the main goals of the first democratically elected government was the modernisation and

43 For the published proceedings see Iatrides (ed.) 1981. It is worth noting here that the Washington conference was described by one of its contributors as conveying the historical interpretation of the 'defeated'. See Liakos 2003: 26.
44 For the published proceedings see Sarafis (ed.) 1980.
45 Marantzidis and Antoniou op. cit.: 226.
46 Kokkinos 1998: 338.
47 Palikidis 2013: 9.

democratisation of the educational system as well as the purging (κάθαρση) of the educational sector of the legacies of the Junta in terms of institutions, personnel and textbooks.[48] To this end, the Karamanlis government introduced the 309 Law 'On the Organisation and Administration of General Education' in 1976, followed by the 576 Law 'On the Organisation and Administration of Secondary and Higher Vocational and Technical Education' in 1977. A discussion on the regulations of these laws and, consequently, the implications of the 1976 educational reform would fall beyond the scope of this study. However, it is worth mentioning that the 1976 Law provided for the establishment of *dimotiki*, the modern vernacular, as the language of instruction at all levels of education, putting an end to the so-called language question (γλωσσικό ζήτημα) that had troubled the nation for more than a century.

The fall of the Junta signalled the decline of the anti-communist and Greek-Christian ideological exemplar. This, along with the legalisation of the Left, the emergence of PASOK and the general political radicalisation of the *metapolitefsi* delegitimised the anti-communist narrative of the Junta about the Greek 1940s, a narrative which was also blatantly reproduced in the school history textbooks of the early 1970s. The latter were accused of containing numerous distortions and of being 'servants of reactionary propaganda and products of dictatorial censorship.'[49] The history textbooks produced during the seven-year Junta were so biased that, as Dimitris

48 See Persianis 1978: 51 and Kazamias 1978: 21-2.
49 Mavroskoufis 1997: 29.

Mavroskoufis notes, 'even Nea Demokratia, which, to some extent, is considered to be the natural heir to the old national-minded Right, admitted through its Deputy Minister of Education that the existing textbooks contain errors, inaccuracies and falsehoods.'[50]

Therefore, in 1976 Nea Demokratia announced that the existing textbooks would be replaced with new ones. The task of developing new school curricula and preparing new textbooks along with the general lines of the proposed educational reform was delegated to the Centre for Educational Studies and In-Service Training (KEME).[51] Until the new history textbooks would be ready to enter the classrooms, the old pre-dictatorship textbooks were used to cover the educational needs of teachers and pupils.

The textbooks that will be discussed in this chapter are Georgios Kafentzis's *Ιστορία των Νεωτέρων Χρόνων* (History of the Modern Times) for pupils in the final year of the *Dimotiko* and Georgia Koulikourdi's *Νεώτερη Ευρωπαϊκή Ιστορία από τον 15ο αιώνα μ.Χ ως σήμερα* (Modern European History from the 15th Century A.D to the Present Day) for final-year *Gymnasio* students. Kafentzis's and Koulikourdi's textbooks remained in use from 1974 to 1979 and from 1975 to 1984, respectively.[52]

---

50 Ibid.

51 The former KEME, now Pedagogical Institute, was established in 1975 by the Karamanlis government. Apart from the implementation of the 1976 educational reform, some of the institution's main responsibilities were the development of new school curricula and textbooks, the conduction of educational research and the provision of in-service training to teachers. For more on the role of KEME and the Pedagogical Institute see Mavroskoufis ibid: 153-330.

52 The *Dimotiko* is the second stage of primary education in Greece (ages 6-12), the first being preschool. The *Gymnasio* (ages 13-15) represents the first stage of secondary education, while the *Lykeio* (ages 16-18) forms the upper, non-compulsory stage of secondary education.

Kafentzis' book was first published in 1956 with the title *Ιστορία της Νεωτέρας Ελλάδος* (History of Modern Greece) by a private publishing house as a state-approved supplement to the official school textbook. In 1974 the book was re-written into *dimotiki* and introduced into schools. Kafentzis's textbook consists of three parts, each of which is further divided into sub-parts and chapters. The chapter dealing with the 1940s covers three and a half pages and focuses exclusively on the Greek experience of WWII, with some references to the international developments of the period 1939-1945. The textbook makes a brief reference to the wartime resistance that had been carried out by 'secret organisations and guerrilla groups' without mentioning, however, any of the resistance organisations and groups that operated during the Occupation.[53] The contribution of the Greek Resistance to the Allied victory on the Eastern Front is exaggerated, as the author implies that the Soviets would not have had enough time to prepare the Eastern line of defence had it not been for the Greek Resistance that delayed the German advance into

---

Regarding the arrangement of the curriculum content in school textbooks, the Greek school system follows a 'spiral' approach. This means that material is revisited at successive levels (*Dimotiko*, *Gymnasio* and *Lykeio*), building on the students' existing knowledge.

In the Greek school system there is a single state-approved textbook for each subject at each education level. From 1937 until 2012 all textbooks were published by the state-run ΟΕΔΒ (Organisation for School Book Publication). For the implications of this single book policy see Avdela 2000: 239-53.

The textbook that replaced Kafentzis's book in 1979 remained in use until 1989. For this reason, it will be examined in Part II. The history textbook for pupils in the final year of the *Lykeio Ιστορία Ελληνική και Ευρωπαϊκή των Νέων Χρόνων* (Greek and European History of the Modern Times) by Ch. Theodoridis and A. Lazarou is not examined here, as it ends with the outbreak of WWI.

53 'Η Ελλάδα όμως έμεινε στην κατοχή των Γερμανών, Ιταλών και Βουλγάρων και έζησε τέσσερα σχεδόν χρόνια κάτω από αφάνταστες στερήσεις και πιέσεις. Σ' όλο όμως το μακρό αυτό διάστημα, ούτε μια στιγμή δεν έπαψε να ελπίζει στη νίκη των συμμαχικών όπλων και να εργάζεται με δολιοφθορές, μυστικές οργανώσεις και ανταρτικά σώματα για τη φθορά του εχθρού.' Kafentzis 1974: 122.

Russia.[54] Also overemphasised is the contribution of the Greek Royal Forces in the Middle East to the Allied victories in Africa and Italy.[55] The chapter concludes with the restoration to the Greek throne of King George II and his death in 1947. Although the book makes no mention of the divisive events that followed Greece's liberation from the Axis occupation, it is noted that one of the reasons that caused King George's health to deteriorate was the 'intensity of those turbulent times.'[56]

Koulikourdi's textbook entered the classrooms in 1975 and replaced the 'Junta textbook' by Matarasis and Papastamatiou. The textbook is divided into five parts, each of which is divided into sub-parts and chapters. The events of the period 1939-1945 cover four pages, half of which focus on the Greek experience of WWII. Regarding the section about the Greek 1940s, the greatest part of the narrative text focuses on the military events of the Greek-Italian War in 1940-1941. The author devotes a brief paragraph of five lines to describe the sufferings of the Greek people during the Tripartite Occupation.[57]

---

54 'Η ελληνική αντίσταση στη γερμανική εισβολή καθυστέρησε την επίθεση των Γερμανών κατά της Ρωσίας και έδωκε καιρό στους Ρώσους να αμυνθούν και να αποκρούσουν τον εχθρό.' Ibid.
55 'Στον αγώνα των συμμάχων κατά των Γερμανών σημαντική βοήθεια πρόσφερε το ελληνικό ναυτικό, και οι στρατιωτικές δυνάμεις δόξασαν και πάλι τα ελληνικά όπλα στις μάχες του Ελ-Αλαμέιν της Αφρικής και στο Ρίμινι της Ιταλίας.' Ibid. 122-3.
56 'Ο βασιλιάς Γεώργιος ο Β΄ επανήλθε στο θρόνο του, αλλά δε χάρηκε για πολύν καιρό τους καρπούς της νίκης. Οι συγκινήσεις της πολυτάραχης εκείνης εποχής, η εντατική του απασχόληση, ο ασκητικός του βίος και η συνεχής και αδιάκοπη εργασία του τού είχαν υποσκάψει την υγεία του και την 1η Απριλίου 1947 πέθανε στα ανάκτορα των Αθηνών από καρδιακή προσβολή.' Ibid.: 123-4. This phrase is omitted from later reprints. The first edition of 1956 included a separate chapter on the Civil War written from a fiercely anti-communist perspective. Not surprisingly, this chapter was removed from the 1974 edition. For more on the 1956 edition see Mariolis 2013.
57 'Στην Ελλάδα άρχισε μια τριπλή κατοχή Γερμανών, Ιταλών και Βουλγάρων, (οι τελευταίοι κατέλαβαν τη Μακεδονία). Η παραγωγή απορροφήθηκε από τα γερμανικά στρατεύματα, το νόμισμα έχασε την αξία του. Ο ελληνικός πληθυσμός μειώθηκε φοβερά από την πείνα, τις σφαγές και τις καταστροφές κάθε είδους (600.000 νεκροί).' Koulikourdi 1975: 323.

However, Koulikourdi's textbook makes no reference to either the resistance movement that developed in Greece or to the struggle of the Greek Armed Forces in the Middle East. The chapter ends with a brief reference to the Civil War, which provides barely any information on the divisive events of the post-liberation period: 'Greece was liberated on October 12, 1944. With the wounds of war still open, Greece was ravaged by a terrible civil war (1944-1945 and 1945-1949), which opened up new wounds, destroyed the country, stirred up hatred and obstructed the country's smooth political development for many years.'[58]

A comparative examination of the chapters dealing with the Greek 1940s in Kafentzis's and Koulikourdi's textbooks brings us to the following observations: a) both textbooks strongly emphasise the quasi-unity of the Greek people during the Tripartite Occupation b) both textbooks suppress the subject of wartime collaboration c) neither one of the books mentions any of the resistance organisations and groups that operated during the Occupation d) in Koulikourdi's textbook the Greek Civil War is completely disassociated from its wider political context. As the author avoids all discussion about the divisive events of the immediate post-liberation period that paved the way for the outbreak of the full-scale Civil War, the latter is interpreted as a tragedy that just 'happened'.

---

58 'Η Ελλάδα ελευθερώθηκε στις 12 Οκτωβρίου 1944. Πριν προφτάσει όμως να κλείσει τις πληγές ου πολέμου, δοκιμάστηκε από ένα φοβερό εμφύλιο πόλεμο (1944-1945 και 1945-1949), που άνοιξε βαθιές πληγές, κατέστρεψε τη χώρα, υποδαύλισε τα μίση και εμπόδισε την ομαλή πολιτική εξέλιξη για πολλά χρόνια.' Ibid.: 331.

In conclusion, it could be argued that the phrase 'more oblivion and less history' encapsulates the spirit underlying the representation of the Greek 1940s in the school history textbooks of the early *metapolitefsi*.[59] As other scholars have also pointed out, when it came to controversial subjects, such as the issue of wartime collaboration, the disunities in the Greek Resistance, the *Dekemvriana* or the Civil War, school history has favoured 'oblivion and selective remembering over critical understanding.'[60]

According to Jacques Le Goff, school history textbooks are the best observation points from which to study the historical mentality of a period.[61] If this statement holds true, then the overall conclusion that can be drawn here is that the suppression of troubling memories of the Greek 1940s in the school textbooks of the early *metapolitefsi* mirrors the new ideological orientations and political imperatives during that time. In 1974 the Greek society was taking its first steps towards democracy under the shadow of the Turkish invasion in Cyprus. Memories of past rivalries were thrust into oblivion in the name of national unity and democratic stability. It was only after the official recognition of the National Resistance in 1982, that the memory of the unsavory aspects of the 1940s would finally find its way into the school history textbooks. As I will go on to show in subsequent chapters, this was also the case with the representation of this period in fiction for young readers.

---

59 Lagani 2008: 360.
60 Palikidis op. cit.: 10.
61 Le Goff 1992: 128.

MODERN BOGEYMEN: THE GERMANS

This chapter looks at the representation of the German occupiers of Greece in the young people's fiction of the early *metapolitefsi*. How are the Nazis, the modern Bogeymen of children's literature according to Lydia Kokkola,[62] portrayed in the books under examination? What trends emerge and what themes can be traced? Were the authors of the 1970s anxious to distinguish between Germans and German Nazis in their stories and help their young readers contextualise the atrociousness of the German occupation regime in Greece? These are some of the main questions that shape my discussion about the representation of the German enemies in young people's fiction from 1974-1981.

In order to outline the main attitudes towards Germans that emerge from the texts under examination, I have employed Emer O'Sullivan's theoretical framework of positive, negative and neutral evaluations. O'Sullivan has examined the shifting attitudes towards Germany and Germans in a corpus of over two hundred books for young readers published in Great Britain since the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, focusing on the interrelation between dates of publication and time-frames.[63] In order to ascertain the dominant attitudes towards Germans, O'Sullivan has assigned one of the three evaluations–positive, negative or neutral–to each of the texts examined. O'Sullivan defines positive texts as ones 'in which authors write about

62 Kokkola 2003: 137.
63 See O'Sullivan 1990.

Germany or Germans in such a way that readers are likely to respond in an affirmative manner towards them.'[64] Texts in which Germany and Germans are depicted 'in an almost exclusively unfavourable light' are termed negative, while the neutral classification refers to texts in which 'the narrator neither comes down on the side of the Germans nor rails against them.'[65]

This approach of identifying positive, negative and neutral representations provides the main methodological framework for my analysis here, though with a few necessary modifications, since the point of discussion here is the depiction of German Nazis in particular rather than Germans in general. Thus, the term 'negative' will be used for stories in which Germans are depicted as the personification of evil and whose authors do not bother to distinguish between Germans and German Nazis, thus allowing 'Germanness' to be equated with 'evil'. Texts in which the Germans featured are stripped of their negative 'Germanness' will be classified as 'positive', while the term 'neutral' will be reserved for stories in which, although the atrociousness of the German occupation regime is not downplayed, authors have resisted portraying their German characters as evil.

The book with the strongest negative representations of Germans is Sofia Fildisi's short story collection *Νιότη χωρίς τραγούδια* (Youth Without Songs, 1978). The stories centre on the experiences of ordinary people struggling to survive in Axis-occupied Greece. There are no historical facts incorporated in the narration and the book requires little background knowledge on the part

64 O'Sullivan 2008: 79.
65 Ibid.: 80.

of the young reader. It also offers little to no explanation on the causes of the war, all blame for which is laid on some clique of 'heartless' and 'insane' decision-makers.[66]

Fildisi goes beyond the image of the jackbooted Prussian soldier that has become the mainstream paradigm for representations of Nazis in post-war popular culture. In her stories, the Germans are dehumanised in the fullest sense of the word and represented as the personification of evil. They are referred to as 'monsters', 'Beelzebubs' (βερζεβούληδες), 'beasts', 'demons' and 'worms' and are depicted with beast-like features:

> Every time he left the house, he cut a half-open rose, still wet with morning dew. He held it close to his evil nostrils taking a deep breath and then he put it in his mouth, bit it and held it between his teeth. […] The woman shuddered at his touch. It felt like she had a cold snake wrapped around her body. […] The beast was still laughing on the phone in the next room. […] The German was now yawning like a lion. […] He opened the door and gave her a pat on the back. She felt as if something heavy had fallen upon her.[67]

Examples like this abound in the books under examination. Stripped of all human qualities and depicted with monster-like features, the representation of Germans as a personification of evil is a recurrent theme in the young people's fiction from the 1970s.

---

66 For example, 'Τι θεόμουρλοι κουμαντέρνουνε τους λαούς. Ποια κατάρα πληρώνανε οι άνθρωποι. Τι άκαρδοι είτανε οι κουμανταδόροι του κόσμου…' and '[…] σαν εκεινούς, που τα κεφάλια τους είχανε άχερο… Και κάμανε πολέμους…' Fildisi 1978: 70 and 246.

67 'Κάθε φορά που έβγαινε από το σπίτι, έκοβε ένα μισόκλειστο τριαντάφυλλο που 'σταζε δροσιά. Το 'φερνε στα διαβολικά του ρουθούνια, ανάσαινε βαθιά–πού ξέρουν τ' αστροπελέκια από άνοιξες–ύστερα το 'βανε στο στόμα, το δάγκωνε και το βάστae με τα δόντια. […] Στ' άγγιγμά του, η γυναίκα ανατρίχιασε. Λες και φίδι είχε τυλιχτεί στο κορμί της και τη φοβέριζε με την κρυάδα του. […] Το χτήνος από την κάμαρα, ακόμα γέλαε στο τηλέφωνο. […] Άκουσε το Γερμανό που χασμουριότανε σαν λιοντάρι. […] Της άνοιξε την πόρτα και τη χτύπησε στις πλάτες. Της φάνηκε πως κάτι βαρύ έπεσ' απάνου της.' Ibid.: 80, 85-6 and 87.

What complicates things, however, is that in *Νιότη χωρίς τραγούδια* Fildisi is not concerned with drawing distinctions between Germans, as a national group, and German Nazis, as a group of supporters of a certain ideological doctrine. In other words, the despised enemies here are not the German Nazis in particular but the Germans in general. The problem that lies here is that their depiction as a personification of evil inevitably results in 'Germanness' being equated with 'evilness'. Moreover, when authors fail to point out that the perpetrators of the Third Reich were very much ordinary people and, instead, go on to portray them as biblical monsters, humans in disguise in the words of Kokkola,[68] the young readers' conceptualisation of Nazism is put in a seriously wrong perspective. Then again attributing all the blame for the war to a group of 'madmen' who had all of a sudden decided to drag an entire nation into a war is also problematic.

At the other end of the spectrum we find the figure of the good Austrian soldier. 'Minas's Easter' (Η Πασχαλιά του Μηνά) is a story about a young boy struggling to survive in famine-stricken Athens. Minas decides to sell his cross-pendant necklace to an Austrian soldier in order to surprise his ailing mother with a proper Easter meal. When the Austrian hears about Minas's misfortunes he bursts into tears and holds him with genuine affection, much to the boy's surprise. As Minas finds out, the nice Austrian was opposed to 'Hitler's nonsense'.[69] Sensitive and good-natured, all that the Austrian soldier

68 Kokkola op. cit.: 134.
69 'Ο κυρ-Θανάσης είπε πως είτανε Αυστριακός, κι από καλό σπίτι. [...] Έτσι, σ' εκείνες τις βραδινές τους κουβέντες του 'χει ειπωμένο για τον τόπο του, κι ακόμα, πως δεν είτανε με του Χίτλερ τα καμώματα.' Fildisi op. cit.: 69.

wanted was to return to his homeland and reunite with his loved ones. In a sad turn of events, the nice Austrian gets shot while on his way to visit Minas with more goods for his Easter table. Minas hears the gunshot and storms out of his house only to find his foreign friend dying in the street:

> He leaned over the soldier. The cross-pendant necklace was shining bright on his chest. It was shining like it had never shone before. A stream of blood was running down his chest where the cross necklace was hanging. Minas whispered in his ear. –Thank you, my brother. [The Austrian] stroked his hair. And then his heart stopped. […] [Minas] left in tears. Before he entered his house, he turned back and looked at him. The cross necklace was shining bright. The soldier looked like Christ, with His side pierced by the spear.[70]

The nice Austrian stands out from the group of hated enemies and appears as an individual character, exhibiting sensitivities that his German comrades seem to lack altogether. Compassionate and kind-hearted, the Austrian bears no resemblance to and shares no common ground, ideological or other, with the evil Germans. To paraphrase O'Sullivan's words, to the same degree to which the Germans are dehumanised, the humane Austrian is de-Germanised, where 'German' is taken to be synonymous with 'evil' and 'Nazi'.[71] While the Germans are portrayed as evil incarnate, the Austrian character is depicted in the most positive light. While the former are represented with bestial features, the latter is depicted as a Christ-like figure. More than three decades after the end of WWII, and only a few years before the outbreak of the

---

70 'Έσκυψε πάνου στο στρατιώτη. Στ' ανοιχτό του στήθος ο σταυρός, άστραφτε, όσο ποτέ. Εκεί που κρεμότανε, το αίμα έτρεχε ποτάμι. Ο Μηνάς του είπε στ' αφτί. –Σ' ευχαριστώ, αδερφέ μου. Εκείνος σήκωσε το χέρι με τον κόπο του ετοιμοθάνατου, και τον χάιδεψε στα μαλλιά. Ύστερα η καρδιά του έπαψε. […] Έφυγε κλαίγοντας. Προτού μπει στο σπίτι, έστριψε και κοίταξε πίσω. Ο σταυρός άστραφτε. Ο στρατιώτης είτανε όμοιος σαν και τον Χριστό, με την πλευρά Του κεντημένη από λόγχη.' Ibid.: 73-4.
71 O'Sullivan 1995: 72.

Waldheim scandal that signalled the collapse of Austria's post-war *Lebenslüge*, the image of the decent Austrian, who had remained unsullied by 'Hitler's nonsense', was still going strong in cultural perceptions and representations of Austria's involvement in WWII.[72]

Another book in which Germans are depicted in an unfavourable light is Dimitris Ferousis's short story collection *Ο Θανάσης και το καρότσι του* (Thanasis and his Wheelbarrow, 1980). In remarkable contrast to all the other narratives examined here, in Ferousis's book the historical setting is not disassociated from its wider context and Greece's subjugation to the Axis powers is seen as a national aspect of an international war, one that was fought 'from the Russian steppes to the African desert.'[73] The author, moreover, has made conscious efforts to provide his young readers with historical background information. A brief preface at the beginning of the book offers an outline of the main events leading up to the German invasion of Greece in the spring of 1941. Other historical information is included in the narrative in the form of wartime ephemera or extracts from radio broadcasts. The book also includes a three-page glossary containing explanations of words that young readers may not be familiar with, translations of German words and definitions of political terms such as 'Axis' and 'Third Reich'.

However, despite the frequent use of words with specific historical meanings and connotations, like 'Third Reich' and 'Gestapo-officers' (γκεσταπίτες), and

---

72 This topic will be explored further in a subsequent chapter.

73 'Έξάλλου, ένα μεγάλο μέρος από τις μάχες και τις επιχειρήσεις του πολέμου που γίνονταν από τις παγωμένες στέπες της Ρωσίας ίσαμε την έρημο της Αφρικής, ήταν να βρεθεί το πολύτιμο αυτό υγρό!' Ferousis 1980: 52.

of slogans that have been associated with the Nazi regime, such as '*Heil Hitler*' or '*Deutschland über alles*', the word 'Nazi' is eschewed throughout the book. Moreover, as was the case with Sofia Fildisi's stories discussed earlier, in Ferousis's book no distinctions are made between Germans and German Nazis. The definition of the term 'Third Reich' as the 'German state' (το γερμανικό κράτος) in the book's glossary is also problematic. When the Nazi regime, a totalitarian regime that ruled for a specific period of time, is defined as the 'German state' in such a loose and undifferentiated manner, the young readers' understanding of Nazism is put in an alarmingly wrong perspective.

As mentioned earlier, in Ferousis's book the Germans are depicted in a strongly negative light. Among other things, they are referred to as 'Huns', 'beasts', 'black beasts of Hell', 'devils', 'devils of the North', 'rabid dogs', 'evil demons' and are depicted with bestial features and an equally monstrous behaviour, which is further underlined by the use of verbs like 'barked' and 'roared'. What brings Fildisi's and Ferousis's books together, therefore, is that in both narratives the Germans are dehumanised and represented as the genuine personification of evil.

However, in Ferousis's book this negative image is somewhat undermined in 'Τα παιδιά της πλατείας' (The Children of the Square). The story is about a group of young boys who decide to help a suffering German soldier:

> He looked like a human wreck with his dry, blanched lips and red eyes. His sweat was running down through his helmet, soaking him as he struggled to walk. […] The person who was standing before him was not an enemy, he was a suffering young man! A man who was about to collapse from exhaustion and thirst. […] This game would help a human being quench his thirst! It would give life to a soldier, even though he was an

> enemy. A Hun, like those who had crushed Kyriakos's leg a few days ago.[74]

The figure of the individual German who, once isolated from the feared group of enemies, is approached with sympathy and compassion comes across in a good deal of children's literature with a WWII setting outside of Greece as well.[75] Authors of books for young readers worldwide have employed the figure of the sympathetic German soldier as a means of counteracting the stereotype of the quasi-warmongering German national character. This is a popular strategy that prompts young readers to recognise that 'Germans are humans too', to borrow the words of Mary Cadogan and Patricia Craig.[76]

The scene with the suffering German guard in the passage quoted above is quite effective in putting this message across. Severely dehydrated and exhausted, the German is allowed to show his vulnerable side, getting the young heroes to realise that he is 'human too'. Although 'humanised', the German soldier is not entirely purged of his negative 'Germanness'. Sympathetic or not, he is still perceived as being one of 'them', the cruel, child-killing Huns. Their encounter with an individual German does not alter the heroes' feelings towards the German occupiers in general nor does it affect

---

74 Ήταν ένα αληθινό ράκος με τα στεγνά, πανιασμένα χείλια και τα κόκκινα μάτια. Καθώς περπατούσε αργά, έτοιμος πια να σωριαστεί χάμω, μέσα απ' το κράνος του έτρεχε ο ιδρώτας και τον μούσκευε ολάκερο. […] Μπροστά του δεν είχε έναν εχθρό, μα ένα αμούστακο παλικάρι που υπόφερε! Έναν άνθρωπο που σε λίγο θα σωριαζόταν κάτω από την δίψα και την εξάντληση!.. […] Αυτό το παιχνιδάκι θα ξεδίψαγε μιαν ανθρώπινη ύπαρξη!... Θα έδινε ζωή σ' έναν στρατιώτη, έστω κι αν ήταν εχθρός. Ένας Ούννος από κείνους που έλιωσαν προχθές το ισχνό πόδι του Κυριάκου.' Ibid.: 28-30.

75 Perhaps the most well-known figure of a good German in children's literature from the 1970s is Rudi from Robert Westall's 1975 novel *The Machine Gunners*. For a discussion on the multiple functions of Rudi see Cadogan and Craig 1978: 256-7, O'Sullivan op. cit.: 71-2 and Lathey 1999: 196-207.

76 Cadogan and Craig op. cit.: 256.

their determination to fight against them. In conclusion, the image of the individual German soldier in Ferousis's story is positive enough to get young readers to recognise that 'Germans are humans too', but, at the same time, not so positive as to counteract the overall negative image that prevails in the rest of the stories.

Just a year after the short story collection *Νιότη χωρίς τραγούδια*, Sofia Fildisi published another book for young readers set in the early 1940s. Entitled *Ο μεγάλος μας αδερφός* (Our Older Brother, 1979), the novel centres on the story of an orphaned family struggling to survive in German-occupied Athens.

As in her previous book, Fildisi is not preoccupied with drawing distinctions between Germans and German Nazis, while words like 'Nazis' or 'Nazism' are in any case eschewed throughout the novel. This time, however, things are more serious. *Ο μεγάλος μας αδερφός* is the only one of the books examined here that makes a passing reference to the existence of Nazi concentration camps, a topic that went completely unaddressed in the young people's fiction from the 1970s. However, the reference to the camps is disassociated from its context and the young reader who lacks historical knowledge of the Holocaust could easily gain the impression that the concentration camps were built by Germans for the purpose of imprisoning Greeks who engaged in subversive activities against them.[77]

---

77 '-Έβαλε ο Θεός το χέρι Του, είπε κάποτες μια γριά μάνα, που βγάλανε το γιο της από το λογαριασμό, την ώρα που το τραίνο κίναγε με τους όμηρους. Μα πού να πρωτόβανε το χέρι Του. Και ποιους να πρόφταινε να γλυτώσει! Εκεινούς που ακόμα δεν είχανε πιαστεί και δουλεύανε ενάντια στον εκτρό, ή τους άλλους, που είχανε κλειστεί στα στρατόπεδα εδώ, και μακρύτερα; Πολλοί–από τους πρώτους που πιαστήκανε–ήτανε φερμένοι από την κόλαση των στρατοπέδων του Άουσβιτς και του Νταχάου και του Μουτχάουζεν και του Μπούχελβαλ. Και υποστηρίζανε, πως

Far from the evil monsters that we find in Fildisi's earlier stories, in *Ο μεγάλος μας αδερφός* the Germans are depicted in a neutral light. Although the atrociousness of the German occupation regime is not downplayed, in *Ο μεγάλος μας αδερφός* the enemies are depicted as ordinary people, who had been pushed into a destructive war that was decided single-handedly by their leader (κουμανταδόρος).[78]

In the novel, for example, there is a scene in which a group of German officers invades the house of the family looking to arrest Damianos –the titular hero. While he is being strip-searched, one of the characters gets tickled and bursts into uncontrollable laughter. Seeing him laughing, 'one of them [German soldiers] felt like he was human again and softened. And he turned his face away in shame. It looked as if he was cursing someone. Perhaps he was cursing himself for having ended up like that.'[79] A few pages later, the protagonist is presented with the opportunity to kill a sleeping German soldier. She almost immediately rejects the thought as she realises that '[the soldier] didn't seem any better off. He was also in a terrible state. The truth is that when you are made to fight for something you don't really believe in, you get fed up. And he seemed fed up. The long war and its ugly ending had crushed his pride.'[80]

μήτε άγιος δεν κατάφερε να μπει σ' ένα από κείνα τα νεκροταφεία των ζωντανών και να κάμει το θάμα του.' Fildisi 1979a: 132-3.

78 '-Έτσι που λες, παιδί μου, ξεσηκωθήκανε αρματωμένοι, γιατί έτσι, λέει, κάπνισε του κουμανταδόρου τους.' Ibid.: 154.

79 'Ένας από δαύτους, σα να αιστάνθηκε άνθρωπος, μαλάκωσε. Και γύρισε στο πλάι, κόκκινος από ντροπή. Μάλιστα, σαν κάποιον να έβριζε. Μπορεί και τον εαυτό του για το κατάντημά του.' Ibid.: 60.

80 'Δε μου φάνηκε πιο νικητής από μας. Τα χάλια του είχε και κείνος. Εδώ που τα λέμε, άμα σου λένε σώνει και καλά να πολεμάς χωρίς να το πιστεύεις, βαριεστάς. Και κείνος είχε

The above representations could be evaluated as positive. Humanised and disposed of their negative 'Germanness', the German soldiers are depicted as victims of a disastrous war that had caused them more resentment and humiliation than victories or pride. Although for sure not 'good', in *Ο μεγάλος μας αδερφός* the Germans are not the biblical monsters that we find in Fildisi's earlier short story collection. What the two books have in common, however, is that in both the blame for the war is attributed to Hitler and Hitler alone, thus perpetuating the stereotypical image of the *Führer* as a madman who had dragged an entire nation into a disgraceful war for some inexplicable reason.

Finally, Dimitris Ravanis-Rentis's *Και η θάλασσα ήταν τόσο κοντά* (And the Sea was so Close, 1978), Pipina Tsimikali's *Ιστορίες της Κατοχής* (Stories from the Occupation, 1979), Kalliopi Sfaelou's *Μικροί αγωνιστές* (Little Fighters, 1979) and Christos Skandalis's *Ο βοριάς και τα λουλούδια* (The Northern Wind and the Flowers, 1979) are books in which Germans are depicted in a neutral light. [81]

In Pipina Tsimikali's stories, for example, the enemy appears as a faceless group of soldiers. Placing particular emphasis on their physical characteristics, such as their cold blue eyes, polished boots and heavy weaponry, their representation adheres to popular cultural images of what was deemed to be a typical Nazi villain. In their main outlines, the Germans are presented as harsh, disciplined, efficient, aggressive and cruel –yet not evil

---

βαριεστήσει. Το μάκρος του πολέμου και το άσχημο τέλος του, του είχε τσακίσει την περηφάνια.' Ibid.: 144.

81 The stories in all four books are set during the Occupation and centre on the sufferings of the Greek people as well as on the contribution of children to the Resistance.

by virtue of their 'Germanness'. Eschewing all words associated with evil like 'devils' or 'demons', Tsimikali's book refers to the occupiers as 'enemies', 'conquerors' or simply 'Germans'. However, the author does not distinguish between Germans, as a national group, and German Nazis, as a group of perpetrators who had been indoctrinated with the ideals of Nazism. In other words, the enemies here are once again the Germans in general rather than German Nazis in particular.

The same can be said for Kalliopi Sfaelou's and Christos Skandalis's short story collections in which no evil monsters are found either. In their stories, the Germans are depicted in a neutral light and referred to as 'soldiers', 'occupiers', 'occupation troops', 'foreigners' and 'foes'. What makes these two books stand out from all of the other narratives examined here is that both authors make use of the word 'Nazis', while in one of Skandalis's stories we also find the term 'Third Reich'. However, neither of the two authors bothers to draw distinctions between Germans and German Nazis, while in both books the term 'Nazis' is used as an alternative for 'Germans'. The undifferentiated use of and casual switching between 'Germans' and 'Nazis' results in these two words being perceived as synonyms. In other words, the Nazis are 'Germanised' and the Germans are 'Nazified', with whatever implications this might have for the young readers' understanding of Nazism.

Dimitris Ravanis-Rentis's *Και η θάλασσα ήταν τόσο κουτά*, on the other hand, is a narrative that resists the inflexible equation Germans = Nazis. In the stories of *Και η θάλασσα ήταν τόσο κουτά* Ravanis-Rentis makes limited use of the otherwise all too frequently employed word 'Germans', opting instead for

the terms 'Fascists' and 'Hitler-supporters' (χιτλερικοί). This makes his book one of the few that refrain from conflating 'Germanness' with 'Nazism'. Dividing Germans and Nazis into two separate groups, the author also resists portraying the war as a conflict between nations –that is to say, between peace-loving Greeks and warmongering Germans. In other words, the enemy here is not the German people but international Fascism in the guise of the German-in-uniform, a theme that was further explored by authors of books for young readers over the following decades.

In this chapter I have outlined the main trends in the representation of the German occupiers in the young people's fiction from the late 1970s. Depicted as biblical monsters or the faceless hordes of Hitler's armies, the representation of Germans in the books examined in this chapter draws on a set of recognisable images that have become embedded in the collective cultural imagination about Nazis.

Generally, the authors of this period did not bother to distinguish between Germans and German Nazis or to help their young readers contextualise the atrociousness of the German occupation regime in Greece as part of a larger picture, something that would require a more elaborate treatment of Nazism as both an ideological doctrine and an epoch-making historical phenomenon. Because they eschew all discussion of Nazism, the war is disassociated from its wider context and presented as a sort of natural catastrophe that just had to be endured. The primary culprit in this catastrophe is either Hitler or some clique of insane decision-makers who had mobilised an entire nation and pushed it into a war for reasons that remain largely unaddressed. And while

there were a few authors who went a long way towards offering positive images of Germans, it would still take several years before Greek authors would begin to allow their German characters a greater level of humanity.

'IO SOLDATO, MA NON FASCISTA': THE ITALIANS

On October 28, 1940, after the dictator Ioannis Metaxas rejected Benito Mussolini's ultimatum demanding free passage for his Italian armies into Greece, Fascist Italy declared war on Greece. The Greco-Italian War lasted six months and ended with the Nazi invasion of Greece in April 1941. Greece was subsequently divided into three zones of occupation with the Italian forces controlling almost two-thirds of the country. Following the signing of the Italian armistice with the Allies in September 1943, the hitherto Italian-occupied territories were taken over by the Germans. And although the Italian crimes in Greece were barely less savage than those of the German Nazis, the impression that the Italian occupation had been moderate and for the most part bloodless in character has grown deep roots in the Greek collective memory of the Occupation.[82] The reasons for this selective oblivion will be discussed as I go on to explore the representation of the Italian enemies in the young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981.

Even a quick look at the corpus of books under examination here reveals that the Italians are underrepresented as the number of stories in which they appear, either as a group or as individual characters, is noticeably smaller than the number of texts that feature their German allies. Either as soldiers fighting in the Greco-Italian War or as occupiers, the Italians are portrayed in an extremely stereotypical manner: they are cowardly, undisciplined and inefficient, frivolous and particularly vulnerable to the battle-cry '*aera*' (αέρα),

82 On Italian war crimes in Greece see Santarelli 2004: 280-99. Also, Rodogno 2006.

which is itself enough to overwhelm them with panic and get them to surrender unconditionally:[83]

> Despite his aching leg, he stood up, got ready for the battle and began to shout; *Aera*! *Aera*! And he started to shoot at random. One by one the rest of the Italians, those who didn't have the courage to run away, started to come out of the dugouts throwing away their weapons and lifting their hands in surrender.[84]

The shout '*aera*' was also effective in demoralising the Italians off the battlefields. Christos Skandalis's story 'Ο παπαγάλος και το ιταλικό φιλότιμο' (The Parrot and Italian Pride, 1979) is about two young boys who teach a parrot the word '*aera*' and then sell it to an Italian officer. The poor Italian goes mad when the bird starts to shout '*aera*', much to the children's amusement. It is worth noting here that the children's sole motivation for this risky deed was their desire 'to poke fun at the Italians.'[85]

The contrast with the Germans is striking. While the latter appear as cruel and ruthless perpetrators, the Italians are presented as harmless, so much so that even young children are not afraid to mess with them. Lidia Santarelli's observation that 'the Italians seem definitely less credible in the guise of

---

83 The battle-cry '*aera*' has been identified more than any other with the Greco-Italian War, encapsulating the spirit of the so-called Greek epopee of 1940-1941. Over the course of time, it continued to inspire a good many songs, films and jokes and it continues to be used to the present day to ridicule the incompetence of the Italian soldiers in the Greco-Italian War.

84 'Μ' όλο τον πόνο του ποδιού του, σηκώθηκε, πήρε θέση μάχης κι άρχισε να φωνάζει: Αέρα! Αέρα! Και να πυροβολεί δεξιά, ζερβά, κουτουρού. Ένας ένα έβγαιναν απ' τ' αμπριά και άλλοι Ιταλοί, όσοι δεν είχαν το θάρρος να το σκάσουν. Πετούσανε τα όπλα και σήκωναν τα χέρια επάνω.' Kanava 1981: 49-50.

85 'Ξαφνικά πετάγεται ορθός ο Περικλής.
-Φώτη, μου 'ρθε μια ιδέα!
-Τι ιδέα, Περικλή!
-Γιατί να λέει «καλημέρα» ο παπαγάλος και να μην λέει «Αέρα».
-Καλά λες, Περικλή, «Αέρα» να κοροϊδεύει κι αυτός τους ιταλούς (sic.).
-Λοιπόν, Φώτη, το μαθαίνουμε να λέει «Αέρα»; Όχι για τίποτα άλλο, για να σπάσουμε πλάκα με τους ιταλούς.' Skandalis 1979: 58.

conquerors and even less credible as an army of butchers and torturers' is aptly illustrated here.[86] As a matter of fact, there is only one text among those examined here which shows an Italian soldier engaging in violence,[87] while in all the other stories it is always the Germans who carry out all the dirty work. And although our authors did not shy away from talking to their young readers about the crimes of the German Nazis in occupied Greece, none of the books examined here make the slightest reference to any of the savagery perpetrated by the Italian forces against the Greek civilian population.

As Gillian Lathey has argued, telling the story of the past to the next generation has always encompassed a range of purposes.[88] In Greek young people's fiction about WWII both moral purpose and didacticism are high on the agenda and the authors' concern to ensure that the mantle of remembrance is passed on to the younger generation is often reflected in the books' prefaces, authorial notes and afterwords.[89] Their texts, therefore, serve as 'remembrance' agents by transmitting memories to a generation that has no first-hand experience of the events that are now part of history. The numerous crimes and atrocities of the Italian occupying forces in Greece are

---

86 Santarelli op.cit.: 282.
87 See Sofia Fildisi's story 'Το πλατάνι του Φώτη' from her book *Νιότη χωρίς τραγούδια.* Fildisi 1978: 218-23.
88 Lathey 1999: 45.
89 See, for instance 'Γιατί η «Νιότη χωρίς τραγούδια» μπορεί να μας συγκλονίσει με το να μας συμπαρασύρει να ζήσουμε, όσοι τις είχαμε ζήσει, ή να ζήσουνε με την φαντασία, όσοι δεν υπήρχαν ακόμη την εποχή εκείνη, ώρες δύσκολες και κρίσιμες για το γένος' in Fildisi op. cit.: 7. 'Αν εμείς πεινάσαμε, πονέσαμε, βασανιστήκαμε, δεν είναι ανάγκη να το πούμε κλαψουρίζοντας στα παιδιά ή τα εγγόνια μας ζητώντας τον οίκτο τους και μαυρίζοντας τις τρυφερές καρδιές τους. Εκείνοι ας μάθουν – κι είναι αυτή η βασική αλήθεια – πώς κι αλυσοδεμένοι κρατήσαμε το κεφάλι ψηλά' in Sfaellou 1979: 9. 'Το βιβλίο «Ο Θανάσης και το καρότσι του», είναι μόνο μια σκιαγράφηση αυτού του Χρονικού της Κατοχής! Με τρόπο ανάγλυφο όμως προσπαθεί να παρουσιάσει τους ηρωισμούς και τις αμέτρητες πράξεις αντίστασης των μικρών παιδιών, που τα ανάδειξαν, σε πολλές περιπτώσεις, άξια της πατρίδας!' in Ferousis 1980: 8.

part of this historical past; yet they are not part of the historical memory that is being passed on to younger generations through the medium of literature. The question that arises here, therefore, is what makes this memory so selective in what it chooses to preserve and what it allows to sink into oblivion?

Dimitris Ferousis's 'Ο Θανάσης και το καρότσι του' (Thanasis and his Wheelbarrow, 1980) is a story about two young boys who shelter an Italian soldier from the German reprisals that followed Italy's capitulation to the Allies. Seeing their former enemies now falling 'prey to the German savagery' and 'suffering under the same [German] lash', 'the hearts of the Greeks opened wide to those poor Italian captives' and 'Benito Mussolini and his Divisions in the mountains of Epirus were forgotten.'[90] All past misdeeds are forgiven and forgotten before the heartbreaking image of 'entire phalanxes of young men with their faces roughened from the hardships of the battle' being captured and taken to 'squares, ports, railway stations and from there to death' by the German 'demons' who 'had plunged all of mankind into bloodshed.'[91]

---

90 'Μπροστά τους έβλεπαν το χθεσινό εχθρό τους, τους Ιταλούς, να υποφέρουν κάτω από το ίδιο μαστίγιο κι αυθόρμητα η καρδιά τους γέμισε με οίκτο... Κι έτσι άδολα και πηγαία, μέσα απ' το είναι των απλών ανθρώπων του μόχθου και της δυστυχίας, ξεπήδησε η επιθυμία της συμπαράστασης. Για μια στιγμή ξεχάστηκε ο Μπενίτο Μουσολίνι με τις Μεραρχίες του στα Ηπειρωτικά βουνά. Μπροστά στην ανάγκη αυτών, των δύστυχων Ιταλών αιχμαλώτων, άνοιξε διάπλατα η καρδιά των Ελλήνων!' Ferousis op. cit.: 59-60.

91 'Φάλαγγες ολόκληρες από αμούστακα παιδιά, αγριεμένα πρόσωπα από τη σκληρότητα της μάχης, βάδιζαν σε ατέλειωτες χιλιάδες τον άγνωστο δρόμο της αιχμαλωσίας! Άοπλοι, πεινασμένοι, εξαντλημένοι από πορείες και αγριότητας, οδηγούνταν στα λιμάνια, στους σιδηροδρομικούς σταθμούς, στις πλατείες κι από κει στο θάνατο!... Οι χτεσινοί κατακτητές ήτανε σήμερα κοπάδια απόγνωσης και σφαγής! [...]
-Θεέ μου τα καημένα τα παιδιά! Τι κάνει στ' αλήθεια ο πόλεμος!..
-Τους άτιμους, τους φονιάδες, πόσο κόσμο σφάζουνε και τυραγνούνε καθημερινά σ' όλη τη γης!
-Ανάθεμά τους... ανάθεμά τους τους σατανάδες! Κύλησαν την ανθρωπότη στο αίμα!' Ibid.: 59 and 61.

One of these young men, Alberto, manages to escape deportation by hiding himself inside Thanasis's wheelbarrow. When the young hero discovers him, Alberto begs for his life: '*Prego, prego… Io soldato, ma non fascista. Sarvatemi, Sarvatemi.*'[92] Thanasis and his friend, Vangelis, decide to hide Alberto in an abandoned cemetery and visit him every night with food and clothes for this 'old enemy, who had now become a captive friend.'[93] Determined to save the poor Italian from the clutches of the Germans, the boys help Alberto flee to the Middle East.

After they part ways, Vangelis reveals to Thanasis that he has had second thoughts about their Italian friend. The boys, however, immediately reject the idea that Alberto could have possibly been one of 'them':

> -I had never seen an Italian soldier so close up before! I always kept a safe distance whenever I came across one of them. With the Germans, it was different.
>
> -So, he was an Italian soldier. So what?
>
> -My mother used to say that these Italians are cruel. They are murderers!…
>
> -Cruel?…
>
> -Yes, cruel and devious!
>
> -What does your mother know? She has never set foot outside of her neighborhood!
>
> -She told me that the Italians killed my father on the Albanian Front. And my father had never hurt anyone. I remember him leaving for the front.…
>
> -!…

92 Ibid.: 63.
93 '[…] προσπαθούσαν να γλυτώσουν οπωσδήποτε ένα παλιό εχθρό, που τώρα ήτανε ένας αιχμάλωτος φίλος!' Ibid.: 71.

-Why are you silent?

-I'm thinking that all these things might be true! But Alberto could not have been one of them! I really believe it!

-Yes! That's what I also believe! Alberto could not have been one of them. Imagine if he were, imagine if he's now wearing my dead father's clothes!...

-That's not possible...! I'm telling you, it's not possible! said Thanasis.

-Yes! That's crazy! There was so much kindness in Alberto![94]

Alberto here represents the type of Italian soldier that came to dominate Europe's collective imagination concerning Italy's involvement in WWII: he is a soldier of *Il Duce*'s army yet not a Fascist; a peace-loving man who was forced to participate in Mussolini's war of aggression against his will, a victim of

---

94 '-Βαγγέλη...
-Τι έγινε πάλι;
-Τίποτα... τίποτα...
-Τι έπαθες μωρέ; Σε χτύπησε το κρύο; Λέγε.
-Να σου το πω;
-Άντε πνίξου! Θα μου βγάλεις το λάδι!...
-Να μωρέ... Μου φάνηκε πως τη στιγμή που ο Αλμπέρτο μας αγκάλιασε κλαίγοντας εσύ λιγάκι δείλιασες...
-!...
-Δε μιλάς;
-Ναι... έχεις δίκιο! Φοβήθηκα!
-Γιατί μωρέ; Τι σου 'κανε ο άνθρωπος;
-Δεν είχα ξαναδεί τόσο κοντά και καθαρά Ιταλό στρατιώτη! Πάντοτε από μακριά πήγαινα όταν τους συναντούσα! Ενώ με τους Γερμανούς δεν ήταν το ίδιο!
-Ε.... και λοιπόν; Τι έγινε επειδή ήταν Ιταλός στρατιώτης;
-Μου έλεγε συχνά η μάνα μου πως αυτοί οι Ιταλοί ήτανε άγριοι. Φονιάδες!...
-Άγριοι;...
-Ναι, άγριοι και ύπουλοι!
-Και πού τους ήξερε μωρέ η μάνα σου; Εκείνη δεν κάνει ρούπι απ' τη γειτονιά της!
-Οι Ιταλοί, μου είπε, σκότωσαν τον πατέρα σου [sic] στην Αλβανία. Κι ο πατέρας μου δεν είχε κάνει τίποτα! Τον θυμάμαι που έφευγε φαντάρος...
-!...
-Δε μιλάς Νάσο;
-Σκέφτουμαι πως όλα αυτά μπορεί να είναι αληθινά! Όμως ο Αλμπέρτο δεν θα 'ταν απ' αυτούς! Το πιστεύω!
-Ναι! Και 'γω έτσι λέω τώρα! Ο Αλμπέρτο δε θα 'ταν απ' αυτούς. Για σκέψου να ήτανε και να φοράει τώρα τα ρούχα του πατέρα μου!...
-Αυτό αποκλείεται!... Αποκλείεται σου λέω! έκανε ξεκομμένα ο Θανάσης.
-Ναι! Αποκλείεται! Είχε τόση καλοσύνη πάνω του ο Αλμπέρτος!...' Ibid.: 83-4.

circumstances rather than a perpetrator. He is a friend who must be saved from the clutches of the Germans, a warm-hearted Mediterranean who has nothing in common with Italy's cold Teutonic allies, a nice person who cannot even be thought of as capable of doing anything evil. In other words, Alberto is a genuine *Italiano bravo*.

The *Italiani brava gente* myth, the notion that the Italians possess an inherent sense of goodness that prevents them from perpetrating inhumane acts, has a long history rooted in the country's colonial past.[95] Following the end of WWII, the exploitation of the *brava gente* myth along with the establishment of the reassuring narrative of a quasi-universal *Resistenza* became the main source of legitimation for Italy and continued to shape the politics of historical memory for nearly half a century.[96] Meanwhile, the disquieting memories of the country's participation in the dirty Axis alliance were swept under the carpet of 'national omertà.'[97] The *brava gente* myth crossed national frontiers and became embedded in the collective imaginary of the post-war Western world, providing a narrative paradigm for cultural representations of the Italian war experience, especially in cinema: from Roberto Rossellini's *Roma città aperta* (1945) and Giuseppe De Santis's *Italiani, brava gente* (1964) to Gabriele Salvatores's *Mediterraneo* (1991) to Roberto Benigni's *La Vita e Bella* (1999) and John Madden's *Captain Corelli's Mandolin* (2001), the cinematic representation of Italy's involvement in WWII

95 See Locatelli 2016: 133-51.
96 On Italy's post-war politics of memory regarding its involvement in WWII see Fogu 2006: 147-76, Foot 2009 and Forlenza 2012: 73-116.
97 Fleischer 2008: 247.

has contributed hugely to the consolidation of the image of Italians as a *brava gente*.[98]

Italy's Ovidian metamorphosis from a perpetrator nation into a nation-victim was further reinforced by the fierce German reprisals that followed the country's capitulation to the Allies and, most importantly, by the lack of a so-called Italian Nuremberg. In the words of Lidia Santarelli, 'the reversal of roles– from an army of occupation to victims of military violence–was retrospectively extended to the entire 1940-43 experience, thereby imposing a theatrical reinterpretation of Italian actions in the occupied territories until the summer of 1943.'[99]

With the Italians having successfully convinced themselves and the world that they were the innocent victims of Fascism, of Mussolini and of the *cattivi* Germans, this version also took root in the cultural memory even of peoples who had suffered hard under Italian occupation. Greece was no exception and the notion that the Italian occupation never actually took the violent character that was inherent in the German Nazi regime is still prevalent in popular perceptions and cultural recollections of the Occupation.[100] In that respect, the representation of the Italians as a group of decent and essentially harmless foes, who would much rather go back to their homes than keep on fighting a war they could not quite understand, is not a novelty of Greek fiction for young

98 On the establishment of the *brava gente* myth as part of an international cinematic mythology see Giovacchini 2007: 55-69.
99 Santarelli op. cit.: 285.
100 For a classic study on the bad German/good Italian post-war dichotomy see Focardi 1996: 55-83.

readers. If anything, it is a direct reflection of the cultural narratives and mythologies that shaped the post-war politics of remembrance both in Greece and abroad.

'UNE POIGNÉE DE MISÉRABLES ET D' INDIGNES': COLLABORATION

In previous chapters I have examined the representation of Greece's wartime enemies in young people's fiction from the 1970s. This chapter sets out to explore the depiction of a different and far more upsetting type of enemy, that is to say the enemy within the walls. The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to discuss the representation of wartime collaboration in the young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981.

As historian Hagen Fleischer has noted in his seminal work about the Greek 1940s, more than four decades after the end of WWII the question of collaborationism was still an open wound for Greece.[101] Greece was, of course, not the only country that entered the post-war period still bearing the wounds of collaboration, nor was it the only country in which these wounds continued to remain unacknowledged, even long after the war had finished.

The end of WWII found Europe both victorious and divided, as divided were memories of the wartime experience in countries with a troubling record of collaboration with the Axis powers. The successful reconstruction of Western Europe's post-war democratic societies was made possible thanks to a series of self-serving narratives that emerged all across the continent, in some cases well before the war was over. From the Italian *Secondo Risorgimento* to Austria's self-portrayal as Hitler's first victim and from the deGaullian *Résistance* to the dubious Swiss neutrality, the post-war national identities of Western Europe were founded on a number of self-justifying myths that

101 Fleischer 1988: 352.

purged even the darkest memories of the war. As Richard Ned Lebow argues, European elites adopted three main strategies in order to restore national cohesion in the aftermath of WWII. The most widespread of these strategies is what Lebow calls 'quarantine', i.e. 'the marking off of the war, the fascist period, the era of collaboration, or whatever events were troubling as special epochs characterized as extraordinary, as diverging from the "normal" trajectory of the nation.'[102] A second strategy involved the 'denial of any national responsibility for the Holocaust',[103] while a common third mechanism was to 'downplay collaboration and emphasize resistance, portraying the latter, when possible, as a national effort.'[104]

This sanitised view of the past, however, was not to remain unchallenged for long. In the wake of the Eichmann trial, with the first post-war generation coming of age in the progressive *milieu* of the 1960s and asking difficult questions regarding the role the previous generation in the war, Western Europe embarked on a course of painful retrospection and demystification of the previous self-excusing mythologies.[105] Starting in the mid-1960s in West Germany, this revival of memory was primarily focused on the Holocaust.[106] Around this, however, there also rotated the question of Europe's collaboration with the instigators of the Final Solution. A few years later, Robert Paxton's groundbreaking study on Vichy France gave new impetus to Western Europe's

---

102 Lebow 2006: 31.
103 Ibid.
104 Ibid.: 32.
105 For a discussion on the relationship between shifting generations and shifting politics of remembrance regarding the experience of WWII see Fogu and Kansteiner 2006: 284-310.
106 Judt 2000: viii.

confrontation with its sinful wartime past, a process which culminated after the momentous events of 1989.[107] Meanwhile, the situation in Greece was quite different.

As Mark Mazower has noted, official Greek policy towards former collaborators turned out to be 'milder and more hesitant than perhaps anywhere else in Europe.'[108] This 'hesitation' must be attributed to the explosive climate of the immediate post-liberation period. Leaving a power vacuum that was hard to fill, the withdrawal of the foreign occupation forces from Greece was followed by the bloody thirty-three-day battle of Athens (the so-called *Dekemvriana*) between the EAM/ELAS camp and the conservative, British-backed Greek government. The struggle for power soon escalated into a catastrophic civil war during which almost 12.000 former collaborators were armed against the guerrillas.[109] The end of the Civil War found the surviving members of the leftist camp exiled, persecuted and condemned to a life of political and social isolation, while former collaborators enjoyed full reintegration into the national-minded and anti-communist regime of the victorious Right.[110] As Eleni Haida observes, the Civil War managed to marginalise the issue of collaboration in Greece and, eventually, to silence it.[111]

---

107 Robert Paxton's study *France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1944* was first published in English in 1972. The following year the book was translated into French.
108 Mazower 2000: 213.
109 Gerolymatos 1985: 25.
110 According to Marc Mazower, in the late 1940s the ratio of those convicted for collaborating with the occupation authorities to those imprisoned for taking part in the Resistance was one to ten. Mazower op. cit.: 215.
111 Haida 2000: 55.

And while the rest of Western Europe was starting to confront its wartime ghosts, Greece was pushing its skeletons deeper into the closet. Following the collapse of the Junta and the return to democratic rule in 1974, the Karamanlis government imposed an official policy of oblivion, thrusting all disquieting memories of the 1940s under a thick veil of silence in the name of national reconciliation. As has been pointed out in the introductory chapter, this approach was also followed in the official state-sponsored schoolbooks of the early *metapolitefsi*, which remained completely silent on the subject of collaboration. This, however, was not the case with young people's fiction of this period.

Before moving on to the main part of this chapter, there is an important question that needs to be addressed: what defines a collaborator as such? Should this term be used without discrimination to describe those who acted as *Gestapo* informers as well as for black-market traders, who profited from the suffering of their compatriots without, however, engaging in active collaboration with the occupying forces? To answer this question one would have to enter into a lengthy discussion about the juridical, political and ethical connotations of the terms 'collaborator' and 'collaboration', a discussion which falls outside the scope of this study. For this reason, along with the word 'collaborator', I shall also employ the Dutch word *fout*, a blanket term which was used extensively in the Netherlands during and after WWII to describe

> traitors, a group which comprised collaborators, those Dutch citizens who had love relationships with Germans (particularly members of the occupation force), those who did business with the occupation government (whether willingly or under duress), those who joined the occupation force by serving in the government or various branches of the military, such as the

> Dutch division of the Waffen-SS, those who betrayed hidden Jews or members of the Resistance and so on.[112]

Traitors and *Gestapo* informers, interpreters who worked for the occupiers, black-market traders and women of loose morals who developed suspicious relationships with the enemy; these are the main types of *fout* that appear in the books of this period. Starting with the first two groups, a comparative reading of the texts under examination reveals that the portrayal of the *fout* conforms to a set of stereotypes and popular clichés that constructed a recognisable image of the collaborator type in Greek cultural representations of WWII.[113] The *fout* here is always a male, female characters engage in different forms of collaboration as I will show later, and is depicted either as a devilish figure or a weakling, who lacks any real personality, moral integrity, or bravery.[114]

---

112 Vanderwal Taylor 1997: 125. For the Dutch distinction between wartime *goed* and *fout* see also De Haan 2010: 71-90.

113 Actors Spyros Kalogirou and Artemis Matsas, for example, have made names for themselves playing the role of the sadistic collaborator or the *mavragoritis* in Greek popular films about WWII. Artemis Matsas in particular has been so strongly identified with his cinematic persona that his name has become a synonym for treachery.

114 For example, '-Συλλαμβάνεστε, είπε ο Γερμανός στη γλώσσα του, κι ο διερμηνέας -τι σκουλήκι κι εκείνο!- το είπε στα Ελληνικά, και πρόστεσε [...] Ο διερμηνέας πάλι εξήγησε. Τι χάρισμα που 'χε! Δεν έφτανε που ήξερε τη γλώσσα του καταχτητή, είχε πάρει και τη σκληράδα του.' Fildisi 1978: 32-3.

'Έπλενε, και καταριότανε την ώρα που μπήκε ο προδότης. Τον άκουσε να μιλάει στο διάδρομο, κι είχε η φωνή του μια φτήνια, την ώρα που πούλαγε στον καταχτητή ονόματα ακριβών ανθρώπων, που η τιμή τους κι ο αγώνας τους έφτανε να 'ναι όμοια με της Πατρίδας την τιμή. Ο Γερμανός κάτι ρώταγε, κι ο άλλος του 'ξηγούσε. -Παρτιτζάνοι, παρτιτζάνοι... Είχ' η φωνή του μια τρεμούλα, γιατί η καρδιά του έτρεμε. Γιατί δεν ήτανε καρδιά αντρίκια. Αν ήτανε, θα τον πρόσταζε να πολεμάει, κι όχι να παραδίνει και να παραδίνεται για ένα κομμάτι ψωμί.' Ibid.: 84.

'Οι Γερμανοί δεν εκάμανε μήτ' ένα βήμα μπροστά. Μοναχά ένας κοντακιανός άντρας ετρούπωσε κάτου από τις αμασκάλες τους. Έκαμε δυο δρασκελιές, και στάθηκε φάτσα στον παπα-Γιάννη.

–Τι τρέχει, ρε Λάμπη; ρώτησε κείνος.

–Τι να τρέχει, παπά μου... Ετούτοι δω –είπε κι έστριψε κατά τους Γερμανούς– ετούτοι κάτι τις γυρεύουνε.

Αγρίεψε ο παπάς. Πού ήτανε κείνη η ησυχία των ματιών του; Και σένα, ρε Λάμπη, τι σε κόφτει τι χάσανε και τι γυρεύουνε τούτοι οι άθεοι; Όσο έλεγε τις κουβέντες του, τον είχε πιάσει από τους χαμηλούς του ώμους και τονε ταρακούναε. Εκείνος εσάστισε.

The portrayal of the *fout*'s physical appearance is also stereotyped. To give just one example, in Christos Skandalis's short story 'Ο Εφιάλτης' (Ephialtes) the titular character is an evil traitor who works for the *Gestapo*.

> Ephialtes was a thirty-year-old man, short and fat, with an ugly face, red hair and a pencil moustache. What everyone noticed about him was his eyes. Eyes small and cunning that were barely visible under his thick, red eyebrows. Sometimes calm, sometimes bitter, his eyes often lit up like the eyes of a tiger before its prey. […] Ephialtes was a nickname. His real name was Nikos. But no one dared call him by his nickname to his face. […] He was an only child. His parents couldn't get him to get married. His father sent him to Germany to study for eight whole years. He was constantly sending him money. He never got his diploma.[115]

In line with his nicknames 'Ephialtes' and 'Judas', Nikos is given a devilish appearance to match his evil personality. Attributing unattractive characteristics to the *fout* and portraying them as social parasites, thugs or pathetic weaklings is a common strategy among the authors of this period. This corresponds to the texts' positive patriotism and is intended to render

---

–Παπά μου, γυρεύουνε το Χρήστο, κι άμα δεν τονε βρούνε… θα… θα πάρουνε τη… Κι έδειξε με το δάχτυλό του την Ξενιώ, που τώρα φαινότανε αγέρωχη, ατάραχη κι αποφασισμένη για όλα.
–Σε λυπάμαι, ρε Λάμπη, ειπ' ο παπάς, και τον έσπρωξε με σιχασιά στην άκρια.
–Για μια μπουκιά ψωμί, μωρέ, ξεπουλάς ό,τι να 'ναι;…
[…] Εκείνος πια ο Λάμπης ήτανε για λύπηση, έτσι μαζωμένος σε μιαν άκρη… Ντροπιασμένος, μικρός πιότερο κι από τη φκιάξη του…
-Ε, Λάμπη, του φώναξε ο παπα-Γιάννης. Η εντέκατη εντολή είναι, «ου προδώσεις τον τόπο σου»… Κακομοίρη μου…' Ibid.: 175-7.
'Πλησίασε προς το πλήθος. Κολλητά στα πόδια του ο διερμηνέας σαν το σκυλάκι στον αφέντη του. Είχε το πρόσωπο στραμμένο πάντα ψηλά να βλέπει κατάματα τον ψηλόσωμο γερμανό και τα χείλη έτοιμα να μεταφράσουν και τον παραμικρό ψίθυρο του αφέντη του.' Skandalis 1979: 13.

115 'Ο Εφιάλτης ήταν ένα τριαντάχρονος άντρας, κοντόχοντρος, ασχημομούρης, κοκκινοτρίχης με μουστάκι λεπτό. Εκείνο που πρόσεχε άνθρωπος αντικρύζοντάς τον ήταν τα μάτια του. Κάτι μάτια μικρά και πονηρά, που μόλις φαίνονταν κάτω από τα ξανθοκόκκινα φρύδια του. Μάτια που άλλοτε φαίνονταν ήρεμα, κακορίζικα και άλλοτε άναβαν σαν της τίγρης που βρίσκεται μπροστά στη λεία της. […] Το «Εφιάλτης» ήταν παρωνύμι. Το πραγματικό του ήταν Νίκος. Με το παρωνύμι δεν τον φώναζε κανένας μπροστά του –ποιος τολμούσε! […] Τον είχαν μοναχοπαίδι. Δεν μπόρεσαν να τον κάνουν να παντρευτεί. Οχτώ ολόκληρα χρόνια τον είχε ο πατέρας του στη Γερμανία για σπουδές. Του έστελνε αδιάκοπα χρήματα. (Κρατιόταν καλά. Διατηρούσε εμπορικό στην αγορά.) Δεν μπόρεσε ποτέ να πάρει το δίπλωμα.' Ibid.: 102-3.

them as hideous as possible to prevent readers' identification with the wrongdoers. At the same time, it paints a reassuring image of wartime treachery as a rare and exceptional phenomenon that did not extend beyond a handful of worthless individuals, *une poignée de misérables et d'indignes* to borrow de Gaulle's famous words.[116]

Also stereotyped is the representation of the next group of *fout*, the so-called *mavragorites*. The prevailing image of the black-market trader in the books under examination is that of an amoral and heartless opportunist who takes advantage of the harsh conditions imposed by the foreign occupation in order to profiteer at the expense of his starving compatriots. The following passages speak for themselves:

> In those dark years of enslavement everything had lost its value. […] Entire households were exchanged for a piece of bread or a pot of oil. Some people had oil and bread and other goods. God knows where they found them. They gave you a bite of bread, barely enough to keep you alive. And in exchange you had to give them everything you owned. […] They waited until you were desperate and then they would pounce on you like vultures.[117]

> Mrs. Kalliopi, the Black Octopus, lives next door. […] Their house is full of goods. […] She is a horrible woman, hideous on the outside and on the inside. She has gathered the possessions of the entire neighbourhood in her house. Every time father becomes desperate, he gives her some of our stuff. Our silver cutlery, a silver jar, a fine woolen blanket, a silver cigarette case that he brought with him from Odessa. In exchange Mrs. Kalliopi gives him a loaf of bread or a few German tins of meat

116 The deGaullian narrative of a collective French *Résistance* was accompanied by the equally fictious narrative that wartime collaboration remained restricted to a small group of abject and worthless individuals. This version also served as a model for the diverse national narratives on WWII throughout the whole of Western Europe.

117 'Όμως εκείνα τα μαύρα χρόνια της σκλαβιάς, όλα είχανε χάσει την αξία τους. […] Για ένα κομμάτι ψωμί, για ένα κατσαρόλι λάδι, δοθήκανε ολάκερα σπιτικά. Κάποιοι, είχανε και λάδι, και ψωμί, κι άλλα φαγώσιμα. Ο Θεός κι η ψυχή τους πού τα βρίσκανε. Σου δίνανε μια μπουκιά, ίσα-ίσα που 'φτανε να ζήσεις εκείνη την ώρα. Κι εσύ, τους έδινες ό,τι κι αν είχες. […] Εκείνοι την ανάγκη σου περιμένανε για να ορμίσουνε πάνω σου σαν και τα όρνια στο ψοφίμι.' Fildisi op. cit.: 67-8.

> or a bottle of oil. Once she got a piano for two pots of oil. […] We call her the Black Octopus because she spreads her tentacles to seize the property of the people.[118]

This predator-like image of the *mavragoritis* contrasts with the depiction of the character of Marinos from Zoi Kanava's novel *Το στοίχημα* (The Bet, 1981). Kanava's novel is the only one of the books discussed here in which the *mavragoritis* is not depicted as yet another evil, well-fed opportunist seeking to profit from the suffering of his compatriots. In an interesting twist on the theme, the *mavragoritis* here is the protagonist, an upright young man with unquestionable patriotic credentials, who fought heroically in the Greco-Italian War and later joins the struggle of the Greek Armed Forces in the Middle East. Coming back from the Albanian Front to famine-stricken Athens, Marinos takes the decision to become a *mavragoritis* in a hopeless attempt to save himself and his mother from starving to death.

> -Things will change! Marinos repeated the words of his mother. How? Nothing changes on its own. How are we supposed to stay decent without becoming liars, thieves, deceivers? The other day I stole a loaf of bread and, just a little later, someone stole it from me. I gave all my money to buy a small jar of jam and it tasted like vomit. […] What were they going to do now? How would they survive? Everyone had an opinion. No one had any actual proposal. They [Marinos and his friends] decided to become black-marketeers. *Mavragorite*s. Just like so many others.[119]

---

118 'Η κυρα-Καλλιόπη, το Μαύρο Χταπόδι, μένει στο πλαϊνό σπίτι. […] Στο σπίτι τους έχουνε και του πουλιού το γάλα. […] Είναι μια γυναίκα φρίκη. Απέξω πανούκλα κι από μέσα πανούκλα. Έχει μαζέψει στο σπίτι της όλα τα πράματα της γειτονιάς. Όταν απελπίζεται ο πατέρας όλο και κάτι της πηγαίνει. Πότε ασημένια μαχαιροπίρουνα, πότε ένα ασημένιο βάζο, μια καλή μάλλινη κουβέρτα, μιαν ασημένια τσιγαροθήκη που είχε φέρει από την Οδησσό. Μ' αυτά η κυρά-Καλλιόπη του δίνει ένα καρβέλι ψωμί, δυο τρεις γερμανικές κονσέρβες κρέας ή ένα μπουκάλι λάδι. Για δυο τενεκέδες λάδι της κουβαλήσανε ένα πιάνο. […] Εμείς τη βαφτίσαμε το Μαύρο Χταπόδι γιατί απλώνει τα πλοκάμια της κι αρπάζει το βιός του κόσμου.' Sari 1974: 58-9.
119 '-Θ' αλλάξουν τα πράματα! επανέλαβε ο Μαρίνος με ειρωνεία τη φράση της μάνας του. Μονάχα; Τίποτε μοναχό δεν αλλάζει. Και πώς να βαστηχτούμε στο μέτρο σωστοί χωρίς να γίνουμε ψεύτες, κλέφτες, απατεώνες; Άρπαξα προχτές μια φραντζόλα ψωμί και μες απ' τα χέρια μου τη βούτηξε άλλος. Ό,τι οικονομίες είχα στην τσέπη τις έδωσα ν' αγοράσω ένα βαζάκι μαρμελάδα κι

Kanava here offers a completely different perspective on the motives of someone who decides to become a *mavragoritis*. Marinos is a *mavragoritis* in the sense that he becomes involved in black-market trading. Nonetheless, he is by no means a *fout*. If anything, he is a victim of the excruciating circumstances of the Occupation that pushed him–'just like so many others'– to engage in such activities in a constant, desperate struggle for survival. This could be viewed as a well-intended attempt on the part of the author to show young readers that even the most decent of people could become *mavragorites* in those dark times of deprivation. At the same time, however, one cannot help but notice that the term *mavragoritis* is often used as another word for 'trader', thus losing its specific historical meaning and traditional negative connotations. Even so, what is important to note here is that Kanava is one of the few authors who managed to depict the character complexities of someone who decides to become a wartime *mavragoritis*, driven merely by the instinct of survival rather than by hunger for profit.

The last group of *fout* that appears in the texts under examination features female characters who engage in, what the French call, '*collaboration horizontale*':

> Our neighbour, as grandfather said when she left the room for a while, was either crazy and couldn't make sense of what was going on around her or she was with the Germans and didn't care about a thing. She seemed to be leading an easy life. She

---

αυτό ήταν ξερατό. [...] Τι θα έκαναν; Πώς θα έβγαζαν το ψωμί τους; Είπε τη γνώμη του καθένας. Δεν είχαν τίποτε σπουδαίο να προτείνουν. Συμφώνησαν να κάνουν κι αυτοί τον έμπορο. Μαυραγορίτες. Όπως και τόσοι άλλοι εξάλλου.' Kanava 1981: 76-7.

> was well-fed, rosy-cheeked and cheerful. She made coffee for the grown-ups and offered me a large piece of halva.[120]
>
> Ms. Pari was nice and everything, but the neighbours did not like her relationship with the conquerors. It was also all these mouth-watering aromas wafting from her window, the smell of fresh coffee and butter that tickled our nostrils. […] Not to mention the music on the gramophone. *Lily Marlene* was playing non-stop.[121]

Of course, we cannot expect that a 1970s book for young readers would delve into details as to what kind of agreement these women could possibly have made with the enemies in order to secure these privileges. In order to avoid any graphic descriptions so as to protect the ostensible innocence of the young readers, the idea of sleeping with the enemy in exchange for scarce commodities is suggested through the image of the well-fed, carefree and cheerful neighbour whose lifestyle seems out of place, drawing strong moral condemnation from her starving compatriots. In a binary opposition that is almost as old as literature itself, these *fout* also represent everything that the mothers of the protagonists are not: they are sexually emancipated, self-centred and somewhat foolish as opposed to the widowed, self-sacrificing and dignified mothers who try to keep their children as far away from these corrupt women as possible.[122] Transgressors of both national and patriarchal moral

---

120 'Η γειτόνισσα, καταπώς είπε ο παππούς, άμα εκείνη έλειψε για λίγο ή ζουρλή ήτανε και δεν ήξερε τι καιρός πέρναγε, ή με το μέρος των Γερμανών, και δεν την ένοιαζε για τίποτα. Φαινότανε να καλοπερνάει. Ήτανε αφράτη, ροδοκόκκινη και γελαστή. Έφτιαξε τον καφέ στους μεγάλους και μένα μου έδωσε ένα μεγάλο κομμάτι χαλβά.' Fildisi 1979a: 96.

121 'Καλή και άγια η κυρα-Παρή μα είχε πολλά πάρε-δώσε με τον κατακτητή κι αυτά τα πράγματα στη γειτονιά δεν άρεσαν. Ήταν κι εκείνες οι μυρωδιές που γαργαλιστικές ξεχύνονταν από το παραθύρι της: Πότε καφές φρεσκοψημένος, πότε καμένο βούτυρο αγνό, ερέθιζαν τα ρουθούνια. –Πού βρήκες, μωρή, πού βρήκες τον καφέ, το βούτυρο; […] Άσε τις μουσικές με το γραμμόφωνο. Κύματα κύματα η Μαρλέν.' Kanava op. cit.: 100-101.

122 'Έξω στο δρόμο ακόμα έπαιζαν τα παιδιά. Κι ο αδερφός του ο Αντρέας, μαζί με δύο φίλους του, μπρος στο παράθυρο της γειτόνισσάς τους, της κυρα-Παρής, κάτι μαζεύανε από κάτω κι

boundaries, this group of *fout* is also a staple in the books of subsequent decades.

So far I have talked about the main groups of *fout* that appear in the young people's fiction from the 1970s. Featuring different types of wrongdoers–traitors, *Gestapo* informers, interpreters, *mavragorites* and 'horizontal' collaborators–what all these texts have in common is that they engage exclusively with the theme of individual collaboration. This observation raises another critical question: just how much did the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* reveal to their young readers about the issue of organised and armed collaboration which is perhaps the most extreme form of collaboration, as it entails 'taking up arms and fighting for and with the occupier against one's own brethren'?[123] The answer is that they revealed absolutely nothing. In a superficial and half-hearted treatment of the subject, authors writing in the early *metapolitefsi* went so far as to admit to the existence of, what seems to have been, a small handful of pathetic and worthless individuals–*une poignée de misérables et d' indignes*–who acted out of fear, self-interest or plain wickedness.

There is, however, one notable exception. This is Georges Sari's largely autobiographical novel *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* (Red Thread Tied, 1974). As Sari mentions in the introduction, *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* was written as a

---

έτρωγαν. Θύμωσε ο Μαρίνος που τον είδε. Γιατί κι η μάνα του κι ο ίδιος χίλιες φορές του το 'πανε: εκεί δε θα πλησίαζε.' Ibid.: 100.
'-Κι όχι πολλές κουβέντες με την πλαϊνή. Δε μ' άρεσε, μήτε το φέρσιμό της μήτε η καλοπέρασή της. Μπορεί να φανερωθεί ο όξω από δω σαν άγιος, και να σας πλανέψει. Το νου σας.' Fildisi op. cit.: 97.
123 Kalyvas 2008: 129.

'supplement' to *Όταν ο ήλιος* (When the Sun, 1971). The latter is a fictionalised account of the author's personal experience of the Occupation that had been published three years earlier, while Greece was still under military rule. Published just a few months after the restoration of democracy, *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* is a book in which the author could finally talk about things that had had to remain unsaid in her previous novel. As Sari notes in the introduction: 'I can now say without lowering my voice: I was in the Resistance. It was about time we held our heads high.'[124]

Her participation in the EAM Resistance, however, is not the only thing that she could now talk openly about. In *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* Sari also acknowledges the reality of armed collaboration. Among other things, the book mentions the existence of the collaborationist Security Battalions, the anti-communist Organisation X and features *fout* who did a lot more than trade a few pots of oil for a piano:

> We arrived at Kyriakou Square, we crossed it and then we stopped in front of the House on Elpidos Street. I immediately realised where I was. This building is another Merlin. […] The commanders of the House are Germans, but all the dirty work is done by Greeks. The Germans' role is to supervise and give orders to the Greeks who execute their duty perfectly: they pull out [the prisoners'] fingernails, they burn their chests with cigarettes, they beat them with heavy chains, they break their bones and hang them upside down for hours to get them to confess, to get them to betray their comrades.[125]

---

124 'Το μόνο που μπορώ να κάνω σήμερα είναι να πω, χωρίς να χαμηλώσω τη φωνή: Ήμουν κι εγώ στην Αντίσταση. Καιρός να σηκώσουμε το κεφάλι.' Sari op. cit.: 12.

125 'Φτάσαμε στην πλατεία Κυριακού, την διασχίσαμε και σταματήσαμε μπροστά στο Σπίτι της οδού Ελπίδος. Αμέσως κατάλαβα πού βρισκόμουν. Αμέσως. Αυτό το κτίριο είναι ένα δεύτερο Μέρλιν. […] Τ' αφεντικά του σπιτιού είναι γερμανοί, αλλά τη δουλειά την κάνουν έλληνες υπάλληλοι. Οι γερμανοί εποπτεύουν, δίνουν διαταγές, οι έλληνες εκτελούν στην εντέλεια το καθήκον τους: Ξεριζώνουν νύχια, καίνε με το τσιγάρο τα στήθια, βαράνε με βαριές αλυσίδες, σπάνε κόκαλα, κρεμάνε ανάποδα τα παιδιά, ώρες ολόκληρες, για να τους αναγκάσουν να ομολογήσουν, να προδώσουν τους συντρόφους.' Ibid.: 87-8. Merlin is the name of the street in

Here the reader is confronted with one of the most disturbing aspects of collaboration, which all other authors of the 1970s made deliberate efforts to shield them from. No matter how evil they portrayed their *fout* characters, no other author went so far as to present a situation in which Greeks engaged in brutal violence against other Greeks. An acclaimed left-wing author, Sari crosses that line and contributes to the leftist epic narrative of the 1940s that gained prominence in the post-dictatorship period. Both in *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* and in her subsequent novel *Οι Νικητές* (The Winners, 1983), Sari paints a sanctified image of the Left in her own attempt to do justice to all those, herself included, who fought a noble patriotic struggle for national liberation and were condemned in return as national traitors, while true traitors were granted complete exoneration for their wartime actions and crimes by the rightist post-war regime.[126] The description of the horrible tortures that resistance fighters suffered at the hands of collaborators in the above scene serves precisely that purpose, promoting the image of a martyred Left and contributing to the heroisation of the EAM fighters, which became a sort of national hobby in the early *metapolitefsi*.[127]

Nevertheless, Sari's example is an exception, an aberration one might say, from the norm at that time. Both in the school history textbooks and in the

---

Athens where the *Gestapo* had its headquarters and it has since become a synonym for torture.

126 See the foreword in *Οι Νικητές*: '[αυτό το βιβλίο είναι] για ν' αναρωτηθείτε πώς φτάσαμε στον Εμφύλιο, πώς έγινε κι οι αληθινοί ήρωες ονομάστηκαν προδότες, ενώ αληθινοί προδότες πήραν μετάλλια, θέσεις και εξουσία.' Sari 1983: 9.

127 'Λένε πως τα παιδιά πολύ τους παιδεύουν γιατί κρατάνε το στόμα σφαλιστό. Ούτε ένα όνομα, ούτε μια διεύθυνση. Σωπαίνουν και πεθαίνουν. Όλα τα μαρτύρια πάνε χαμένα κι ας γίνονται με σύστημα επιστημονικό.' Sari 1974: 88.

young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981, the norm was the silencing of all disquieting memories of the 1940s that could jeopardise Greece's smooth transition to democratic and political stability. As I have shown in this chapter, authors of the late 1970s tiptoed around the issue of collaboration, never fully exploring it nor fully denying it. In order for the project of national reconciliation to succeed, it was critical that Greeks should take pride in their past and view themselves as a nation of resisters who fought united against the occupiers. As I will go on to show in subsequent chapters, this is also the idea that authors of the 1970s have tried to give in their fictional representations of the Greek 1940s. As for those *fout* who betrayed the nation and took the wicked path of collaboration, they were just an insignificant handful of pathetic and worthless individuals.

EXCEPTIONAL HEROES: THE RESISTANCE

In the preceding chapters I have examined the representation of Greece's wartime enemies and their local collaborators in young people's fiction of the early *metapolitefsi*. This chapter sets out to explore the depiction of the Greek Resistance in the books published during the period under consideration.

The end of WWII found the liberated countries of Western Europe in desperate need of a consensual national narrative that would sanitise any troubling memories of the war and serve as moral cement for the successful reconstruction of their post-war democratic societies. With the spectre of wartime collaboration haunting most countries that had experienced foreign occupation, the memory of the Resistance served as a Siloam pool in which Western Europe sought to wash off its wartime sins. Idealised, exaggerated or even fabricated as it had been in some cases, the patriotic narrative of the Resistance became the founding myth of most post-war democratic societies in Western Europe. From the Nordic North to the Mediterranean South, the Resistance continued to serve as the primary frame of reference for official commemorations and reflections on the national experience of WWII for several decades.[128] However, this was not the case with post-war Greece.

While other Western European countries were trying to restore national cohesion in the aftermath of WWII, Greece was sliding into a catastrophic civil war that broke out between the rightist-royalist Greek government and the communist Left, the leading force behind EAM/ELAS's struggle for national

128 See Lagrou 2000: 1-18 and Judt 2002: 157-83.

liberation between 1941 and 1944. The Civil War ended in 1949 with the defeat of the communists by force of arms. The exclusion of the EAM/ELAS Resistance from the anti-communist narrative of the victors and its portrayal as a traitorous organisation of bandits with a clandestine pro-Soviet agenda made the very idea of a consensual national narrative orchestrated around a Greek version of the Resistance myth impossible.[129]

The anti-communist hysteria of the early post-war period reached new heights during the military Junta of 1967-1974. As Mark Mazower observes, the Colonels were determined to turn the clock back to the late 1940s.[130] Left-wing veterans who had been amnestied in the early 1960s were now being re-arrested and sent back to prison or into exile, while former collaborators were granted state pensions and other benefits in recognition of their wartime 'resistance' against EAM/ELAS's alleged plans to turn Greece into a Soviet satellite state. Yet, as a prominent historian of the Greek 1940s has pointed out, 'history is written by the victors. But eventually, the defeated take their revenge.'[131] And this is what happened after the fall of the Junta and the delegitimisation of the anti-communist policy in 1974.

As discussed in the introductory chapter, the early *metapolitefsi* saw an upsurge of interest in the 1940s in general and in left-wing Resistance in particular. This memory boom took many forms: from the publication of memoirs written by former cadres and members of the left-wing Resistance,

129 Chandrinos 2015: 199.
130 Mazower 2000: 224.
131 Liakos 2007: 278.

to the foundation of numerous EAM/ELAS veterans' associations, the organisation of events commemorating the EAM Resistance and even the re-emergence of old partisan songs, which became hugely popular especially among young left-wingers.[132] The post-dictatorship glamorisation of the left-wing struggle also influenced popular perceptions of the Resistance and the post-war image of the *saboteur* acting under the instructions of the Middle East Command gave way to the iconic figure of the rifle-toting *andartis*.[133]

This tendency to glorify EAM in the early *metapolitefsi* was captured perfectly by Greek-American writer Nick Gage in the afterword of his 1983 memoir *Eleni*:

> But I arrived in Athens [in 1977] to be confronted with a resurgence of communist power in the country. [...] After the Communist Party was legalized in Greece in 1974 and the thirty-year statute of limitations on all crimes committed during the war years passed, the Greek Communists in exile came flooding back and begun to propagate their own version of the war, making the Communist guerilla leaders into popular heroes. When I moved to Greece, I was confronted daily with the party's success in winning the loyalties of Greeks who had been born since the war. Fresh-faced college students knocked at my door every weekend, handing me propaganda leaflets and inviting me to the ubiquitous Communist youth festivals. [...] There was no escaping the Communists' success in glamorizing the guerillas in the eyes of modern Greek youth and rewriting the history of the war, even in the minds of children born to those from my own village.[134]

And although the restoration of democracy with the subsequent legalisation of the Left paved the way for the rehabilitation of the left-wing Resistance in public memory, it would still be another eight years before the EAM/ELAS

---

132 Papadogiannis 2015: 65-124.
133 As Evanthis Chatzivasileiou points out, the publication of Dominique Etude's *Les Kapetanios* in Greek in 1974 contributed hugely to this shift. See Chatzivasileiou 2015: 347.
134 Gage 1983: 450-1.

struggle could finally find its way into the official national narrative. Steeped in too many controversies, the memory of the Resistance was hardly able to provide the kind of national consensus that Greek society needed in order to make its transition to the *metapolitefsi* era as smooth and seamless as possible. This also explains the awkward silence surrounding the subject of the Resistance in the school history textbooks of the early *metapolitefsi*. Bearing all this in mind, in the remainder of this chapter I will go on to explore the representation of the Resistance in the young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981.

A comparative reading of the books under examination reveals that there are several common themes in the representation of the Resistance in the fiction of this period. The first is that in almost all of the stories the protagonists are children who live and operate outside the traditional family unit. War orphans, children whose parents have fled to the Middle East or are fighting the enemies in the mountains and street urchins take matters into their own hands and do their bit in the struggle for national liberation. They become *saltadoroi* stealing food from German lorries,[135] they write patriotic slogans on the walls,[136] they undertake small acts of sabotage,[137] they shelter members of secret resistance organisations,[138] they assist imprisoned

135 See 'Ο μπαρμπ' Ανέστης' in Fildisi 1978, Fildisi 1979a, 'Τα παιδιά της πλατείας' in Ferousis 1980 and Kanava 1981.
136 See 'Το στοίχημα' in Skandalis 1979. Also Fildisi op. cit.
137 See 'Η Αφρούλα', 'Το γεφύρι' and 'Σαμποτάζ' in Sfaellou 1979, Fildisi op. cit. and 'Έξτρα πρίμα γκουντ' in Ferousis op. cit.
138 See 'Ο Μπάρμπας', 'Το κοτσύφι' and 'Ο μπογιατζής' in Sfaellou op. cit.

resisters[139] and carry messages to the guerrillas at risk, and sometimes even at the expense, of their own lives.[140] This is a common strategy among authors of this period that allows them to get their young protagonists involved in dangerous situations, free from parental control or any other family restrictions.

Another common theme is that the heroes are almost always presented to act on their own initiative. To put it in plain numbers, in a total of more than thirty narratives–comprising both novels and individual short stories–there are only six texts in which the protagonists are shown to operate under the instructions of a resistance organisation.[141] In all the other stories the protagonists engage in spontaneous and improvised acts of resistance. Participation in organised resistance is an adults-only affair, or, to be more precise, a men-only affair. Taking up to the mountains to join the guerrillas or working in a resistance organisation is a privilege that, for the most part, is enjoyed by male characters. Accordingly, participation in the Resistance is much more restricted in the case of female characters. At best, the latter are shown to undertake tasks consistent with their traditional gender roles, such as teaching orphaned children or sheltering wanted fighters and catering for their needs.[142] When they do take more active action, it is to fill the shoes of

---

139 'Η αγγαρεία' in Sfaellou op. cit.
140 See 'Μια καρδιά δώδεκα χρονώ' and 'Το πλατάνι του Φώτη' in Fildisi 1978, 'Η φωτιά' in Tsimikali 1979 and 'Το μήνυμα' and 'Το γεφύρι' in Sfaellou op. cit.
141 See short stories 'Το κοτσύφι' and 'Σαμποτάζ' in Sfaellou op. cit., 'Ο μικρός αγωνιστής' in Varika-Moskovi 1977 and 'Χωρίς ημερομηνία' in Ferousis op. cit. Also, Sari 1974 and Fildisi 1979a.
142 See for example 'Η δασκαλίτσα' in Skandalis op. cit. and 'Η γριά Μιχαλού' in Tsimikali op. cit.

their male relatives who have either died or become unable to carry on with their missions. Husbands, fathers and brothers, on the other hand, flee to the Middle East to fight in the Allied struggle, they become *andartes* or join secret resistance organisations and other clandestine groups.

Often spelled with a capital 'O' these organisations remain vague and purged of all ideological or political characteristics that would perhaps make them too identifiable. This is another recurrent theme in the representation of the Resistance in the books published during the early *metapolitefsi*. When not spontaneous and improvised, the Resistance is centred around the activities of some unspecified patriotic organisations that fight for national liberation, harbouring no other agendas or political plans for the post-war future. In general, authors writing in the early *metapolitefsi* painted a depoliticised picture of the Resistance, deliberately refraining from making references to the EAM/ELAS movement or to any of the other resistance organisations that operated during the Occupation. Instead, they opted to keep the focus on the individual hero and his unique patriotic contribution to the struggle for liberation.

There is, however, one notable exception. This is Georges Sari's largely autobiographical novel *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* (Red Thread Tied, 1974). Published immediately after the restoration of democracy, the book was written as a 'supplement' to *Όταν ο Ήλιος…* (When the Sun…, 1971), an earlier fictionalised account of the author's experience of the early 1940s.[143] Sari's

143 *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* was published in November 1974, just four months after the restoration of democracy. As the author notes in the preface, 'Η *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* δεν

trilogy on the Greek 1940s was completed with the 1983 novel *Οι Νικητές* (The Winners) that is set during the *Dekemvriana*. Most of the characters from the first novel reappear in the next two books, while in all three books the protagonist and focalising hero is Zoi, Sari's fictional persona that also appears in many of her subsequent novels.[144]

As mentioned previously, *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* was written as a 'supplement' to *Όταν ο ήλιος…* In reality, *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* is a book in which Sari took the opportunity to talk about things that could not be talked about three years earlier, with first and foremost among them being her participation in the EAM movement. Having participated in the Resistance from the ranks of EPON, EAM's youth wing, this was a detail that had to go unmentioned in her previous novel. But in 1974 gone were the restrictions that had forced Sari to remain silent about her participation in the left-wing Resistance. As the author notes in the preface of *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη*, 'I can now say without having to lower my voice: I was in the Resistance.'[145]

Bold, candid and shockingly political for its time, the preface of *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* invites particular attention. It begins with the author elaborating on the reasons that had motivated her to write this book:

> Young Zoi didn't have a camera back then, she didn't care to take pictures. Her eyes were her camera. Her ears were her recorder. But as the years passed, those photographs, those writings became clouded in my memory. […] I grew up, I had my

---

είναι μια συνέχεια, είναι ένα πολύ μικρό συμπλήρωμα του *Όταν ο Ήλιος…*'. Κατοχή, πείνα, Αντίσταση…. αληθινές ιστορίες, που τις έζησα, τα πρόσωπα υπήρξανε, δε χρειάστηκε να τα φανταστώ….' Sari 1974: 9.

144 For a comprehensive examination of the characters that appear in Sari's *oeuvre* see Kouraki 2008.

145 'Το μόνο που μπορώ να κάνω σήμερα είναι να πω, χωρίς να χαμηλώσω τη φωνή: Ήμουν κι εγώ στην Αντίσταση. Καιρός να σηκώσουμε το κεφάλι.' Sari op. cit.: 12.

> children and I decided to 'remember'. To remember for myself and for my children.[146]

Although such introductions are quite common in books for young readers who have no first-hand memories of the events they are about to read, Sari goes on to deliver one of the most political pieces of writing ever to be included in a book about the Greek 1940s written for a young audience. The second part of the preface serves as a political commentary on the post-war suppression of the historical memory of a period which the author calls an 'Era' with a capital E. Most importantly, she also delivers a political commentary on a long-standing demand of the Left, that is to say, the demand for official rehabilitation of the left-wing Resistance in the national memory of the 1940s:

> In Europe, anywhere you go, you can see the memory of the Second World War, the memory of the Occupation and Resistance preserved on street walls, in towns and villages, in museums, in libraries, in exhibitions. [...] But that's the situation in Europe... Here, I came to a devastating realisation. I ran to meet my past and, instead, I stumbled upon a tall and dark wall of silence. An old comrade of mine told me in a low voice: 'I have many photographs and other documents, but I have buried them in a safe place in my village so that no one can find them and have them destroyed... [...]' I've searched in libraries, I've searched in old newspapers. I wasn't able to find a single photograph... [...]Isn't it the responsibility of the State to protect the past from the ravages of time, is it not its responsibility to collect any surviving photographs, to blow the dust off them, to sort them out, to write names and dates on them and display them in the Museum of Occupation and Resistance for us to remember and for the younger to learn? [...] For how much longer is this Era going to be buried somewhere in a small village, in a 'safe place'? [...] The only thing I can do

146 'Η μικρή Ζωή δεν είχε φωτογραφική μηχανή, δε νοιαζότανε να τραβήξει φωτογραφίες. Τα μάτια της κοιτούσαν: φωτογράφιζαν. Τ' αυτιά της άκουγαν: έγραφαν. Όμως τα χρόνια πέρασαν και η μνήμη θόλωσε εκείνες τις φωτογραφίες, εκείνα τα γραφτά. [...] Μεγάλωσα, απόκτησα παιδιά κι αποφάσισα να «θυμηθώ». Να θυμηθώ για μένα, για τα παιδιά μου.' Ibid.: 9-10.

today is to say without having to lower my voice: I was in the Resistance. It is time we held our heads high.'[147]

In *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* Georges/Zoi's story becomes intertwined with the history of EAM, the author's memory meets the collective memory of an Era and the speaking subject becomes an integral part of a collective 'we': 'I was in the Resistance. It is time we held our heads high.' In sharp contrast to all the other authors of this period who centred their stories around the actions of a few heroic individuals, Sari shifts the focus onto the collective subject of the Resistance: 'Tell me, who were these people that liberated Greece? It was us, father. We fought for four years. We risked our lives. It was Zoi, it was me, it was George, it was all of us who saved Greece.'[148]

But again, Sari's book is an exception. In all the other stories there is no mass Resistance as there is no EAM Resistance either; only a few isolated individuals or groups of patriots that undertake action against the occupiers. As I have discussed in the previous chapter, the momentous changes of the

147 'Στην Ευρώπη, όπου κι αν περπατήσεις, βλέπεις πάνω στους τοίχους των δρόμων, στις πόλεις και στα χωριά, στα μουσεία, στις βιβλιοθήκες, σε μόνιμες εκθέσεις, συγκεντρωμένη τη μνήμη των χρόνων του Β' Παγκοσμίου Πολέμου, της Κατοχής και της Αντίστασης. […] Στην Ευρώπη… Εδώ, η διαπίστωση που έκανα ήταν τραγική. Έτρεξα να βρω το παρελθόν μου και σκόνταψα πάνω σ' έναν τοίχο, ψηλό και σκοτεινό, έναν τοίχο σιωπής. Μια συναγωνίστρια μου είπε χαμηλώνοντας τη φωνή της: «Έχω πολλές φωτογραφίες και ντοκουμέντα, αλλά τα 'χω θάψει στο χωριό μου, σε μέρος ασφαλές, κανένας δεν μπορεί να βρει και να τα καταστρέψει… […]» Πήγα σε δημόσιες βιβλιοθήκες, πήγα σ' εφημερίδες, σ' αυτές που βγαίνανε τότε. Ούτε μια φωτογραφία… […] Μα πώς και δεν έρχεται το Κράτος, που πρέπει να προστατεύει το χτες από τη φθορά του χρόνου, να τις μαζέψει τούτες τις φωτογραφίες, έστω κι αν είναι λίγες, να τις ξεσκονίσει, να τις ταξινομήσει, να γράψει πάνω τους ημερομηνίες, ονόματα και να τις κρεμάσει στο μουσείο της Κατοχής και της Αντίστασης, να μπορεί ο καθένας από μας να πηγαίνει εκεί και να θυμάται και οι νέοι να βλέπουν κι να μαθαίνουν; […] Ως πότε θ' αντέξει αυτή η Εποχή, θαμμένη, κάπου, σ' ένα μικρό χωριό, σε «μέρος ασφαλές»; […] Το μόνο που μπορώ να κάνω σήμερα είναι να πω, χωρίς να χαμηλώσω τη φωνή: Ήμουν κι εγώ στην Αντίσταση. Καιρός να σηκώσουμε το κεφάλι.' Ibid.: 10-12.
148 'Ποιοι λοιπόν είναι αυτοί οι ελεύθεροι άνθρωποι που ελευθέρωσαν την Ελλάδα; Εμείς, πατέρα. Τέσσερα χρόνια αγωνιστήκαμε. Παίξαμε τη ζωή μας κορώνα-γράμματα. Η Ζωή, εγώ, ο Γιώργος, όλοι μας, σώσαμε την Ελλάδα.' Ibid.: 111.

metapolitefsi gave authors of books for young readers the opportunity to touch upon subjects that had remained strictly off-limits until then. Yet, they only went so far as to the point where history becomes too much history. Talking about the Resistance was no longer a forbidden topic for the authors of the early *metapolitefsi*. Talking about the EAM movement, on the other hand, would continue to remain *terra prohibita* until the official recognition of the left-wing Resistance in the early 1980s.

HAPPY EVER AFTER?: THE CIVIL WAR

Following the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and the collapse of the Junta, Konstantinos Karamanlis was summoned back to Greece and on July 24, 1974, he became the first Prime Minister of the Third Hellenic Republic.[149] For Karamanlis to set Greece on the path to democratic stability he first had to restore national unity, fractured as it had been by three decades of divisions between first-class citizens, the so-called *ethnikofrones*, and the rest.[150] A veteran politician of the Right, Karamanlis was quick to legalise the outlawed KKE, taking the first decisive step towards national reconciliation. As Nikos Demertzis notes, 'reconciliation' became a popular catchword during the early *metapolitefsi* embraced by the Right and the Left alike.[151] Demertzis goes on to add, however, that 'such an almost universal demand was premised on a paradoxical act of "remembering to forget"' and, more specifically, 'on a highly selective process of restructuring the official and the collective memory of the 1940s.'[152] And while the memory of the left-wing Resistance could finally find its way into the national narrative, the divisive events of the immediate post-liberation period were swept under a thick veil of silence.

The patriotic struggle of communist-dominated EAM/ELAS against the foreign occupiers had no equivalent in the narrative of the Left about the

149 Karamanlis fled Greece after the electoral defeat of his National Radical Union party in 1963 and spent the next eleven years in self-imposed exile in Paris.
150 As Minas Samatas notes, 'the "rest" was the sick, non-nationally-minded *miasma*–the second-class–including not only communists, leftists, and sympathizers, but also anyone "disloyal", i.e., not actively demonstrating conformity and obedience to the anticommunist state.' Samatas 1986: 30.
151 Demertzis 2016: 147.
152 Ibid.

events of the late 1940s, and the memory of the Civil War was eclipsed by the memory of three decades of persecution, detention camps and forced exile.[153] As Nikolaos Papadogiannis points out, 'the Greek Left in the 1970s spoke merely of a "patriotic" war in the early 1940s and on no account of a "civil" one.'[154]

The post-dictatorship Right was not at ease with the civil war past either. The delegitimisation of anti-communism in 1974 led to the adoption of a more conciliatory narrative by the conservative Right as well. A characteristic example of recontextualisation of the Civil War in the discourse of the post-dictatorship Right is the family metaphor, which became a common theme in the circulated texts of Nea Demokratia during the early *metapolitefsi*. Commenting on two DAP-NDFK leaflets distributed to university students in 1976,[155] Papadogiannis observes that the Civil War was no longer referred to as a war against 'bandits' but rather as one among 'siblings', notwithstanding the depiction of the 'red' sibling as the troublesome one, while the second leaflet treated both sides of the conflict as 'victims' and equal members of the Greek nation.[156]

Yet, the Greek society of the 1970s was still far from embarking on a course of painful retrospection and public reckoning with its civil war skeletons, an essential prerequisite for the achievement of genuine national reconciliation. As Peter Siani-Davies and Stefanos Katsikas have pointed out, 'reconciliation

153 Elefantis 2002: 109.
154 Papadogiannis 2015: 90.
155 DAP-NDFK is the youth organisation of Nea Demokratia.
156 Papadogiannis op. cit.: 85-6.

in 1974 was, therefore, not primarily about healing the wounds of the conflict but was, rather, a specific political project designed to bridge the divides in Greek society so as to forge a national consensus',[157] a consensus that was largely premised on the imperative of 'remembering to forget'. Sidelined in the official discourses of the post-dictatorship political elites, the troubling memories of the late 1940s were also suppressed in the official history textbooks of the early *metapolitefsi*, as I have shown in the introductory chapter.

As has been discussed in previous chapters, young people's fiction of the early *metapolitefsi* became a privileged site for the perpetuation of popular perceptions and official national interpretations of the 1940s. Savage Germans, nice Italians, a handful of pathetic traitors and a nation of brave patriots that resisted the occupiers as one; the authors of this period offered their young readers a largely depoliticised and massively reassuring picture of the early 1940s. What happens, however, when it comes to representing the period that followed Greece's liberation from the foreign yoke? Just how much did the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* tell their readers about the *Dekemvriana*, the so-called 'white terror' or the Civil War? In other words, what did they tell their young readers about the turbulent late 1940s?

The answer is that they said absolutely nothing. Consequently, young readers are often given the misleading impression that the sufferings of the Greek people ended after the end of the Occupation. This is especially the case

157 Siani-Davies and Katsikas 2009: 566.

with authors who did not shy away from distorting historical reality for the sake of a happy-ever-after ending, with many of them reassuring their audience that 'after the [end of the] war, peace was restored in Greece.'[158]

Moreover, the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* were particularly concerned to emphasise the quasi-united character of the national struggle for liberation. At the same time, they eschewed all discussion of the civil strife that broke out between the main resistance organisations while Greece was still under foreign domination:

> Occupation. Bitter years, years full of hardship and suffering. Years full of pain. Yet, amid all this misery that crushed [the people's] chests, there was something else, something valuable and rare: an unwavering resistance spirit [living] inside young people, older people and children. A national unity that overpowered all other differences.[159]
>
> During the three-and-a-half years of foreign occupation, the Germans and the Italians felt the full force of the great upheaval that made our Nation swell their ranks day and night in towns and villages.[160]

A nation that fought the occupiers united as 'one soul', an unbreakable national unity that overpowered all other differences and a post-liberation happy ending that never was; this describes in a nutshell the representation of the 1940s in the young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981. Suppressed in both the official discourses of the post-dictatorship political parties and the

---

158 For instance, 'Μετά τον πόλεμο, που γίνηκε ειρήνη [...] ύστερα από τον πόλεμο, που γίνηκε ειρήνη' in Fildisi 1978: 231-2 and 'Η γαλήνη ξανάρθε πλούσια, σ' όλη την Ελληνική χώρα, από το πιο απομακρυσμένο χωριό, ως την πρωτεύουσα' in Varika-Moskovi 1977: 32.

159 'Χρόνια κατοχής. Χρόνια πικρά, γεμάτα στερήσεις και βάσανα. Χρόνια γεμάτα πόνο. Μα μέσα στη βαριά κατάθλιψη που πλάκωνε τα στήθη, υπήρχε και κάτι άλλο πολύτιμο, δυσεύρετο: Ένα αγωνιστικό πνεύμα αδάμαστο σε νέους, γέρους και παιδιά. Μια εθνική ενότητα που καταργούσε κάθε διαφορά.' Sfaelou 1979: 9.

160 'Στα τριάμισι χρόνια της ξενικής Κατοχής, Απρίλης 1941-Οκτώβρης 1944, οι Γερμανοϊταλοί νιώθουν έντονα το γενναίο τράνταγμα που με μια ψυχή προκαλεί το Έθνος στις τάξεις τους μέρα και νύχτα, σε πόλεις και χωριά.' Ferousis 1980: 7.

state-sponsored history textbooks, the divisive aspects of the 1940s also remained *terra prohibita* for the authors of the early *metapolitefsi*.

In his book introduction, Dimitris Ferousis notes that his stories 'aim to convey a message of optimism and hope for the future, [a message] for the resilience of our people and Nation.'[161] This is precisely the spirit that the authors under examination sought to convey in their stories, a message of optimism for the future springing from the comforting realisation that, despite all the hardships they came to endure in the past, the Greek people have always managed to remain resilient and united as 'one soul'. Writing their stories at a time when Greek society was struggling to leave behind the animosities of the past and with the newly found national unity largely premised on the imperative of 'remembering to forget', it is no wonder that the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* remained completely silent about the events that had divided the nation for three decades.

The happy-ever-after ending is also not compromised in Georges Sari's *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* (Red Thread Tied, 1974).[162] Praised as one of the most 'vigorous voices' of the second post-war generation of writers for the young,[163] Sari touched upon subjects that remained completely avoided by all other authors of this period. As mentioned in the previous chapter, in *Κόκκινη*

---

161 'Ταυτόχρονα, ωστόσο, τα διηγήματα αυτά φέρνουν κι ένα μήνυμα αισιοδοξίας κι ελπίδας για το μέλλον και τη δύναμη του λαού και του Έθνους μας.' Ibid.: 8.
162 'Κοιτάω τριγύρω μου τις γυναίκες και τους άντρες, τους νέους και τα παιδιά, που σηκώνουν ψηλά τις γροθιές τους και φωνάζουν. Όλο αυτό το πανηγύρι μοιάζει με παραμύθι. Ένα παραμύθι με δράκοντες και παλικάρια που σκοτώνουν τους δράκοντες κι όλα τελειώνουν με χαρές και γέλια και ζούμε εμείς καλά κι εμείς πάλι καλύτερα.' Sari 1974: 129.
163 Delonis 1986: 44.

κλωστή δεμένη Sari took the opportunity to talk about things that could not be talked about in her earlier novel *Όταν ο ήλιος…* (When the Sun…, 1971); about the collaborationist Security Battalions, for example, the EAM Resistance and her own participation in EPON. What she could not yet openly talk about, however, was her experience of the battle of Athens that broke out in December 1944. This would only happen in 1983 with the novel *Οι Νικητές* (The Winners).

Ten years after its original publication, *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* was republished in 1984 by a different publishing house. Although the text was left unaltered in the 1984 edition, an interesting change took place in the paratext. As mentioned in the previous chapter, *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* includes several photographs from the Occupation as well as a few photographs of the public celebrations that took place in Athens after the Germans' withdrawal in October 1944. One of these photographs depicts a large crowd of Athenians celebrating Greece's liberation in Syntagma Square. However, this photograph was removed from the 1984 edition and replaced with two other pictures. Taken after the *Dekemvriana*, these photographs show a group of EAM members holding placards bearing the slogans 'amnesty', 'general political amnesty', 'freedom for the detainees' and 'freedom for the imprisoned EPON youth'. The accompanying caption reads: 'The people take to the streets of Athens demanding amnesty for the Resistance fighters thrown into prison after the *Dekemvriana*.' Whether it was the editor or Sari herself who decided not to include these photographs in the first edition of *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη* in 1974, it is an eloquent example of the extent to

which the representation of the late 1940s in young people's books of the early *metapolitefsi* was conditioned by the imperative of 'remembering to forget' and the politics of memory discussed at the beginning of this chapter. It also shows that even the most 'vigorous' authors had to wait until the official recognition of the left-wing Resistance in 1982 before they could finally talk to their young readers about the divisive events of the post-liberation period.

Sofia Fildisi's 'Οι σύμμαχοι' (The Allies) is the only one of the texts discussed here that goes on to hint at the troubles of the early post-liberation period. Part of the short story collection *Το τραγούδι του πατέρα μου* (My Father's Song, 1979), 'Οι σύμμαχοι' is set in a small provincial town in central Greece and focuses on a group of schoolchildren, who are upset by the idea of their town once again being taken over by foreign soldiers:

> Shortly after Liberation, Mytikas was filled with English soldiers, much to our resentment. [...] The grown-ups couldn't understand our reaction.
>
> -They are our allies, you silly kids, they reassured us.
>
> -Yes, but they are holding guns, we answered worried.
>
> -Well, they are soldiers. What did you expect them to be holding?
>
> [...] The next morning we decided to ask our teacher. An educated man like him, he would probably know more to tell us.
>
> -Are the English soldiers going to stay in Mytikas for long, sir?
>
> -Why are they here, sir? Is there something bad going on?
>
> -Do we still have peace, sir?
>
> His eyes filled with tears. [...]
>
> -They will leave, he said, you have nothing to fear. Not anymore.
>
> -Give us your word, give us your word, we all shouted together. [...]

That day no one could concentrate on the lesson. We were all upset. Our homeland was being taken away from us once again. […] And just when we thought that now [that the Germans were gone] this land was ours again, they [English soldiers] showed up.

-There is something else too, we told our teacher.

-Tell me.

-We, sir, are starving and they, they have plenty to eat.

-Well, he didn't know what to say, they have to eat well so…

-So they are able to fight, is that right?

-Why should this concern us? No one has asked us.

-We must have patience, kids, we all must have patience, the teacher told us. Better days will come. The bad days are gone, everything will be like before.

We had enough listening to the same speech over and over again. Better days will come, all will be forgotten, everything will be like before.[164]

---

164 Άμα λίγο μετά την απελεφτέρωση γιόμισε ο Μύτικας Εγγλέζους, εμάς των παιδιών, πολύ μας κακοφάνηκε. […] Οι μεγάλοι, σαστίσανε με την αγριεμάρα μας.
-Είναι σύμμαχοί μας μωρέ, μας καθησυχάζανε.
-Βαστάνε όμως ντουφέκι, αγωνιούσαμε εμείς.
- Ε! στρατιώτες είναι, τι να βαστάγανε;
[…] Την άλλη μέρα το πρωί, είπαμε να ρωτήσουμε και το δάσκαλο. Γραμματιζούμενος ήτανε, κάτι παραπάνου θα ήξερε.
-Θα κάτσουνε καιρό οι Εγγλέζοι στο Μύτικα κύριε;
-Για κακό είναι φερμένοι κύριε;
-Έχουμε ή δεν έχουμε ειρήνη κύριε;
Είχε [ο δάσκαλος] τα μάτια βουρκωμένα. […]
-Θα φύγουνε, είπε ύστερα, δεν έχετε να φοβόσαστε τίποτα. Τίποτα πια.
-Το λόγο σου, το λόγο σου, φωνάξαμε όλοι μαζί. […]
Κείνη την ημέρα, πού νους για μάθημα. Μας τον είχε πάρει το παράπονό μας. Πώς μας πήρανε το μέρος μας για άλλη μια φορά. […] Κι απάνου που είπαμε, πως απόμεινε ο τόπος δικός μας, κουβαληθήκανε και κείνοι.
-Είναι και τ' άλλο, είπαμε στο δάσκαλο.
-Να τ' ακούσω.
-Εμείς κύριε, πεινάμε, και κείνοι τρώνε του καλού καιρού.
-Ε, δεν έβρισκε τι να ειπεί, εκείνοι πρέπει να τρώνε για να…
-Για να πολεμάνε, ε;
-Και τι μας νοιάζει; μας ρωτήσανε;
-Να κάνουμε υπομονή παιδιά μου, όλοι να κάνουμε υπομονή, μας γύρεψε ο δάσκαλος. Θα 'ρθουνε καλές ημέρες. Το κακό πέρασε, όλα θα γίνουνε σαν και πρώτα.
Είχαμε βαρεθεί ν' ακούμε τα ίδια και τα ίδια. Θα 'ρθουνε καλές ημέρες, όλα θα ξεχαστούνε, όλα θα γίνουνε σαν και πρώτα. […]' Fildisi 1979b: 58-60.

Setting the story in the immediate post-liberation period, Fildisi here implies that the bad days did not quite end with Greece's liberation from the Axis occupation. The war is over, Greece is free again and yet, for some unexplained reason, the British 'allies' are still in the country, holding rifles and preparing for new battles, much to the children's frustration, who are left wondering 'do we have peace or not?' Despite the adults' reassurances that the British soldiers have come to the town as allies, the children view them as invaders who came to take over their land and inflict new miseries upon them.

Although clearly alluding to the *Dekemvriana* and the British interventionist policies in liberated Greece, Fildisi has avoided delving into details about the controversies of this period, much less about the national divisions that soon exploded into a catastrophic civil war. Instead, the text perpetuates the traditional victimising self-image of Greece as a nation whose destiny has always been decided by the powerful of this world.

Despite having gone further than any other author of this period in hinting at the national troubles of the post-liberation period, Fildisi did not go so far as to talk about Greeks fighting against Greeks. Again, this was a topic that remained strictly off-limits for the authors of the early *metapolitefsi*, regardless of their personal experience of the events, ideological inclinations or authorial talents.

PART II

THE GREEK 1940S AND THE POLITICS OF MEMORY: 1982-1989

On October 18, 1981, under the leadership of Andreas Papandreou and with the catchword 'change' (αλλαγή) as it main slogan, PASOK won the national elections and formed the first socialist government of the Third Hellenic Republic, ending four decades of uninterrupted right-wing rule. It was a moment of tremendous significance, because PASOK's rise to power meant that for the first time since the end of the Civil War political power would be exercised in the name of the Left.[165]

Following on from the legalisation of the Left by the conservative government of Konstantinos Karamanlis in 1974, the Papandreou government made considerable progress towards national reconciliation during its first period in office (October 1981-June 1985). Having presented itself as the ideological heir to the EAM tradition, PASOK promised to accommodate the commemoration of the left-wing Resistance in the national narrative and to put a definite end to the lingering effects of the bitter divisions of the 1940s.

Just a few days after it was sworn in, the Papandreou government abolished all state-organised commemorations of the victory of the Greek Army over the communist DSE in the Civil War, also known as 'celebrations of hate'. Fulfilling one of its main promises and, at the same time, a long-outstanding demand from the Left, PASOK introduced the bill on the 'Recognition of the

165 Kitroeff 1997: 21.

National Resistance of the Greek People against the Occupation Troops, 1941-1944' in April 1982. Despite meeting with strong opposition from Nea Demokratia MPs, the bill went through with the support of the leftist parties and in August 1982 EAM and its affiliates were officially recognised by the Greek state. Further provisions of the 1285/1982 Law included the annulment of a series of prior legislative decrees that offered material benefits to wartime collaborators. It also established November 25 as a national day of commemoration, celebrating the destruction of the Gorgopotamos Bridge, which would henceforth become a symbol of the united spirit of the National Resistance.[166] With the follow-up Law 1543/1985 PASOK granted state pensions and other benefits to disabled veterans of the Resistance and restored pension rights to public servants who had lost their jobs due to their left-wing inclinations.[167] Last but not least, PASOK provided for the repatriation of thousands of political refugees who had fled to Communist Bloc countries following the military defeat of DSE in the summer of 1949.[168]

All this resulted in the establishment of a new national narrative, orchestrated around the PASOK-introduced idea of a united National Resistance. It was an inclusive and unifying narrative in which everyone could find their own comfortable place: from ELAS guerrillas to *Lieutenant Natasha*

166 Part of Operation Harling, the Gorgopotamos Bridge was blown up on November 25, 1942. The successful sabotage was the result of cooperation between British commandos and the forces of ELAS and EDES.
167 However, the PASOK government ended up granting pensions to pretty much anyone who claimed to have taken part in the Resistance. See Antoniou and Paschaloudi 2014: 306-27.
168 For more on these reforms see Tzoukas 2010: 133-6, Antoniou and Paschaloudi op. cit.: 294-313 and Striftobola 2015: 239-49.

or supporters of the Resistance among the Greek people in general.[169] Moreover, in PASOK's leftist discourse the Right was depicted as the main guilty party, responsible for all post-liberation national woes. The same went for foreigners and, in particular, for the Anglo-American politics of intervention with regard to the domestic affairs of post-war Greece. EAM, on the other hand, was presented as the heart and soul of the entire resistance movement, a patriotic organisation with a national-liberation agenda that had rallied the 'people' (λαός) behind its banner.[170]

PASOK's nationalistic appropriation of the Resistance played a central role in the party's efforts to deepen the Right/anti-Right split and strengthen its own appeal among voters of the anti-Right bloc. The ideological polarisation of the period 1981-1984 reached new heights during the election campaign of 1985. Indicative of the toxic political climate of that period was the publication in the mass-circulation newspaper *Avriani*, PASOK's official mouthpiece, of an old photograph of a smiling Konstantinos Mitsotakis (the leader of Nea Demokratia) between two German soldiers. Slanderously representing Mitsotakis as a collaborator, PASOK made the motto 'no to the friend of the SS' one of its main slogans in the run-up to the 1985 legislative elections.[171]

---

169 *Lieutenant Natasha* (Υπολοχαγός Νατάσα) is a Greek film from the 1970s set in German-occupied Athens and revolving round the romance of a young couple who join a Middle Eastern-sponsored resistance organisation. The film was a huge success selling an unprecedented number of tickets (750.000).
170 See Rori 2008: 307-8. Also, Antoniou and Marantzidis 2008: 36-7.
171 In reality, Mitsotakis had been an active member of the Cretan resistance to the German occupation.

Eventually, PASOK managed to capitalise on the reforms of its first term and won the elections. Times, however, had started to change and the political exploitation of the 1940s would soon cease to serve as a golden-egg-laying-goose for PASOK and its clientelist practices. A few years later, it would be the two old Civil War rivals that would have the last word in the official political burial of the country's divisive past.

Following the resignation of Georgios Rallis after ND's poor performance in the 1981 legislative and European Parliament elections, Evangelos Averoff had assumed the leadership of Nea Demokratia, a position he retained until 1984. A veteran rightist politician with strong anti-communist views, Averoff took Nea Demokratia back to the ideological ground of the pre-dictatorship Right, appealing to the conservative *noikokyraioi* (νοικοκυραίοι), who were feeling insecure in the new era of PASOK's socialist rule.[172] During Averoff's presidency, Nea Demokratia continued to participate in the 'celebrations of hate', while the party was notably absent from the much-publicised 1982 commemoration of the destruction of the Gorgopotamos Bridge, an event attended by representatives of all other political parties.[173] Nea Demokratia's leader and MPs were also opposed to recognition of the EAM Resistance and walked out of the Parliament in protest when the relevant bill was put to the vote. Averoff himself argued that it was impossible for his MPs to vote in favour of a bill, which would in effect grant a pardon to the communist Left for its

172 See also Triantafillou 2010: 3-6. The term *nykokoiraioi*, literally householders, is used to describe the conservative middle-class, who have always been a vital part of the Right's traditional voter base.
173 See also Fytili 2015: 29-39.

'anti-national actions during the Occupation', promising to repeal the law should his party return to power.

Yet PASOK's sweeping victory in both the 1984 European Parliament and the 1985 legislative elections made it clear to Nea Demokratia that their efforts to keep the old fear of the communist bogeyman alive were no longer effective in influencing partisan alignments and winning votes. In 1984 the moderate Konstantinos Mitsotakis succeeded Averoff and set Nea Demokratia on a new path. Under his leadership, ND turned its back on the anti-communist rhetoric of the Averoff period and introduced itself in the guise of a modern liberal-conservative party with no ideological ties to the pre-dictatorship Right. To mark this shift, representatives of ND participated for the first time in the official commemoration of the destruction of the Gorgopotamos viaduct in November 1986. At the same time, and in an effort to delegitimise the Right/anti-Right polarisation that PASOK had been crafting and exploiting for almost a decade, Mitsotakis introduced a campaign of rapprochement aimed at bridging the communication gap between the Right and the Left.

ND's 'opening to the Left' campaign was welcomed by the two Communist Parties, which had good reason to feel threatened by PASOK's encroachment on their traditional voter base. The official recognition of the EAM Resistance and the political cooperation of some of the Left's most prominent personalities with PASOK robbed the traditional Left of what it had hitherto regarded as its own preserve.[174] Once the EAM Resistance was incorporated into the national

174 Manolis Glezos and Markos Vafiadis, for example, were both leading figures of the left-wing Resistance who openly supported PASOK.

narrative, it ceased being part of the Left's past and became part of the past of the entire nation.[175] Alarmed by the increasing haemorrhaging of votes to PASOK, the KKE tried to reappropriate the Resistance by means of a discourse that emphasised the leading role of the communist Left in the national-liberation struggle of the early 1940s.[176] Meanwhile, the KKE was continuing to avoid all public entanglement with memories of the Civil War and would continue to do so until the mid-1990s.[177]

The KKE of the Interior, on the other hand, took a more critical approach to the past. In the discourse of the Eurocommunist faction of the Left, the once fearsome Right was now demythologised and disassociated from Nea Demokratia, which was in turn reappraised and approached in terms of a modern political opponent. As the president of the KKE of the Interior Leonidas Kyrkos mentioned in a speech in 1984, 'the modern Right is not about exile islands (Μακρονήσια) and prisons. These were all phenomena of the Civil War.'[178]

The fratricidal war had ended long ago and by the mid-1980s the time had come for the ghosts of the past to stop haunting the political present of the old enemies. The de-demonisation of the Right in the discourse of the communist parties and ND's campaign of 'opening to the Left' paved the way for a political alliance that would have been unthinkable just a few years earlier. In 1989

175 Voglis 2007: 454.
176 Paschaloudi 2013: 144.
177 As Polymeris Voglis points out, for example, the fortieth anniversary of the foundation of DSE in 1986 passed uncommemorated. That same year the KKE celebrated other Resistance-related anniversaries. See Voglis op. cit.: 438.
178 Cited in Paschaloudi op. cit.: 145.

the project of national reconciliation was steered through its last and final phase by the two old Civil War rivals.

After eight consecutive years in power, PASOK lost the 1989 legislative elections, following a series of allegations of corruption and government scandals. Since no other party was able to secure an absolute majority, ND and the representatives of the Left, which had meanwhile merged into a single party called Coalition of Forces of the Left and Progress (ΣΥΝΑΣΠΙΣΜΟΣ), agreed to collaborate and form the first coalition government of the Third Hellenic Republic. Although short-lived, this unprecedented political and governmental alliance between the Right and the Left signalled Greece's transition to the post-Cold War era, putting an end to a long tradition of mutual suspicion and distrust.

Soon after its appointment, the coalition government passed a law that provided for the official rehabilitation of the leftists defeated in the Civil War. In a highly symbolic gesture, the 1863/89 Law 'on the abolition of the consequences of the Civil War' was put before the Greek Parliament on August 29, 1989, the fortieth anniversary of the decisive battle on Mount Grammos, which is regarded as marking the official end of the Civil War. Among other things, the 1863/89 Law ordained that the fratricidal war should henceforth be referred to as 'Civil War' and no longer as a 'war against bandits' (συμμοριτοπόλεμος). Further provisions of that law banned all discrimination against veterans and supporters of the communist camp and granted

pensions to disabled DSE veterans.[179] As David Close notes, all in all, the 1863/89 Law did 'all that legislation could do to prevent further discrimination against the defeated Left and made reconciliation official state policy, which was henceforth followed by all parties.'[180]

The closing act of the national reconciliation drama came a few hours later and involved the burning of millions of secret police files on individual leftists from the post-war period. The incineration took place at the *Chalyvourgiki* steelworks and was attended by government officials, representatives of other political parties and the Greek media. Although tainted with opportunism and arousing vigorous protests from left-wing intellectuals, who argued against the destruction of what were now valuable historical records, the burning of the files was another highly symbolic act initiated by the two old rivals, both now determined to prove that they were committed to getting rid of all remnants of the divisive past. As K. Mitsotakis argued in the Greek Parliament 'there exist aspects of our national history which we prefer not to know about.'[181]

The 1989 Greek *Compromesso Storico*, the regulations of the law on the abolition of the consequences of the Civil War and the burning of the surveillance files produced a new narrative in which the traumatic memories of the Civil War were neither suppressed nor invoked in order to serve partisan or other political agendas. As N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou have argued, in 1989 the subject of the Civil War closed 'officially, theoretically

179 For more on the 1863/89 Law on the 'abolition of the consequences of the Civil War 1944-1949' see Antoniou and Paschaloudi op. cit.: 313-17.
180 Close 2004: 271-2.
181 Ibid.: 273.

and politically for the Greek public opinion.'[182] Whether the subject of the Civil War was indeed closed once and for all in 1989 is something that has incited a lot of discussion and will be examined in detail in a subsequent chapter. However, what can certainly be said is that the 1980s spirit of national reconciliation opened the way to academic interest in the Greek 1940s.

Four decades after the end of the Second World War the time seemed propitious for the organisation of the first international conference on the 1940s in Greece. Hosted in Athens in April 1984, the conference 'Greece in 1936-44: Dictatorship-Occupation-Resistance' (Η Ελλάδα 1936-44: Δικτατορία-Κατοχή-Αντίσταση) looked at the period from the establishment of the Metaxas dictatorship until the end of the Occupation.[183] Just two years after its official recognition, the Greek Resistance–and most notably the EAM Resistance–was incorporated into the mainstream historiographical discourse.

Yet this was not the case with the events of the post-liberation period. The exclusion of the late 1940s from both the conference title and its programme was a conscious choice on the part of the organisers, who agreed that it was neither the time nor the place to touch upon such sensitive topics. As Hagen Fleischer has noted, his insistence at the time that the Civil War should also be addressed in the conference was met a negative response from Nikos Svoronos: 'Don't be too hasty'.[184]

182 Demertzis, Paschaloudi and Antoniou 2013: 15.
183 For the published proceedings see Fleischer and Svoronos (eds.) 1989.
184 Fleischer 2003: 12.

Instead, it was to be the neutral Danish capital that hosted the first conference on the Greek Civil War. Also held in 1984, the conference dealt exclusively with the post-liberation period and was followed three years later by a second congress on the Greek Civil War, also hosted in Denmark.[185] Meanwhile, in Greece the Civil War continued to be perceived as an aberration from the otherwise glorious 1940s. The recognition of the National Resistance did indeed pave the way towards a more comprehensive historiographical approach to the 1940s; its idealisation, however, obstructed the development of Greek scholarship on the Civil War for several years.[186]

And while the academic discourse was still far from influencing popular attitudes and inspiring public debates about the controversies of the past, cinema was never as close as in March 1984 when *Eleni* premiered in Athens amid jeers, protests and, on several occasions, violence.[187] The film was based on the 1983 memoir of the same title by Greek-American journalist Nick Gage and revolved around the efforts of Gage's mother to arrange the secret escape of her children from their guerrilla-controlled village in order to prevent a communist-planned transfer to the Eastern Bloc.[188] The film provoked such hostile reactions from the Left that all scheduled screenings were cancelled until things calmed down.

---

185 For the published proceedings see Baerentzen, Iatrides and Smith (eds.) 1987 (1984 conference) and Iatrides and Wrigley (eds.) 1995 (1987 conference).
186 This is also reflected in the small number of studies about the 1940s that were published in Greece during the 1970s and 1980s. See Voglis 2015: 354.
187 See Koutsogiannaki 2010: 166-9.
188 Nick Gage's *Eleni* was first published in English in 1983. The same year the book was translated into Greek by author Alexandros Kotzias.

Both the novel and its screen adaptation have been criticised for their poor aesthetic value. Whether *Eleni* is a 'bad adaptation of bad novel' is of little relevance here.[189] After all, the significance of *Eleni* does not lie in its artistic merit, whatever that might be. *Eleni* is important because it radically challenged the sanctified image of the Left as the martyred victim of the 1940s at a time when the idealisation of the left-wing Resistance had become a sort of national obsession. In the end, the fierce responses to *Eleni* showed that the socialist 1980s was not a favourable time for revisionist approaches and alternative interpretations of the past.[190]

If one was asked to pick a single scene from a film or any other cultural production of the 1980s that best encapsulates Greece's national perceptions of the traumatic past, this would have to be the scene between Manos Katrakis and Dionysis Papagiannopoulos from Theo Angelopoulos's 1984 film *Ταξίδι στα Κύθηρα* (Voyage to Cythera). A veteran partisan of the left-wing Resistance, Spyros (played by Manos Katrakis) is allowed to return to his homeland after living in exile in the USSR for more than three decades. On a visit to his now-deserted village, Spyros runs into his old rival (Dionysis Papagiannopoulos). Tall, solemn and dignified, Spyros walks towards his old enemy, who in a bittersweet gesture of reconciliation offers him a cigarette and tells in a broken voice: 'They made us fight. We pulled out each other's eyes. You from this side,

189 Flitouris 2008: 404.

190 In the meantime, films like the acclaimed *Ταξίδι στα Κύθηρα* (Voyage to Cythera, 1984) by Th. Angelopoulos, *Τα χρόνια της Θύελλας* (The Years of the Tempest, 1984) by N. Tzimas and *Τα πέτρινα χρόνια* (Stone Years, 1985) by P. Voulgaris were continuing what Lemonidou calls 'the epic leftist cinematic version of the 1940s' that started in the mid-1970s. See Lemonidou 2013: 230-33.

me from the other. We both lost.' Featuring the main protagonists of the Civil War drama–the martyred Left, the regretful Right and some unidentified 'others' as the usual suspects for all national tragedies–this scene encapsulates the ideological underpinnings of the new national narrative on the 1940s that gained prominence after PASOK's rise to power.

So far, I have tried to give an overview of the public uses and abuses of the memory of the Greek 1940s during the second period of the *metapolitefsi*. From politics to historiography and from cinema to the public sphere, the socialist 1980s witnessed a sweeping revival of the once repressed past. It also witnessed the hegemony of a new national narrative constructed around the idea of a quasi-united Resistance by the Greek 'people' (λαός). Before I go on to discuss how young people's fiction of the 1980s responded to these changes it is important to examine the representation of the Greek 1940s in the official school textbooks of that period.

In 1979 Nikolaos Diamantopoulos and Anastasios Kyriazopoulos's *Ελληνική Ιστορία των Νεωτέρων Χρόνων* (Modern Greek History) replaced the 1974 textbook for pupils in the last year of the *Dimotiko* and remained in use for a decade.[191] Like the previous textbook, Diamantopoulos and Kyriazopoulos's book is quite nationalistic in its approach to the Greek 1940s, aiming to inspire feelings of patriotism and national pride in respect of the 'struggle of the small Greek nation' which 'amazed the entire world.'[192] The 1979 textbook

191 The book was first issued in 1967. The 1979 textbook is a revised version of the 1967 edition.
192 Diamandopoulos and Kyriazopoulos 1979: 179.

is no different to its predecessor when it comes to the representation of the Greek Resistance either. In a spirit of even-handedness, the authors devote one paragraph to the Greek allied struggle in the Middle East and one paragraph to the Resistance within Greece –but without making specific references to any of the resistance organisations that operated during the Occupation.[193] However, a closer look at the two textbooks reveals that there is one small yet quite important difference in this respect. In the 1974 textbook the young reader learns that, after Greece's surrender to the Axis forces 'the surviving units of the Army, Navy and Air Force followed the King to the Middle East and continued the struggle alongside the Allies.'[194] This sentence is reproduced almost unchanged in the 1979 textbook with the exception of one little detail. The relevant excerpt reads: 'The surviving units of the Army, Navy and Air Force fled to the Middle East and continued the struggle alongside our Allies.'[195] The omission of the part that points to the leading role of the Crown in the Greek struggle in the Middle East from the 1979 textbook is a direct reflection of the new narrative that prevailed in the post-1974 era. In this narrative, whether in the Middle East or in Axis-occupied Greece, it was the 'people' (λαός) that had the leading role in the struggle for liberation.

---

193 A few years after PASOK assumed power, Diamandopoulos and Kyriazopoulos's textbook was revised. The 1985 revised edition came with a short addition that read: 'Οι αγώνες και οι θυσίες των Ελλήνων πατριωτών εναντίον των κατακτητών αναγνωρίστηκαν επίσημα από την Πολιτεία το έτος 1982 και ορίστηκε ως ημέρα εορτασμού της Εθνικής Αντίστασης η 25η Νοεμβρίου, ημέρα ανατίναξης της γέφυρας του Γοργοπόταμου.' Diamandopoulos and Kyriazopoulos 1985: 177.

194 'Όσος στρατός, ναυτικό και αεροπορία σώθηκε, πήγε μαζί με τον βασιλιά στη Μέση Ανατολή και συνέχισε τον αγώνα στο πλευρό των συμμάχων.' Kafentzis 1974: 122.

195 'Όσος στρατός, ναυτικό και αεροπορία σώθηκαν, πήγαν στη Μέση Ανατολή και συνέχισαν τον αγώνα στο πλευρό των συμμάχων μας ως την τελική νίκη.' Diamandopoulos and Kyriazopoulos 1979: 179.

Nonetheless, the authors of the 1979 textbook also remained silent on the subject of wartime collaboration, a difficult topic that school historiography has been struggling with for decades. In marked contrast to its predecessor, in Diamantopoulos and Kyriazopoulos's textbook the events of the immediate post-liberation period do come under consideration in a separate chapter entitled 'Η δοκιμασία του Έθνους κατά την περίοδο 1944-1949 και η σημασία της εθνικής ενότητας' (The Trial of the Nation in 1944-1949 and the Importance of National Unity). Though not ignoring the wartime tensions between the various 'factions' (παρατάξεις) of the Resistance, in this case the authors raise the spectre of the foreign factor. Consequently, all blame for the post-liberation national troubles is placed on the country's former allies and their insidious plans to secure their influence in post-war Greece.[196] Revealing very little about the events of the late 1940s, the chapter continues with half a page of what could be described as a sermon on the importance of national unity.

Just a few years after PASOK took power new textbooks were produced for the final year of the *Gymnasio* and the *Lykeio*. Vasilis Kremmydas's *Ιστορία Νεότερη-Σύγχρονη: Ελληνική-Ευρωπαϊκή και Παγκόσμια* (Modern History of Greece and Europe), written for the third year of the *Gymnasio*, was introduced to schools in 1984 and remained in use until 1991.

Kremmydas's book gives a comprehensive picture of the Greek 1940s and engages with subjects that had been ignored or positively supressed in the previous textbook. Eschewing all discussion about the Greek allied struggle

196 Diamandopoulos and Kyriazopoulos ibid.: 185.

in the Middle East, the textbook focuses on the resistance movement that developed in Greece. Moreover, Kremmydas's book is the first textbook for this level to name the main resistance organisations operating during the Occupation.[197] Although the author avoids commenting on the individual contribution of each organisation, he goes on to include a 1943 source in which EAM and its affiliates are described as the 'pillar' of the entire resistance movement.[198] His book is one of the few schoolbooks of the *metapolitefsi* to admit that EAM, EDES and EKKA each had different ideological grounds and distinct political agendas. It is also one of the few textbooks to acknowledge that 'the Civil War had begun during the Occupation between EAM and the other resistance organisations.'[199]

Regarding the differences that marked the post-liberation period, the author adopts a hard-line leftist perspective quite far from the even-handed approach that became the paradigm for the textbooks of the *metapolitefsi*. In Kremmydas's textbook all responsibility for the events of December 1944 are ascribed to the British and their plans to 'engage in open warfare with EAM, should the latter refuse to surrender.'[200] In the same vein, all blame for the outbreak of the Civil War is put on the shoulders of the monarchist camp and its 'unprecedented campaign of terror against its rivals and in particular against the people of EAM.'[201]

197 Namely EAM, EDES and EKKA.
198 Kremmydas 1984: 322.
199 Ibid.: 322-3.
200 Ibid.: 323.
201 Ibid.: 324.

Despite its innovations,[202] Kremmydas's textbook was sharply criticised and was withdrawn from schools after Nea Demokratia assumed power in 1991.[203] The 1984 textbook *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη* (Modern and Contemporary History) by Vasileios Skoulatos, Nikolaos Dimakopoulos and Sotirios Kondis for the pupils of the *Lykeio*, on the other hand, was one of the longest-lived and most acclaimed textbooks of the entire period 1974-2014.

The Greek 1940s is treated in a single chapter entitled 'Η Ελλάδα κατά την περίοδο 1941-1949: Ο θρίαμβος της Εθνικής Αντίστασης και η τραγωδία του Εμφυλίου Πολέμου' (Greece in 1941-1944: the Triumph of the National Resistance and the Civil War Tragedy).[204] As in Kremmydas's textbook, here too the discussion is all about the resistance movement in Axis-occupied Greece. According to the authors, 'while the Cairo-based Greek royalist government was completely cut off from the country, the enslaved Greeks started to seek ways of resisting the occupiers.'[205] It is worth noting once again that the 1980s was the period of the glorification of the Resistance of the Greek 'people' (λαός) and this spirit was promulgated first and foremost in the official school textbooks of the time. The book offers a detailed description of the main resistance organisations of the Occupation. However, it avoids engaging in a discussion about their ideological and other programmatic differences. At the same time, the authors did not shy away from the subject of wartime

202 See Theodorou 2003: 124-5.
203 Mavroskoufis 1997: 100-101.
204 The chapter is divided into two parts; the first treats the period 1941-1944 while the second deals with the events of the immediate post-liberation period.
205 Skoulatos, Dimakopoulos and Kondis 1994: 274.

collaboration. Neither did they shy away from the question of the armed conflicts that had broken out between the main resistance organisations while Greece was still under foreign domination.

Regarding the post-liberation period, the view that is put forward here is that the Civil War started during the Occupation with the British playing 'a central role in this respect.'[206] Unlike Kremmydas's one-sided perspective, the approach in the textbook for the *Lykeio* is more even-handed and blame is attributed equally to all sides, i.e. EAM, the Greek government and the foreigners, for the post-liberation hostilities. All in all, the textbook acknowledges that both the Right and the Left were equally responsible for the Civil War tragedy. It is a view that fully embodies the spirit of national reconciliation which became a major ideological cornerstone of the early *metapolitefsi*.

Obliterated from the textbooks of the early *metapolitefsi*, the memories of the Resistance and the Civil War could at long last find their way into school historiography after the official recognition of the National Resistance in 1982. School historiography was quick to respond to these shifts in national perceptions and interpretations of the 1940s; in subsequent chapters I will explore whether this also happened with young people's fiction of the 1980s.

206 Ibid.: 288.

ORDINARY MEN: THE GERMANS AND GERMAN NAZIS

This chapter discusses the representation of the German occupiers in young people's fiction from the 1980s. As I will go on to show in this chapter, the authors of the 1980s moved away from the oversimplified approaches of the previous decade, introduced new themes and began to engage with subjects that had remained unexplored up until then.

The first striking difference in the representation of Germans is that the latter are no longer depicted as evil monsters with bestial features, as was the case with several of the books published during the previous decade. Moreover, words like 'demons' or 'devils' are found in three narratives out of the thirteen novels and short story collections that comprise the corpus of the texts examined here.[207] Instead, the authors opted for the neutral words 'enemies', 'occupiers', 'occupation authorities', 'German soldiers' or simply 'Germans'.[208]

Another shift in their representation is that the enemies are now depicted in a more realistic light and presented as what they actually were: ordinary in terms of their physical appearance, disciplined and efficient as soldiers, severe, aggressive and violent as occupiers –yet not evil by virtue of their 'Germanness'. In most of the stories examined here the Germans appear as a

---

207 In Pepi Daraki's novel *Τα περιστέρια του καμπαναριού* (The Pigeons of the Bell Tower, 1983) the Germans are sometimes referred to as 'savage beasts' (ανήμερα θεριά) and 'Satans' (σατανάδες). In Soula Rodopoulou's *Εκείνοι τότε…* (Those, Then…, 1988) they are referred to as 'Satans' (σατανάδες), 'blonde devils' (ξανθοί διάβολοι) and 'demons' (δαίμονες), while the latter word is also found in Spyros Tsiros's *Οι πήλινες μούσες* (The Clay Muses, 1988).
208 For the definitions of the terms 'positive', 'negative' and 'neutral' see chapter 2 in Part I.

faceless group of soldiers whose presence is enough to overwhelm their victims with fear:

> The terrible German flags, the iron uniforms, all this horrified me. Disciplined, armed, tall like giants, they looked as if they were part of the motorcycles they rode. Their presence made our teeth chatter with fear.[209]
>
> Armed to the teeth, mute and severe, the Nazis jumped out of their vehicles and started to search around with their eyes. The children that happened to be in the square when they arrived run away in terror. […] Armed soldiers with their feldgrau uniforms and their helmets pulled down over their eyes, with their weapons in their hands and the sound of their armoured boots clanging on the cobblestone that felt as if someone was punching us in the head.[210]
>
> I can still hear their shouts and I still shudder every time I remember their iron helmets, their armbands with those awful swastikas and the sound of their boots, clanging on the asphalt of Achilles Street.[211]

Disciplined, aggressive, masculine, steel-helmeted, jackbooted and with swastika armbands stitched onto their immaculate uniforms; it is clear that the depiction of the Germans clung to the image of the fearsome Nazi stormtrooper that became a stock character in post-war cultural representations of WWII.[212] In this respect, the authors of the 1980s continued

---

209 'Οι μισητές γερμανικές σημαίες, οι σιδερένιες στολές στρατιωτών μού προκαλούσαν φρίκη. Πειθαρχημένοι, πάνοπλοι, ψηλοί σαν γίγαντες, έμοιαζαν μ' εξάρτημα της μηχανής που οδηγούσαν. Έκαναν τα δόντια μας να χτυπούν ασταμάτητα στη ζεστή μέρα.' Vogiatzoglou 1982: 41.

210 'Οπλισμένοι σαν αστακοί, αμίλητοι και βλοσυροί, οι ναζήδες ξεπετιούνταν από τα στρατιωτικά καμιόνια, ρίχνοντας ολόγυρά τους ερευνητικά βλέμματα. Τα παιδιά που έλαχε να βρεθούν κείνη την ώρα στην πλατεία της Κάργιανης άρχισαν να τρέχουν τρομοκρατημένα εδώ κι εκεί. […] οπλισμένοι στρατιώτες, με τις γκριζοπράσινες φορεσιές, με τα κράνη να κατεβαίνουν ως τα μάτια τους, με τα πολυβόλα και τα βαριά όπλα στα χέρια και τις βαριές μπότες τους που, ντακ ντουκ, ντάκα ντουκ, χτυπούσαν στο λιθόστρωτο και τις νιώθανε σα χτυπιές στο κεφάλι τους.' Daraki 1983: 100-101.

211 'Ακόμη βουίζουν στ' αυτιά μου οι βάρβαρες κραυγές τους, κι ανατριχιάζω όταν θυμάμαι τα σιδερένια κράνη τους, τα περιβραχιόνια με τους αγκυλωτούς σταυρούς–τις απαίσιες σβάστικες– που φορούσανε, και τον κρότο που έκαναν οι βαριές μπότες τους στην άσφαλτο της οδού Αχιλλέως.' Tsiros 1988: 55-6.

212 See also Abbenhuis and Buttsworth 2010, especially pages xiii-xl.

to portray Germans as a group of cold-blooded exterminators. At the same time, however, they introduced their young readers to subjects that had remained entirely unexplored in the books of the previous decade, the most notable among them being the subjects of Nazism and the Holocaust.

As discussed in Part I, authors in the 1970s avoided using the term 'Nazis' in their stories, while the few who did ended up using 'Nazis' as an alternative to 'Germans'. As I have also argued in that chapter, the overuse of the demonym 'Germans' and the non-use or misuse of the term 'Nazis' inevitably conveys the impression that it was the Germans rather than the Nazis who inflicted so much suffering upon the world. The authors of the 1980s, on the other hand, were careful to avoid conflating Germans with Nazis and made consistent efforts to caution their young readers against such generalisations: 'After all, the Nazis did not represent the German people as a whole. The German people should not be blamed for their [the Nazis'] atrocities.'[213] In addition to the other words and epithets mentioned earlier, the authors of the period examined here made extensive use of the terms 'Nazis', 'Fascists' and 'Hitler's Nazis' to refer to the occupiers. This is of particular importance and indicates a critical shift in the representation of the enemy. In other words, now it is not the Germans in general but the Nazis in particular who are perceived as enemies.

I argued earlier that authors writing in the 1980s extended the boundaries of what was considered a permissible subject in books for young readers about

213 'Έπειτα οι ναζί δεν αντιπροσώπευαν το σύνολο του γερμανικού λαού. Δεν ευθύνεται ο λαός ο γερμανικός για τα φοβερά τους εγκλήματα.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1989: 94.

WWII and did not shy away from talking to their audience about the ideological nature of the Third Reich, its genocidal agenda and its murderous implementation upon millions of innocents worldwide. The 1980s, moreover, saw the first books for young readers dealing with the Holocaust. This sudden preoccupation with Nazism and its legacies was, of course, not irrelevant to international developments that challenged conventional understandings of the Holocaust, engaging historians, intellectuals and the general public in a series of heated debates about Germany's–and by extension, Europe's–wartime past. However, this is a topic that requires further discussion and will be explored in a separate chapter.

Another point made in Part I is that the authors of the period 1974-1981 did not touch on the subject of accountability. This situation changed in the following decade and the question of who was to blame for the war is one that 1980s authors addressed in their books, even if only in passing. Pepi Daraki's, Lela Petala-Papadopoulou's and Spyros Tsiros's stories, for example, subscribe to the traditional view that Hitler and Hitler alone was responsible for the tragedy of WWII:

> Marina remembered that one evening she heard her father and brother talking about Hitler. They said that he was fanaticising the German people with his speeches and that he was preparing troops and other terrible weapons.
>
> 'Father, remember my words, said Argyris, this maniac, Hitler, is determined to start a war, he is determined to conquer Europe.[214]

214 'Η Μαρίνα θυμήθηκε πως πέρυσι, κάποιο βράδυ, ο πατέρας της κουβέντιαζε με τ' αδέλφια της για το Χίτλερ πως έβγαζε, λέει, λόγους κι αφιόνιζε τους Γερμανούς κι ετοίμαζε στρατό και όπλα «φοβερά». «Να το θυμηθείς, πατέρα, έλεγε ο αδελφός της ο Αργύρης, φιρί φιρί το πάει αυτός, ο μανιακός, ο Χίτλερ να κάνει πόλεμο, να κατακτήσει την Ευρώπη...».' Daraki op. cit.: 9.

> Everyone knew that the German people became involved in a multi-front war and continued to fight, not because they believed in it, but to satisfy the sinister pride of their psychopath leader!...[215]
>
> We were told that they had been fanaticised by a paranoid with a small moustache and an evil look who run their country.[216]

The representation of WWII as Hitler's venture is not a new idea, nor is the stereotypical portrayal of the *Führer* as a madman who managed to fanaticise an entire nation and manipulate it into starting a war in order to fulfil his sick ambitions. Attributing all the blame for the war to Hitler and the Nazi leadership is quite problematic because, among other things, this interpretation ignores the question of the Germans' collective responsibility for the crimes of Nazism, while perpetuating stereotypes about the German people's quasi-blind obedience to the orders of whoever happens to be in power.

Set on Samos and in Palestine, Litsa Psarafti's *Το διπλό ταξίδι* (The Double Voyage, 1987) is a novel based on the author's experience of WWII. One of the most acclaimed young people's novels of the 1980s, *Το διπλό ταξίδι* is also a book that resists such simplified interpretations of the war.

The beginning of the story finds the protagonist attending a conference in Israel, four decades after the end of WWII. After a visit to Jerusalem's Holocaust Memorial that leaves the heroine traumatised, Vangelitsa returns to her hotel. There she is introduced to Dr. and Mrs. Baumann, a nice German

---

215 'Όλοι ξέρανε πως οι Γερμανοί μπλεχτήκανε σ' ένα πολυμέτωπο πόλεμο, και τον συνεχίσανε, όχι γιατί πιστεύανε στη νίκη, αλλά για να ικανοποιήσουνε την αμαρτωλή περηφάνεια του ψυχοπαθιασμένου αρχηγού τους!...' Petala-Papadopoulou 1985: 261.
216 'Μας είπαν ότι τους είχε αφιονίσει ένας παρανοϊκός με μικρό μουστάκι και διαβολικό βλέμμα, που κυβερνούσε τη χώρα τους.' Tsiros op. cit.: 60.

couple who are delighted to learn that Vangelitsa is Greek. The revelations that unfold one after another as she chats with them leave the heroine sickened:

> Tell me about your country, she said when she realised that all this time she hadn't let me talk at all. My husband often talks about the Aegean islands.
>
> -It's really a great opportunity to learn a few things about Greece, her husband interrupted her.
>
> -How do you know about our islands? Have you ever been to a Greek island? I asked him.
>
> -Yes, I have… forty years ago. I was a bomber pilot. I remember flying over Leros, Kos, Samos… beautiful islands…
>
> I felt like someone had punched me in the chest. I struggled to make my voice sound normal.
>
> -What were you doing flying over our islands?
>
> -Well, my dear, what do bomber planes do in a war? They bomb! he said laughing and looked at me with some discomfort.[217]

With much of young people's fiction attributing all the blame for the crimes of the Third Reich to Hitler and Hitler alone, Psarafti shifts the focus onto ordinary Germans, pointing to their role in supporting the regime's murderous agendas. Countering all traditional expectations of what a Nazi perpetrator is supposed to look and behave like, Dr. Baumann is depicted in a favourable

---

217 'Μιλήστε μου όμως για τη δική σας χώρα, συνέχισε, όταν κατάλαβε πως τόση ώρα δε με είχε αφήσει να πω κουβέντα. Ο άντρας μου θυμάται συχνά τα νησιά του Αιγαίου…
-Είναι πραγματικά μια ουρανοκατέβατη ευκαιρία για να μάθεις κάτι για τη σημερινή Ελλάδα, την έκοψε ο άντρας της.
-Κι εσείς πώς ξέρετε για τα νησιά μας; Έχετε πάει; τον ρώτησα.
-Ναι… πριν από σαράντα χρόνια. Ήμουν πιλότος σε βομβαρδιστικό αεροπλάνο. Θυμάμαι, πετούσα πάνω από τη Λέρο, την Κω, τη Σάμο… όμορφα νησιά…
Σαν να δέχτηκα μια γροθιά στο στήθος. Προσπάθησα να κάνω τη φωνή μου αδιάφορη.
-Τι κάνατε πετώντας πάνω από τα νησιά μας;
-Μα, αγαπητή μου, τι κάνουν τα βομβαρδιστικά στον πόλεμο; Ρίχνουν βόμβες! γέλασε και με κοίταξε λιγάκι αμήχανα.' Psarafti 1987: 11.

light. Sophisticated, eloquent and well-mannered, there is nothing evil in this German man.

However, Dr. Baumann is a man who is revealed to have participated in the bombing of Samos in 1943 that left the island almost completely destroyed, forcing little Vangelitsa, along with hundreds of other islanders, to seek refuge in Palestine. Annoyed by Vangelitsa's persistent questions about his past, Dr. Baumann attempts to absolve himself of any responsibility for his involvement in the atrocities of the Third Reich by claiming that he was only doing his duty: 'Well, my dear, what do bomber planes do in a war? They bomb!'

Psarafti here touches upon a subject that had previously remained completely unexplored, that is to say, the question of how much responsibility ordinary Germans had for the atrocities perpetrated in the name of the Third Reich. This issue is brought up on another occasion in the novel, this time by Mrs. Baumann:

> I was a young girl back in 1945. We were living in East Prussia, in the town of Königsberg that is now Kaliningrad. The war was approaching its end, Germany had been defeated. When the victors entered our town, thousands of civilians sought refuge in our homeland. Germany had turned into a huge pile of ruins. Entire families had been orphaned and uprooted. Thousands of German soldiers who had returned from the Front were searching through the ruins. We were living in basements. We were searching in the victors' garbage, hoping to find a can to lick off the leftovers. We ate mice and dogs... Don't look at me like this, I know what you're thinking...
>
> -How can I not be? You are to blame for all these things.
>
> -Yes, the blame is ours and we paid for it. The German people paid a heavy price for all these marches and parades, the new symbols of Nazism. The blame is on us for following that

> demagogue, the *Führer*, and for letting him slaughter the world·
> Mrs. Baumann's voice was quivering…[218]

Quite unlike the oversimplified approaches discussed earlier, in *Το διπλό ταξίδι* Psarafti prompts her young readers to understand that the *Führer* did not act alone. If Hitler was responsible for 'slaughtering the whole world', ordinary Germans were also responsible for having let him do so. That makes Psarafti one of the few authors who resisted subscribing to the view that Hitler was single-handedly responsible for the tragedy of WWII. Instead, she shifted the focus onto ordinary Germans, pointing to their share of responsibility for having supported a totalitarian regime rooted in violence.

What also makes Psarafti's novel stand out is that the author allows the voice of the 'others' to be heard as well. Mrs. Baumann is allowed to speak for herself and present events from her perspective. This is of particular importance as the young reader is presented with multiple subject positions, namely the position of the victims (represented by the protagonist) and the position of the perpetrators cum victims (represented by Mrs. Baumann), a strategy that prevents identification with a single perspective.[219] Confronted

---

218 'Θυμάμαι την περιπέτεια και τα βάσανα της οικογένειάς μου. Ήμουν κοπελίτσα το 1945. Ζούσαμε στην Ανατολική Πρωσία, στο Κένικσμπεργκ, το σημερινό Καλίνιγκραντ. Ο πόλεμος κόντευε να τελειώσει, η Γερμανία είχε νικηθεί. Όταν μπήκαν στην πόλη μας οι νικητές, χιλιάδες άμαχοι ζητήσαμε καταφύγιο πίσω στην πατρίδα. Η Γερμανία ήταν ένας σωρός μπάζα απ' άκρη σ' άκρη. Ολόκληρες οικογένειες είχαν ξεκληριστεί. Χιλιάδες Γερμανοί στρατιώτες γύριζαν από τα μέτωπα κι έψαχναν στα ερείπια. Ζούσαμε στα υπόγεια. Ψαχουλεύαμε στα σκουπίδια που πετούσαν οι στρατιώτες των νικητών για να γλείψουμε τ' απομεινάρια από τις κονσέρβες. Φάγαμε ποντίκια και σκύλους… Μη με κοιτάζεις έτσι, ξέρω τι σκέφτεσαι…
-Πώς να μην το σκέφτομαι; Για όλα αυτά φταίξατε σεις οι ίδιοι.
-Ναι, φταίξαμε και πληρώσαμε. Όλοι οι Γερμανοί πληρώσαμε ακριβά εκείνα τα εμβατήρια και τις παρελάσεις, τα καινούρια είδωλα του ναζισμού. Φταίξαμε γιατί ακολουθήσαμε εκείνον το λαοπλάνο, το Φύρερ, και τον αφήσαμε να αιματοκυλήσει ολόκληρο τον κόσμο, η φωνή της κυρίας Μπάουμαν έτρεμε.' Ibid.: 156-7.
219 See also Stephens 1992: 47-83.

with different perspectives, the young reader is encouraged to engage in critical reading and to realise that the 'other' side had also suffered the bitter consequences of the war. That being so, it should also be noted that the line between victims and perpetrators remains clear-cut throughout the novel. Although young readers are encouraged to sympathise with the German people for their post-war plight, they are not absolved of the horrific realities of Nazism, which, as Mrs. Baumann admits, would not have been possible without their support. Heavy as it was, the price the Germans paid after the collapse of the Third Reich is presented as a kind of moral punishment for allowing themselves to be indoctrinated with the ideals of Nazism.

Manolis Kornilios's short novel *Πολύ ωραίο το όνομά σου, Ελευθερία!* (You Have a Beautiful Name, *Eleftheria*!, 1987) offers a completely different perspective on the question of who is to blame for the war. The story is set in German-occupied Athens and centres on the friendship between a group of Greek children and Greta, a German girl whose father has been arrested for his anti-Nazi views. Their friendship with Greta helps the young heroes to realise that 'it was actually possible to love this German girl, even though her compatriots are inflicting so much suffering and death upon our people.'[220] The same goes for Greta who cannot understand how 'the German soldiers

220 'Είχαν κάνει μια σπουδαία ανακάλυψη: ότι μπορούσαν ν' αγαπούν ένα Γερμανόπουλο, όπως η Γκρέτα, τη στιγμή που οι συμπατριώτες του, οι Γερμανοί κατακτητές, σκορπούσαν θάνατο και δυστυχία στη δική τους πατρίδα!' Kornilios 1987: 19.

have so much hatred for the Greeks' when she feels nothing but genuine love for her new friends.[221]

Torn between national loyalties and personal feelings, Greta struggles to make sense of the war and turns to her mother for answers. There follows a lengthy and complex analysis of the 'real' causes of the war in the form of a question-and-answer discussion between Greta and her mother. The main points of this analysis are summarised in the following excerpt:

> […] Sure, her father was against Hitler. But what did it mean to be a supporter of Hitler?
>
> -[…] This is a difficult question she [Greta's mother] said. For one to answer it, one first needs to think about who are these people who decide wars. Come on, let's find the answer together. Who decides a war?
>
> -Those who rule said Greta.
>
> -[….] Now, although they are obliged to obey not all citizens have the same opinion; some may agree with the decision to go to war and some others may not.
>
> -[…] Does this mean, then, that even those who agree [to go to war] may not actually want the war?
>
> -Of course.
>
> -How can this be? Then this could also mean that even the leaders who make the decision [to go to war] may not actually want the war?
>
> -It is possible.
>
> -Then why do they decide to start a war?
>
> -[The reason is] that their decisions may not always comply with their will. They are not always free to decide on their own. […] The power is handed to the leaders by the people who vote for them […] It is the state with its armed forces and courts that has the power. To survive, a state needs money. […] The real power, therefore, is in the hands of those who have the money.

221 'Πώς, ενώ αυτή με τα τρία Ελληνόπουλα αγαπιούνταν τόσο, οι συμπατριώτες της, οι Γερμανοί στρατιώτες, μισούσαν τόσο πολύ τους Έλληνες κατοίκους της συνοικίας;' Ibid.: 38.

> […] When world leaders decide to go to war, it is because this is the will of the rich and of those who have the real power. […] Of course, a country cannot go to war unless it is the will of those who have the real power, because it takes huge amounts of money to prepare and launch a war.[222]

Perhaps instead of asking who was responsible for the war it would be more appropriate to ask who was not: apparently it was neither Hitler nor the Nazis and certainly not the Germans. Instead, the view conveyed in Kornilios's book is that the real driving force behind WWII, behind any war in fact, is the safeguarding of the interests of the 'rich', an interpretation which I find quite problematic for three reasons. The first is that the attribution of the responsibility for WWII to some group of rich people exonerates the Nazi leadership (κυβερνήτες) for the crimes of the Third Reich by presenting them as puppets in the hands of those who have the 'real power'. Correspondingly, ordinary Germans are also absolved of their share of responsibility for the

---

222 '[…] Ήταν, βέβαια, κατά του Χίτλερ ο πατέρας της. Τι ήταν όμως οι χιτλερικοί;
- […] Δεν είναι εύκολη ερώτηση αυτή, είπε. Για ν' απαντήσει κανένας, πρέπει πρώτα να σκεφτεί ποιοι αποφασίζουν τους πολέμους. Έλα, λοιπόν, να ψάξουμε μαζί να βρούμε την απάντηση. Ποιοι αποφασίζουν τους πολέμους;
-Οι κυβερνήτες, είπε η Γκρέτα.
- […] Οι πολίτες, τώρα, ενώ είναι υποχρεωμένοι να υπακούν, δεν έχουν όλοι την ίδια γνώμη: μπορεί μερικοί να συμφωνούν με την απόφαση για πόλεμο και άλλοι όχι.
- […] Μπορεί, δηλαδή, να μη θέλουν πόλεμο κι αυτοί που συμφωνούν;
-Γιατί όχι;
-Μα είναι δυνατό; Τότε, μπορεί και οι κυβερνήτες, που παίρνουν την απόφαση, να μη θέλουν τον πόλεμο;
-Δεν αποκλείεται.
-Τότε, γιατί τον αποφασίζουν;
- […] Ότι δεν αποφασίζουν μόνοι τους, με την πραγματική τους θέληση. Μπορεί κι αυτοί ακόμα να μην είναι ελεύθεροι. […] Κανονικά, τη δύναμη στους κυβερνήτες τη δίνει ο λαός που τους ψηφίζει ή τους υποστηρίζει […] Το κράτος, με την ένοπλη δύναμη και τα δικαστήρια, έχει την πραγματική δύναμη. […] Το κράτος συντηρείται με κάτι άλλο: με το χρήμα. […] Έτσι, τελικά, την πραγματική δύναμη την έχουν οι πλούσιοι. […] Όταν οι κυβερνήτες αποφασίζουν έναν πόλεμο, θα πει πως τον θέλουν οι πλούσιοι ή μόνο μια μερίδα από τους πλούσιους, οι πιο δυνατοί […] Οπωσδήποτε, μια κυβέρνηση δεν μπορεί να κάνει έναν πόλεμο, αν δεν τον θέλουν εκείνοι που έχουν την πραγματική δύναμη, γιατί ο πόλεμος χρειάζεται τεράστια έξοδα και για να προετοιμαστεί και για να γίνει.' Ibid.: 38-44.

dreadful realities of Nazism. The third and most important reason is that the Second World War is thus dehistoricised and equated with all other wars that have taken place in the past or may occur in the future. Such equations, however, often lead to historical relativisation and this is precisely the book's most serious shortcoming. In other words, the attribution of the responsibility for the war to some clique of the rich and powerful completely fails to take account of the historical specificity of WWII, the ideological motives of the perpetrators, the racial agenda of the Nazi regime and its genocidal implementation to the detriment of millions of innocents worldwide.

At the same time, Kornilios was careful to distinguish between Germans and German Nazis:

> -I was right! Kostas said.
>
> -Right about what? Nikos asked.
>
> -About saying that those who live in Megali Vila are with the Germans and the Italians.
>
> -They are with Hitler and Mussolini, you mean, Eleftheria corrected him.
>
> -Well, it's the same thing.
>
> -No, it isn't.[223]

In a remarkable departure from the authors of the 1970s who did not care to distinguish between Germans and German Nazis, Kornilios here draws a clear distinction between the German people, as a nation, and German

---

223 '-Καλά το 'λεγα εγώ! είπε ο Κώστας.
-Τι έλεγες; τον ρώτησε ο Νίκος.
-Πως αυτοί στη Μεγάλη Βίλα είναι με τους Γερμανούς και τους Ιταλούς.
-Με τον Χίτλερ και τον Μουσολίνι, θέλεις να πεις, τον διόρθωσε η Ελευθερία.
-Το ίδιο κάνει.
-Όχι, δεν κάνει το ίδιο.' Ibid.: 28.

supporters of Nazism. In *Πολύ ωραίο το όνομά σου, Ελευθερία!* Greta and her parents are ardent anti-Nazis. The girl signs off her letters to her Greek friends with the slogans 'Long Live Liberty' and 'Long Live Peace', while she repeatedly apologises for the sufferings her compatriots have inflicted upon the Greek people, something that, as she admits, makes her feel ashamed of being German. A passionate anti-Nazi, Greta's father faces execution for his subversive views. In the end, the man manages to escape death and joins the Greek Resistance with the help of his daughter's new friends.

Manolis Kornilios was not the only author of the 1980s who resisted equating Germans with German Nazis. Soula Rodopoulou, Kira Sinou and Avgi Papakou-Lagou also made efforts to help their young readers understand that not all Germans were Nazis:

> At least there was some sense of pride among the soldiers of the Wehrmacht. Not all of them were Fascists. There was still something left from the moral codes of the past.[224]

> And the German folks, what was to blame them for? Not all of them were Nazis. Not all of them wanted to fight. As with many other nations in the world, most of them had been forced to fight. Many of them had managed to preserve their humanity.[225]

> Not all of them were Fascists. There were many soldiers and officers who would give anything to distance themselves from the frantic Nazis. They were ashamed of their [the Nazis'] atrocities.'[226]

---

224 'Στη Βέρμαχτ είχε μείνει λίγο φιλότιμο. Δεν ήταν όλοι βαμμένοι φασίστες. Κάτι απόμεινε απ' τους κώδικες ηθικής του παλιού καιρού.' Rodopoulou 1988: 38.
225 'Μα και τ' άλλα παιδιά, οι Γερμανοί, τι φταίγανε κι εκείνα; Σάμπως ήταν όλοι τους ναζί; Σάμπως ήθελαν όλοι τους να πολεμήσουν; Όπως σε κάθε λαό στον κόσμο, στους περισσότερους με το ζόρι τους φορέσανε τη στολή κι έστω και Γερμανοί στρατιώτες, ήταν αρκετοί που είχαν κρατήσει την ανθρωπιά τους.' Sinou 1989: 44.
226 'Δεν ήταν όλοι φασίστες. Στρατιώτες κι αξιωματικοί, τι δεν θα 'διναν για να διαχωρίσουν τη θέση τους από τη ναζιστική μανία. Ντρέπονταν για τη θηριωδία τους.' Papakou-Lagou 1988: 60.

It is striking that the phrase 'not all soldiers were Fascists/Nazis' is reproduced with almost the exact same wording in all of the passages quoted above. It might also be noted that, in their efforts to distinguish ordinary German soldiers from Nazi war criminals and the Wehrmacht from 'Nazi mania', these authors have made wholesale use of one of the longest-lived myths of the post-war period; that is to say, the myth of the 'unblemished' Wehrmacht. The soldiers' professionalism and adherence to old moral codes, their preservation of their pride, upright conduct and honour (φιλότιμο), the way they distanced themselves from the ideological doctrines of Nazism and their abhorrence of the outrages perpetrated in the name of the New Order, all lie at the heart of the post-war myth that the Wehrmacht was a 'clean' institution that remained uninvolved in the ideologies and murderous policies of the Third Reich.[227] The perpetuation of the image of a Wehrmacht that had kept its hands clean in books intented for an audience whose grandparents were still likely to remember these 'dignified' soldiers committing numerous atrocities in occupied Greece speaks volumes about the cultural endurance of the 'unsullied' Wehrmacht myth.[228]

Regardless, what is important to note here is that the 1980s saw a number of authors who made conscious efforts to help their young readers understand that Germans and Nazis are two different concepts, that not all Germans were

227 For the post-war predominance of the 'unblemished' Wehrmacht myth see Förster 1998: 266-83, Naumann 2000: 417-29 and Shepherd 2009: 455-73.
228 Specifically for Wehrmacht's role in the 1943 massacre in Komeno see Mazower 2000: 146-74.

Nazis and that there were also many Germans who despised Nazis and Nazism. Just like their peace-loving southern neighbours.

‘JOINING THE NAZIS WOULD BE UNTHINKABLE!’: THE AUSTRIANS[229]

Avgi Papakou-Lagou’s novel *Μην κλαις μικρούλα μου* (Don’t Cry, Little Girl, 1988) is set during the Greek 1940s and centres on the efforts of a loving husband and father to reunite with his family. After returning from the Albanian Front, Giorgos is devastated to learn that both his wife and daughter have gone missing. Eventually, the hero manages to track down his wife only to find that she is suffering from amnesia. On top of that, Giorgos discovers that his wife is now involved romantically with a former German soldier, Erik, who is also suffering from amnesia.

Erik is depicted in the most positive light throughout the novel. He is a sensitive young man, a devoted fiancée and a passionate anti-Nazi, who feels ‘outraged by the atrocities committed by his Nazi compatriots.’[230] His already strained relationship with his comrades[231] was shattered for good when it was revealed that Erik had been helping secretly the Greek guerrillas in their operations against the Germans. After the end of the war and having no memories of his past life, Erik is shocked to learn about the Germans’ role in the war and struggles to come to terms with the idea that he is German.[232] Quite simply, there is nothing ‘German’ about him.

---

229 I have taken the title from Captain von Trapp’s line: ‘To refuse them [the Nazis] would be fatal for all of us. And joining them would be unthinkable’ in Robert Wise’s 1965 film *The Sound of Music*.
230 ‘Ο νεαρός Γερμανός ασφυκτιούσε με τη θηριωδία των Ναζήδων συμπατριωτών του.’ Papakou-Lagou 1988: 61.
231 ‘Η ανθρωπιά του, τους εξαγρίωνε και τους έκανε να δυσπιστούν μαζί του.’ Ibid.
232 ‘Διαβάζει εφημερίδες, συζητάει, σαν όμως ένας άνθρωπος που τώρα μαθαίνει τι έγινε. Δεν μπορεί να το συνειδητοποιήσει πως είναι ένας Γερμανός.’ Ibid.: 96.

Giorgos, however, is not the only one searching for his loved ones. Erik's parents have also been looking for their missing son. With the help of Erik's nurse, they manage to discover the whereabouts of their son and travel to Greece to reunite with him. Their arrival makes everything fall into place: the reason why Erik could not bear the thought that he was German was because he was not, in fact, a German. As it is revealed, Erik is Austrian and so are both his parents.

Like their son, Mr. and Mrs. von Kreisler 'hated the Nazis and were ashamed of all the horrible things they had caused to the world.'[233] As genuine Austrians, moreover, Erik and his parents 'were among those who did not want the war, but no one had asked for their opinion. They were not Nazis.'[234] All responsibility and guilt for the crimes of Nazism are attributed to their Prusso-German neighbours; the Austrians, on the other hand, had been forced into a disgraceful war that no genuine Austrian wanted to fight. After all, Nazism is interpreted as 'un-Austrian' *per se*, in contrast to the Austrian national character'[235] as exhibited by the von Kreislers in the novel and, long before them, by the peace-loving and musical von Trapps in popular culture.[236] The message here is clear: the Austrians were 'good', they despised

233 'Μισούσαν τους Ναζί και ντρέπονταν, για όλα τα φοβερά που είχαν κάνει σ' ολόκληρο τον κόσμο.' Ibid.: 113.
234 'Αυστριακοί είναι, την καθησύχασε... Είν' απ' αυτούς που δεν τον ήθελαν τον πόλεμο, μα ποιος τους ρωτούσε; Δεν είναι ναζήδες...' Ibid.: 138.
235 Uhl 2006: 43.
236 I am referring to the 1965 film *The Sound of Music* which contributed a great deal to the popularisation of Austria's post-war image as a nation of patriots with unquestionable anti-Nazi credentials.

the Nazis and, above all, they were victims of a disastrous war for which they had no responsibility.

In Soula Rodopoulou's *Τα σαράντα κόσκινα* (The Forty Sieves, 1984) and Loty Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's *Λάθος, κύριε Νόιγκερ!* (Wrong, Mr. Neuger!, 1989) the tale of the good Austrian is conflated with another Greek post-war myth. On December 13, 1943, in retaliation for the execution of seventy German soldiers by ELAS, troops of the German Army's 117th *Jäger* Division entered the town of Kalavryta and assembled all male residents aged fourteen and over.[237] The men were marched to a hill outside the town and machine-gunned en masse. The women and children of Kalavryta were transferred to the local school. The school was set on fire and those trapped inside would have been burned alive had it not been for a benevolent soldier, who opened the door and helped the imprisoned get out of the flaming building.

This is the point where historical reality merges into the realm of post-war mythology. Even to this day, there is a widespread belief that the soldier who saved the lives of the women and children of Kalavryta was Austrian. However, this scenario is not supported by historical research and there has never been any hard evidence about the true national identity of the 'good' soldier of Kalavryta.[238] In fact, it is doubtful whether this 'good' soldier ever existed at

237 For a detailed account of Operation Kalavryta and its aftermath see Meyer 2004.
238 Meyer ibid.: 458-61, Fleischer 2008: 511 and Botz 2015: 33-4.

all, as suggested by several survivors who insist that the imprisoned managed to release themselves out of the school without outside help.[239]

Historian Gerhard Botz notes that when he first heard this story he could not help feeling proud of being an Austrian.[240] However, it was not long before he started to suspect that there was little historical truth in this heroic tale. During one of his visits to Kalavryta, Botz turned to a local priest for answers. Instead of an explicit answer, the priest asked Botz 'why he insisted on knowing the truth', adding that he 'should be grateful that there is such a beautiful story about Austrians' and that 'historical reality is of little importance.'[241] Botz realised that the tale of the nice Austrian of Kalavryta was just another post-war myth, a view shared by several other scholars of the Greek 1940s.[242] Nonetheless, the story about the Austrian soldier who risked his own life to save the children and women of Kalavryta has grown deep roots in the Greek collective memory of the Occupation and even to this day this narrative is recorded as fact on several travel websites and in guidebooks.[243]

As mentioned earlier, this tale is also perpetuated in two novels for young people from the 1980s. The relevant passage from Soula Rodopoulou's *Τα σαράντα κόσκινα* reads:

---

239 Some of these testimonies can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E4dc_sI0IZc and https://www.kalavrytanews.com/2014/12/13-12-1943-KALAVRYTA.html.
240 Botz op. cit.: 34.
241 Ibid.
242 Ibid. See also Meyer op. cit.: 458-61 and Fleischer op. cit.: 511.
243 See, for instance https://www.tripadvisor.com/ShowUserReviews-g315841-d602250-r121581699-Municipal_Museum_of_the_Holocaust_of_Kalavryta-Kalavrita_Achaea_Region_Peloponnes.html, http://www.greeka.com/peloponnese/kalavryta/kalavryta-excursions/kalavryta-holocaust.htm. Also, Hellander et al. 2006: 172 and Enfield 2011: 46.

> The terrible news arrived. The massacre of Kalavryta. All men aged fourteen and over were ordered to gather at the square. The women and children were locked up inside the school. […] The women and children were screaming as the school started to burn. […] The Austrian who was guarding the door took pity on the desperate women and children and opened the door.[244]

Loty Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's *Λάθος, κύριε Νόιγκερ!* is one of the most acclaimed young people's novels from the 1980s. It is also a novel whose theme is based on the tale of the good Austrian of Kalavryta. It all starts when young Philippos decides to spend the summer at his grandparents' village, close to the town of Kalavryta. Philippos is accompanied by his Greek-Austrian tutor Alexis Neuger. Philippos's relationship with his teacher becomes strained when the boy starts to suspect that Mr. Neuger has been keeping secrets from him. After a series of misunderstandings, Mr. Neuger's secret is finally revealed: the real reason he agreed to spend the summer in Philippos's village was to fulfill an old promise to his deceased father, Franz, the man who saved the women and children of Kalavryta from being burned alive back in 1943.

A distinguished musician, Franz Neuger had been forced by the Nazis to serve in their disgraceful war.[245] Kind-hearted and sensitive, Franz was above all a proud Austrian who had nothing to do with the Nazi ruffians.[246] Wounded by the bullets of his comrades after it was revealed that he had released the

---

244 'Έφτασε η τρομερή είδηση. Η καταστροφή των Καλαβρύτων. Μάζεψαν τους άντρες από δεκατεσσάρων χρονών και πάνω στην πλατεία. Τα γυναικόπαιδα τα έκλεισαν στο σχολείο. […] Και το σχολείο άρχισε να καίγεται, ενώ ακούγονταν οι στριγγλιές των γυναικών και τα γοερά κλάματα των παιδιών. […] Ο Αυστριακός που φύλαγε την πόρτα, λυπήθηκε όλα αυτά, τ' απελπισμένα γυναικόπαιδα και άνοιξε την πόρτα.' Rodopoulou 1984: 101.

245 'Πώς να νιώθει όταν αναλογίζεται, ότι, σε κείνο τον πόλεμο, από τη μια μεριά πολεμούσε ο παππούς του ο Έλληνας και ο θείος του… Από την άλλη, αναγκασμένος από τους ναζί, ο πατέρας του ο Αυστριακός!' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1989: 149.

246 '[…] ένας στρατιώτης, που τίποτα κοινό δεν είχε, φαίνεται, με τους κακούργους ναζί.' Ibid.: 99.

imprisoned out of the school, Franz spent days in hiding until he managed to escape to Italy with the help of a nice German lady, who was also an ardent anti-Nazi. Before he left, Franz promised to return after the end of the war and bring her a bouquet of her favorite roses.

However, Franz was unable to fulfill his promise. Every time the opportunity presented itself, memories of the horror he had witnessed in Kalavryta came flooding back, leaving him sick and unable to travel. Although a hero and saviour of hundreds of innocents, Franz spent the rest of his life struggling with guilt, refusing to accept praises for his humane deed and humbly insisting that 'he only did his duty.'[247]

It would be interesting to remind here that, not long before the massacre of Kalavryta, Dr. Baumann was flying over the Greek islands on his bomber, enjoying the spectacular view while sending thousands of innocents to their deaths. As the perpetrator tells Vangelitsa years later without a hint of guilt or remorse, he was 'just doing his duty.' It seems, therefore, that there is a fundamental difference in how the concept of 'doing one's own duty' is understood by the German and Austrian characters in the novels under examination. While Dr. Baumann is bombing civilians, Franz Neuger and Eric are putting themselves in danger to help others. And while Mrs. Baumann's bitter confession about the post-war plight of the German people is countered by Vangelitsa's harsh verdict: 'You were responsible for all these things', no one comes to blame the Austrians for their involvement in the atrocities of the

247 'Υποστήριζες πως τίποτα το σπουδαίο δεν έκανες. Απλώς το καθήκον σου.' Ibid.: 161.

Third Reich. After all, as repeatedly emphasised in the novels discussed here, the Austrian people were not Nazis. If anything, they were victims of Nazi aggression, having been forced to serve in a terrible war that no genuine Austrian wanted to fight.

It is clear that this hagiographical representation of Austrians is posited on the post-war notion of Austria as the first victim of Hitler's aggression.[248] Following the Moscow Declaration in 1943, the narrative of victimhood and the idea that Austrians had remained uninvolved in the criminal ideologies and practices of the Third Reich became central to official interpretations and popular perceptions regarding the country's involvement in WWII, both in Austria and abroad. Even at a time when Austria's post-war *Lebenslüge* was beginning to collapse and the revelations of the Waldheim scandal were forcing the nation into its own painful *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, the idea that the Austrian people remained uncorrupted by the scourge of Nazism continued to dominate cultural imaginations and representations of Austria and the Austrians. As I have gone on to show in this chapter, young people's fiction in Greece was no exception in this respect.

248 For the theory of the first victim and Austria's post-war politics of memory regarding its Nazi past see Uhl 1997: 64-94. Also, Uhl 2006: 40-72.

'HEIL PUCCINI!': THE ITALIANS[249]

The Austrians, however, were not alone in portraying themselves as victims of WWII. In the early 1950s German aristocrat Ehrengard Schramm visited the town of Kalavryta where the memories of the 1943 Nazi massacre were still fresh. There Schramm heard a beautiful story about a nice foreign soldier who saved the children and women of Kalavryta from being burnt alive. This time, however, the story was told with a little twist. In this version the hero of Kalavryta was proclaimed to be Italian. When Schramm pointed out that the nice soldier could not have possibly been Italian since Italy had already surrendered to the Allies by then, she received the response: 'Yes, yes, we know that. He was Italian. No German could have done what he did.'[250]

In a previous chapter I talked about Italy's post-war *colpo grosso,* that is to say its astonishing transformation from a perpetrator nation into a nation of victims.[251] In that same chapter I examined the portrayal of the Italian occupiers in the young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981 and argued that their representation adheres to the familiar image that came to dominate Europe's collective imagination as regards Italy's involvement in WWII: the Italians were inefficient as soldiers, harmless as occupiers and, above all, victims of a disastrous war they had been tricked into by their Fascist leader. This chapter sets out to explore the representation of the Italians in young people's fiction from the 1980s.

---

249 I have taken the title from Captain Corelli's reply 'Heil Puccini' to a Nazi officer's 'Heil Hitler' in John Madden's 2001 film *Captain Corelli's Mandolin*.
250 As cited in Leech 2010: 17.
251 See chapter 3 in Part I.

Even a quick look at the corpus of texts under examination here reveals that the Italians continue to be represented as the 'emblem of expansionism with a human face' to borrow the words of Lidia Santarelli.[252] To give one example, Charis Sakellariou's story 'Οι σφαίρες και το ποτάμι' (The Bullets and the River, 1984) is about a young boy who falls into a river while trying to cross a bridge carrying a bag full of bullets for the guerrillas. A group of Italian soldiers witness the scene and immediately sympathise with the boy as he struggles against the raging water:

> -*Sopra*, *ragazzo*! *Tire*! (sic)..., the Italians were shouting behind me and their voices mingled with the moaning river. It was clear that they shared my agony, my desperate struggle to keep on the surface, fighting against this terrible element of nature.[253]

When the boy eventually manages to pull himself out of the water the Italians burst into cheers: 'on the other side of the river the Italians were cheering: -*Bravo*, *ragazzo*! *Bravissimo*! Two or three of them even applauded.'[254] Unlike the unsparing Germans, the Italians are shown to be driven by an innate sense of goodness. As the young protagonists also come to observe in Soula Rodopoulou's novel *Τα σαράντα κόσκινα* (The Forty Sieves, 1984), 'the Italians seemed more mellow, more humane. They even smiled at

252 Santarelli 2004: 280.
253 '-Σόπρα, ραγκάτσο! Τίρε!..., φώναζαν πίσω μου οι Ιταλοί κι η φωνή τους γινόταν ένα με το μουγκρητό του ποταμού. Ήταν φανερό πως εκείνες τις στιγμές ζούσαν κι αυτοί την αγωνία μου, τον απελπισμένο αγώνα μιας ζωής να κρατηθεί στην επιφάνεια παλεύοντας μ' ένα στοιχειό της πλάσης φοβερό.' Sakellariou 1984: 111.
254 'Οι Ιταλοί από την άλλη μεριά του ποταμιού έβαλαν τις φωνές: -Μπράβο, ραγκάτσο! Μπραβίσιμο! Δυο τρεις μάλιστα χειροκρότησαν.' Ibid.: 112-3.

times.'[255] Quite simply, there is something less fearsome in these warm-hearted Mediterraneans.

The reasons behind the long-held (mis)apprehension that the Italian occupation had been less extreme and for the most part bloodless in character have already been discussed in a previous chapter. In addition to those reasons, one should also take into account another factor, which is perhaps best encapsulated in the motto *una faccia, una razza* (one face, one race), a popular phrase that is often used to denote the strong genetic and cultural links between Greeks and Italians. This interpretation, the idea that there exists a causal connection between the inherent goodness of the Italians–the 'people who resemble us' in the words of George Theotokas–[256]and their close affinities with the unfailingly good Greeks is also conveyed in Soula Rodopoulou's novel *Εκείνοι τότε…* (Those, Then…, 1988):

> The Italians were soft. Especially the ordinary soldiers. […] Many of them were from Sicily and Calabria. Some of them may also have been of the same [Greek] blood. […] A few of the officers had become fanatics and behaved in a rigid and selfish way, but no one can actually say that they did harm. […] They seemed more like looters than fighters and occupiers. [257]

The last two phrases describe in a nutshell the image of the Italian conqueror that has become firmly inscribed in the Greek collective memory of

---

255 'Οι Ιταλοί, τους φαίνονταν πιο μαλακοί, πιο ανθρώπινοι. Χαμογελούσαν κιόλας κάποτε.' Rodopoulou 1984: 56.

256 'It's as if, once weapons were laid down and the belligerent atmosphere between them and us dissipated, there rose to the surface some hidden solidarity with the "people who resemble us".' Theotokas 2005: 426.

257 'Οι Ιταλοί ήταν μαλακοί. Περισσότερο οι απλοί στρατιώτες. […] Πολλοί απ' τη Σικελία και την Καλαβρία. Μπορεί να είχαν μερικοί και αίμα ελληνικό. Χιλιάδες-χιλιάδων Έλληνες δεν έζησαν εκεί απ' τα αρχαία χρόνια και τα χρόνια τα Βυζαντινά και της Τουρκοκρατίας; […] Μερικοί απ' τους αξιωματικούς ήταν φανατισμένοι και φέρονταν απότομα και εγωιστικά, όμως δεν μπορεί να πει κανένας πως έβλαψαν. […] Πιότερο πλατσικολόγοι ήταν, παρά πολεμιστές και κατακτητές.' Rodopoulou 1988: 39 and 79.

the Occupation. It is also quite astonishing how closely they echo the words of the Italian general Mario Roatta, a man who has gone down in history as the 'black beast' for his role in war crimes perpetrated against civilian populations in the Balkans: 'Italians as war criminals? At most one can admit to soldiers stealing a few chickens (or pigs) during battle without the knowledge of their superiors…'[258]

Incapable of doing anything evil, the Italians are also presented as victims of their manipulative leader. Beguiled by Mussolini's promises, the poor Italians were misled into believing that invading Greece would be a walk in the park.[259] Instead, they were catapulted into a Fascist war of aggression fighting opposite the brave Greeks who, unlike the invaders, 'knew exactly what they were fighting for': they were fighting 'for [the defence of] their land, their own land, their homes, their country.'[260] With little motivation to fight and a strong urge to escape the harsh realities of war, the Italians 'ditched their weapons and ran away like hares' whenever confronted by the *aera*-shouting Greeks.[261] Pushed into a pointless war against an enemy for whom they had no real hatred, the Italians fraternised with the Greek soldiers and often talked to

258 Cited in Focardi and Klinkhammer 2004: 339.
259 'Ο αρχηγός τους με την καράφλα ήταν ύπουλος σαν την ύαινα και μεγάλος φαφλατάς. Τους είχε πείσει ότι θα ξεκινούσαν για… περίπατο και σε λίγες μέρες θα λιαζόντουσαν στην Ομόνοια. Οι άμοιροι. Πίστεψαν τα παραμύθια του, κι ούτε φαντάστηκαν τη λαχτάρα που τους περίμενε.' Tsiros 1988: 53.
260 '-Εμείς ξέρουμε γιατί πολεμάμε. Για τη γη μας, τη δικιά μας γης. Για τα σπίτια μας. Την πατρίδα μας. Είναι ιερός για μας τούτος ο Πόλεμος. Εκείνοι γιατί πολεμούν;' Vryakou-Geli 1983: 68.
261 'Σαν όμως γίνεται μάχη, ορμούμε φωνάζοντας «αέρα» και τότε γίνονται λαγοί πετώντας τα όπλα τους.' Papakou-Lagou 1988: 33.

them 'in broken Greek about their families, about their desire to be done with this war.'[262]

Incompetent as soldiers, the Italians are even less efficient as occupiers. Musical, light-hearted and famous for their epicurean lifestyle, the Italians are shown to spend most of their time indulging in the pleasures of life 'giving not a damn about Mussolini and his war.'[263] Unlike the *cattivi Tedeschi*, who spread death, destruction and despair wherever they go, the *bravi Italiani* fraternise with the locals, trying to replicate the warmth of the families they had left behind.[264] Totally indifferent to Mussolini's agendas and expansionist designs, some of them even decide to desert and join the guerrilla struggle.

This is largely how the Italian enemies are portrayed in the books under examination. Described as I tried to sketch above, it is clear that their representation continues to hinge on the notion of Italians as harmless, well-meaning and decent occupiers. This image, however, is somewhat undermined in Litsa Psarafti's *Το διπλό ταξίδι* (The Double Voyage, 1987) and Iro Papamoschou's *Το πέτρινο σπίτι* (The Stone House, 1989), two of the most acclaimed 1980s novels for young readers that are both set on the Italian-occupied island of Samos:

> -You will get in serious trouble with all these comings and goings to the mountains. The Italians are not joking. If they

---

262 'Μ' αυτούς όμως εδώ, που μας μιλάνε για τις οικογένειές τους με σπασμένα Ελληνικά, για τον καημό τους να τελειώσει αυτός ο πόλεμος, τα πράγματα είναι αλλιώς.' Ibid.: 34.
263 'Ιταλοί ήταν αυτοί και είχαν τα κόλπα τους... Ποιος τους φτάνει στην τέχνη του έρωτα! Μες στον πειρασμό ήταν όλη την ώρα. Δεν περνούσε και βραδιά, που να μην το γλεντήσουν οι φίλοι. Ας τα κλαίει που τα 'χει. Αμ! Πώς!.. θα σκοτίζονταν για το Μουσολίνι και τον πόλεμό του!..' Rodopoulou op. cit.: 65.
264 'Πολλοί απ' τους Ιταλούς είχαν πιάσει φιλίες με χωριανούς και βοηθούσαν στις αγροτικές δουλειές, μακριά απ' τα μάτια των αξιωματικών τους. Μερικοί συζητούσαν ν' ανέβουν στο βουνό.' Rodopoulou 1984: 86.

> catch you with these leaflets in your pockets they will put you up against the wall and shoot you![265]
>
> The Italians had us on a tight leash. People were called every day into the Italian authorities for interrogations, warnings and threats.[266]
>
> When the Fascists saw the torn picture of Mussolini they grabbed three villagers and started to beat them up, trying to get them to confess – Who tore the picture? – and after they refused to speak they [the Fascists] put them up against the wall and shot them.[267]
>
> In the woods above the main road the Fascists beat up a little kid. […][268]
>
> The Fascists kill, they torture, they jail. The villages suffer.[269]

It is quite evident that these particular *Italiani* are anything but *bravi*. Violent, merciless and 'not joking', the depiction of the Italians here is far from the stereotypical and often caricature portrayals that I have discussed so far. Unlike the harmless figures that dominate all the other books examined up till now, the Italians here are presented as fearsome enemies, committed to the ideals and imperial mandates of Fascism and capable of every monstrosity without the help of their German allies. And yet it is not these Fascist criminals who occupy the foreground in the two novels.

---

265 '-Θα φας το κεφάλι σου μ' αυτά τα πηγαινέλα στα βουνά. Οι Ιταλοί δεν αστειεύονται. Αν σε πιάσουν με προκηρύξεις στις τσέπες σου, θα σε στήσουν στον τοίχο, θα σε τουφεκίσουν!' Psarafti 1987: 32.
266 'Οι Ιταλοί, όσο περνούσε ο καιρός, μας έσφιγγαν τα λουριά. Κάθε μέρα ένα σωρό κόσμος μπαινόβγαινε στις στρατιωτικές υπηρεσίες για ανάκριση, συστάσεις, φοβέρες.' Ibid.: 36.
267 'Μαθαίνουν πως οι φασίστες, σαν είδαν ξεσκισμένη τη φωτογραφία του Μουσολίνι, άρπαξαν τρεις χωριάτες, τους έσπασαν στο ξύλο για να μιλήσουν – ποιοι έσκισαν τη φωτογραφία του Μουσολίνι; – κι επειδή αυτοί δε μίλησαν, τους έστησαν στον τοίχο και τους σκότωσαν.' Papamoschou 1989b: 34.
268 'Στο δάσος, πάνω από τη δημοσιά, οι φασίστες, που έχουν εκεί τα αντίσκηνά τους, σπάσανε μια μέρα στο ξύλο ένα πιτσιρίκι.' Papamoschou 1989a: 157.
269 'Οι φασίστες σκοτώνουν, βασανίζουν, φυλακίζουν. Τα χωριά στενάζουν.' Papamoschou 1989b: 133.

In a previous chapter I analysed the figure of Alberto, a nice soldier who embodies all the virtues of a genuine *Italiano bravo*. Similar characters are also found in the novels cited above. In Litsa Psarafti's *Το διπλό ταξίδι*, for example, Vittorio is a handsome young sub-lieutenant, who falls in love with the protagonist's older sister, Ismini. Confronted by her uncle Leonidas, who objects strongly to this relationship, stressing that Vittorio is 'a conqueror, a foe who sucks our blood',[270] Ismini insists that her beloved Italian is not an enemy. Just like Alberto or the Austrian hero of Kalavryta, Vittorio is just another victim of the circumstances that made him abandon his peaceful habits and take up arms.[271] Despite his initial objections, Leonidas is at last convinced when Ismini shows him one of Vittorio's letters in which he reveals his intention to 'ditch [his] gun and flee to the mountains of this heroic land and join the guerrillas in their struggle against our common enemy, Fascism.'[272]

Strongly opposed to the ideology and imperialist designs of Fascism, Vittorio is a man who was forced to participate in Mussolini's war against his will; a good friend who has nothing in common with the Fascist thugs; a victim of the war rather than a perpetrator. In other words, Vittorio is a true *Italiano bravo*. As such, he keeps his promise and returns to Samos to ask for Ismini's

---

270 '-Παίζεις με τη φωτιά, Ισμήνη. Σε θάμπωσαν τα λιλιά και οι καντσονέτες του Ιταλιάνου και ξεχνάς ότι είναι κατακτητής, εχθρός, που πίνει το αίμα μας και σφίγγει τη θηλιά στο λαιμό μας.' Psarafti op. cit.: 44.

271 'Μισεί κι αυτός τον πόλεμο και βρίζει το Μουσολίνι, που τον ανάγκασε ν' αφήσει τις σπουδές του και να πάρει το τουφέκι.' Ibid.

272 'Έχω σκεφτεί πολλές φορές να πετάξω το όπλο μου και να τρέξω στα βουνά αυτού του ηρωικού κι ανυπότακτου νησιού, να πολεμήσω μαζί με τους αντάρτες τον κοινό μας εχθρό, το φασισμό.' Ibid.: 46.

hand in marriage immediately after the end of the war. Married to his beloved Greek girl with the blessings of both their families, all ends well for the nice Italian; no grudges are held and no past enmities can cloud his bright future.

And while the *Italiano bravo* gets his happy ending, Mrs. Baumann is forever burdened with a *Vergangenheit die nicht vergehen will*. Decades after the end of the war, Mrs. Bauman's painful confession about the Germans' post-war sufferings is countered by the protagonist's harsh verdict: 'You were responsible for all these things.' Although too young to have participated in the Nazi atrocities, Mrs. Bauman is condemned to a life of unrelieved guilt and shame. The *Italiano bravo*, on the other hand, is allowed to move on with his life, completely absolved of any responsibility or guilt for his wartime past.

The distinguishing line between 'bad' Fascists and 'good' Italians is even clearer in Iro Papamoschou's *Το πέτρινο σπίτι*, as is shown in the passages quoted earlier. Also set on the Italian-occupied island of Samos, the novel tells the story of young Katerina and her family, who struggle to survive the war. When the occupation authorities commandeer the house of Katerina's grandparents, the girl and her young brother, Nikolas, come to understand that not all Italians are keen Fascists. First comes to live with them *signore* Ugo, a man who confounds all expectations about what a conqueror is supposed to look and behave like:

> Katerina and Nikolas were puzzled. They thought that all Italians were supposed to be savage like… monsters.
>
> -With wild eyes… and big teeth…, like dragons, said Nikolas.
>
> -Well, maybe not like dragons, but ugly for sure, with red noses and bowed legs and… and feathers on their head.

> [...] But this man who was standing at the door was tall and handsome and he had white teeth and a straight nose and brown, smiling eyes.
>
> [...] –He is an ordinary man, [Katerina] shouted, he is not an Italian.[273]

Being a father himself, *signore* Ugo is affectionate with the children and respectful towards their grandparents. As Katerina's grandmother observes, 'it was as if he was apologising for having come to our island. You might find it odd, but I felt bad for him. I could swear that he hates the war as much as we do.'[274] Friendly, kind and peace-loving, signore Ugo is, in a nutshell, a true *Italiano bravo*.

So is *Dottore* Vittorio, an army doctor who–as Katerina realises–'may be Italian but for sure he is not a Fascist.'[275] Also dragged into Mussolini's war against his will, *Dottore* Vittorio settles into the family's house and becomes their most trusted friend, caring for them and protecting them from the violence of the Fascists:

> Grandfather made it clear to them. Beware of the Fascists. Dottore Vittorio advised them the same thing.[276]

---

273 'Την πρώτη μέρα που ήρθε ο σινιόρε Ούγκο –αυτός που κοιμάται στο δωμάτιο με την μπαλκονόπορτα– η Κατερίνα κι ο Νικόλας ξαφνιάστηκαν. Πίστευαν πως οι Ιταλοί έπρεπε να 'ναι άγριοι σαν... τέρατα.
-Και με μάτια άγρια..., και δόντια μεγάλα..., σαν το δράκο, έλεγε ο Νικόλας.
-Όχι σαν το δράκο, μα άσκημοι, με κόκκινες μύτες και στραβά πόδια και... φτερά στο κεφάλι.
[...] Γιατί αυτός ο άντρας που στεκόταν στην πόρτα ήταν ψηλός και όμορφος, κι είχε κάτασπρα δόντια και μύτη ολόισια και μάτια καστανά που χαμογελούσαν.
[...] -Αυτός είναι άνθρωπος, φώναξε, δεν είναι Ιταλός.' Papamoschou 1989a: 138.

274 '-Κι όμως, Ιωσήφ, ήταν σαν να γύρευε συγγνώμη που ήρθε στον τόπο μας. Θα σου φανεί παράξενο, κι όμως τον λυπήθηκα. Φιλάω σταυρό πως μισεί κι αυτός τον πόλεμο, όσο κι εμείς.' Ibid.: 139-40.

275 'Τιατί ο ντοτόρε-Βιτόριο μπορεί να είναι Ιταλός, όμως φασίστας δεν είναι.' Ibid.: 169.

276 'Ο παππούς τούς το ξεκαθάρισε προχτές. Να προσέχουν τους φασίστες. Τους το είπε κι ο ντοτόρε-Βιτόριο.' Ibid.

> Grandmother does not know how to thank him, while he is apologising for the savage behaviour of the Blackshirt. He is ashamed of him [the Blackshirt] and his eyes look sad.[277]

Also *bravo* is Vittorio's assistant, Tonio. A warm-hearted young man, Tonio also fraternises with the family and is viewed by them as 'an old friend rather than a soldier who came to occupy our land.'[278] Living with these *Italiani bravi* Katerina and Nikolas grow to understand that enmity between nations is not a clear-cult and absolute matter:

> -Isn't it shameful that I love them even though they were Italians?
>
> -Why 'were'? They are Italians.
>
> -Yes, but I even loved them when the Italians were our enemies.
>
> Her mother stroked her.
>
> -No, Katerina, it is not shameful. *Dottore* Vittorio and Tonio are, above all, humans.[279]

But most importantly, they learn to distinguish between Italians and Italian Fascists, 'bad' Fascists and 'good' Italians:

> -So, this Italian is going to help us? Vasilis asked confused.
>
> -He is not Italian, Nikolas said.
>
> -What is he then?
>
> -Well, he is Italian, but he is a different Italian…

---

277 'Η γιαγιά δεν ξέρει πώς να τον ευχαριστήσει. Μα εκείνος γυρεύει συγγνώμη για τον άγριο τρόπο του μαυροσκούφη. Σαν να ντρέπεται για το μαυροσκούφη και τα μάτια του είναι λυπημένα.' Ibid.: 155.

278 'Κι ο Τόνιο, που στέκεται σιωπηλός και μαζωμένος, μοιάζει πιο πολύ με παλιό φίλο του σπιτιού παρά με στρατιώτη που ήρθε να πάρει τη γη τους.' Papamoschou 1989b: 124.

279 ' Δεν είναι ντροπή που τους αγαπάω, ενώ… ήτανε Ιταλοί;
-Γιατί ήτανε; Είναι Ιταλοί.
-Ναι, αλλά εγώ τους αγαπούσα και τότε που ήταν εχθροί μας οι Ιταλοί.
Η μαμά τη χαϊδεύει.
-Όχι, Κατερίνα, δεν είναι ντροπή. Ο ντοτόρε-Βιτόριο κι ο Τόνιο είναι πάνω απ' όλα άνθρωποι.' Ibid.: 173.

-He is not a Fascist, Katerina said.

-But he is for a fact Italian.[280]

One of the very few texts to distinguish Italians from Italian Fascists, Papamoschou's novel is at the same time a book that perpetuates the notion of the occupiers as a *brava gente*. All acts of savagery, all crimes and all abominations are perpetrated by a small minority of fanatical Blackshirts and gung-ho Fascists who never come out of the shadows as fully-fledged characters. *Signore* Ugo, Dr. Vittorio and Tonio, on the other hand, are presented as victims of a war they had despised wholeheartedly from the very beginning. They are friends, protectors and 'above all humans' whose hands have never been stained with Greek blood. More than anything else, these fellows are genuine *Italiani bravi*, whose overall conduct gives the impression that they came to the country as visitors and not as soldiers of Mussolini's invading army. After all, as Saverio Giovacchini concludes in his article on the cinematic exploitation of the *Italiani brava gente* myth, 'a good man never invades a country: he just visits it.'[281]

---

280 '-Θα μας βοηθήσει ο Ιταλός; απορεί ο Βασίλης.
-Αυτός δεν είναι Ιταλός, πετιέται ο Νικόλας.
-Και τι είναι;
-Δηλαδή είναι Ιταλός, αλλά είναι αλλιώτικος Ιταλός...
-Δεν είναι φασίστας, λέει η Κατερίνα.
-Όμως Ιταλός είναι.' Ibid.: 140.
281 Giovacchini 2007: 68-9.

THE ENEMY WITHIN THE WALLS: COLLABORATION

In chapter 4, Part I, I examined the representation of wartime collaboration in young people's fiction of the period 1974-1981. Looking at the portrayal of various types of *fout* that appear in the texts of this period, I argued that authors writing in the 1970s painted a reassuring image of wartime collaboration as a rare and exceptional phenomenon that remained restricted to a small group of wicked, weak and worthless individuals. Meanwhile, the question of organised and armed collaboration remained off-limits for authors of this period.

The issue of wartime collaboration continued to preoccupy the authors of books for young readers during the second period of the *metapolitefsi* (1981-1989) as well. The political circumstances, however, had now changed and so had the official national perspectives on the Greek 1940s. As I will go on to show in subsequent chapters, authors of this period could now write about subjects that had previously remained *terra prohibita* in the fiction aimed at this particular audience. They could now talk, for example, about the left-wing resistance movement, the events of December 1944 and the Civil War. This chapter sets out to explore whether this was also the case with the subject of wartime collaboration.

Traitors, interpreters working for the *Gestapo*, black-marketeers and 'horizontal' collaborators, the old familiar cast of *fout* also appears in the books of this period. Starting with the first two groups, even a quick look at the texts under examination here reveals that 1980s authors continued to base their

depictions of the *fout* on the same representational tropes that were discussed in Part I. Unattractive on the outside, these *fout* are even more hideous on the inside. Sparing no compassion for their victims in their zeal to please their foreign masters, their cruelty is often shown to surpass that of their masters:

> The interpreter, a chunky forty-year-old man with a hooked nose was looking at the crowd with his devious black eyes.[282]

> The interpreter, a devious and black-souled man, conducts the interrogations. With a notepad in his hand, he enters the basement, grabs [a prisoner] by his collar and begins the interrogation. [...] The interpreter is getting furious. He slaps [the prisoner] in the face. [...] The interpreter nods at the two Germans who are standing nearby. The Germans pounce on him. They remove his clothes and start to beat him with a knout while the interpreter is shouting at him: '-Speak out!... Speak!...'[283]

> He could swear that it was him, Kostas, the man who was working as their interpreter, when they arrested Nikos and treated him way more brutally than the Germans themselves.[284]

> Masked traitors, pointing at people they knew they were in the Resistance and also at others, completely random people, just to demonstrate their loyalty to their masters.[285]

Not much has changed in the portrayal of the *mavragoritis* type either. Pitiless, cruel and unsparing, with a devilish look on his face, hawk-like features and evil eyes filled with hatred, this is in a nutshell the prevailing

---

282 'Ο διερμηνέας, ένας κοντόχοντρος σαραντάρης, με γαμψή μύτη κοίταζε καταπρόσωπο τους συγκεντρωμένους, με τα πονηρά μαύρα του μάτια.' Daraki 1983: 101.
283 'Ο διερμηνέας, ένας ύπουλος και μαυρόψυχος άνθρωπος, κάνει ανακρίσεις. Μ' ένα τεφτέρι στα χέρια, μπαίνει στο υπόγειο, τραβά έναν απ' το γιακά κι αρχίζει τις ερωτήσεις. [...] Ο διερμηνέας αγριεύει. Του δίνει έναν μπάτσο. [...] Ο διερμηνέας γνέφει στους δυο Γερμανούς, που παραστέκουν. Εκείνοι ρίχνονται και τον πιάνουν. Τον γδύνουν κι αρχίζουν να τον χτυπούν μ' ένα συρμάτινο αγκαθωτό βούρδουλα. Κάθε τόσο ο διερμηνέας του φωνάζει: -Λέγε!... Μαρτύρα!...' Sakellariou 1984: 115-6.
284 'Πήγαινε στοίχημα πως ήταν εκείνος ο Κώστας που έκανε το διερμηνέα στους πεταλάδες όταν συλλάβανε τον Νίκο και φέρθηκε πολύ πιο βάναυσα από τους ίδιους τους Γερμανούς.' Sinou 1989: 44-5.
285 'Μασκοφόροι προδότες διαλέγανε τους αγωνιστές που γνωρίζανε, αλλά κι άλλους άσχετους, έτσι για να δείξουν προθυμία στ' αφεντικά τους...' Petala-Papadopoulou 1985: 285.

image of the black-marketeer in the texts of this period.[286] Here, though, we shall not find any sympathetic *mavragorites* with justifiable motives, only calculating *fout* seeking to profit at the expense of their desperate compatriots and 'scum who always found a way to get their hands on food and then sold it at exorbitant prices, while at the same time little children with swollen bellies and sunken eyes were searching through the garbage wailing 'I'm hungry!... I'm hungry!'[287]

---

286 See, for example, '-Με κοροϊδεύεις; Τι κουρέλι ειν' αυτό που μου κουβάλησες, μωρή; ξεφώνισε ο Αρπέκος γουρλώνοντας τα μάτια του, μόλις η κυρά-Λένη ξεδίπλωσε μπροστά του το σεγκούνι.
-Τίποτα δεν αξίζει, μωρή, ξανάπε ξεσπώντας σε κοροϊδευτικά γέλια. Το φούχτωσε και το πέταξε πάνω στον πάγκο.
[...] -Πάρε, καλέ μου άνθρωπε, αυτό το χρυσοκέντητο ρούχο και δος μου μια φούχτα στάρι να συνεφέρω τα παιδιά μου. Ρέψανε από την πείνα. Αν είσαι χριστιανός λυπήσου μας, ψιθύρισε η κυρά-Λένη με λυπημένη φωνή.
-Παράτα, μωρή, το Χριστό, εκεί ψηλά που βρίσκεται. Μη με ζαλίζεις, λέω, άλλο. Έχω πολλή δουλειά, λέω. Άντε μάζεψε, λέω, το κουρέλι που μου κουβάλησες κι άδειαζέ μου τη γωνιά, φώναξε ξαφνικά με τραχιά, σχεδόν άγρια φωνή.
Ξαναφούχτωσε το ρούχο και το πέταξε με οργή στα πόδια της κυρα-Λένης, που χλώμιασε κι έπεσε λιπόθυμη.
[...] Η Μαρίνα θάρρεψε για μια στιγμή πως έβλεπε το πρόσωπο του ίδιου του Βελζεβούλ.
-Λένε πως είσαι κακός άνθρωπος, σκληρός και άπονος. «Ο άνθρωπος με τη πέτρινη καρδιά» έτσι σε λέει ο κόσμος.' Daraki op. cit.: 56-8.
'Μπήκε διακριτικά απ' την τζαμόπορτα. Ο ιδιοκτήτης, ένας αρκετά περασμένης ηλικίας, με συρμάτινα στρογγυλά γυαλιά, γυρτός, με γδυτό το μισό του κεφάλι, ακριβώς πάνω απ' το μέτωπο, με κοφτό μουστάκι, τόσο όσο έπιανε από πάνω του η μύτη, τον κοίταξε με σκληρό μάτι. [...]
-Τι... συμβαίνει; ρώτησε ξερά.
-Ήρθα για τη δουλειά του βοηθού, είπε θαρρετά.
-Πόσα χρονάκια έχεις στην πλάτη σου!
-Έκλεισα τα δεκαπέντε.
-Έχεις ξαναδουλέψει σε ταβέρνα;
-Όχι!.. αλλά ήμουνα εφτά χρόνια στ' Ορφανοτροφείο και ξέρω από κουζίνα, σερβίρισμα, καθάρισμα, πλύσιμο πιάτων! Ό,τι κι αν σας χρειαστεί... ξέρω απ' όλα.
-Που πάει να πει πως είσαι ορφανός από πατέρα;
-Ορφανός κι από τους δυο!
Λάμψανε τα μάτια του από ηδονή. Αν ήτανε δυνατόν να χαίρεται άνθρωπος γιατί ένα παιδί είναι πεντάρφανο. Ο Κώστας προσπαθούσε να καταλάβει γιατί χάρηκε και μάλιστα τόσο ξεσκέπαστα για την ορφάνια του, αλλά τον έκοψε η συνέχεια.
-Μιστό δεν έχει εδώ! Αυτό το ξέρεις; του είπε κοφτά. Ό,τι βγάλεις απ' τα πουρμπουάρ. Έχω καλή και χουβαρντάδικη πελατεία. [...]
Τα πονηρά του μάτια στριφογύρισαν πίσω απ' τα γυαλιά. Τρόμαζες απ' το φορτίο του μίσους, που ήταν κλεισμένο μέσα τους.' Petala-Papadopoulou op. cit.: 119-20 and 140.
287 'Αυτά τα κατακάθια βρίσκανε τον τρόπο να οικονομάνε τρόφιμα και να τα πουλάνε σε υπέρογκες τιμές, όταν τα παιδάκια με πρησμένες κοιλιές και βαθουλωμένα μάτια, σκαλίζανε τα σκουπίδια και νιαουρίζανε σαν γατιά... «πεινάω καλέ!... πεινάω καλέ!».' Ibid.: 131.

The same also goes for the portrayal of next group of *fout*, the so-called 'horizontal' collaborators. The following excerpt from Stella Vogiatzoglou's novel *Καβάλα σε δύο φεγγάρια* (Riding on Two Moons, 1982) is a good case in point:

> When the Germans entered the town, we all closeted ourselves in our homes. That fat niece of Annetta's, Voula, you know what that darling did instead? She grabbed a bouquet of flowers and went to welcome the Germans together with others like her. You should have seen her disgusting manner, the way she was flirting and giggling with them. […] She entered the house jangling her ridiculous bracelets that covered her entire arm. She was clearly drunk. Her breath smelled of alcohol and cigarettes. She had a disgusting look on her stupid face. She had one hand on her hip while swinging her bag with the other.[288]

Vulgar, promiscuous and corrupt, these female *fout* are twice as repulsive as their male counterparts due to their total disregard for both national ideals and patriarchal moral values. Moreover, in all the books that have been discussed so far, practising 'horizontal' collaboration is presented as a choice made by women of loose morals, selfish motives or low intelligence, yet never as–say–a tragic situation that many women were forced into in their desperate struggle to survive the famine. Litsa Psarafti is the only author who has touched upon this dramatic reality: 'The girls are starving and they have to pay a heavy price for a loaf of bread and a tin of food.'[289] Ironically enough,

---

288 'Όταν μπήκαν οι Γερμανοί στην πόλη, όλοι σχεδόν κλειδαμπαρωθήκαμε μέσα. Ενώ εκείνη η χοντρο-ανιψιά της Ανέττας, η Βούλα, ξέρεις τι έκανε; Βούτηξε, η καλή σου, μια ανθοδέσμη και έτρεξε με τους ομοίους της να προϋπαντήσει τους Γερμαναράδες. Και τι λιγώματα, αηδίες και χαρές να 'βλεπες και χαζά ξεφωνητά μαζί τους. […] Μπήκε μέσα κουδουνίζοντας θριαμβευτικά τα γελοία βραχιόλια της, που 'φταναν στο μπράτσο. Ήταν, ασφαλώς, μεθυσμένη. Τα χνώτα της βρομούσαν πιοτό και τσιγάρο. Μια χυδαία έκφραση απλωνόταν στο βοϊδίσιο πρόσωπό της. Με το 'να χέρι κρατούσε σφιχτά το γοφό της και με τ' άλλο στριφογύριζε την τσάντα της.' Vogiatzoglou 1982: 42 and 70.

289 'Τα κορίτσια πεινάνε και πληρώνουν βαριά πληρωμή για ένα καρβέλι και μια κονσέρβα…' Psarafti 1987: 48.

this view comes from Ismini, a Greek girl who is involved romantically with Vittorio, a nice Italian officer, while her island is under Italian occupation. Luckily for Ismini's reputation, though, Vittorio is an *Italiano bravo*, a man who cannot even be thought of as an enemy by virtue of his inherent 'goodness'.

So far I have discussed the representation of the main groups of wartime *fout* that appear in the books under examination. The conclusion that can be drawn here is that the authors of the 1980s were not particularly interested in experimenting with alternative, let alone subversive, figures of wartime villains. Instead, their stories continued to reproduce the same old ideas and clichés that had become firmly attached to the image of the *fout* in Greek post-war cinematic and other cultural representations of the Occupation.[290] At the same time, however, the authors of this period did not shy away from the subject of armed collaboration:

> One night he stood on the corner of a narrow street, close to the gendarmerie headquarters at Makrygiannis. For the past several days, a man had passed through there every night at eight o'clock or so. He was a *germanotsolias*, one of those who wore the traditional uniform and fought against the Greek resisters with German arms.[291]
>
> -Do not call your sister by that name again! This word has been tainted forever by the traitors of our country. From now on,

290 See, for example, the popular and highly influential sketches by well-known cartoonist Phokion Dimitriadis (1894-1977). For a collection of Dimitriadis's illustrations of Greece under Nazi rule see Dimitriadis 2004. For the representation of the collaborator type in Greek fiction from the post-war period see Bodila 2006: 249-67.

291 'Κι ένα βράδυ, απάνω που 'πεφτε το σκοτάδι, στήθηκε σε μια γωνιά, σ' ένα στενό σοκάκι, κοντά στου Μακρυγιάννη. Μέρες τώρα έβλεπε να περνά από κει, γύρω στις οχτώ το βράδυ, ένας γερμανοτσολιάς, απ' αυτούς που είχαν φορέσει τη στολή του τσολιά, αλλά με τα όπλα των Γερμανών χτυπούσαν τους δικούς μας.' Sakellariou op. cit.: 11.

every time we use the word '*tsolias*' we will actually mean 'Security Battalions'! Mr. Nikos said seriously.[292]

Argyro still cannot understand. She asks again:

-And what about the *tagmatasfalites*?

-At first they collaborated with the Germans. Now they are helping the English slaughter our people.[293]

The news from Greece is bad, father said seriously. [...] In the Peloponnese the *tagmatasfalites*, the collaborators of the Germans, are fighting against the ELAS forces.[294]

Not a single night passes without someone being slaughtered down there. One night the communists slaughter a *tagmatalitis* and the next the *tagmatalites* murder some communist.[295]

The *tagmatasfalites* were cruel, savage. They had no limits, no restrictions, they were inventive. They impaled the men. They beat them to death, pulled out their eyes and hair, cut off their genitals, they butchered them.[296]

Germanotsoliades and *tagmatasfalites*, death squads acting on the orders of the occupation authorities, armed clashes between the Security Battalions and ELAS, anti-communist groups and terrorist gangs of the extreme Right fighting alongside the occupiers; these are some of the previously untouched topics that authors of books for young readers had now started to broach in

---

292 '-Μην ξαναδώσεις σε παρακαλώ αυτό το κοσμητικό στην αδελφή σου! Τη λέξη τη λερώσανε οι προδότες της πατρίδας. Όταν πια λέμε «τσολιάς», θα εννοούμε ταγματασφαλίτης! είπε σοβαρά ο κ. Νίκος.' Petala-Papadopoulou op. cit.: 222.

293 Ή Αργυρώ ούτε τώρα καταλαβαίνει. Ξαναρωτάει:
-Και οι ταγματασφαλίτες;
-Αυτοί συνεργάστηκαν με τους Γερμανούς. Τώρα συνεργάζονται με τους Εγγλέζους και σφάζουνε τους δικούς μας.' Kokoreli 1987: 58.

294 Τα νέα από την Ελλάδα είναι άσχημα, είπε σοβαρά ο πατέρας. [...] Στην Πελοπόννησο οι ταγματασφαλίτες συνεργάτες των Γερμανών χτυπιούνται με τις ομάδες του ΕΛΑΣ.' Psarafti op. cit.: 169.

295 'Δεν περνάει νύχτα να μη σφάξουν κάποιον κει κάτω. Ή οι κομουνιστές σφάζουν κάποιο ταγματαλήτη ή οι ταγματαλίτες καθαρίζουν ένα κομουνιστή.' Sinou op. cit.: 24. *Tagmatalitis* is a portmanteau word that combines the words *tagmatasfalitis* (member of the Security Battalions) and *alitis* (bastard).

296 'Οι ταγματασφαλίτες ήταν σκληροί, φοβεροί. Δεν είχαν όριο, δεν είχαν μέτρο, ήταν εφευρετικοί. Παλούκωναν τους άντρες από πίσω. Τους έδερναν μέχρι θανάτου, έβγαζαν μάτια, ξερίζωναν μαλλιά, έκοβαν γεννητικά όργανα, ξεκοίλιαζαν.' Rodopoulou 1988: 110.

their stories. Hardly random or coincidental, the acknowledgment of this ugly reality was a direct result of the post-1981 developments that led to the emergence and rapid dominance of a new official national narrative on the Greek 1940s. Orchestrated around the glorificatory myth of a united National Resistance, this narrative also aimed to bring Greeks together in a patriotic consensus against those who had collaborated with the foreign enemies.[297] Elaborated by PASOK, this narrative became fully institutionalised following the party's rise to power and the 1285/1982 Law on the official recognition of the National Resistance.[298] Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou justified the recognition of the National Resistance in August 1982 with a historic speech to the Greek Parliament in which he spoke out clearly and openly against 'those who [had] betrayed the *pallikaria* [of the Resistance], those who fought against our unified National Resistance.'[299] PASOK's condemnation of the former collaborators, however, was not limited to verbal denunciations. Along with the official rehabilitation of EAM and its affiliates, the 1285/1982 Law also ordained the annulment of a series of preceding legislative decrees, which granted state pensions and other material benefits to former members of the collaborationist Security Battalions for their contribution to the so-called 'resistance' against the foreign and internal–that is to say communist–

297 Fleischer 2006: 257.
298 See also chapter 1 in Part II.
299 See Papandreou's parliamentary speech on the official recognition of the National Resistance. Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bemQvjovsFc

threat.[300] After almost four decades of blatant state tolerance towards former collaborators, in 1982 the balance finally turned.[301]

This new interpretation was also followed in the school history textbooks of the period 1981-1989, as I have discussed in the introductory chapter. With school historiography now openly acknowledging the reality of armed collaboration, this subject was no longer *terra prohibita* in fictional explorations and representations of the 1940s in books for young readers. From the reassuring picture of a small handful of *fout* to the ugly reality of the Security Battalions, the representation of wartime collaboration in young people's fiction of the first two decades of the *metapolitefsi* offers a direct and clear reflection of the ever-shifting national perspectives on the past, of the ever-shifting boundaries between what we should forget and what we ought to remember.

300 Kostopoulos 2005: 158.
301 Fleischer op. cit.: 257.

'NOT THE ALLIES. IT WAS THE RESISTANCE!'

The period that has been described by Antonis Delonis as the 'Springtime of Greek Children's Literature' was entering a phase of maturity and growing self-awareness in the 1980s.[302] As Vasilis Anagnostopoulos has pointed out, the novels published since the mid-1980s were bolder than ever, both in terms of themes and narrative techniques.[303] This shift towards bolder themes is also evident in the fiction that deals with the Greek 1940s. As I have shown in the previous chapters, the authors of this period introduced new themes and engaged with subjects that had remained *terra prohibita* until then.

The aim of this chapter is to explore whether authors in the 1980s took an equally bold approach to the subject of the Resistance. As discussed in Part I, the authors of the period 1974-1981 focused their representations on the deeds of a few courageous individuals, offering stories of exceptionalism and personal heroism. Meanwhile, with the exception of Georges Sari, the subject of the EAM Resistance remained off-limits for authors of the early *metapolitefsi*.

This situation, however, changed in the 1980s. The official recognition of the National Resistance in 1982 led to the establishment of a new national narrative, one that was orchestrated around a purged and idealised version of the 1941-1944 struggle for liberation. The Resistance was now baptised 'united' and 'universal' and was given back to the 'people' (λαός). Moreover,

302 See Delonis 1986: 24-7. Also, Kallergis 1995: 91-3.
303 Anagnostopoulos1996: 189.

EAM was now recognised as a genuine patriotic force that had led the biggest resistance movement in occupied Greece.

The way had been cleared and the socialist 1980s saw an explosion of interest in the Resistance in general and in the EAM Resistance in particular. Following the organisation's official rehabilitation in the national memory of the 1940s, the preoccupation with EAM spread to pretty much all aspects of society and culture: politics, public commemorations, academic conferences and cinema, to mention but a few of the areas concerned.[304] In this chapter I go on to explore whether these developments also influenced the representation of the Resistance in the fiction for young readers published between 1982 and 1989.

A comparative reading of the texts under examination reveals that the 1980s authors approached the subject from two different ideological perspectives. Stella Vogiatzoglou, Mary Vryakou-Geli, Pepi Daraki, Manolis Kornilios, Avgi Papakou-Lagou, Soula Rodopoulou, Spyros Tsiros and Iro Papamoschou form a group of authors who opted for a more inclusive approach. In their stories the Resistance is presented as a collective endeavour that had mobilised the entire nation, as illustrated in the following passages:

> But no one bowed his head. Everyone did their bit. From little children to old men, everyone was carrying the spirit of the Resistance in them.[305]

304 See also chapter 1 in this Part.
305 'Αλλά κανένας δεν έσκυβε το κεφάλι. Αγωνιζόταν όπως μπορούσε. Όλοι, απ' το μικρό παιδί ως το γέρο, κουβαλούσαν μέσα τους την αντίσταση.' Vogiatzoglou 1982: 66, 105.

> Round-ups, hostages, imprisonments, tortures, executions; and the people's response to all this was Resistance.[306]
>
> […] the resistance of the enslaved [Greeks] started to grow fierce in cities and villages. People of all ages were getting organised and started to take action against the enemies [307]
>
> The Greek people did not tolerate this situation for long. They waged a new war, the National Resistance, and started to fight for the liberation of [our] homeland.[308]
>
> How could the conquerors cope with the heroic National Resistance that had grown fierce in the mountains, in villages and cities? […] The resistance movement was growing bigger and bigger, day after day, moment by moment. […] The people gained back their freedom with their blood. With their courageous Resistance during the dark years of Occupation.[309]
>
> Without these patriots, Freedom may never have returned. […] They formed armed groups, they fought from the mountains or in cities and villages, they collected useful information, they cooperated with our allies and waited for the right moment and place to attack the enemies. […] Our enslaved Homeland depended on them. Women and children were also fighting alongside them. We called them the Resistance.[310]

What is emphasised in all of the novels quoted above is that, from young children to adults, whether they were living in small villages or big cities, participating in guerrilla warfare or engaging in clandestine activities, the

---

306 'Μπλόκα, όμηροι, φυλακίσεις, βασανιστήρια, εκτελέσεις και σαν απάντηση τούτου του λαού, αντίσταση, αισιόδοξη αντίσταση.' Vryakou-Geli 1983: 106.

307 'Δεν ήξερε, βέβαια, τότε ακόμα πως από την πρώτη χρονιά που οι εχθροί σκλαβώσανε τη χώρα, η αντίσταση των σκλάβων είχε αρχίσει να φουντώνει σε πόλεις και χωριά. Άνθρωποι κάθε ηλικίας οργανώνονταν κι αρχίζανε την αντιστασιακή δράση, φέρνοντας περισπασμούς κι εμπόδια στον εχθρό με χίλιους τρόπους.' Daraki 1983: 62.

308 'Αυτή την κατάσταση δεν την ανέχτηκε για πολύ ο ελληνικός λαός. Γρήγορα άρχισε την Εθνική Αντίσταση στις πόλεις και στα βουνά, έναν καινούριο δηλαδή πόλεμο, κρυφό και φανερό, για την απελευθέρωση της πατρίδας.' Kornilios 1987: 10.

309 'Πώς να τα βγάλουν πέρα με την ηρωική Εθνική Αντίσταση που 'χε φουντώσει σε βουνά, χωριά και πολιτείες; […] Τ' αντιστασιακό κίνημα γιγάντωνε, μέρα τη μέρα, στιγμή τη στιγμή. […] Ξανακέρδισαν με το αίμα τους τη λευτεριά τους. Με τη γενναία τους Αντίσταση μέσα στη μαύρη Κατοχή.' Papakou-Lagou 1988: 60-61.

310 'Χωρίς τους πατριώτες, ίσως και να μην ξαναρχότανε η Λευτεριά. […] Είχανε συγκροτήσει ομάδες οπλισμένες, ανέβαιναν στα βουνά ή κατέβαιναν σε πόλεις και χωριά, μάζευαν χρήσιμες πληροφορίες, συνεργάζονταν με τους συμμάχους μας, στέλνοντας σήματα με τους ασυρμάτους, και διάλεγαν την κατάλληλη στιγμή και το μέρος, όπου θα χτυπούσαν τους εχθρούς. […] Η σκλαβωμένη Πατρίδα είχε την ανάγκη τους. Μαζί τους αγωνίζονταν και γυναίκες και παιδιά. Αντίσταση τους λέγαμε…' Tsiros 1988: 58.

struggle for liberation had mobilised the entire nation. In striking contrast to the stories of the previous decade where the spotlight was on the individual hero, the focus had now shifted onto the 'people' (λαός) and their collective efforts against the occupiers. Massive in terms of participation, the Resistance is also presented as springing from and belonging to the 'people'. To put it in a nutshell, the Resistance is the 'people' and the 'people' are the Resistance: 'We called them the Resistance.'

Another idea that is strongly emphasised in these stories is that the Resistance had a purely national liberation character. People of all ages and backgrounds created a formidable movement with one aim in mind, which was to liberate themselves and their country from the foreign yoke: 'We went to the mountains and became *andartes*. We would fight the enemies from up there and that's all we wanted to do, to fight them.'[311] The people's Resistance, thus, is presented as a united struggle aimed at national liberation and national liberation alone, harbouring no other ideological agendas or political plans for the post-war future.

The heroes in the above-mentioned novels flee to the mountains to become *andartes*, children become liaisons between resistance organisations and the guerrillas, while others join a 'group', a secret 'organisation' or simply an 'Organisation' (Οργάνωση) that is never named or identified. Continuing the tradition of the previous decade, the authors who took this approach refrained

311 'Τρεις βδομάδες με φιλοξένησαν, μετά καθώς το παλικάρι ήξερε τους ανθρώπους και τον τόπο ανεβήκαμε μαζί στο βουνό, γίναμε αντάρτες. Από δω πάνω θα πολεμούσαμε τους κατακτητές κι αυτό ήταν μονάχα που θέλαμε, να τους πολεμήσουμε.' Vryakou-Geli op. cit.: 144.

from making specific references to any of the resistance organisations and groups that operated during the Occupation. Even authors known for their involvement in the left-wing Resistance eschewed all discussion of EAM and its leading role in the struggle for liberation. Instead, they opted for a more inclusive approach, keeping the focus on the people (λαός) and their united efforts against the occupiers.

Set in German-occupied Athens, Manolis Kornilios's *Πολύ ωραίο το όνομά σου, Ελευθερία!* (You Have a Beautiful Name, *Eleftheria*!, 1987), for example, is a short novel about the friendship between a German girl and three Greek children who are members of a resistance 'Organisation'. A veteran of the left-wing Resistance, Kornilios refrained from making explicit references to EAM, even though it is evident that this 'Organisation' has EAM written all over it.[312] Another case in point is Pepi Daraki's novel *Τα περιστέρια του καμπαναριού* (The Pigeons of the Bell Tower, 1983). Another veteran of EAM, Daraki has created a version of historical events that sometimes shows a little EAM-free twist. In the novel, for example, there is a scene in which the young protagonist hears her brother talking about the latest achievements of the people's Resistance:

> Argyris paused for a moment to light a cigarette and then he turned the page of the newspaper. -It says here, he continued, that people started pouring into the streets of Athens shouting 'freedom'. Last week a demonstration took place at Panepistimou Street. [Reading from the newspaper] 'A girl climbed the statue of Rigas Ferraios that is in front of the University and placed a crown of flowers on its head. Then the German tanks arrived and opened fire on the unarmed crowd. 'Down with the tyrants' men, women and children were shouting in one voice. And all these people started singing the national

312 '-Τώρα καταλαβαίνω γιατί μια μέρα στη συγκέντρωση της Οργάνωσης είπαν: «Ο αγώνας μας είναι απελευθερωτικός και αντιφασιστικός», είπε ο Κώστας.' Kornilios op. cit.: 28.

> anthem and moving forward with their heads held high. Suddenly, at the head of the demonstration, a girl unfurled a Greek flag and held it up. That moment a German tank began to fire into the crowd and started moving towards the girl. The girl with the Greek flag was shot in the chest. The tank did not stop. It ran over the girl with its heavy tracks and continued its course towards the crowd. […] The protesters picked up the dead girl while cursing the Nazis and shouting 'Liberty! Revenge! Down with the tyrants!'[313]

The events described here are real and refer to the massive demonstration that took place in Athens in July 1943 against the German plans to expand the Bulgarian occupation zone into central Macedonia. What is left untold, however, is that the protest was organised by EAM and that the girl who was crushed by the German tank was a member of EPON.[314] Yet, whether the protest was organised by EAM, or by any other resistance organisation for that matter, is of no concern or importance here. Again, what remained the main consideration for this group of authors was to emphasise the idea that the Resistance had been a collective national endeavour that sprang from and was led by the 'people'.[315]

---

313 'Ο Αργύρης έκανε μια διακοπή για ν' ανάψει τσιγάρο και γύρισε τη σελίδα της εφημερίδας. -Εδώ γράφει, συνέχισε, πως ο λαός άρχισε να ξεχύνεται στους δρόμους της Αθήνας, και να φωνάζει «λευτεριά». Την περασμένη εβδομάδα έγινε στην οδό Πανεπιστημίου μεγάλη λαϊκή διαδήλωση. Ένα κορίτσι σκαρφάλωσε στο άγαλμα του Ρήγα Φερραίου, που είναι μπροστά στο Πανεπιστήμιο και τον στεφάνωσε. Την ίδια στιγμή φτάσανε τα γερμανικά τανκς κι ενώ οι διαδηλωτές είχαν γονατίσει κι έψελναν τον εθνικό ύμνο άρχισαν να πυροβολούν το άοπλο πλήθος. «Κάτω οι τύραννοι» φώναζαν με μια φωνή άντρες, γυναίκες, παιδιά. Κι όλος αυτός ο κόσμος άρχισε να τραγουδά τον εθνικό ύμνο, και να προχωρεί με το κεφάλι ψηλά. Ξαφνικά στην κορυφή της διαδήλωσης ένα κορίτσι ξεδίπλωσε ψηλά την ελληνική σημαία. Την ίδια στιγμή ένα γερμανικό τανκς, άρχισε να πυροβολεί τον κόσμο και να προχωρεί αδίστακτα επάνω του. Χτύπησε κατάστηθα το κορίτσι, που κρατούσε ψηλά την ελληνική σημαία. Το τανκς δε σταμάτησε. Πέρασε από πάνω του με τις βαριές αλυσίδες του και προχώρησε πάνω στο πλήθος… […] [Οι διαδηλωτές] σήκωσαν ψηλά το σκοτωμένο κορίτσι και καταριόταν τους ναζήδες, φωνάζοντας: «Λευτεριά! Εκδίκηση! Κάτω οι τύραννοι»!' Daraki op. cit.: 84-5.

314 The name of the murdered girl was Panagiota Stathopoulou.

315 This brings to mind Nikos Demertzis observation that, 'ο αντιστασιακός μύθος δεν υμνούσε τόσο την Αντίσταση όσο υμνούσε ένα λαό που αντιστάθηκε, ένα λαό που συμβολίστηκε δίχως διαμεσολαβητές, όπως πολιτικά κόμματα, κινήματα ή ηγέτες.' Demertzis 2013: 73.

Charis Sakellariou, Lela Petala-Papadopoulou and Argyro Kokoreli, on the other hand, form a group of authors who did not shy away from talking about EAM and its leading role in the Greek Resistance. Charis Sakellariou's *Αντιστασιακά παιδικά διηγήματα* (Children's Stories of the Resistance, 1984) focuses on the contribution of the child heroes of the Resistance, a commonplace theme in books for young readers on the subject.[316] This time, however, the resistance organisation that the young heroes are shown to assist or participate in is not without a name. Now EAM and its affiliates dominate the scene, the protagonists are organised in EPON dreaming that one day they will be able to join 'Aris and his men' in the mountains,[317] they become *Aetopoula*[318] and help the *ELASites* in their operations against the occupiers.

Also organised in the left-wing Resistance is Kostas, the young protagonist of Lela Petala-Papadopoulou's novel *Καρτερώντας την άνοιξη* (Waiting for the Spring, 1985). After leaving the orphanage where he spent most of childhood, Kostas struggles to survive in German-occupied and famine-stricken Athens. Things start to get better for the hero after he is invited to live with his childhood friend, Stelios, and his family in their country home. Stelios is a member of EPON, his parents and sister are organised in the Resistance and

316 The book is a collection of nine short stories, two of which ('Το Αετόπουλο' and 'Ο μικρός σωτήρας') were originally published in the 1944 textbook *Ελεύθερη Ελλάδα*. The textbook was commissioned by the EAM-sponsored PEEA for pupils in the last two grades of the *Dimotiko* living in the EAM-controlled regions of Greece. For more on the so-called 'Mountain Education' see Sakellariou 1984 and Papastefanaki 2016.
317 Aris Velouchiotis, ELAS's leader and a prominent figure of the Greek Resistance.
318 EAM's youth division.

Kostas also ends up joining EPON. Meanwhile, Kostas discovers that his father, whom he believed to be dead, is searching for him. As the apple rarely falls far from the tree, the hero also finds out that his father is a renowned captain of ELAN.[319]

Although not exactly an orphan, life was not easy for Argyro as we read in Argyro Kokoreli's 1987 largely autobiographical novel *Η ζωή με τον πατέρα* (Life with Father). In an ironic contrast to the novel's title, the story follows little Argyro as she grows up traumatised by the constant absence of her father, who is fighting with ELAS and is later sent into exile for his involvement in the left-wing Resistance.

I have argued earlier that in the stories by the first group of authors, the Resistance is identified with the 'people' (λαός) or, as it was phrased there, the Resistance is the 'people' and the 'people' are the Resistance. For this group of authors, however, there is another factor added to this equation. Now EAM, the Resistance and the 'people' are identified as one or, to put it in different words, the 'people' are EAM and EAM is the Resistance.[320] Moreover, in these stories EAM is presented as the head and heart of the entire resistance movement, the *sine qua non* of the Greek Resistance. At the same time,

319 EAM's naval force.

320 In Lela-Petala Papadopoulou's novel *Καρτερώντας την άνοιξη*, for example, EAM is referred to as 'the Organisation of the National Resistance': 'Η Οργάνωση της Εθνικής Αντίστασης βασίζεται σε δυο πράγματα: στην εχεμύθεια και στην προθυμία για δράση! Ελπίζω να κατάλαβες πόση προσοχή χρειάζεται και πόσο σκληρό λουκέτο στο στόμα! -Αυτά έπρεπε να μου τα έχεις πει από την πρώτη μέρα, που άρχισες να μου μιλάς αόριστα για το Εθνικό Απελευθερωτικό Μέτωπο!' Petala-Papadopoulou 1985: 216.

however, the contribution of all other resistance organisations and groups that fought for the liberation of Greece goes completely unacknowledged.

Additionally, in these stories EAM is portrayed as a patriotic force that led a massive popular movement aimed at national liberation and national liberation alone. This, however, is a portrait that does not entirely correspond to historical reality. According to its charter, EAM's declared objectives were 'the liberation of the Nation from the present foreign yoke' and, after the occupiers would have been expelled, the formation of an EAM-led provisional government with the sole aim of proclaiming elections 'so that the sovereign people will decide on the form of its government', something that EAM had promised to defend against 'all reactionary attempts to impose solutions different from the popular will.'[321] The political aspect of the EAM movement, however, is a reality that remained largely unaddressed in the books under examination. At best, the knowledgeable reader will be able to discern a few hints suggesting that EAM had also harbored other agendas besides the liberation of Greece from the foreign yoke. In *Η ζωή με του πατέρα*, for example, Argyro's grandfather slaps the girl when he hears her cheering: '-Hooray! The King will return!' Puzzled by his reaction, Argyro, who envisions the King as a

321 According to the charters' second clause, 'Σκοπός του Εθνικού Μετώπου είναι: α) Η απελευθέρωσις του Έθνους μας από τον σημερινόν ξένον ζυγόν και η απόκτησις της πλήρους ανεξαρτησίας της χώρας μας. β) Ο σχηματισμός προσωρινής κυβερνήσεως του ΕΑΜ αμέσως μετά την εκδίωξιν των ξένων κατακτητών, μοναδικός σκοπός της οποίας θα είναι η προκήρυξις εκλογών διά συντακτικήν εθνοσυνέλευσιν, με βάση την αναλογικήν ίνα ο λαός αποφανθή κυριαρχικώς επί του τρόπου της διακυβερνήσεώς του. γ) Η κατοχύρωσις του κυριαρχικού τούτου δικαιώματος του Ελληνικού Λαού, όπως αποφανθή περί του τρόπου της διακυβερνήσεώς του, από πάσαν αντιδραστικήν απόπειρα, ήτις θα τείνη να επιβάλη εις τον λαόν λύσεις αντιθέτους προς τας επιθυμίας του και η εκμηδένισις δι' όλων των μέσων του ΕΑΜ και των οργάνων που το αποτελούν, πάσης τοιαύτης αποπείρας.' Available at https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=3741680

fairy-tale Prince Charming, asks him why he hit her. Her grandfather then replies: 'Do you know what the King is? He is a dragon, like the ones that eat people. Your father did not fight the Germans so that he could come back but for us to be able to live free.'[322] But this is as much as any of the 1980s authors ultimately revealed about EAM's progressive agendas and visions of post-war political reform.

In *Το διπλό ταξίδι* (The Double Voyage, 1987) Litsa Psarafti introduced her readers to another aspect of the Greek Resistance. When Samos is surrendered to the Italian forces uncle Leonidas joins a secret resistance organisation. So does the young protagonist's father, who smuggles members of this 'Organisation' to the Middle East. Confused by all this, Vangelitsa turns to her uncle for answers: 'But you 're the one who has always said that patriots ought not to abandon the struggle and hide… -They are not going there to hide. There is another front down there from where they will continue to fight the enemies.'[323] Uncle Leonidas also goes on to explain that 'when the Germans invaded Greece, our Army escaped to the Middle East and is continuing the fight from there.'[324] After the German conquest of Samos Vangelitsa's family escapes to Palestine, while uncle Leonidas flees to the Middle East to join the struggle of the Greek Armed Forces: 'We will do what

322 '–Γιατί μ' έδειρες; Τι έκανα; -Ξέρεις τι είναι ο βασιλιάς; Δράκος είναι, σαν αυτούς που τρώνε τους ανθρώπους. Ο πατέρας σου δεν πολέμησε τους Γερμανούς για να γυρίσει αυτός, αλλά για να ζήσουμε ελεύθεροι.' Kokoreli 1987: 67.

323 '-Μα εσύ λες πως οι πατριώτες δεν πρέπει ν' αφήνουν τον αγώνα και να κρύβονται… -Εκεί όπου πάνε δε θα κρυφτούν. Υπάρχει ένα άλλο μέτωπο εκεί κάτω και θα πολεμήσουν με το δικό τους τρόπο τον εχθρό, μέχρι να λευτερωθεί η πατρίδα και να φύγουν οι κατακτητές.' Psarafti 1987: 39.

324 'Ο Λεωνίδας έλεγε πως μόλις μπήκαν οι Γερμανοί στην Ελλάδα, ο στρατός μας πέρασε με χίλιες δυο δυσκολίες στη Μέση Ανατολή για να συνεχίσει τον αγώνα.' Ibid.: 131.

the big bosses, the Allies, have commanded. We will withdraw to the Middle East…'[325]

The struggle of the Greek government-in-exile and its Armed Forces in the Middle East campaigns of WWII is one of the least often represented aspects of the Greek Resistance in the books published over the entire period 1974-2014. The reasons for this underrepresentation of the Middle East Resistance can be best explained in the context of the new national interpretation of the 1940s that gained prominence after the *metapolitefsi*. After 1974 the focus shifted from the war in the Middle East to the struggle fought in the Greek mountains, from the Royal Armed Forces to the *andartes*, and from the Greek Crown and the Allies to the 'people' (λαός) and their united National Resistance. That being so, it is not surprising that most of the authors examined here have conveyed a rather unfavourable view of the Allies in their stories. It is also no surprise that their books emphasise the idea that it was the 'people' who liberated themselves from the foreign yoke. As the protagonist of Stella Vogiatzoglou's 1982 novel *Καβάλα σε δύο φεγγάρια* exclaims: 'No, not the Allies, father. No, it was not the Allies. It was the Resistance, father. The Resistance of the people. Do you understand? It was the Resistance!'[326]

In Psarafti's novel, on the other hand, the heads of the Resistance (τα μεγάλα αφεντικά) are neither EAM nor the 'people'. Instead, it is the Allies and the

---

325 'Θα κάνουμε αυτό που προστάζουν τα μεγάλα αφεντικά, οι Σύμμαχοι. Θα συμπτυχθούμε όλοι στη Μέση Ανατολή…' Ibid.: 73.
326 '-Όχι, οι σύμμαχοι, πατέρα, ψιθύρισα πικρά. Όχι, οι σύμμαχοι. Η Αντίσταση, πατέρα. Αυτή η αντίσταση που την είχε γραμμένη μέσα του όλος ο λαός. Την αντίσταση οποιασδήποτε μορφής. Κατάλαβες; ξεφώνισα, η αντίσταση!' Vogiatzoglou op. cit.: 115.

Cairo-based Greek government with its Armed Forces that are shown to play a leading role in the struggle for liberation. As for the resistance movement that developed in occupied Greece, Vangelitsa hears from her father that 'the news from Greece is bad. The Germans are continuing their atrocities and killings. […] As if all this wasn't enough, the armed groups [of the Resistance] are now fighting against each other.'[327]

This is perhaps the only occasion when a 1980s book has hinted at this divisive aspect of the Resistance. As I have shown in the previous chapter, the authors of the 1980s did not shy away from talking to their young readers about the violent clashes that broke out between the collaborationist Security Battalions and ELAS and, as I will go on to show in the next chapter, they also did not shy away from talking about the divisive events of the immediate post-liberation period. However, the subject of the armed skirmishes that broke out between the main resistance organisations while Greece was still under foreign domination continued to be a largely unaddressed reality in the books of the 1980s. Again, regardless of whether the spotlight was on the 'people' or on EAM, the authors of the 1980s were concerned first and foremost with reassuring their readers that the Greek Resistance had been a universal, unanimous and, above all, united national endeavour.[328]

---

327 '-Τα νέα από την Ελλάδα είναι άσχημα, είπε σοβαρά ο πατέρας. Οι Γερμανοί συνεχίζουν τις αγριότητες και τους σκοτωμούς […]. Σαν να μην έφταναν όλα αυτά, οι ένοπλες ομάδες βάλθηκαν να ξεκαθαρίσουν τους λογαριασμούς τους. Το αίμα χύνεται άφθονο.' Psarafti op. cit.: 169

328 This idea was greatly emphasised by Andreas Papandreou in his speech on the occasion of the recognition of the National Resistance: 'Πολλοί θα πουν ότι η ενιαία Αντίσταση δεν υπήρξε γιατί μεσολάβησαν συγκρούσεις ανάμεσα σε οργανώσεις και κατά την περίοδο της Αντίστασης. Πράγματι, υπήρξαν συγκρούσεις που στοίχησαν ζωές αγωνιστών πραγματικών σ' όλες τις οργανώσεις. Ο λαός μας, όμως στη βάση του έμεινε πάντοτε ενωμένος, ενώ οι οργανώσεις

As I have shown in this chapter, the authors of the second period of the *metapolitefsi* conveyed different views of the Resistance in their books. To summarise the main trends, most of the authors examined here opted for a more inclusive approach, shifting their focus onto the 'people' (λαός) and their collective efforts against the occupiers. In their stories, the Resistance is portrayed as a movement for national liberation that sprang from and was led by the 'people'. At the same time, a second group of authors turned the focus onto EAM and its leading role in the Greek Resistance, portraying the former as a patriotic force that had rallied the entire 'people' behind its national-liberation banner.

Convenient as it may be, an interpretation that premises the authors' diverse treatment of the subject on their ideological inclinations or personal experiences of the Resistance is, nonetheless, both misguided and misleading, as illustrated by the examples of Manolis Kornilios and Pepi Daraki that were discussed earlier. Rather than focusing on the authors' backgrounds, therefore, our attention should be directed to the exploration of the relationship between changing national perspectives on the Resistance and the reception of this subject in books published during the same period. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the 1980s saw the emergence and rapid dominance of a new national narrative, one that glorified the united Resistance of the 'people' and exalted the role of EAM/ELAS in it. It is only when placed within this context that we can fully understand, for example,

---

ἐβρισκαν τον τρόπο–δύσκολα ίσως–να ξαναδούν και να αντιμετωπίσουν τον κοινό εχθρό, τον ξένο, το φασίστα, κατακτητή.' Cited in Antoniou and Paschaloudi 2014: 296.

why the adjective 'National' begins to appear in books published after 1982 or why authors started to talk openly about the EAM movement only after the official recognition of the left-wing Resistance.[329]

But in any case and despite their having approached the subject from different ideological perspectives, the overall conclusion here is that the authors of the 1980s painted a rather reassuring picture of the Resistance, a Resistance that had remained united and free from internal conflicts, disagreements or other unpleasantness. In short, a Resistance that never quite was.

329 Stella Vogiatzoglou's novel *Καβάλα σε δύο φεγγάρια*, for example, was published in May 1982, three months before the official recognition of the left-wing Resistance. In the novel there is a scene in which the heroine finds out that her cousin is organised in the Resistance: '-Γιατί δε μου είπες τόσο καιρό, Αλέκο; τον ρωτούσα και τον ξαναρωτούσα διαρκώς.' Twelve years later, in 1994, the book was republished after substantial revision. In the new edition the above phrase is reproduced with one important addition: '-Γιατί δεν μου είπες τόσο καιρό, Αλέκο; τον ρωτούσα και τον ξαναρωτούσα συνέχεια. Είσαι και εσύ στο Ε.Α.Μ.;'. See Vogiatzoglou 1982: 67 and Vogiatzoglou 1994: 79.

THEY MADE US FIGHT AGAINST EACH OTHER: THE CIVIL WAR

In the last chapter of Part I, I discussed the representation of the late 1940s in the young people's fiction of the early *metapolitefsi*. As I showed there, the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* avoided touching upon the subject of the national divisions that culminated in full-scale civil war, just a few years after Greece was liberated from a foreign occupation. Writing their stories at a time when civil war skeletons were pushed deep into the closet in the name of national reconciliation, authors in the 1970s remained completely silent about the events of the post-liberation period that had divided the nation for three decades.

However, this changed in the 1980s. PASOK's rise to power was followed by the emergence and rapid dominance of a new narrative, one that celebrated the nation's quasi-united Resistance to its foreign enemies. In this narrative, the spotlight was on the Resistance, the unsettling memories of the wartime civil strife that broke out between the main Resistance forces were sidelined, the blame for the outbreak of the *Dekemvriana* was attributed to the foreign element, and the Civil War was perceived as an 'aberration', a blot on the otherwise glorious history of the 1940s. The tragic victim of this period was the people of Greece, who had been dragged into a catastrophic civil war resulting from the right-wing 'white terror' and Anglo-American intervention in Greece's internal affairs.[330]

330 See also chapter 1 in this Part.

PASOK's leftist interpretation of the 1940s was also propagated in the new state-sponsored history textbooks that were produced shortly after the party took office. The new textbooks highlighted the role of Anglo-Americans in the post-liberation national woes and laid all responsibility for the outbreak of the Civil War on the government/monarchist camp and its 'white terror' campaign against former fighters and supporters of the left-wing Resistance.

Despite the new political circumstances that allowed for more critical approaches to the past, the authors' reluctance to engage with the events of the post-liberation period continued well into the 1980s. Most of the authors examined here continued to adhere to the happy-ever-after endings that had become the norm for the authors of the previous decade. Stella Vogiatzoglou's novel *Καβάλα σε δυο φεγγάρια* (Riding on Two Moons, 1982), for example, ends with the celebrations that took place after Greece's liberation from the Axis occupation:

> An unbridled enthusiasm of freedom is spreading across the sea of people that are pouring into the streets. 'It is true', I hear a man next to me telling his wife, 'it is true that a new era is now beginning for Greece.' 'That's right! That's right!', she nods in agreement. The sun is burning. Like the hopes that are burning inside us. Hopes…[331]

The same reassuring ending is also given in Mary Vryakou-Geli's and Pepi Daraki's books:

> Autumn 1944. They are gone, they, who had arrived as conquerors, left humiliated, disgraced. The nightmare is over. Where there was darkness before, now there is light and the sun

331 'Ο ασυγκράτητος ενθουσιασμός της λευτεριάς, όλο και μεγαλώνει στην ανθρωποθάλασσα που ξεχύνεται από παντού. «Είναι γεγονός» ακούω έναν κύριο δίπλα μου να λέει στη γυναίκα του. «Είναι γεγονός ότι αρχίζει μια νέα περίοδος για την Ελλάδα». «'Έτσι είναι! Έτσι είναι!», κουνά αυτή σε συμφωνία το κεφάλι της. Καίει ο ήλιος. Καίνε και μέσα μας ελπίδες. Ελπίδες…' Vogiatzoglou 1982: 119.

> has risen again, shining brightly on our land. The Sun of Freedom.[332]
>
> The four friends were standing embraced, looking straight ahead, filled with joy for the days to come. Broad smiles blossomed on their young faces.[333]

In a similar tone, in Soula Rodopoulou's *Τα σαράντα κόσκινα* (The Forty Sieves, 1984) the protagonists return to a peaceful life after the occupiers depart from their village. Families are reunited, the children return to their carefree games and nothing can threaten the blissful life that now lies ahead:

> The war is continuing fierce in the heart of Europe. [...] This long and terrible war would soon come to an end, leaving people wrecked, miserable, steeped in grief for the loss of so many loved ones. But a better world would be built with a better future for the younger generation. That is what everyone said and truly believed.[334]

The occupiers are gone, the 'Sun of Freedom' shines bright again, the heroes face the future with unspoiled optimism and the young reader is left with the impression that all sufferings ended with the end of the Occupation.

At the same time, however, there were other authors who moved away from the reassuring happy-ever-after endings and broke the wall of silence that had surrounded the representation of the late 1940s in the young people's fiction of the previous decade. Georges Sari's novel *Οι Νικητές* (The Winners, 1983) is

---

332 'Φθινόπωρο του 1944. Εκείνοι έφυγαν, εκείνοι οι κατακτητές κυνηγημένοι, ντροπιασμένοι, έφυγαν. Ο εφιάλτης πέρασε. Στη σκοτεινιά ήρθε το φως, βγήκε ο ήλιος και έλαμψε πέρα ως πέρα στον τόπο μας. Ο Ήλιος της λευτεριάς.' Vryakou-Geli 1983: 187.

333 'Οι τέσσερις φίλοι αγκαλιασμένοι κι ακινητοποιημένοι από τη συγκίνηση, με το βλέμμα ίσια μπροστά τους, παραδίνονταν σε μια ατέλειωτη χαρά για το τώρα, για το ύστερα, για το αύριο. Χαμόγελα πλατιά ανθίζανε στα νεανικά τους πρόσωπα.' Daraki 1983: 113.

334 'Ο πόλεμος στη καρδιά της Ευρώπης συνεχιζόταν άγριος. [...] Ο μεγάλος και φοβερός αυτός πόλεμος θα τέλειωνε, αφήνοντας τους ανθρώπους καταστραμμένους, δυστυχισμένους, βουλιαγμένους στο πένθος, για το χαμό τόσων αγαπημένων προσώπων. Όμως, θα φτιαχνόταν ένας καλύτερος κόσμος, με καλύτερο μέλλον, για τους νέους. Όλοι, αυτά έλεγαν και πίστευαν.' Rodopoulou 1984: 121.

a fictionalised account of the author's personal experience of the events of December 1944, the so-called *Dekemvriana*. An active member of the EAM Resistance during the Occupation, in *Οι Νικητές* Sari reflects on her time at the British-controlled Agia Olga Hospital, where she was transferred after a British air aid that almost cost her her life during the early days of the *Dekemvriana*.

Published just a year after the official recognition of the left-wing Resistance, *Οι Νικητές* was the first book for young readers to engage with the *Dekemvriana*. Although critical of the novel's biases, Kyriakos Delopoulos has noted in his review that '*Οι Νικητές* was a long-overdue book. But it got to be written at last.'[335] Delopoulos also went on to remark that it 'is a book that has the privilege of raising questions [...] in the minds of young readers, who know nothing of these events from our recent history.'[336]

These, largely uneasy, questions are invited as early as from the book foreword. Written by Sari's personal friend and fellow author Zoi Valasi, the foreword of *Οι Νικητές* is one of the most political pieces of writing to have been included in a book for young readers in the entire *metapolitefsi* period. The following passage speaks for itself:

> You see, this book dares to talk about thoughts and deeds and events that have remained double-locked, dusted, forbidden for years. When I was a child there were no books available to us about the Occupation and the Metaxas dictatorship. No one talked to us about those things back then. You, on the other hand, have a lot of good books about these subjects as well as about other subjects. About the Resistance, for example. Yet, even these do not go further than Liberation. On the events that

335 Delopoulos 1984: 46.
336 Ibid.: 44.

> came after [the Liberation there is] absolute silence. […] If you see the words 'The fallen of the Resistance' you will recall the brave men who were killed by the German occupiers. But if you come across the title 'The victims of Meligalas', what will you get from that? […] This book will make you ask yourselves how we got to the Civil War, how true heroes came to be called traitors, while real traitors were given metals, positions and power.[337]

The greater part of the novel is set in Agia Olga. A few days after the outbreak of the battle of Athens Zoi is rushed to Agia Olga, following a British attack on the building where she and her EPON comrades were holding a meeting. While the December fighting is taking over the streets of Athens, the patients in Agia Olga decide to go on a hunger strike in protest at their poor treatment by the British officials who are in control of the hospital. Agia Olga defines the boundaries between two different worlds; the world of those inside the hospital and that of those outside. This inside/outside division also affects the ways in which the battle of Athens is perceived by the characters. Overjoyed at the success of their hunger strike, those inside the hospital project their victorious experience onto the conflict that is taking place in the outside world and become convinced that the EAM/ELAS camp will win the battle. At the same time, those outside of the hospital know all too well that it is a matter of time before ELAS loses ground to the British/government side.

---

337 'Βλέπετε, αυτό το βιβλίο τολμά να μιλάει για σκέψεις και πράξεις και γεγονότα που χρόνια μένανε διπλοκλειδωμένα, αραχνιασμένα, απαγορευμένα. Όταν ήμουν παιδί δεν είχα κανένα βιβλίο για την Κατοχή και τη δικτατορία του Μεταξά. Κανείς δε μας μιλούσε τότε γι' αυτά. Εσείς, όμως, έχετε πολλά κι ωραία βιβλία μ' αυτά τα θέματα κι ακόμα παραπέρα. Για την Αντίσταση. Μα και πάλι ως ένα σημείο· ως την Απελευθέρωση. Για τα κατοπινά, σιωπή. […] Αν δείτε τις λέξεις ΟΙ ΝΕΚΡΟΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΤΙΣΤΑΣΗΣ, θ' αναπλάσετε, όχι βέβαια το ίδιο ζωντανά και ξεκάθαρα όπως πριν, τα παλικάρια που εκτελέστηκαν ή σκοτώθηκαν από τους Γερμανούς καταχτητές. Αν όμως δείτε τον τίτλο ΟΙ ΝΕΚΡΟΙ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΛΙΓΑΛΑ, αυτό πώς θα το διαβάσετε; […] για ν' αναρωτηθείτε πώς φτάσαμε στον Εμφύλιο, πώς έγινε κι οι αληθινοί ήρωες ονομάστηκαν προδότες, ενώ αληθινοί προδότες πήραν μετάλλια, θέσεις και εξουσία. Γι' αυτά και γι' άλλα ακόμα είναι τούτο το βιβλίο της Ζωρζ Σαρή που ΟΙ ΝΙΚΗΤΕΣ τη λένε Ζωή, κι η ζωή τούς λέει νικητές.' Sari 1983: 7-9.

This interplay between what those inside Agia Olga believe as opposed to what those outside the hospital witness, allows the reader to see the *Dekemvriana* through multiple perspectives.[338]

The first book for young readers to commemorate the events of December 1944, *Οι Νικητές*, however, does not resist its ideological biases, offering a one-sided view of the December conflict from the vantage point of the Left. Sari, nonetheless, avoids conveying her personal political views in the words she puts in the mouths of her characters. Her views are, instead, reflected in the selection of the documents and other historical material included in the novel. The tone is set in a brief introduction informing young readers about the main political developments and events that took place between Greece's liberation from the Axis occupation and the outbreak of the *Dekemvriana*:

> When Hitler's defeated troops left [Athens] on 12 October 1944, EAM/ELAS was the only remaining force in Greece [...] Following the Lebanon Agreement, a National Unity government was formed under the leadership of G. Papandreou. Under the Caserta Agreement, it was decided that ELAS would not enter Athens. Instead, it would be placed under the command of British General Scobie. This situation created a state of dual power; on one side there were the Resistance forces and on the other there were the forces of the reaction, supported by groups of collaborators and Security Battalionists and backed by the British bayonets. This situation, however, could not last forever; either the people [λαός] would take power or the reaction would crush the people. Having agreed with Stalin on the carve-up of the Balkans, Churchill put forward a plan to eliminate

338 Overjoyed at the success of their hunger strike, Zoi, for example, says to her sister Eirini who has come to visit her in Agia Olga: 'Νικήσαμε, ο αγώνας συνεχίζεται κι όταν γυρίσουν οι δικοί μας, τότε θα καταλάβουν οι κύριοι κύριοι τι τους περιμένει. Ο ΕΛΑΣ θα σαρώσει, είναι πάνοπλος. Ε, και κάνει πως ροβολάει κατά δω, φτερό στον άνεμο οι Εγγλέζοι και τα τσιράκια τους.' One of the main 'outside' characters, Eirini, however, has a different opinion: 'Τούτος εδώ ο θάλαμος μοιάζει τρελός, έξω από το χρόνο τον αληθινό κι ο χρόνος βιάζει. Τώρα στην Αθήνα κυρίαρχοι είναι οι Άγγλοι. Τι ωφελεί να μιλάμε για νίκες μελλοντικές και για επέλαση του ΕΛΑΣ. Η αλήθεια σκληρή. Οι γυναίκες πρέπει να τη μάθουν, φτάνουν οι ζητωκραυγές και οι μάταιες ελπίδες.' Ibid.: 169.

> EAM/ELAS at all costs, since Greece fell within the British 'sphere of influence.'[339]

Here EAM/ELAS is presented as the sole representative of the entire resistance movement (οι δυνάμεις της Αντίστασης) and identified with the Greek 'people' (λαός) itself, while the battle of Athens is perceived as a conflict between the people/EAM on one side and the Greek monarchist reaction/British forces, on the other. The responsibility for the outbreak of the December hostilities is attributed to the foreign element and seen as part of one man's–that is to say, Churchill's–deliberate plan to decimate EAM in order to ensure that post-war Greece remained within the British sphere of influence, as stipulated in the notorious Churchill-Stalin 'Percentages Agreement'.[340]

---

339 'Όταν στις 12 του Οκτώβρη του 1944 τα χιτλερικά στρατεύματα αποχωρούσαν ηττημένα, μόνη δύναμη στην Ελλάδα έμενε το ΕΑΜ-ΕΛΑΣ. [...] Με τη συμφωνία του Λιβάνου είχε σχηματιστεί μια αστική κυβέρνηση Εθνικής Ενότητας, με πρωθυπουργό τον Γ. Παπανδρέου. Με τη συμφωνία της Καζέρτας είχε αποφασιστεί να μην μπει ο ΕΛΑΣ στην Αθήνα και ταυτόχρονα να βρεθεί κάτω από τις διαταγές του Βρετανού στρατηγού Σκόμπυ. Μ' αυτόν τον τρόπο επικράτησε μια κατάσταση δυαδικής εξουσίας: από τη μια οι αντιστασιακές δυνάμεις κι από την άλλη οι δυνάμεις της αντίδρασης, οι συνεργάτες των Γερμανών και οι ταγματασφαλίτες, με τη στήριξη των βρετανικών λογχών. Μια τέτοια κατάσταση όμως δεν μπορούσε να κρατήσει επ' άπειρον: ή ο λαός θα έπαιρνε την εξουσία ή η αντίδραση θα τσάκιζε το λαό. Ο Τσώρτσιλ, έχοντας συμφωνήσει με τον Στάλιν πάνω στο μοίρασμα των Βαλκανίων, έβαλε μπροστά την εξόντωση του ΕΑΜ-ΕΛΑΣ με κάθε μέσο, μια και η Ελλάδα ήταν στη βρετανική «σφαίρα επιρροής».' Ibid.: 11-12.

340 The agreement was signed between the two war leaders in October 1944 in Moscow. The 'naughty document', as Churchill used to call it, provided for the division of the Balkans into Soviet and British spheres of influence, with Stalin extending his power over Romania and Bulgaria and Churchill taking Greece. Although modern historians dismiss the idea that the agreement had any real impact on subsequent developments, the tale of the secret Churchill-Stalin encounter occupied centre stage in popular perceptions and interpretations of the Civil War in Greece. As Geoffrey Roberts notes, the infamous agreement 'came to symbolise, for both the Left and the Right, the fate of postwar Europe; on the one hand, there was a leftist narrative of Stalin's betrayal of the revolution in Greece and, by extension, in Western Europe; on the other hand, a conservative parable of Churchill's sacrifice of East European freedom on the altar of British strategic and imperial interests.' Roberts 2002. On the 'Percentages Agreement' see also Resis 1978: 368-87, Papastratis 1984: 198-202 and Ross 1988: 67-77.

This view is further supported by the inclusion in the novel of a controversial document, a telegram to Anthony Eden in which W. Churchill minuted his Foreign Secretary that:

> In my opinion, having paid the price we have to Russia for freedom of action in Greece, we should not hesitate to use British troops to support the Royal Hellenic Government under G. Papandreou. […] I fully expect a clash with EAM, and we must not shrink from it provided the ground is well chosen.[341]

Again, the view conveyed here is that the December conflict was instigated by the British Prime Minister, who had been preparing for an armed confrontation with EAM all along since the Moscow agreement won him a free hand in Greece. Attributing all responsibility for the *Dekemvriana* to British interventionism is a convenient interpretation that completely ignores the question of the escalating internal tensions in Greece during the war and exonerates the Greek Left from its own share of the responsibility for the December bloodshed. Moreover, it is an interpretation that is aligned with the leftist narrative which, as I have discussed in the introductory chapter, gained prominence after PASOK's rise to power.

To dispel any doubts that EAM may have had some part to play in the violence that erupted during the fateful demonstration of December 3, the author also goes on to include in the novel a long passage from W. Byford-Jone's 1946 memoir *The Greek Trilogy*. Having witnessed the events from a nearby coffeehouse, the British officer recalls:

---

341 'Κατά τη γνώμη μου, αφού έχουμε πληρώσει στη Ρωσία το τίμημα για να επιτύχουμε ελευθερία δράσεως στην Ελλάδα, δεν πρέπει να διστάσουμε να χρησιμοποιήσουμε βρετανικές δυνάμεις για να υποστηρίξουμε τη βασιλική ελληνική κυβέρνηση υπό τον Γ. Παπανδρέου. […] Περιμένω ανοιχτή σύγκρουση με το ΕΑΜ και δεν πρέπει να τη φοβόμαστε, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι έχουμε διαλέξει με προσοχή το έδαφος.' Sari op. cit.: 13-4.

> The head of it [EAM procession] had reached the road in front of the old royal palace when my attention was attracted by the sound of voices to a group of police officers leaning on the balcony of the second floor of the building above the bar. To my surprise these officers had rifles at the ready. […] There was nothing sullen or menacing about the procession. […] My attention was again attracted to the balcony above by what sounded like an order, given in Greek. The head of the procession was at this time thirty yards away. Mr. S. Barber of the United Press, told me later that it was an order to fire. […] What happened next was so fantastically unreal I might have been watching a film. The squad of police above emptied their rifles into the procession… […] Every moment those of us who stood within the line of fire expected EAM to use arms. On the roof of the KKE headquarters in the square there was a machine-gun nest, and it could have raked the neighbourhood with devastating fire. But EAM contented themselves with cursing and threatening. I do not think anyone in the procession was armed.[342]

In addition to providing historical insight into the events that signalled the beginning of the battle of Athens, the inclusion of the above passage serves an ideological purpose, suggesting that EAM never had any intention of engaging in an armed confrontation with the British/government camp, much less of provoking it. Unarmed and unprepared for the attack, EAM found itself trapped in a helpless situation that had been set up by the British/Greek

342 Ή κεφαλή της διαδήλωσης είχε φτάσει στο δρόμο που περνά μπροστά από τα Παλαιά Ανάκτορα, όταν την προσοχή μου τράβηξαν φωνές μιας ομάδας αξιωματικών της αστυνομίας που έσκυβαν από το μπαλκόνι του δεύτερου πατώματος του κτιρίου, ακριβώς πάνω από το καφενείο. Με κατάπληξη διαπίστωσα ότι οι αξιωματικοί κρατούσαν όπλα έτοιμοι να πυροβολήσουν. […] Η διαδήλωση δεν έδειχνε τίποτε το απειλητικό. […] Την προσοχή μου τράβηξε πάλι στο μπαλκόνι μια επιτακτική φωνή που έμοιαζε σαν διαταγή, στα ελληνικά. Εκείνη τη στιγμή η κεφαλή της διαδήλωσης βρισκόταν σε απόσταση τριάντα μέτρων περίπου. Ο κύριος Σ. Μπάρμπερ του Ηνωμένου Τύπου μου εξήγησε αργότερα ότι η φωνή που είχα ακούσει ήταν διαταγή πυροβολισμού. […] Αυτό που συνέβη εκείνη τη στιγμή ήταν τόσο απίστευτο που, προς στιγμή, νόμισα πως παρακολουθούσα κινηματογραφική ταινία… Οι αστυνομικοί άδειασαν τις σφαίρες των όπλων τους πάνω στους διαδηλωτές… […] Όσοι από τους θεατές βρισκόμαστε στη γραμμή του πυρός περιμέναμε από στιγμή σε στιγμή το ΕΑΜ να απαντήσει με όπλα. Πάνω στη σκεπή των κεντρικών γραφείων του ΚΚΕ που βρίσκονταν στην πλατεία, υπήρχαν οπλοπολυβόλα τα οποία μπορούσαν να γαζώσουν ολόκληρη τη γειτονιά με καταιγιστικό πυρ. Το ΕΑΜ όμως περιορίστηκε σε βρισιές και απειλές. Δε νομίζω πως υπήρχαν οπλισμένοι διαδηλωτές.' Ibid.: 68-70.

monarchist reaction in order to crush EAM/people's continuing struggle for 'justice and freedom'.[343]

While the responsibility for the *Dekemvriana* is attributed to foreigners and their local government/monarchist stooges, EAM is depicted in a light that exonerates it of all blame. In line with the author's political views and the general ideological orientations of the *metapolitefsi*, the novel offers a sanitised picture of EAM/ELAS's role in the atrocities that followed the demonstration of December 3.

To give one example, towards the end of the novel there is a scene in which a mass grave is 'discovered' in a field near Agia Olga. Surrounded by several British correspondents who have been invited to cover the event, the grave is dug up revealing dozens of mutilated bodies. When a black-clad woman identifies one of the corpses as her daughter and begins to scream that her poor girl was butchered by the *ELASites*, she is confronted by Amalia, the head nurse of Agia Olga. A vivid supporter of the government/monarchist camp, Amalia attacks the grieving woman when she realises that the whole episode has been staged: '-You, liar, that's not your daughter. That's Ioanna. I know her mother. Ioanna was killed by a bomb while waiting in line for milk. Liar. We buried her, along with everyone else here, in this very pit…'[344]

---

343 '[…] οι Εγγλέζοι και οι ντόπιοι πράκτορές τους είναι φασίστες και πως ο ΕΛΑΣ παλεύει για το δίκιο και τη λευτεριά.' Ibid.: 85.

344 '-Μωρή ψεύτρα, ποιο παιδί σου και ποια κόρη σου; Αυτή είναι η Ιωάννα. Τη μάνα της την ξέρω. Στεκόταν στην ουρά για γάλα κι έπεσε πάνω της μπόμπα και τη σακάτεψε. Ψεύτρα. Εμείς τη θάψαμε, μαζί με όλους τους άλλους, στο λάκκο…' Ibid.: 173.

The scene is followed by an excerpt from Heinz Richter's book *Two revolutions and counter-revolutions in Greece 1936-1946*. In this, the German historian talks about the widely published story of the mutilated corpses that were exhumed from a gravesite in the Athenian neighborhood of Peristeri and presented as victims of ELAS's barbarity during the *Dekemvriana*. The passage concludes: 'Summing up, we can conclude that the allegations about the mass murders committed by ELAS were false. These atrocities were carried out by the Right and provided the British and the government with a political propaganda weapon in order to blacken the moral reputation of ELAS.'[345]

Again, besides its informational purpose, the inclusion of excerpts from documents and other historical material in the novel plays an instrumental role in conveying the author's views on the events narrated. More importantly, it plays an instrumental role in shaping perceptions about the role of the two warring camps in the atrocities that consumed Athens for more than a month. Exaggerated as it had been, there was, nonetheless, a good deal of truth in the

345 'Ανακεφαλαιώνοντας μπορούμε να διαπιστώσουμε, ότι η κατηγορία των μαζικών φόνων εκ μέρους τους ΕΛΑΣ δεν είναι αληθινή. Οι κατασκευασμένες από τη Δεξιά ωμότητες χρησίμεψαν στη βρετανική και την κυβερνητική προπαγάνδα για να βληθεί η ηθική υπόσταση του ΕΛΑΣ…' Ibid.: 178. Richter here refers to the so-called Citrine report. In late January 1945, a British TUC delegation, headed by Sir Walter Citrine, was sent to Greece in order to evaluate the country's situation on the spot. While in Athens, the delegates were taken to the district of Peristeri where they were presented with hundreds of mutilated corpses –allegedly victims of ELAS. In reality, most of the 'victims' had died of natural causes or been killed during the December fighting; their bodies were then dug up from the city's cemeteries by members of right-wing gangs, mutilated and displayed as victims of ELAS's barbarity. Upon their return to England, the delegates produced a report entitled *What we saw in Greece*, which presented the ELAS in the most unfavourable light and played a crucial role in counteracting British criticism over Churchill's politics of intervention in Greece. Besides a propaganda triumph for the British, the story of the mutilated corpses was also exploited by the post-war Greek Right for the promotion of its anti-communist agenda. On the massacre allegations and the TUC delegation see Richter 1985: 27-30 and Sakkas 2013: 54-8. For the political exploitation of these allegations by the post-war Right in Greece see Charalambidis 2014, Spiliotopoulou 2016: 464-75 and Voglis 2017: 239-59.

allegations about ELAS's violent tactics and practices against civilians during the *Dekemvriana*. Caught up in a vicious circle of retributive violence, ELAS– alongside the communist-controlled OPLA and the National Civil Guard– carried out mass executions, terorrised innocents and took thousands of civilian hostages following its defeat in the battle of Athens. Yet, the fact that EAM/ELAS had its own part to play in the December bloodshed is an unsettling truth that remains silenced in Sari's book.[346]

The novel closes with an excerpt from Tom Driberg's speech in the House of Commons on December 8, 1944. Delivered just a few days after the outbreak of the *Dekemvriana*, the Labour MP opined in his speech that 'I hope that it is not civil war, and I do not think that it is: to my mind it is war between the bulk of the Greek population on the one side and a few quislings and Royalists on the other, backed up by British bayonets.'[347]

Quoted twice in the novel, the closing passage neatly summarises the author's views on the political character of the December conflict. And the view that is conveyed in *Οι Νικητές* is that what happened on the streets of Athens in December 1944 was not a civil war. Instead, it was a fight between the 'people' (λαός) represented by EAM/ELAS on one side and the British imperialists supported by the Greek government/monarchist camp on the other. More importantly, it was a struggle in defence of the Greek people's

346 On the atrocities of the EAM/ELAS camp during the *Dekemvriana* see Gerolymatos 2004: 149-85 and Lambatos 2016: 103-116.

347 'Ελπίζω ότι δεν είναι εμφύλιος πόλεμος και πιστεύω ότι δεν είναι. Έχω τη γνώμη ότι από τη μια μεριά μάχεται ο όγκος του ελληνικού λαού και από την άλλη μερικοί κουίσλιγκς και μοναρχικοί που υποστηρίζονται από τις βρετανικές λόγχες.' Sari op. cit.: 61 and 186.

right to self-determination, a struggle for national independence in the face of Churchill's plans to turn Greece into a British protectorate.

The same view is also conveyed in Argyro Kokoreli's *Η ζωή με τον πατέρα* (Life with Father, 1987). Little Argyro cannot understand why her *ELASitis* father has still not come back home, although Greece is now free and the occupiers are gone. Eventually, she learns that her father is fighting in Athens against 'the English and the Security Battalionists who are slaughtering the people.'[348] Confused by this new war, Argyro turns to her mother for answers. Her mother explains to her that 'the English, who, at first, were our friends and fought the Germans alongside the guerrillas, have now become friends with the Security Battalionists and turned against them [guerrillas].'[349] Argyro's grandfather also affirms this new reality: 'now that we've got rid of the Germans, the English want to take their place. They want to enslave our people.'[350]

As in Sari's novel, here too the battle of Athens is represented as a conflict between EAM/the Greek people on one side and the British forces, supported by groups of collaborators and right-wing extremists, on the other. Continuing the national liberation struggle of the Occupation and having once again rallied the 'people' (λαός) behind its banner, EAM/ELAS was now fighting a

348 'Ο πατέρας δεν ήρθε ακόμα. Η Αργυρώ άρπαξε από δω κι από κει κάτι κουβέντες. Βρίσκεται κάπου στην Αθήνα. Εκεί γίνονται μάχες. Οι Εγγλέζοι και οι ταγματασφαλίτες σκοτώνουν τον κόσμο. Οι αντάρτες πολεμάνε πάλι.' Kokoreli 1987: 57.
349 'Η μάνα της λέει πως οι Εγγλέζοι, που ήταν φίλοι και πολεμούσαν μαζί με τους αντάρτες τους Γερμανούς, σήμερα έγιναν φίλοι με τους τσολιάδες και τους ταγματασφαλίτες και πολεμάνε τους δικούς μας.' Ibid.: 58.
350 '-Είναι αλήθεια, παππού, πως οι Εγγλέζοι πολεμάνε τους δικούς μας; -Είναι αλήθεια. Τώρα που διώξαμε τους Γερμανούς, οι Εγγλέζοι θέλουν να πάρουν τη θέση τους. Θέλουν να σκλαβώσουν αυτοί το λαό.' Ibid.

new war, this time against its former foreign allies and their plans to keep Greece under their control.

In the afterword of *Οι Νικητές* Sari encourages her young readers to find out for themselves what happened after the end of the battle of Athens: 'My young reader, this story does not end here... If you want to know what happened in 1945, what happened after 1945, search, learn and give your own ending to this story.'[351] Kokoreli, on the other hand, goes on to tell the full story. Following the end of the *Dekemvriana*, the winners launched a campaign of terror and violence against veterans and sympathisers of the EAM Resistance. Argyro's father goes into hiding, her grandmother is murdered by a group of paramilitaries, her uncle is harassed by the gendarmeries and Alekos, a former *ELASitis* and a good friend of Argyro's father, is killed by a gang of Security Battalionists.

Greece descends into a disastrous civil war and Argyro's father is arrested and sent to an island camp. As the little girl hears their relatives telling her mother, his only hope to reunite with his wife and daughters is to sign a declaration of repentance–the so-called *dilosi*. Argyro, who has no clue what this *dilosi* is, turns to her mother once again:

> –Well, it's a piece of paper that they give you to sign, to put your name on it. It says that you regret going to the mountains and fighting the Germans and that you recant your ideas. It is a paper that says that you will come around and that from now on you will sit quietly.

351 'Μικρέ μου αναγνώστη, τούτη η αληθινή ιστορία δεν τελειώνει εδώ... Αν θέλεις να μάθεις τι έγινε το 1945, τι έγινε μετά το 1945, ψάξε να το 'βρεις και γράψε μόνος σου τη συνέχεια.' Sari op. cit.: 187.

–Is it like apologising?

–Yes.

–But father didn't do anything wrong, why does he have to apologise then?

–So that he can come back to us, mother said in tears.[352]

The Civil War ends with the defeat of the communist guerrillas and Argyro's father signs the *dilosi* only to return to a life of misery, discrimination and social marginalisation. The novel closes with adult Argyro reflecting on the bitter years that followed her father's return from exile: 'You never left again. You didn't have to. You had signed. […] You signed and you threw yourself into the struggle for survival. You wasted your life in dusty offices, begging for a piece of bread, living a miserable life.'[353]

An otherwise well-written novel, Kokoreli's book paints a one-sided picture of the fratricidal drama. All blame for the Civil War is laid on the 'others' who unleashed an orgy of violence against Argyro's father, Alekos and all the other people who had shed their blood in the fight for national liberation. While the side of 'others' is demonised, the Left is presented as the pious victim of the Civil War; a patriotic force that that had done the most to liberate the country from the foreign yoke, only to see former collaborators become fully integrated

352 '-Να, είναι ένα χαρτί που πρέπει να υπογράψεις, να βάλεις τ' όνομά σου. Να γράφει πως μετανοείς που πήγες στο βουνό, που πολέμησες τους Γερμανούς και ότι αλλάζεις τις ιδέες σου. Ένα χαρτί που να γράφει πως θ' αλλάξεις μυαλά, θα καθίσεις ήσυχος.
-Σαν να ζητάει συγγνώμη;
-Ναι.
-Μα αφού ο πατέρας δεν έκανε κανένα κακό, γιατί να ζητήσει συγγνώμη;
-Για να γυρίσει κοντά μας, δακρύζει η μάνα.' Kokoreli op. cit.: 88.
353 'Δεν ξανάφυγες. Δε χρειαζόταν πια. Είχε υπογράψει. […] Υπόγραψες και ρίχτηκες στον αγώνα για το μεροκάματο. Σε σκονισμένα γραφεία, φιλώντας «κατουρημένες ποδιές» για ένα κομμάτι ψωμί, ζώντας μια ζωή μίζερη.' Ibid.: 104.

into the post-war political establishment and the left-wing patriots suffering the bitter consequences of this new reality.

This is largely the trope that the Left had employed since the early 1950s to describe its involvement in the Civil War.[354] As Mark, Townson and Voglis have noted, 'the emblematic figure of the Civil War [for the post-war Left] was not the courageous fighter but rather the defeated political prisoner in the Makronisos island camp.'[355] Argyro's father becomes a genuine embodiment of this emblem, a personification of the victimised Left, a figure whose personal drama encloses the collective drama of the defeated Left. At the same time, however, as Eleni Sarantini has pointed out in her review, Kokoreli spares 'no explanation, no glance or nod, no wrinkle of concern for those who found themselves fighting on the opposite side.'[356]

The same can also be said for Giota Fotiadou-Balafouti's largely autobiographical novel *Ποτέ ξανά* (Never Again, 1987).[357] The novel describes the sufferings of a family of left-wingers during and after the Civil War. With their mother a political refugee in Romania and their father in prison, life is

---

354 Demertzis 2016: 150. As Angelos Elefantis notes, 'Θα έλεγε κανείς ότι ο πολεμικός Εμφύλιος δεν ήθελε να εγκατασταθεί στη συλλογική μνήμη ούτε καν των αριστερών. Τον απωθούσαν. Αντίθετα, οι αριστεροί μίλησαν πολύ και επικέντρωσαν την προσοχή στα γεγονότα της καταστολής: τις εκτελέσεις, τις πάσης φύσεως διώξεις, τους ξυλοδαρμούς, τα Μακρονήσια, τους εξόριστους, τους φυλακισμένους, το κλίμα της λευκής τρομοκρατίας, τις δηλώσεις μετανοίας, τον νόμο και τον τρόμο του χωροφύλακα, τους μάρτυρες και τα μαρτύρια, τα πιστοποιητικά κοινωνικών φρονημάτων, τα έκτακτα μέτρα, όλο αυτό το κλίμα της δικτατόρευσης και της δικτατορίας που βασίλευε στην Ελλάδα ως το 1974.' Elefantis 2002: 109.
355 Mark, Townson and Voglis 2013: 76.
356 Sarantini 1997.
357 Originally published in 1979 by 'Synchroni Epochi', the book was republished nine years later by 'Kastaniotis Editions' as part of their 'Library for the Youth' collection. Therefore, it is open to question whether the book was actually intended for a young audience. Still, the fact that the second publisher went on to include the novel in its youth collection shows that the Civil War was no longer a subject that authors and publishers of books for young readers would shy away from.

difficult for the young protagonist and her four siblings. After ten years of political stigmatisation, social isolation and numerous other adversities, the family finally manages to reunite.

As with Kokoreli's novel, here too the events of the post-liberation period are presented from the perspective of the Left. Perpetuating the image of the Left as the victim of the Civil War, the novel focuses on the innumerable atrocities that former EAM supporters suffered under the reign of the 'white terror' as well as on their frantic persecution by the post-war rightist regime. Accordingly, the Civil War is represented as the direct result of the 'white terror':

> The persecutions became fiercer. As a result, many of the persecuted, particularly men, started to flee to the mountains. This is how the second *andartiko* began. […] Either because of fear, indignation or sense of injustice, one by one they took to the mountains thinking that they would return in a year or so.[358]

Drawing on personal experiences, the author of *Ποτέ ξανά* views the Civil War through the ideological lens of the Left, focusing on the drama of the defeated. And this is what brings the books of Georges Sari, Argyro Kokoreli and Giota Fotiadou-Balafouti together. In all three books the Left is presented as the victim of the Civil War, all responsibility for which is placed on 'others', be they the British imperialists, Churchill himself, the monarchist camp, the

---

358 'Και οι διωγμοί γίνονταν ολοένα και πιο λυσσασμένοι. Γι' αυτό πολλοί αγανακτισμένοι άρχισαν, ιδίως οι άντρες, να φεύγουν στα βουνά. Έτσι άρχισε το δεύτερο αντάρτικο. […] Άλλος από φόβο, άλλος από αγανάκτηση, άλλος από αδικία, παίρνανε τα μάτια τους κι έφευγαν για τα ψηλά βουνά με την ιδέα ότι θα γύριζαν το πολύ σ' ένα χρόνο.' Fotiadou-Balafouti 1987: 36 and 43. The reference to the second *andartiko* here is of particular interest. Employed mainly by the post-war Left, the term suggests continuity between EAM/ELAS's 1941-'44 struggle for national liberation and the struggle of communist-led DSE against the Anglo-Americans and the Greek monarchist reaction during the Civil War. See also Elefantis op. cit.: 106-7.

government side or the Greek Right in general. All the responsibility for the outbreak of the Civil War, all wrongdoings and all violence are attributed to the side of the 'others'. At the same time, the numerous atrocities committed by the left-wing side during the *Dekemvriana* and the Civil War, the mass killings, the hostage-taking, the forced evacuation of children to Eastern Bloc countries, the forcible recruitment of civilians in the DSE, were all blanketed under a veil of silence.

The same also goes for Soula Rodopoulou's *Εκείνοι τότε…* (Those, Then…, 1988) and Avgi Papakou-Lagou's *Μην κλαις μικρούλα μου* (Don't Cry, Little Girl, 1988). Both novels talk about the violent persecution of left-wing Resistance supporters during the 'white terror':

> Those who fought for justice and freedom and sacrificed their lives were now hiding and living in fear. Those who had collaborated with the Germans and the Italians were now playing the patriots. […] Armed by the British, the Security Battalionists and all other traitors began torturing people like wild beasts. They were murdering, burning and raping. Terror and fear were now reigning everywhere. The days were restless and the nights were sleepless. This situation was even worse than the German Occupation.[359]

> She stood up with great effort. She was not old in years but she had suffered a lot, being the wife of a leftist. They forgot that her husband had died from enemy bullets… She was proud of his heroism. But those who are now causing trouble, where were they when the conquerors were invading the country?[360]

---

359 'Όσοι αγωνίστηκαν για δίκιο και λευτεριά και θυσιάστηκαν σαν τα μανάρια στον κατακτητή, τώρα, φοβόνταν και κρύβονταν. Όσοι είχαν πάρε δώσε με τους Γερμανούς και τους Ιταλούς, τώρα έβγαιναν κι έκαναν τον πατριώτη. […] Οι ταγματασφαλίτες κι οι κάθε λογής προδότες, οπλισμένοι απ' τους Εγγλέζους, άρχισαν σαν άγρια θηρία να τυραννούν τον κόσμο. Σκότωναν, έκαιγαν, βίαζαν. Παντού φόβος και τρόμος. Μέρες ανήσυχες και νύχτες άυπνες. Ζούσαν μ' αγωνία. Χειρότερα κι απ' τη Γερμανική Κατοχή.' Rodopoulou 1988: 140 and 143.

360 'Σηκώθηκε με κόπο. Μεγάλη στα χρόνια δεν ήταν, μα έφταιγαν οι κακουχίες και το κυνηγητό, που της γινόταν, γιατί ο άντρας της ήταν αριστερός. Ξεχνούσαν πως έκανε το καθήκον του προς την Πατρίδα και χάθηκε από εχθρική σφαίρα… Αυτή ήταν περήφανη για τον ηρωισμό

Perpetuating the traditional self-image of Greece as a victim of powerful foreigners and their insidious political games, a self-concept that is almost as old as the modern Greek nation-state itself, both narratives emphasise the idea of the 'foreign factor' as instigating and being responsible for the post-liberation national woes. Having conveniently forgotten about Greece's 'enormous contribution to the Allied struggle for the final defeat of the Fascist monster',[361] the scheming former Allies sowed the seeds of discord among liberated Greeks and managed to turn them against each other.[362] What ensued was a disastrous civil war that saw the 'destruction of the generation that would have created a better future' and the 'slaughter of the finest of the [nation's] youth for the sake of foreign interests.'[363]

The attribution of responsibility for the outbreak of the Civil War to foreigners, is of course, not a new idea. As has been discussed in the introductory chapter of this Part, the notion of the 'foreign factor' occupied centre stage in official national interpretations and cultural reflections on the Civil War, especially after PASOK's rise to power, which gave added momentum to the already significant anti-Western sentiment in the Greek

---

του. Όμως τούτοι δω, που, σήμερα δημιουργούν επεισόδια, πού βρίσκονταν την ώρα που ο κατακτητής πατούσε τη χώρα τους;' Papakou-Lagou 1988: 108.

361 'Έχασαν οι Σύμμαχοι... Δεν τους άφησαν να χαρούν την απελευθέρωσή τους. Λησμόνησαν την τεράστια προσφορά της Ελλάδας, με την ηρωική Αντίσταση των παιδιών της, ενάντια στον κατακτητή. Πόσο διευκόλυναν τους Συμμάχους, για την τελική νίκη του φασιστικού τέρατος.' Ibid.

362 'Η διχόνοια, καλά οργανωμένη από τους ξένους δυνάμωνε. Μια καχυποψία βασίλευε παντού.' Ibid.

363 'Στον εμφύλιο χάθηκε η γενιά, που θα δημιουργούσε το καλύτερο μέλλον της χώρας. Πετσοκόφτηκαν τα καλύτερα παιδιά, γιατί έτσι το 'θελαν τα ξένα συμφέροντα.' Rodopoulou op. cit.: 171.

society of the *metapolitefsi*.[364] As Nikos Svoronos has pointed out, such a conception 'gives the impression–so widespread in Greek historiography and politics–that Greece is merely a stage for puppets whose strings are moved by alien hands.'[365] Besides historiography and politics, the idea that the nation had been dragged into a devastating civil war for the sake of foreign interests was also a central theme in the representation of this period in young people's fiction from the 1980s.

In this chapter I have gone on to explore the main trends in the representation of the turbulent post-liberation period in books published during 1982-1989. To summarise the main points of my discussion, a large number of the authors examined here continued to hold on tight to the reassuring happy-ever-after endings that had become the norm for the authors of the previous decade. At the same time, there were other authors who did not shy away from talking about the divisive events that followed Greece's liberation from Axis rule. Published shortly after the official recognition of EAM and the left-wing Resistance, these books reflect the dominant narrative of their time; the Left is presented as the pious victim of the Civil War, the 'other' side is demonised, while the responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities is attributed to foreigners and their plans to keep Greece under their control.

---

364 Greece's traditional anti-Western sentiment was further exacerbated in the 1970s following increasing allegations about America's involvement in the 1967 *coup* and the Turkish invasion of Cyprus.
365 Svoronos 1981: 2.

PASOK's rise to power gave the 1980s authors the opportunity to lift the veil of silence that had shrouded the representation of the *Dekemvriana* and the Civil War in young people's fiction of the early *metapolitefsi*. However, this veil was only lifted to the point where it exposed the wrongdoings of the 'other' side. It would still take an odd political alliance between the two former civil war rivals and a few heated debates about the Left's controversial role in the Civil War before authors of books for young readers would start to adopt a more dispassionate and even-handed approach to the subject.

PART III

THE GREEK 1940S AND THE POLITICS OF MEMORY: 1990-2014

To call 1989 Europe's *annus mirabilis* would be an understatement. The fall of the Berlin Wall signalled the collapse of Soviet domination in Eastern Europe, heralding the end of the post-war bipolar world. To say that 1989 was a critical year for Greece would also be an understatement. After eight consecutive years in power, PASOK was experiencing its worst political crisis, following a barrage of revelations of corruption and government scandals. Amid an atmosphere of escalating polarisation and growing political destabilisation, the two old Civil War rivals agreed to form a coalition government with a mandate to implement 'catharsis'.[366] One of the first actions of the coalition government was to pass a law abolishing the consequences of the Civil War, which was followed by the incineration of millions of secret police files held on leftist citizens during the post-war period; these were both highly symbolic acts that marked Greece's transition to the post-Cold War era. According to one group of scholars, in 1989 the subject of the Civil War closed 'officially, theoretically and politically for the Greek public opinion.'[367] Contrary to this perception, this chapter aims to show that the 1940s continued to cast a shadow over the post-1989 era, fuelling old controversies and sparking new debates among historians, intellectuals, politicians and the general public.

366 That is purging Greek political life of PASOK's scandals. See also chapter 1 in Part II.
367 Demertzis, Paschaloudi and Antoniou 2013: 15.

Greece entered the 1990s swept up in a wave of nationalistic fervour over the so-called Macedonia dispute. The hyper-politicisation of the 1980s gave way to a predominately nationalist discourse and the political exploitation of the past lost all its erstwhile power to influence political attitudes and forge partisan alignments. By the beginning of the new decade, the 1940s was a distant and forgotten past, irrelevant to the new ideological orientations and national concerns. In 1994 the owner of the reputable *Kedros* publishing house, for example, claimed that the subject of the Civil War was 'a bit *passé*.'[368] Ironically enough, that same year witnessed an intense dispute that brought the Greek 1940s back into the limelight.

Ten years after the strong reactions that followed the Greek translation of Nick Gage's *Eleni* in 1983, the publication of Thanasis Valtinos's *Ορθοκωστά* (*Orthokosta*, 1994) sparked a new debate. As a leftist critic has commented sarcastically, although the author of *Eleni*, who was 'American, [and] therefore clearly a C.I.A. agent' could be ignored, the author of the acclaimed *Η κάθοδος των εννιά* (Descent of the Nine, 1978) who 'apostatised' and 'from an apologist of the DSE rebels' became an 'apologist of the Security Battalions' could not possibly be overlooked.[369]

The debate was kick-started by Angelos Elefantis's polemical review published in the periodical *O Politis* in the summer of 1994.[370] Elefantis's article was followed by a series of reviews and counter-reviews that appeared

368 Cited in Chouliaras 2003: 428.
369 Raftopoulos 2012: 19-20.
370 Now in Elefantis 2002: 281-94.

in various journals and newspapers during subsequent months. Valtinos's narrative was criticised on both literary and ideological grounds, initiating a long dispute that has come to be known as the '*Orthokosta* controversy'.[371]

Leaving aside the aesthetic part and focusing on the ideological aspect of the debate, Valtinos was accused of promulgating a falsified version of the Civil War, that is to say, the version that was put forward by the victors from the late 1940s until the *metapolitefsi*. What occasioned Elefantis's wrath, and the wrath of a large group of leftist critics and commentators who shared Elefantis's views, was Valtinos's alleged attempt at offering a sort of moral exoneration of the collaborationist Security Battalions.[372] For what Valtinos did in *Ορθοκωστά* was to focus on the stories of people from southern Kinouria in the Peloponnese, who joined the Security Battalions in an attempt to protect themselves from or avenge the violence of the ELAS guerrillas. In reversing the roles of victims and victimisers, *Ορθοκωστά* radically challenged the traditional self-image of the Left as the martyred victim of the civil conflict.

Striking the first blow in the deconstruction of the post-1974 leftist orthodoxies and interpretations of the past, *Ορθοκωστά* became a forerunner of the new trends in the historical preoccupation with the 1940s that would start to reach critical mass some ten years later. In this respect, *Ορθοκωστά* is a classic example of the sort of civil-war fiction, which, according to Venetia Apostolidou, has served as an 'intermediate public space', a testing ground for

371 For a thorough discussion of the *Orthokosta* controversy see Skoupras 2007: 198-211 and Paivanas 2010: 21-53.
372 Paivanas ibid.: 24.

different memories and interpretations that later passed into the spheres of historiography and public controversy.[373] Yet, back in 1994 the fierceness of the *Ορθοκωστά* debate clearly showed that early 1990s Greek society was not yet ready to take all of its Civil War skeletons out of the closet.

The *Ορθοκωστά* dispute came at a time when a new trend in historical research into the Greek 1940s was beginning to pick up speed. The 1990s saw the emergence of a new generation of researchers, who challenged old historiographical certainties and breathed new life into scholarly research into the 1940s. Coming from various disciplines and working on different research areas, this group of scholars shifted their focus away from the political and diplomatic aspects of the 1940s. Instead, they centred on the grassroots level and explored the diverse ways in which the Occupation and the Civil War were experienced by different subjects and social collectivities.[374]

There were two main factors that facilitated these developments. The melting of the Cold War ice at international level and the cooling of old political passions in Greece allowed for a more dispassionate approach to the 1940s.[375] Moreover, the opening of classified archives after the collapse of the Communist Bloc gave scholars access to hitherto unexplored material, allowing more comprehensive research. In addition to all this, the foundation of new institutions and research centres–with the most notable among them

373 Apostolidou 2010: 21.
374 Works by Giorgos Margaritis (1993), Mark Mazower (1993), Tasoula Vervenioti (1994) and Riki Van Boeschoten (1997) are considered to have set the new paradigm. For a comprehensive list of the relevant studies published during the 1990s see Dordanas and Michailidis 2007: 191-4.
375 Sakkas 2013: 430.

being the establishment of the ASKI archival institute in 1992–further encouraged the new orientations towards investigating localities and social collectivities, a trend which peaked in the 2000s.[376]

A few years earlier, in 1984, Athens hosted an international conference on the Greek 1940s, the first such conference to be held on Greek soil. As mentioned in a previous chapter, Hagen Fleischer's insistence at the time that the Civil War should also be included in the conference programme was met with a negative response from Nikos Svoronos: 'Don't be hasty'. Almost a decade later, in 1995, Athens organised another conference on the Greek 1940s; however, this time it addressed the entire period 1936-1949.[377] As Antonis Liakos has pointed out, a closer look at the proceedings of that conference reveals that none of the papers actually dealt with either the internecine conflicts of 1943-1944, the *Dekemvriana* or the events of the full-scale Civil War of 1947-1949.[378]

And while the subject of the Civil War was viewed as a minefield by many scholars who still felt somewhat apprehensive about sharing their ideas in public, the communist Left was breaking a decades-old tradition of silence. That became evident in 1996 when the communist newspaper *Rizospastis* hosted a special feature on the Civil War for the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation for the communist DSE. That same year Charilaos Florakis, the

376 On the opening of foreign archives and new research institutes in Greece during the 1990s see Dordanas and Michailidis op. cit.: 185-8.
377 The title of the conference was 'Η Ελλάδα 1936-1949. Δικτατορία–Κατοχή-Εμφύλιος: Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες.' For the published proceedings see Fleisher (ed.) 2003.
378 Liakos 2003: 33.

general secretary of the KKE at the time and a veteran of the DSE Army, visited Florina, expressing his excitement at returning to the town that had served as 'the main fortress and symbol of the heroic struggle of DSE.'[379] The celebrations continued with excursions to the old battlefields of Grammos and Vitsi and communist pilgrimages to other Civil War *lieux de mémoire* and culminated in the publication of a commemorative volume on the 'three-year epic of the DSE.'[380] After four decades in the party's memory dustbin, the 1946-1949 struggle of the DSE was now reframed as an 'epic', taking its proud place next to the EAM epic of 1941-1944.

This sweeping revival of a once silenced past was, of course, not irrelevant to post-1989 developments. Like most other European communist parties, the KKE went through its own existential crisis after the collapse of the USSR and its split from the Coalition of the Left and Progress alliance. In an attempt to bolster its revolutionary credentials and to differentiate itself from all other parties that had more or less adhered to the ideological line of reconciliation of the 1980s, the KKE shifted the scope of its historical discourse from the Resistance to the Civil War.[381] The latter was no longer interpreted as a national tragedy that had been brought about by external forces but as the

379 'Αγαπητοί φίλοι, αγαπητοί σύντροφοι, είπε ανεβαίνοντας στο βήμα, δε σας κρύβω πως χαίρομαι πολύ που βρίσκομαι σήμερα μαζί σας, που ήρθα ξανά ύστερα από 47 χρόνια στην περιοχή του Βίτσι, φυσικά κάτω από εντελώς διαφορετικές συνθήκες από τότε, το 1949. […] Βρίσκομαι, είπε, σε μία περιοχή που αποτέλεσε Κάστρο και σύμβολο του ηρωικού αγώνα του Δημοκρατικού Στρατού Ελλάδας, που τα 50 του χρόνια γιορτάζουμε σήμερα εδώ στη Φλώρινα.' See *Rizospastis*'s coverage of Florakis's visit to Florina, available at https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=5312069

380 Published in 1998 with the title Η τρίχρονη Εποποιία του Δημοκρατικού Στρατού Ελλάδας, 1946-1949.

381 Marantzidis 2013: 180.

KKE's own strategic political choice in the face of the political circumstances of the late 1940s. The KKE's public engagement with the Civil War continued well into the following decade and gradually took on a more radical character as the Greek crisis began to unfold.[382]

Meanwhile, public interest in the 1940s was also increasing. Dionysis Charitopoulos's best-selling biography, or hagiography according to some, of Aris Velouchiotis published in 1997 enjoyed widespread popular acclaim.[383] The same year, the state-owned ERT aired Roviros Manthoulis's documentary about the Greek Civil War. The programme was a huge success and ERT broadcast it again three days later after receiving some two thousand calls from viewers requesting a rerun.[384] After the hegemonic reign of the politics of oblivion and the selective remembering of the 1970s and 1980s, Greece's encounter with its Civil War ghosts was entering a more dynamic, and in several instances aggressive, phase.

This increasing interest also extended to the academic sphere. In 1999, on the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Civil War, three international conferences were organised; one in London, one in Karpenisi and a third one

---

382 See also Voglis 2007: 437, Papathanasiou 2009 and Marantzidis op. cit.: 180-84. A clear manifestation of this 'radical turn' was the party's decision to rehabilitate Aris Velouchiotis, Nikos Zachariadis and Nikos Vavoudis in the summer of 2011, just as the Greek crisis was growing deeper and more complex. As Nikos Marantzidis has pointed out, the rehabilitation of these emblematic and highly controversial figures of the 1940s was in line with the party's new historical reading of the Civil War. Marantzidis ibid.: 183.

383 Charitopoulos's two-volume *Άρης, ο αρχηγός των ατάκτων* (Aris, Leader of the Irregulars) was first published in 1997 and by 2009 it had gone through three editions, reaching the impressive number of 180.000 copies. See Demertzis 2013: 82-3.

384 See https://tvxs.gr/webtv/ntokimanter/o-ellinikos-emfylios-polemos

in Athens.[385] Five decades after the end of the civil bloodshed and fifteen years after Nikos Svoronos's 'don't be hasty' response, the time was at last right for the Greek capital to host its first conference on the Civil War.

The organisation of these conferences marked a turning point in the scholarly research into the 1940s, shifting the focus from the period of the Occupation and Resistance to that of the Civil War.[386] Another contributing factor was the establishment in the summer of 2000 of the 'Network for the Study of Civil Wars', an informal group of scholars from different disciplines with a common interest in the Greek Civil War and its legacies. Throughout the 2000s, the members of the Network organised a number of conferences and published several of their proceedings. Using combined methodological tools from different disciplines and adopting a bottom-up approach with a strong local bent, this group of scholars engaged with aspects of the 1940s that had been ignored by previous historians. The question of organised collaboration, for example, the politics of violence, the investigation of the experience of women and children, the subject of political refugees and the examination of the role of ethnic minorities and non-Greek speaking communities in the Civil War, are some of the main areas that attracted widespread research interest during the 2000s.[387]

---

385 For more on the 1999 conferences see Dordanas and Michailidis op. cit.: 189-90. For the published proceedings see Koutsoukis and Sakkas (eds.) 2000 (conference in Karpenisi), Nikolakopoulos, Rigos and Psallidas (eds.) 2002 (Athens conference) and Carabott and Sfikas (eds.) 2004 (conference held at King's College London).
386 Voglis and Nioutsikos 2017: 324.
387 For an evaluation of the contribution of the Network to scholarship on the Greek Civil War see Marantzidis 2012: 11-21. Also, for an outline of the main ideological and methodological principles of this new generation of researchers see Antoniou and Marantzidis 2008: 40-3.

The new trends were self-styled as 'new wave' by political scientists Stathis Kalyvas and Nikos Marantzidis. On March 20, 2004, the duo published an article in the book review supplement of the mass-circulation newspaper *TA NEA*. Titled 'Νέες τάσεις στη μελέτη του Εμφυλίου Πολέμου' (New Trends in the Study of the Civil War), the article was presented as a ten-point manifesto of the latest trends and currents in historical research into the 1940s.[388]

What ensued was a heated public debate that went on for several months in the mainstream press. Kalyvas and Marantzidis's so-called post-revisionist positions were heavily criticised on both ideological and methodological grounds. One of the article's main points, which provoked a tempest of criticism, was the authors' insistence that the starting point of the Civil War should be traced back to the internecine conflicts of 1943-1944, as such a periodisation revived, in essence, the post-war scheme of the so-called 'three rounds'. The supporters of the post-revisionist school were also accused of excessive emphasis on the 'red terror' and castigated for their obsession with the micro-level and their almost exclusive preoccupation with the investigation of specific localities and particularities.[389]

Notwithstanding its fierceness, the debate fertilised the ground and triggered a publishing boom in the history and historiography of the Greek 1940s, a trend which continued to pick up speed during subsequent

388 Kalyvas and Marantzidis 2004, also available at http://ellinikosemfilios.blogspot.com/2012/03/n.html
389 Sakkas op. cit.

decade.[390] The so-called 'historians' civil war on the Civil War' was not restricted to the academic field. Quite the opposite. As most of the discussion took place in the mainstream press and on the Internet, the debate grew in size and access, engaging the wider Greek public in a retrospective 'war' on history and memory.

If in 1994 *Ορθοκωστά* had anticipated the new trends in academic research into the 1940s, a few years later it was developments in the field of historical research that fed novelists' imaginations and their fictional explorations of the past. Reflecting the upsurge in academic and wider public interest in the 1940s, the 2000s also saw the beginning of a new 'round' of civil-war fiction.[391] Such was the momentum of this trend that, as Vangelis Chatzivasileiou has noted, the Civil War 'haunted' the novelistic output of the late 2000s.[392]

In this new 'round' the stories were told by a younger generation of authors with no first-hand experience or memories of the Civil War and its legacies. Viewing the past from a safe distance and without the emotional baggage of the older generations, this group of novelists engaged with those aspects of the lingering civil-war trauma that remained unacknowledged or half-explored.[393]

---

390 For a detailed, though not exhaustive, list of the studies published during the 2000s and 2010s see Voglis and Nioutsikos op. cit.: 324-8.
391 Chatzivasileiou 2010. Available at http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=218349
392 Ibid.
393 Vangelis Chatzivasileiou has discerned three main tendencies in post-2000 fiction that engages with the Civil War and its multiple legacies. A first trend includes authors who attempt to trace a connection between the lingering impact of the unresolved civil-war traumas and present realities. A second group includes novels that deal with the subject of political refugees, while a third includes novels that take the life of children in the Queen's camps as their subject. See Chatzivasileiou' s presentation titled 'Ένας νέος λογοτεχνικός γύρος για τον Εμφύλιο.' The presentation was given as part of a series of seminars organised by ASKI

By the end of 2008, the past was enjoying a thorough-going revival that extended well beyond the walls of lecture theatres or the pages of novels and special features in mass-circulation newspapers. It had begun to take over the streets of Athens, the same streets that had become part of the urban battlefields during the *Dekemvriana* sixty-four years earlier.

It all started on the night of December 6 when fifteen-year-old student Alexis Grigoropoulos was killed in cold blood by an armed police officer in central Athens. There followed three weeks of civil unrest and mass demonstrations that soon escalated into violent clashes between protesters and the police, nation-wide occupations of university buildings and large-scale destruction of private and public property.

The parallels with the events of December 1944 were instant and direct. Almost from the outbreak of the riots, the use of the term *Dekemvriana* became standard in the mass media. Despite their initial refusal to adhere to a specific ideological heritage, the young December activists also made explicit references to the events of December 1944, associating the traumas of the past with the grievances of the present.[394] Slogans like 'In these *Dekemvriana* we shall win' and 'The *Dekemvriana* of our generation', started to appear on flyers, pamphlets and other circulated materials as well as on the walls of several Athenian buildings.[395] And although the situation had begun to de-

---

and ΚΙΚΡΕ (Warfare Foundation for Social and Cultural Affairs) in Athens from February to May 2016 under the general title of 'Η ταραγμένη δεκαετία του 1940. Πολιτικές διαστάσεις και κοινωνικές εξελίξεις.' Chatzivasileiou's presentation is available at http://www.blod.gr/lectures/Pages/viewlecture.aspx?LectureID=2807

394 Kornetis 2010: 179.

395 Ibid.

escalate by the first weeks of 2009, the return of the divisive past continued with new impetus.

Just a few months after the Athens riots, in October 2009, Pantelis Voulgaris released his film *Ψυχή Βαθιά* (A Soul so Deep). The main storyline revolved around two young brothers who got caught up in the fighting on opposite sides during the last months of the Civil War. Despite its commercial success, Voulgaris's film provoked strong reactions. In a heated public discussion that went on for several weeks in the mainstream press, the leftist director was accused by critics and viewers alike of offering an allegedly oversimplified and de-ideologised picture of the Civil War drama.[396]

Employing the classic brother-against-brother trope, Voulgaris attempted to give a filmic narrative of reconciliation by depicting 'both sides of the face of the same drama.'[397] In a spirit of even-handedness, Voulgaris laid all the blame on the Soviet-American factor, subscribing to the view that foreigners had been entirely responsible for the outbreak of the civil strife.[398] At the same time, the Greeks were depicted as victims of a war they had never wished to fight. The scene in which Thanasis Veggos's character exclaims: 'This is not a war; this is a pure disgrace. Greeks shooting Greeks!' is one of the film's most memorable.

396For a collection of reviews and articles on Voulgaris's film see http://www.biblionet.gr/book/146697/%CE%A8%CF%85%CF%87%CE%AE_%CE%B2%CE%B1%CE%B8%CE%B9%CE%AC

397 See Richard Pine's review of Voulgaris's film published in *The Irish Times* on November 12, 2009. Available at https://www.irishtimes.com/news/tale-of-two-brothers-recalls-the-bitterness-of-greece-s-civil-war-1.770192. The same trope was also employed by Ken Loach in his 2006 film *The Wind that Shakes the Barley* as well as by Theo Angelopoulos in his 2006 film *Το λιβάδι που δακρύζει* (The Weeping Meadow).

398 Kornetis 2014: 102.

Two years later, Kostas Charalambous's film *Δεμένη Κόκκινη Κλωστή* (Tied Red Thread, 2011) approached the Civil War from a different perspective, one steeped in multiple layers of violence. As Kostis Kornetis has argued, Voulgaris's and Charalambous's films symbolise the cinematic transition from a narrative of reconciliation to a narrative that makes violence its main point of focus.[399] It is no coincidence that this happened at a time when Greece was going through a tectonic transition from a long period of prosperity to an era of deep, multidimensional crisis.

When on April 23, 2010 in the scenic harbour of Kastelorizo Prime Minister George Papandreou announced his intention of calling on his international partners to help Greece cope with the crushing weight of its sovereign debt crisis, there was hardly anyone who could foretell just how far-reaching the implications of this single development would be. A few weeks later the Papandreou government signed the first, and what was then believed to be the last, bailout agreement (Memorandum of Understanding) with Greece's creditors and the IMF. The bailout deal came with conditions and was linked to harsh austerity measures. Among other things, it stipulated major spending cuts, tax increases, fiscal reforms and privatisations, plunging Greece into one of its deepest post-war recessions.

The mass protests that followed the announcement of the new measures made clear that the implications of the crisis were far from just financial. From

399 Ibid.: 94.

its onset, the Greek crisis was perceived as a multidimensional crisis that challenged the political and social foundations of the nation-state itself.

Greece's subjugation to the economic tutelage of the Troika triggered a series of momentous political changes. The post-dictatorship certainties collapsed almost overnight, resulting in a radical reconfiguration of the established political order. One of the most tangible manifestations of this change was the substitution of the traditional Left-Right divide with a new opposition that distinguished between political powers from the so-called pro-memorandum and anti-memorandum blocs, opening up new opportunities for smaller parties that rode the wave of anti-memorandum populism.[400]

These developments were translated into a massive realignment of the electorate away from the traditional political elites in the two successive legislative elections that were held in the spring and summer of 2012.[401] The next day saw the end of bipartisanship, the electoral shrinking of the once-mighty PASOK and the astonishing rise of the left-wing SYRIZA, the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn and the rightist ANEL, all parties of a fragmented and ideologically inconsistent anti-memorandum camp. It also saw the beginning of a period of deep political polarisation, continuing recession and widespread public resentment.

---

400 Notably SYRIZA, ANEL and Golden Dawn. These three parties also benefited from the rise of the 'Outraged Citizens' or 'Greek *Indignados*' anti-austerity movement, a spontaneous grassroots mobilisation of people from different political backgrounds, which sprang up in May 2011 and remained active until the end of that summer. For more on the 'Greek *Indignados*' movement see Sotirakopoulos and Sotiropoulos 2013: 443-56.

401 Political scientists Giannis Voulgaris and Ilias Nikolakopoulos have described the two electoral contests of May 6 and June 17, 2012, as 'history-making'. Voulgaris and Nikolakopoulos 2014: 9.

Deep into the tunnel of the crisis and with no likelihood of seeing light in the foreseeable future, it was natural that Greeks should look back to the past, seeking parallels between earlier periods of hardship and their current predicament. And no past experience could offer more relevant parallels than the experience of the German occupation.

Germany's status as one of Greece's main creditors reawakened the old ghost of the Nazi oppressor who, according to popular sentiment, was now attempting to 'strike again' in order to finish off the Greek people, this time by means of financial suffocation.[402] Consequently, the current situation was perceived as a modern-style foreign occupation of a troubled yet proud nation, stirring widespread anti-German feeling among Greeks.

The disgraceful events that occurred at the 2011 national celebrations of *'OXI'* (No!) day were a clear expression of the anti-German hysteria that had taken over a large part of the populace.[403] In Thessaloniki the scheduled parade was cancelled after the President of the Republic was branded a traitor and booed, while in other cities the parades were turned into mass anti-German protests. The participants held banners with the slogans 'No to the 4th Reich', 'Down with the new Occupation', 'In 1940-'41 the Greek people said NO to the Occupation and Germany, today we say NO to the sell-out and betrayal [of Greece]', while in some cases rioters burned German flags.

---

402 Originating from the 1948 film *Οι Γερμανοί ξανάρχονται* (The Germans Strike Again), this phrase has become a popular expression commonly used to describe an imminent threat that inspires great fear.

403 According to Spyros Plakoudas, anti-German hysteria reached its peak in 2011-2013 as Greeks vividly 'relived' the memories of the wartime Occupation. Plakoudas 2016: 312.

The anti-German discourse was given further impetus after the re-emergence of the issue of Germany's unpaid wartime debts and reparations to Greece. Politicians, popular public figures and the Greek media played a central role in escalating the issue, arguing that Berlin was in no position to call for economic sacrifices from the Greeks since Germany had still not paid its own debts and reparations for wartime damage.[404]

The mass media, in particular, played an instrumental role in exacerbating anti-German sentiment among crisis-stricken Greeks. Old stereotypes about the cold, stiff and humourless Germans and more recent memories that conjured up the image of the fearsome Nazi conqueror were revisited by journalists and popular television personalities competing to win the sympathies of the Greek public.[405] Chancellor Angela Merkel and Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble became frequent targets of anti-German media populism,[406] while even left-wing newspapers could not resist linking Germany's hard-line stance on the Greek debt crisis to the policies of the Nazi regime through photoshopped pictures of German government officials dressed in Nazi uniforms.[407]

---

404 Tziovas 2017: 27-9.

405 On the role of the Greek media in the perpetuation of anti-German stereotypes see Capelos and Exadaktylos 2015: 46-68 and Vletsas 2012, also available at https://tvxs.gr/news/apopseis/o-antigermanismos-kai-oi-mythoi-poy-ton-trofodotoyn-toy-spyroy-bletsa

406 The anti-German rhetoric reached a new low point a few years later when a popular TV comedian attacked Wolfgang Schäuble for his strict stance on the Greek debt with the comment that 'the longer a person is stuck in a chair, the more his mind gets stuck on an idea.'

407 In early 2015, for example, the left-wing newspaper *Avgi* published a cartoon sketch of Wolfgang Schäuble dressed in a Nazi uniform declaring that 'we insist that we make soap out of your flesh but we are open to discussion about what to do with your ashes.' Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras was quick to condemn the incident.

Anti-German resentment was not just the result of a spontaneous resurgence of latent historical memories in times of crisis. The mass media was one of the two main actors that played a strategic role in the diffusion of anti-German bitterness; the other was the political elites.

Bearing, as they did, the political burden of signing the first two bailout agreements, both PASOK and Nea Demokratia played up the idea of the external–chiefly German–enemy, conveniently shifting the blame for the current predicament to the foreign bogeyman calling the shots.[408] The idea of the external enemy was also integrated into the political communication strategies of the other parties. Seeking to capitalise on the widespread anti-German sentiment, almost all parties invested in the anti-German discourse and exploited in more or less explicit ways the memories of wartime German oppression.[409] The parties of the anti-memorandum camp also sought to benefit from the public resentment against the traditional political elites –and, in particular, against the two parties that had been alternating in power since the *metapolitefsi*. In the rhetoric of the anti-memorandum bloc, PASOK and Nea Demokratia were slanderously dubbed collaborators and accused of committing treason after signing onerous agreements with the foreign creditors in order to save a country they themselves had allegedly wrecked in the first place.[410] Despite the tactical exploitation of memories of Greece under Nazi rule and the accusations of collaborationism, both pro-memorandum and

408 Lialiouti and Bithymitris 2013: 167.
409 Ibid.: 167-9.
410 Plakoudas op. cit.: 312.

anti-memorandum parties were equally careful to avoid associations with the Civil War.

However, this was not the case with Golden Dawn, a neo-Nazi formation with a reputation for violence that had remained on the margins of the political mainstream for almost three decades until its electoral breakthrough in the 2012 legislative elections.[411] With anti-communism as one of its main ideological principles, Golden Dawn invested heavily in the memory of the Civil War, seeking its supporters among nostalgists of the old collaborationist and anti-communist traditions who could not find political representation in the parties of the mainstream Right. Since the outbreak of the crisis, Golden Dawn's public engagement with the divisive past has intensified and the annual ceremonies in Meligalas have become an important event in the calendar for the party's members and supporters, who are invited to honour the memory of the *Tagmatasfalites* and their 'patriotic' struggle against the 'traitorous' ELAS.[412]

At the other end of the political spectrum, SYRIZA orchestrated its discourse around the idea of the 'resisting spirit' that is allegedly embedded in the Greek psyche. Having benefited hugely from PASOK's dramatic decline, SYRIZA couched the public resentment against the domestic and European elites in a discourse that called for popular resistance to Germany's neoliberal agendas.

411 On the rise of Golden Dawn and its progression from a grassroots street movement to a parliamentary party see Ellinas 2013: 543-65. Also, Vasilopoulou and Halikiopoulou 2015, especially chapter 2 titled 'The Rise of the Golden Dawn in the Context of the Greek Crisis.'
412 Golden Dawn's anti-communist zeal is also demonstrated in the numerous pseudo-historical articles about the Civil War that appear regularly on the organization's official website.

As with other parties of the anti-memorandum camp, in SYRIZA's rhetoric Greece was depicted as a nation under attack from abroad and its traditional elites as traitors to the interests of the people.[413] The Greek people were urged once again to join forces against these foreign oppressors and their local political pawns. This resistance movement has a historical analogue in the struggle of EAM, as Alexis Tsipras stressed in his speech during the party's first congress in the summer of 2013.[414] A clear example of SYRIZA's attempts to appropriate the memory of the Greek wartime Resistance was its strategic decision to put Manolis Glezos–a hero of the National Resistance, treasured by all political sides–at the top of its list of candidates before the 2012 elections.

At the same time, SYRIZA's cadres were instructed to avoid all references to the divisive aspects of the past. Talk of the Civil War was irrelevant to the party's political agendas, especially after the results of the 2012 June elections created the widespread impression that SYRIZA would most likely be the next party to rule the country. The exploitation of positive memories of the Resistance, on the other hand, was instrumental in forging a strong sense of national unity in the face of an external threat.[415] It was also instrumental in

413 On SYRIZA's political investment in the memories of the Occupation and Resistance see Panagiotopoulos 2013: 268-72.

414 'Συντρόφισσες και σύντροφοι,
Καθώς το κοινωνικό κράτος καταρρέει την ίδια ώρα χιλιάδες λαού αυτοοργανώνονται εκατοντάδες δομές κοινωνικής αλληλεγγύης σε όλη την Ελλάδα. Για να μη μείνει κανείς μόνος του στην κρίση. Χωρίς αποκλεισμούς. Για όλους. Πρόκειται για τη συλλογική αντίδραση ενός λαού που ανακαλεί στη συλλογική του μνήμη το ΕΑΜ. Αυτό που μας έσωσε από την πείνα για να οργανώσει το έπος της Εθνικής Αντίστασης.' Excerpt from Alexis Tsipras's speech at the 1st Congress of SYRIZA on July 13, 2013. Available at https://left.gr/news/alexis-tsipras-ftiahnoyme-oloi-mazi-enan-forea-dimokratiko-polytasiko-ployralistiko-vinteo

415 Panagiotopoulos op. cit.: 264-7.

framing Greece's troubled relationship with its foreign creditors in terms of a David-vs.-Goliath battle, a battle that, as the experience of the Resistance had shown, the Greek people knew all too well how to fight and win.

With these analogies SYRIZA entered the arena at the legislative elections of January 2015, winning a sweeping 36.34 percent of the popular vote and making its main slogan 'for the first time, the Left in government' a historic reality. The next day opened a new chapter in the history of the Third Hellenic Republic, one that is still being written.

So far, I have given an overview of the various uses and abuses of the memories of the Greek 1940s during the period 1990-2014. From fiction to historiography and from cinema to politics, the preoccupation with the traumatic past continued into the post-1989 period, reviving old controversies and sparking new public debates. Before I go on to examine the representation of the Greek 1940s in young people's fiction, it is crucial to look at the ways in which this period is addressed in the school textbooks of the period 1989-2014.

Commissioned to replace the existing textbook for pupils in the final year of the *Dimotiko*, *Στα νεότερα χρόνια* (In Modern Times) by Dionysios Aktypis et al. was introduced to school classrooms in 1989. After a substantial revision in 1997, the book was replaced in 2006 with *Στα νεότερα και σύγχρονα χρόνια* (In Modern and Contemporary Times) by Maria Repousi et al. The new textbook was withdrawn after a year, having provoked a massive debate over the

authors' allegedly unpatriotic representation of the Asia Minor Disaster.[416] Repousi's book was consequently replaced by its predecessor. After staying in use for another five years, the veteran textbook *Στα νεότερα χρόνια* was replaced in 2012 with *Ιστορία του νεότερου και σύγχρονου κόσμου* (History of Modern and Contemporary World) by Ioannis Koliopoulos et al.

As other scholars have previously pointed out, what underpins the representation of the Greek 1940s in the 1989 textbook by Aktypis et al. is the authors' 'unifying' spirit and their scrupulous efforts to make the narration as inclusive as possible.[417] This best example of this spirit is found in the part that deals with the Greek Resistance. Adopting the all-embracing term 'National Resistance' the authors overemphasise the significance of the destruction of the Gorgopotamos Bridge, describing this united act of sabotage as 'the crowning achievement' of the Greek Resistance.[418] Despite their honest attempts at a balanced approach, the 1989 textbook makes no reference to the contribution of the Cairo-based Greek government or to the struggle of the Greek Royal Forces in the Middle East. And this is one of the most crucial differences between the 1989 textbook and its predecessors. Reflecting the shifting national perspectives on the past, the textbooks of the *metapolitefsi*

---

416 For a detailed discussion of the dispute over Repousi's textbook see Athanasiadis 2015.
417 For a thorough analysis of the representation of the Greek 1940s in the textbook by Aktypis et al. see Kokkinos, Gatsotis and Lemonidou 2012: 217-42.
418 'Η Εθνική αντίσταση όμως θέριευε και προκαλούσε στον κατακτητή σοβαρές απώλειες. Κορυφαίο κατόρθωμα ήταν η ανατίναξη της γέφυρας του Γοργοπόταμου (25 Νοεμβρίου 1942). Με την καταστροφή της καθυστέρησε ο ανεφοδιασμός των στρατευμάτων του Άξονα, που πολεμούσαν στην Αφρική. Από την άλλη μεριά η αντίσταση ανάγκασε τους κατακτητές να διατηρήσουν πολύ στρατό στην Ελλάδα, ενώ τους ήταν απαραίτητος σε άλλα μέτωπα. Ήταν μια ακόμη προσφορά των Ελλήνων στη συμμαχική νίκη εναντίον των δυνάμεων του Άξονα.' Aktypis et al. 1991: 280.

also shifted their focus from the allied struggle of the Greek Armed Forces in the Middle East to a more even-handed narrative and an approach that put the 'people' in the spotlight. In a remarkable contrast to its predecessors, all the discussion in the 1989 textbook is about the resistance movement that developed in occupied Greece. The leading protagonist of this struggle is now the 'people', who refused to 'bow their heads before the occupiers' and took the matter of national liberation into their own hands by forming various resistance organisations and guerrilla groups.[419]

What could also be perceived as an expression of the book's 'unifying' spirit is the authors' complete silence on the issue of wartime collaboration. Unmentioned in the preceding textbooks of 1974 and 1979, the subject of collaborationism remained one of the most enduring taboos of Greek school historiography. This situation changed only after 1997 when the revised edition of *Στα νεότερα χρόνια* came with a short addition, which pointed out that 'the people did not bow their heads, although there were a few who did not hesitate to collaborate with the occupiers, as also happened in the rest of Europe.'[420]

Regarding the events of the immediate post-liberation period, they are dealt with in a separate chapter under the unusually straightforward title of 'The Civil War'. Here the authors employ an even-handed approach as

---

419 'Ο λαός, όμως, δεν έσκυψε το κεφάλι. Σύντομα δημιουργήθηκαν αντιστασιακές οργανώσεις και άρχισε ο ανταρτοπόλεμος εναντίον των κατακτητών.' Ibid.
420 'Ο λαός, όμως, δεν έσκυψε το κεφάλι, παρότι βρέθηκαν, όπως και στην υπόλοιπη Ευρώπη, κάποιοι άνθρωποι που δε δίστασαν να συνεργαστούν με τους κατακτητές.' Aktypis et al. 1997: 241.

demonstrated by the way that the blame for the December bloodshed is attributed to the 'mistakes and mishandlings of all sides' as well as to British interventionism.[421] Without ignoring the escalating tensions between the main resistance organisations, the authors of the 1989 textbook point to the foreign factor as instigating and being responsible for the post-war national woes. The idea that Greece's post-war fate had been predetermined by the Big Three was –and to a certain extent still is–a central concept in national perceptions and interpretations of the 1940s.[422]

Issued in the aftermath of the 'historians' civil war on the Civil War', the short-lived 2006 textbook *Στα νεότερα και σύγχρονα χρόνια* broke a number of taboos regarding the subject of the Greek 1940s. For example, the textbook acknowledges the existence of Greek quisling governments, an unsettling reality that had been positively suppressed in the previous schoolbooks for the *Dimotiko*.[423] Moreover, Repousi's book is the first textbook for this level to mention by name the main resistance organisations that were operating during the Occupation.[424] While this textbook also eschews all references to the struggle of the Greek Royal Forces in the Middle East it does not shy away from rendering the Greek side responsible for the post-liberation troubles, pointing to the irreconcilable differences between EAM on the one side and the

421 'Από λάθη και παραλείψεις όλων των παρατάξεων και την ανάμειξη των Άγγλων, ξέσπασαν στην Αθήνα άγριες συγκρούσεις (Δεκέμβριος 1944).' Aktypis et al. 1991: 265.
422 See, for example, earlier discussion about Voulgaris's representation of the Civil War in *Ψυχή Βαθιά*.
423 Although employing the somewhat milder term 'Occupation government.' See Repousi et al. 2006: 112.
424 Namely EAM/ELAS and the smaller organisations EDES and EKKA.

exiled Greek government of the King together with the anti-communist EDES and EKKA on the other. Last but not least, Repousi's textbook resists the traditional interpretation of the 'foreign factor' altogether and describes the Civil War as one that was fought between two distinct political camps; namely the communist-supported DSE and the royalist government.

The 2012 textbook by Koliopoulos et al., on the other hand, has been criticised for its diffuse ideological and historiographical conservatism.[425] Regarding the Greek 1940s, the book adheres to the 'unifying' spirit of its predecessors and propagates the reassuring idea of a pan-Hellenic united Resistance free from quislings, political agendas, internal disagreements or any other controversies that could raise eyebrows.

One of the textbook's major shortcomings is its examination of the entire period 1941-1949 in a single chapter under the awkward title 'A Decade of Struggles and Sacrifices for Freedom', which inevitably implies that the Civil War was also a struggle in defence of national freedom. Nonetheless, the authors were quite careful in their treatment of the subject. Closely following the text of the previous schoolbook by Aktypis et al., the authors attribute the blame for the outbreak of the Civil War to the 'mistakes and mishandlings of the two rival sides' as well as to the intervention of foreign powers (sic.).[426] All in all, the representation of the Greek 1940s in the 2012 textbook by

425 For a detailed examination of the representation of the Greek 1940s in the 2012 textbook by Koliopoulos et al. see Kokkinos, Gatsotis and Lemonidou op. cit. Also, Palikidis 2013: 75-127.

426 'Λάθη και παραλείψεις των δύο πλευρών καθώς και παρεμβάσεις των ξένων Δυνάμεων οδήγησαν τελικά σε Εμφύλιο Πόλεμο.' Koliopoulos et al. 2012: 213.

Koliopoulos et al. marks a drastic departure from the innovations introduced in Repousi's ill-fated book, while at the same time signalling a return to the 'reconciliation' paradigm presented by the textbooks of the early *metapolitefsi*.

In 1991 Vasilis Sfyroeras's *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη* (Modern and Contemporary History) was introduced for the final year of the *Gymnasio* and remained in classrooms until 2007 when it was replaced by *Νεότερη και Σύγχρονη Ιστορία* (Modern and Contemporary History) by Evangelia Louvi and Dimitris Xifaras. Regarding the Greek 1940s, the authors of these two textbooks adopt a quite similar approach,[427] one that does not seek to avoid the difficult subject of wartime collaboration. Both textbooks acknowledge the existence of the black market and Greek quisling governments, while Louvi and Xifaras also talk about the activities of the collaborationist Security Battalions. Another similarity is their approach to the subject of the Resistance, apart from the fact that Louvi and Xifaras's textbook focuses exclusively on the resistance movement developed in occupied Greece while the earlier textbook by Sfyroeras also devotes a short paragraph to the contribution of the Greek Armed Forces in the allied struggle.[428]

The differences between the two textbooks become more noticeable in the parts that treat the events of the immediate post-liberation period. Presented under the cautious title 'A Crucial Five-year Period', the representation of the

427 For a detailed analysis of the representation of the Greek 1940s in the 2007 textbook by E. Louvi and D. Xifaras see Kokkinos, Gatsotis and Lemonidou op. cit. Also, Palikidis op. cit. On Sfyroeras's 1991 textbook see Bodila 2008: 338-9 and Lagani 2008: 359-69.
428 Louvi and Xifaras also devote a separate paragraph to women's contribution to the Resistance.

post-liberation national troubles in Sfyroeras's 1991 textbook is quite apprehensive by comparison with Louvi and Xifaras's textbook. To give just one example, while Louvi and Xifaras point to the post-war 'persecution that were unleashed against leftist citizens condoned by, and at times with the support of, the government' as one of the main causes of the Civil War,[429] Sfyroeras's 1991 textbook talks more generally and vaguely about some 'extreme elements' that 'made a new armed confrontation seem imminent.'[430]

One could argue that Louvi and Xifaras's bolder approach was a product of its time. Issued in 2007, the textbook came at a time when the historical preoccupation with the 1940s had started to reach critical mass, breaking down old taboos and opening up new pathways in national encounters with the traumatic past. As the latest textbook for the *Lykeio* has shown, schoolbooks have not always kept up with the historiographical trends and innovations of their time.

The book *Ιστορία του νεότερου και του σύγχρονου κόσμου (από το 1815 έως σήμερα)* (History of Modern and Contemporary World: from 1815 to the Present Day) was issued in 2007 for final-year *Lykeio* students under the editorship of Ioannis Koliopoulos, who was also involved in the production of the 2012

429 'Η συμφωνία της Βάρκιζας δεν έφερε την ειρήνευση, επειδή κύριες ρυθμίσεις της δεν εφαρμόστηκαν. Αντιθέτως, εξαπολύθηκαν διώξεις σε βάρος αριστερών πολιτών, που έγιναν με την ανοχή, κάποτε και με την ενθάρρυνση, της κυβέρνησης.' Louvi and Xifaras 2007: 151.
430 'Η γαλήνη που επανήλθε στη χώρα υπήρξε επιφανειακή και πολλοί από τις δύο πλευρές δεν είχαν αποδεχτεί τη συμφωνία της Βάρκιζας. Μέσα από τις νέες πολιτικές συνθήκες που δημιουργήθηκαν (αποχή εαμικών κομμάτων από τις εκλογές, επάνοδος του βασιλιά Γεωργίου Β' στις 27 Σεπτεμβρίου 1946, ακρότητες), μια νέα ένοπλη σύγκρουση φαινόταν να πλησιάζει.' Sfyroeras 1991: 370-71.

textbook for pupils of the *Dimotiko*.[431] Like the latter, the new textbook for the *Lykeio* was sharply criticised for its intense ideological and epistemological conservatism.[432]

This conservatism is also evident in the chapter that concerns the Greek 1940s. In it, the authors promote the myth of a united pan-Hellenic Resistance, reserving particular praise for the contribution of the Greek Armed Forces in the allied struggle and the tireless efforts of the Greek government-in-exile to 'defend the national interests with all available means.'[433]

Moreover, the textbook has been criticised for its complete silence on the subject of wartime collaboration. The question of the wartime armed conflicts that broken out between the main resistance organisations also goes unaddressed. In general, the writing team has avoided all troubling aspects of the period 1941-1944 that could spoil the self-flattering image of a nation that put up a united resistance to its foreign enemies. The authors' overzealous efforts to promulgate the idea of a National Resistance free from internal disagreements and controversies takes an alarmingly anti-epistemological turn when the young student is reassured that 'in no other European country

---

431 Five years earlier, in 2002, a new textbook was produced for the final year of the *Lykeio*. The book was entitled *Ιστορία του Νεότερου και Σύγχρονου Κόσμου 1815-2000* (History of Modern and Contemporary World, 1815-2000) and was authored by a group of historians under the editorship of G. Kokkinos. However, the book was withdrawn just a few days after the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year, following adverse reactions to the authors' allegedly unpatriotic representation of the Greek-Cypriot struggle for liberation.

432 See Kokkinos, Gatsotis and Lemonidou op. cit. and Palikidis op. cit.

433 'Η εξόριστη πλέον ελληνική κυβέρνηση, μετά την επίσημη αναγνώρισή της από τα συμμαχικά κράτη, θα υπερασπίσει, με όσα μέσα διέθετε, τα εθνικά συμφέροντα.' Koliopoulos et al. 2007: 122.

had the resistance movement been so universal, in proportion to the [size of the] population, and the number of collaborators so limited!'[434]

The overall conclusion that can be drawn from the above discussion is that the representation of the Greek 1940s in the textbooks of the period under examination largely conformed to the 'reconciliation' paradigm of the 1980s. With few exceptions, authors of schoolbooks were reluctant to engage in an in-depth examination of certain unsettling aspects of the 1940s. The subject of organised collaboration, for example, the internal divisions in the Resistance and the politics of violence are some of those aspects that school historiography still struggles with, despite their comprehensive presence in the academic and wider public discourse on the 1940s. One the other hand, as I will go on to show in the next few chapters, young people's fiction was quick to respond to these new discourses regarding Greece's traumatic past.

434 'Πουθενά στην Ευρώπη η αντιστασιακή κίνηση δεν υπήρξε, αναλογικά με τον πληθυσμό της χώρας, τόσο καθολική και ο αριθμός των συνεργατών του κατακτητή τόσο περιορισμένος!' Ibid.: 124.

‘PEOPLE ARE GOOD AT HEART’: THE GERMANS[435]

In the introductory chapter I have discussed how the collapse of the Cold War divisions in Greece allowed a new relationship to emerge between history and memory. Not always easy or reassuring, this relationship in turn allowed the emergence of new historiographical and public discourses on the Greek 1940s, opening up new opportunities for the exploration of certain aspects of the past that had been suppressed for decades.

As I will go on to show in subsequent chapters, young people’s fiction in the period 1990-2014 was quick to respond to these developments. Authors of this period engaged with subjects that had remained unexplored in the books of previous decades. Much of the young people’s fiction about the 1940s, for example, was now preoccupied with the internal divisions in the Greek Resistance, the wrongdoings of this or that side, the Civil War and its bitter legacies. In general, over the past twenty-five years there has been a proliferation of young people’s books about the troubles of the post-liberation period, a trend that is, of course, not irrelevant to the post-1989 general upsurge of interest in this period.

This shift in themes and time-frames means that much of the recent fiction for young people has been less preoccupied with the Occupation than with, for example, the Civil War. It also explains why Greece’s wartime enemies were underrepresented in books published between 1990 and 2014. This is not to

435 The title is a reference to Anne Frank’s famous quote: ‘In spite of everything, I still believe that people are really good at heart.’

say that enemy figures are completely absent from the corpus of books under examination here. Though they are few and far between, there are some texts that offer interesting and often subversive depictions of the enemy. And although these texts cannot be examined as part of a coherent trend or group, given that they are few in number and scattered over a period of twenty-five years, there are still enough instances to justify a discussion of the portrayal of Greece's enemies. As in Parts I and II, I will start with an exploration of how the German occupiers were depicted.

Eirini Marra's *Το άδειο μπουκάλι* (The Empty Bottle, 1996) is a novel about two young boys and their mother living in German-occupied Athens. The prevailing image of the Germans is negative and the same representational tropes as were discussed in Parts I and II are employed:

> Boots and buttons, helmet and uniform, blonde and tall and full of himself. His [German soldier's] presence terrified him. […] The German lifted the glass up to his eyes and fixed his gaze on the child, staring him down through the glass. Pantelis pursed his lips and looked at his face. His face looked deformed and frightening through the transparent glass. […] He tried to shout but his mouth hung half-open, voiceless. A brutal German was standing before him, with his shining buttons and even shinier eyes. He spoke to him in German and his words squeaked as they came out of his mouth. The boy didn't understand a word. His mouth was moving over his buttoned collar that was embellished with iron badges. The German looked down at him as if he were an insect. He picked up a bottle and started to drink. He drank it all in one breath, like dragons in fairy tales that suck up entire rivers.[436]

436 'Μπότες και κουμπιά, καπέλο και στολή, ξανθός και ψηλός και κάργα ύφος. Ένιωσε να του κόβονται τα γόνατα. […] Ο Γερμανός σήκωσε ψηλά το ποτήρι, το 'φερε μπροστά στα μάτια του και κάρφωσε το βλέμμα του στο πρόσωπο του παιδιού κοιτώντας επίμονα μέσα απ' το ποτήρι. Ο Παντελής έσφιξε τα χείλη του και στύλωσε κι αυτός τα μάτια του στο πρόσωπο του Γερμανού, που, μέσ' από το διάφανο, στρογγυλό ποτήρι, φάνταζε παραμορφωμένο, τρομαχτικό. […] Έκανε να φωνάξει, μα το στόμα του έμεινε ανοιχτό, κοκαλωμένο. Μπροστά του στεκόταν ένας Γερμαναράς άγριος, με γυαλιστερά κουμπιά και πιο γυαλιστερά μάτια. Του μιλούσε γερμανικά, κι οι λέξεις τρίζανε. Ο μικρός δεν καταλάβαινε τίποτα, κι ο Γερμαναράς όλο μιλούσε. Το στόμα

Blonde, tall, with a terrifying face and eyes shining with malevolence, fearsome in his uniform and polished jackboots, arrogant, loud and brutal; the representation of the occupiers in Marra's book clings to the image of the German Nazis as modern-day Bogeymen. Depicted in a negative light and stripped off all human qualities, these figures are a typical example of what Lydia Kokkola calls 'humans in disguise'.[437]

The negative evaluation of the Germans, however, is not limited to their portrayal as dehumanised servants of a well-oiled war machine. Even when they appear as individual characters, their 'Germanness' is enough to justify negative representations.

To give one example, the brothers are invited to the house of a German professor who is obsessed with collecting 'stones'. The professor is presented in a negative light: '[the professor] is unattractive. He wears glasses and sits behind a desk entirely covered with stacks of paper and stones. The wall behind him is loaded with books. No way he has read them all! He's just showing off.'[438]

It is not long before the boys realise that the professor is involved in illicit trade in Greek antiquities and that these strange-looking stones are pieces of ancient sculptures. Seeking to profit from their miseries, the German offers

---

του ανοιγόκλεινε πάνω από τον κουμπωμένο του γιακά, κι εκεί γύρω γυάλιζαν λογιών λογιών σιδερένια στολίδια. Ο Γερμανός τον κοίταξε σαν να ήταν μύγα. Πήρε μόνος του ένα μπουκάλι, το άνοιξε κι άρχισε να πίνει. Το ρούφηξε όλο με μιαν ανάσα, μια και κάτω, σαν τους δράκους που ρουφάνε τα ποτάμια στα παραμύθια.' Marra 1996: 28, 29 and 73-4.

437 Kokkola 2003: 134.

438 'Ο άντρας της ωραίας Γερμανίδας δεν είναι ωραίος Φοράει γυαλιά και κάθεται σκυμμένος πάνω στο γραφείο του, που είναι φορτωμένο πέτρες και χαρτιά. Πίσω του ο τοίχος είναι γεμάτος βιβλία. Σιγά να μην τα 'χει διαβάσει όλα! Φιγούρα πουλάει.' Marra op. cit..: 90.

them protection, food and other commodities in exchange for their cooperation in his shady dealings. Determined to preserve their patriotism and moral integrity, the boys storm out of his house. Once out in the street, Pantelis lectures his younger brother about the quasi-preeminence of the Greek race and culture:

> -Listen, he said calmer. These stones are not random stones. They are special. Ancient. They are of great value. They were carved by people with brilliant minds. By the ancient Greeks. Do you get it? Greeks, not Germans or British or those spaghetti-eating Italians. GREEKS! Our ancestors![439]

A little awkward in its nationalistic overtones, this passage offers a reassuring image of the national Self as opposed to the uncivilised national 'other' of the traditional auto-stereotypes of 'Greekness'. To return to the figure of the professor, this German represents everything that a Greek is not: he is pretentious and unsophisticated–'no way he has read them all! he is just showing off'–corrupt, cunning and unscrupulous, to name but a few of his negative traits that act as unmistakable signifiers of his otherness, leaving no room for narrative empathy or identification with a representative of the enemies.

Leaping forward to 2010, negative depictions of Germans are also found in Eleni Priovolou's novel *Tsoko Bloc* (Τσόκο Μπλοκ). However, the prevailing image of the enemies here is quite different from what has been discussed so far:

---

439 '-Άκου, ξανάπε πιο ήσυχα τώρα. Αυτές οι πέτρες που θέλει αυτός δεν είναι όποιες κι όποιες. Είναι σπουδαίες. Αρχαίες. Έχουν μεγάλη αξία. Τις σκαλίσανε άνθρωποι με πολύ μυαλό. Οι αρχαίοι Έλληνες. Κατάλαβες; Έλληνες, όχι Γερμανοί ή Άγγλοι ή Ιταλοί μακαρονάδες. ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ! Δικοί μας!' Ibid.: 94.

> The Steel Soldiers repeated the salute [*Heil Hitler*] and sung the Nazi anthem. I think I've never been more terrified in my life before. Not even when I had to walk back home alone at night after the rehearsals. The vampires and ghosts of my imagination paled in comparison to these real-life Steel Soldiers. They looked like zombies coming out of their graves to devour us all. […] Their commander was Otto Ermebeg, the man who shook my hand last night after the concert. He was more terrifying than a zombie. His eyes looked like empty sockets.[440]

Up until now we have seen depictions of Germans as biblical monsters, warmongering Huns or hordes of robot-like stormtroopers. To this repertoire we should also add the image of German Nazis as bloodthirsty zombies.

The Nazi zombie trope is a recent trend that has found popular appeal, especially within the video gaming community. Knowing that her audience's knowledge of WWII is more likely to derive from video games, such as the hugely successful *Call of Duty* and *Wolfenstein* franchises, than from traditional historical discourses, Eleni Priovolou seeks to keep her depiction of the enemy relevant and in line with modern cultural fascinations.[441] And although we cannot speak of a general trend, the depiction of the German enemy as zombie-like figures is a testament to the powerful influence of the

---

440 'Οι ατσάλινοι στρατιώτες επανέλαβαν τη φράση και έπειτα όρθιοι άρχισαν να ψάλλουν το χιτλερικό ύμνο. Νομίζω πως ποτέ άλλοτε δεν είχα φοβηθεί περισσότερο στη ζωή μου. Ούτε όταν γύριζα τα βράδια από την πρόβα. Οι βρικόλακες και τα φαντάσματα που γεννούσε η φαντασία μου ωχριούσαν μπροστά στους ατσάλινους στρατιώτες. Έμοιαζαν με ζόμπι που μόλις είχαν βγει από τους τάφους, έτοιμα να μας κατασπαράξουν. […] Επικεφαλής τους ήταν ο λοχαγός που μου έσφιξε το χέρι το προηγούμενο βράδυ μετά την πρωτοχρονιάτικη συναυλία, ο Όττο Έρμεμπεγκ. Ήταν πιο τρομερός κι από τα ζόμπι. Τα μάτια του έμοιαζαν με άδειες κόγχες.' Priovolou 2010: 69 and 78.

441 As Jeff Hayton notes, 'gaming has increasingly become a site of mass-schooling. But just because FPS [first person shooter games] will never enter educational curricula due to their extreme violence, it does not follow that individuals are not learning from them at home.' Hayton 2012: 200.

video game industry and community in creating and popularising new representational tropes in the portrayal of Nazis.[442]

I shall continue the discussion with two books from the 1990s in which Germans are presented in a completely different light. The first is Filomila Vakali-Syrogiannopoulou's novel *Αγαπάει Γιάγκο, αγαπάει…* (Yago Loves, He Loves a Lot, 1997). The book begins with Danai listening to the latest news about a war that is taking place in a faraway country. The news triggers her own painful memories of WWII and takes her back to her childhood years.

Danai was just a little girl when the war broke out, plunging the country and her family into complete misery. Shortly after Greece's subjugation to the Axis, Danai hears that the occupying authorities have commandeered her house and that a stranger (ξένος) will come to live with them. Although the word 'German' is eschewed throughout the novel, the description of the foreign soldier leaves little doubt about his nationality:

> A tall man was standing before my mother. She looked so small next to him. He was followed by another man who was also huge. Their clothes were strange, identical, with gold piping and buttons. Their boots were black and thick and reaching to their knees. They were shouting in a strange, rough language and their faces were cruel and cold.[443]

---

442 For a discussion of the video game industry's immense capacity in shaping popular understandings of WWII, see Hayton ibid.: 199-218. Especially for the *Call of Duty* franchise and its influence in shaping modern cultural narratives about WWII see Ramsay 2015: 94-113.

443 'Ένας άντρας ως εκεί πάνω ψηλός είχε σταθεί μπρος στη μάνα. Μια στάλα έδειχνε κοντά του. Αμέσως πρόβαλε ακόμα ένας, το ίδιο μεγαλόσωμος κι αυτός. Τα ρούχα τους ήταν περίεργα, ίδια και των δύο, με σιρίτια και χρυσά κουμπιά. Οι μπότες μαύρες, χοντρές, έφταναν μέχρι τα γόνατα. Έβγαζαν ακαταλαβίστικες κραυγές, τραχιές, και το βλέμμα τους ήταν άγριο και παγερό.' Vakali-Syrogiannopoulou 1997: 74.

Tall and cruel, dressed in his tailored uniform and knee-high boots and shouting orders in an aggressive language; it is quite evident that this man has 'German' written all over him. However, this is not another novel featuring warmongering Huns or cardboard villains in jackboots. Instead, what we have here is a narrative that seeks to subvert negative stereotypes about Germans through the figure of the good enemy soldier.

Terrified of him at first, Danai soon realises that this stranger might not be as terrible as she first thought. Her initial impression is proved to be false when she is caught in the soldier's room playing with his precious puppets. Fearing his reaction, Danai's grandfather reprimands the girl when the stranger jumps to her defence:

> -Enough, I don't want her to be afraid of me, let her play. I was the one who forgot to lock the door. He made a motion to Danai to come closer to the puppets. [...]. -Aren't they cute? I bought them from a group of traveling players. One day I will return home, I have a little child like her... he said with a bitter smile.[444]

Relieved and trying to win his friendship, Danai's family invites the soldier to have tea with them. The stranger then starts to open up about his life, much to Danai's surprise:

> How strange, the soldier had a homeland of his own, a beautiful homeland that he loved deeply... He was a teacher. His students waited for him to return to their school, like Andreas and his classmates were waiting for Mr. Achilleas to return... His parents were old and worried about him, like our grandparents worried about our own father... His best friend was killed in a battle, like Vangelis's father... He had a wife and a little daughter who looked like Danai... One day he would go back to

444 '-Αρκεί, δε θέλω να με φοβάται η μικρή, αφήστε την να παίξει. Εγώ ξέχασα την πόρτα ανοιχτή. Έκανε νόημα στη Δανάη να πλησιάζει τις μαριονέτες. Χωρίς να την περιμένει, άρχισε να κουνά τα νήματα.
-Δεν είναι γουστόζικες; Τις αγόρασα από έναν πλανόδιο θίασο Θα γυρίσω στο σπίτι μου μια μέρα, έχω ένα παιδί σαν τη μικρή σας... είπε με πικρό χαμόγελο.' Ibid.: 106.

> them. One day he would return home… […] How strange, the conqueror had his own worries… He had feelings, fears and doubts. He held Danai in his arms and his embrace was warm, like the embrace of her father, uncle, brother… From that moment on he became their 'friend'.[445]

This is the moment when the foreign soldier 'metamorphoses from the unmistakable Other into someone who is strikingly familiar'[446] to all those people that Danai has grown to love and hold dear. In a few moments, the once fearsome foe has metamorphosed into a friend. The stranger has now become 'her' stranger, a loving fatherlike figure who reminds nothing of the cruel man that Danai encountered when she first set eyes on him.

After that incident, Danai and her brother seek to spend as much time as possible with their new friend, who is also happy to be around the children. He brings them treats, he draws them pictures trying to communicate all these feelings he cannot express in words and sings children's songs in his language, which no longer sounds hostile.

With the foreign soldier now an important part of her life, Danai becomes devastated to learn that her friend has been ordered to leave their town. The two friends say their last goodbyes before 'her' stranger metamorphoses back into the 'stranger' of their first encounter:

> She ran towards him. He put his things down and held her in his arms. He gave her a kiss and stroked her hair. 'Oh Danai,

---

445 Τι περίεργο, ο στρατιώτης είχε πατρίδα, μια όμορφη πατρίδα που αγαπούσε πολύ… Ήταν δάσκαλος και τα παιδιά τον περίμεναν να γυρίσει στο σχολείο, όπως ο Αντρέας και οι συμμαθητές περίμεναν τον κύριο Αχιλλέα… Είχε γέρους γονείς που ανησυχούσαν γι' αυτόν, όπως ακριβώς ανησυχούσαν ο παππούς και γιαγιά για τον δικό τους πατέρα…. Ο καλύτερός του φίλος είχε σκοτωθεί στη μάχη, όπως είχε σκοτωθεί ο πατέρας του Βαγγελή… Είχε γυναίκα και ένα κοριτσάκι μικρό, που ήταν όμοιο με τη Δανάη… Κάποια μέρα θα γυρνούσε κοντά τους… Θα γυρνούσε στο σπίτι του… […] Πώς γινόταν ο κατακτητής να έχει ανησυχίες… Να έχει αισθήματα, φόβους κι αμφιβολίες; Κράτησε τη Δανάη αγκαλιά κι αυτή τη φορά η αγκαλιά του ήταν όμοια θερμή με την αγκαλιά του πατέρα, του θείου, του αδερφού… Σε λίγη ώρα έγινε «φίλος».' Ibid.: 106-7.
446 O'Sullivan 2008: 78.

> oh Danai' he kept saying. […] His face then took on the other look, the harsh and cruel one. […] And she was sad to see him leave like we become sad to see a nice guest leaving our house. […] He had arrived like a wild storm, a nightmare, he had turned her life upside down. And that morning he left like a nice neighbor, a good friend that you're hoping to see again one day at your door.[447]

One could say that the last phrase sounds rather awkward. For all his niceness, the soldier was still a foe, a conqueror, a fearsome 'other' once out in public. And as fond as she has grown of him, Danai still struggles to understand 'if he didn't want to leave his home, if he didn't want to come to her country, to her neighbourhood, then why did he? Who had sent him here?'[448] However, this is a question that goes unanswered for both little Danai and the young reader.

Nevertheless, this is not a novel that aims to expand the readers' knowledge or understanding of Nazism. This is why the author has deliberately avoided using the word 'German' or 'Nazi' in the novel, though this soldier is clearly both. As she notes towards the end of the book, 'in the following years all this acquired a new meaning for Danai. The stranger became a symbol of all the young men, ours or strangers, who fell victim to the same fate.'[449] In the end,

---

447 'Γκρινιάζοντας που δεν την είχαν ξυπνήσει νωρίτερα, έτρεξε κοντά του. Εκείνος άφησε τα πράγματα που κρατούσε και τη σήκωσε με λαχτάρα στην αγκαλιά του. Τη φίλησε, της χάιδεψε τα μαλλιά. «Ω Δαναή, ω Δαναή…» επαναλάμβανε, χωρίς, από τη συγκίνηση, να μπορεί άλλη λέξη να πει. […] Έξω στο έντονο φως, οι σκιές χάθηκαν. Για τους διαβάτες, το πρόσωπο πήρε την άλλη του όψη, τη σκληρή και άγρια. […] Και λυπήθηκε όταν τον αποχαιρετούσε, όπως λυπάται κανείς όταν φεύγει ένας καλός επισκέπτης, συναίσθημα της στιγμής, αφού ο επισκέπτης μπορεί να ξανάρθει. […] Είχε έρθει στο σπίτι της σαν την άγρια μπόρα, ένας εφιάλτης, είχε αναστατώσει τη ζωή της. Κι έφυγε, εκείνο το πρωινό, σαν το γείτονα τον καλό, σαν το φίλο που περιμένεις με λαχτάρα να ξαναχτυπήσει την πόρτα σου.' Vakali-Syrogiannopoulou op. cit.: 112-4.

448 'Αφού δεν ήθελε ν' αφήσει το σπίτι του, δεν ήθελε να 'ρθει στην πατρίδα, στη γειτονιά της, γιατί ήρθε; Ποιος τον έστειλε…;' Ibid.: 110.

449 'Τα χρόνια τα κατοπινά, όλα τούτα, απόκτησαν άλλη σημασία για τη Δανάη. Ο ξένος έγινε σύμβολο, άγνωστος στρατιώτης, ξεστρατισμένη μαριονέτα που κάποιοι, τραβώντας τα νήματα, της

this is a novel about human beings, neither evil nor heroic, who got caught up in a consuming war and managed to preserve their humanity. And if the moral mandate for authors in previous decades was to help their young readers understand that 'Germans are humans too', Filomila Vakali-Syrogiannopoulou has employed the figure of the good enemy soldier to convey a different message, the message that humanity should not be associated with one's nationality and that examples of goodness can be found on all sides. Even on the side of the enemies.

The figure of the good German soldier also appeared in a number of American and British children's books of the 1970s. The hero's encounter with an individual German is a popular strategy that enables authors to undermine negative stereotypes about Germans and Germanness, prompting questions about the often conflicted relationship between national loyalty and individual conscience.[450] Having studied this subject in depth, Emer O'Sullivan has identified two strategies that authors usually employ to resist negative stereotyping, that is to say, 'revalorisation of known images and negation of the stereotyped Germanness of individual characters.'[451] This is most commonly achieved by isolating an individual character from the enemy group and depicting him in a positive light. And this is what also happens in Thomas Nikolaou's novel *Ο καβαλάρης της νύχτας* (The Night Rider, 1998).

έκοψαν το δρόμο της καρδιάς. [...] Τόσων παλικαριών, ξένων και δικών, της ίδιας μοίρας θύματα, που η ψυχή τους μόνο τον πόλεμο δε λαχταρούσε, δε λαχταρά.' Ibid.: 114 and 117.
450 See also Agnew and Fox 2001, especially Chapter 3.
451 O'Sullivan op. cit.

Makis is a young boy who spends the night alone in his father's watermill preparing bread for the guerrillas when a wounded German soldier enters the mill seeking for shelter. Unknown to Makis, the soldier is a deserter who was shot by his comrades while trying to escape to the mountains and join the Greek partisans. When he first sees him, Makis mistakes the soldier for a guerrilla. However, he soon realises that the man lying half-dead on the floor is one of 'them', the fearsome 'jackbooted thugs, all polished and swaggering with their iron-armoured chests and cold eyes.'[452] Having experienced their cruelty first-hand, Makis begins to feel 'his chest burning with hatred and his anger becoming like a punch ready to strike.'[453] The boy picks up the soldier's gun and sits for hours pointing it at the unconscious German while waiting for the guerrillas to arrive.

Meanwhile, the focus shifts to the soldier. Rather than being externally observed, the man is internally focalised, thus allowing the reader direct insight into his feelings and thoughts. In doing so, the author seeks to elicit the readers' sympathy towards the suffering German and get them to recognise that 'he is human too':

> Two fires of hatred were burning on his little [Makis's] face. The soldier felt these eyes like bullets, two sharp knives ready to rip off his heart. The wounded man tried to smile. […] But the

---

452 'Ολόγυρά του μια ντουζίνα μπότες, τραπ-τραπ, όλοι αστραφτεροί, αγέρωχοι, φορτωμένοι με σίδερο στο στήθος και με κείνον τον πάγο στα μάτια…' Nikolaou 1998: 50-51.

453 'Το αγόρι γνώριζε πάρα πολύ καλά τη σκληρότητα των χιτλερικών. Ήξερε πως είναι αδίστακτοι. Δεν πάει καιρός που, εκεί κοντά σε ένα χωριό, το Κατωμέρι, πήραν μια ντουζίνα γέρους, γυναίκες και παιδιά, τους έκλεισαν στην εκκλησία και τους έκαψαν ζωντανούς. Το παιδί είχε ολοζώντανες μέσα του τις φρικτές εικόνες εκείνης της τραγωδίας. Είχε ακόμα στα μάτια του τις πύρινες φλόγες που έζωναν το κτίριο και στ' αυτιά του ηχούσαν οι τρομαγμένες φωνές των ανθρώπων που καίγονταν. Αυτές οι σκηνές πανικού ήταν αδύνατο να ξεχαστούν· το μίσος θέριεψε στα στήθη του παιδιού κι όλος αυτός ο άγριος θυμός έμοιαζε με γροθιά έτοιμη να χτυπήσει.' Ibid.: 27.

> child's face remained dead serious. Makis didn't move at all. The only thing that moved slightly was his finger on the trigger. This movement caused a horrible cold feeling inside him that started from his [German's] chest and went all the way up to his throat, choking him. He felt the need to fill his lungs with air. 'God', he whispered, 'am I really going to die in such a stupid way? How can I make this child understand that I don't want to hurt him?'454

With the German soldier falling in and out of consciousness, the focus shifts back to Makis, prompting the reader's emotional participation in the moral conflict that is taking place inside the boy's mind and soul. Becoming less and less confident of his past certainties, Makis is fighting his own inner battle between right and wrong, between national loyalty and individual conscience:

> 'What are you waiting for?' the voice in his head was asking. 'He is a Fascist, a murderer. Why don't you kill him already?' 'Not all of them are murderers', another voice replied. 'Remember that German that joined the guerrillas… He is a friend of your father's, isn't he?' 'Are you saying that all Greeks are good?' a third voice asked. 'What about that [collaborator], *Deneke*?'455

Wrestling with his conscience, the boy observes that this German does not conform to the image of 'Germans' that has become firmly fixed in his mind: 'There was something different about him. His appearance, his bearing, there was something that differentiated him from all the other Germans that Makis

---

454 'Σ' αυτό το λεπτό πρόσωπο όμως έκαιγαν δυο φωτιές μίσους. Ο στρατιώτης ένιωθε αυτά τα μάτια σαν δυο σφαίρες, σαν δυο αιχμηρά στιλέτα που ήταν ικανά να του ξεσχίσουν την καρδιά. Ο τραυματίας προσπάθησε να χαμογελάσει. […] Το πρόσωπο του παιδιού, όμως, έμεινε σοβαρό κι ανέκφραστο. Ο Μάκης δεν κινήθηκε καθόλου. Μονάχα ο δείχτης του κύρτωσε ελάχιστα επάνω στη σκανδάλη. Αυτή η μικρή κίνηση στάθηκε ικανή να γεννήσει στο στήθος του Γερμανού ένα φοβερό πάγωμα, που ξεχύθηκε ως το λαιμό και του έκοψε την ανάσα. Είχε ανάγκη να γεμίσει τα πνευμόνια του αέρα. «Θεέ μου», ψιθύρισε, «θα πεθάνω με τόσο ανόητο τρόπο; Πώς μπορώ να δώσω σ' αυτό το παιδί να καταλάβει, πως δε θέλω το κακό του;»' Ibid.: 33-4.

455'«Τι περιμένεις;» ρωτούσε η φωνή. «Αυτός είναι ένας φασίστας, ένας φονιάς. Γιατί δεν τον σκοτώνεις;» «Δεν είναι όλοι φονιάδες», έλεγε η άλλη φωνή. «Για σκέψου το Γερμανό αντάρτη που οι δικοί μας τον φωνάζουν Μανώλη… Αυτός δεν είναι φίλος του πατέρα σου;» «Είναι όλοι οι Έλληνες καλοί;» ρωτούσε η Τρίτη φωνή. Ξέχασες τον Ντενεκέ;»' Ibid.: 56-7.

had seen before.'[456] Eventually, the boy decides to save the soldier from dying alone in the basement of the watermill:

> For the first time, Makis was able to look into his eyes. These eyes did not have the coldness that he remembered seeing in the eyes of the other [German] officer. The light was falling on the soldier's face, spreading a sweet glow on his short beard. His deep wrinkles were adding to the liveliness of his face, which no longer seemed cold and dead. The boy noticed the dark circles under his eyes and the bitterness in the lines around his mouth. He noticed the wrinkles on his forehead. It was clear that he had been through hell. This soldier was different from the Germans who killed Toula [Makis's pet goat] and burned down the church. Yes! He was definitely different from those who did so much evil in [the village of] Katomeri. […] Makis now understood why he looked different from the other German soldiers. He didn't have the swastika badge on his uniform.[457]

What we have here is a characteristic example of what Emer O'Sullivan has described as a 'non-"German" German' in her analysis of Rudi, the nice German soldier from Robert Westall's 1975 novel *The Machine Gunners*. Like Rudi, the suffering soldier in Nikolaou's novel is also a German 'but at the same time he is not a "'German" where "German" is taken to be synonymous with "evil" and "Nazi".'[458] Sensitive, vulnerable and free of the horrific ideological signifier of evil, the swastika badge, this German is nothing like the evil Nazis that Makis had grown to hate. Yet, to quote O'Sullivan again, 'he

---

456 'Κάτι σ' αυτόν ήταν διαφορετικό. Η όψη του, η στάση του, κάτι στην εξωτερική του εμφάνιση τον έκανε να ξεχωρίζει από τους γερμανούς που είχε δει ο Μάκης.' Ibid.: 78-9.
457 'Για πρώτη φορά ο Μάκης τον κοίταζε κατάματα. Αυτά τα μάτια που έβλεπε τώρα το παιδί, δεν είχαν την παγωνιά που θυμόταν ότι είχε δει στα μάτια του αξιωματικού. Το φως που έπεφτε στο πρόσωπο του στρατιώτη χάριζε μια γλυκιά λάμψη στα κοντά του γένια. Οι βαθιές ρυτίδες έδιναν ζωντάνια στο πρόσωπό του και το παιδί δεν το έβλεπε πια ψυχρό κι ανέκφραστο. Το αγόρι πρόσεξε τους μαύρους κύκλους κάτω από τα μάτια και την πίκρα που ξεχείλιζε από τις γραμμές του στόματος. Κοίταξε τις ρυτίδες του στο μέτωπο. Ήταν φανερό πως είχε περάσει δύσκολες ώρες. Αυτός ο στρατιώτης ήταν διαφορετικός από τους Γερμανούς που σκότωσαν την Τούλα και έκαψαν την εκκλησία. Ναι! Σίγουρα ήταν τελείως διαφορετικός από εκείνους που έκαναν τόσο κακό στο Κατωμέρι. […] Ο Μάκης τώρα ήξερε ποια ήταν η διαφορά του από τους άλλους Γερμανούς στρατιώτες. Από τη στολή του έλειπε η σβάστικα.' Ibid.: 93 and 97.
458 O'Sullivan 1995: 72.

exists only in contrast to them.'[459] His encounter with the wounded soldier does not change the boy's hatred for the Germans in general. But it does change his feelings towards this individual German.

A renowned scholar in the field of memory studies, Luisa Passerini has argued that 'the first area of resistance to memory concerns the image of the enemy. Among all images, that of the enemy is the most easily reducible to a set of rigid stereotypes which do not allow exceptions.'[460] I have chosen to close my discussion with two 'exceptions', two texts that offer a more nuanced image of the enemy, hoping to undermine rigid stereotypes of Germans and 'Germanness'. This is achieved through the figure of the good German soldier who, once isolated from the feared group, is presented in a positive light, prompting both protagonists and readers to re-evaluate their assumptions regarding the relationship between national enmities and individual conscience, traditional loyalties and personal morals.

Although this was a popular trope in the Anglo-American children's literature of the 1970s, young readers in Greece would have to wait until the late 1990s before they were presented with fictional constructions of good Germans. With Greece having suffered hard under Axis occupation, it is perhaps natural that this particular 'resistance' to memory was a bit more persistent in Greece than in other countries that had not experienced foreign rule, as was the case with America and Britain.

---

459 Ibid.
460 Passerini 1999: 290.

And finally in the late 1990s, with Germany unified and strong within the post-Cold War European landscape, the time had come for a more nuanced treatment of the image of Germans in Greek fiction for young readers. It is no coincidence that the first figures of good Germans appeared just a few years after the international celebrations of the fiftieth anniversary of the end of WWII, during which Germany showed genuine willingness to confront its ghosts and honour the memory of its wartime victims. To quote Passerini again, 'it is through a new compassionate understanding of our common past and of past enmities and conflicts that the construction of a European memory of the war becomes possible.'[461] The figure of the good German should, therefore, be viewed as a testament to this transformed view of Europe, a lesson in international understanding that aims to transcend old hatreds and get younger generations to realise that 'humanity has nothing to do with one's nationality.'[462]

461 Ibid.: 296.
462 'Γιατί, όπως ήδη θα το κατάλαβες, η ανθρωπιά δεν έχει εθνικότητα.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 2007: 89.

A NATION OF BRAVI: THE ITALIANS

Moving on to the next group of enemies, the Italians are also underrepresented in the young people's fiction of the period 1990-2014 for the same reasons discussed in the previous chapter. Not exactly original or subversive, the representation of the Italian occupiers in the books examined here continues to adhere to the same old ideas and cultural stereotypes that have been discussed in Parts I and II. The story is again a painfully familiar one.

A nation of *bravi* and rather naïve people, the Italians were beguiled by Mussolini's imperialist vision and set off to fight a war they did not quite believe in, only to be defeated by the brave Greeks in the snowy mountains of Albania.[463] Vanquished and humiliated, the situation only changed after their German partners intervened on their behalf and managed to subjugate Greece, giving the Italians almost complete control of the country. Incompetent as soldiers, the Italians were even less credible as occupiers, disdained by Greeks and Germans alike as worthless, disposable, second-class conquerors.[464]

---

463 '-Ο Μουσολίνι και οι φασίστες του θέλουν, λέει, να κάνουν την πατρίδα μας επαρχία της Ιταλίας, ακούς; έκανε αγριεμένη.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1992: 25. 'Μου εξομολογήθηκε, χωρίς να κρύβει τη λύπη του, ότι στην πατρίδα του είχε τη γιαγιά, τον παππού του, τους συμμαθητές του. Αν και τον νευρίαζαν πολλοί απ' αυτούς. Παθιάζονταν με τον πόλεμο και πίστευαν τις μπούρδες που τους έλεγαν στο σχολείο. Ότι ο Μουσολίνι θα κάνει τη Ρώμη πρωτεύουσα της Ρωμαϊκής Αυτοκρατορίας.' Priovolou 2010: 21.

464 'Ένας ηλικιωμένος κύριος, ο οποίος καθόταν παραδίπλα, έλεγε πως οι Ιταλοί, που εκείνη τη στιγμή έκαναν τους καμπόσους στον άμαχο πληθυσμό, δεν ήταν τίποτε άλλο από χωροφύλακες των Γερμανών και ότι οι Γερμανοί τους περιφρονούσαν. Έλεγε επίσης ότι σύντομα οι ατσάλινοι στρατιώτες του Χίτλερ θα τους τσάκιζαν, όπως και όλους τους συμμάχους τους, για να είναι οι απόλυτοι κυρίαρχοι στον κόσμο.' Priovolou ibid.: 101.

Reproducing the notion of Italian moderation, the representation of the Italian conquerors paints an image of a Fascist occupation regime with a human face that remained benign and devoid of anti-Semitic sentiments or other racist agendas.[465] The Italian occupation regime in Greece was simply a pale and half-hearted imitation of its fierce Nazi counterpart, demonstrating unequivocally that Mussolini and his Fascist ideals had completely failed to transform these good-natured Mediterraneans into the cruel perpetrator that the average German soldier was portrayed as being. After all, Greeks and Italians were cut from the same cloth.[466] It was, therefore, natural that the Italians should soon realise that they had been fighting on the wrong side. Once they did, switching alliances was all that these decent fellows had to do in order to clear their reputation and see all their past misdeeds forgiven and forgotten.[467]

---

465 'Οι Ιταλοί είχαν αρχίσει να ψαχουλεύουν τα στρώματα, τις βελέντζες και τα ντουλάπια. Κατέβηκαν στο κατώι, άδειασαν τα σακιά με τα άχυρα, μπήκαν στην αποθήκη κι ανακάτεψαν με τα όπλα τους τα τσουβάλια με το καλαμπόκι, το σιτάρι και τα καρύδια και πήραν μαζί τους τα σακούλια με τα ξερά σύκα. Ευχαριστημένοι γιατί δε βρήκαν όπλα χαιρέτησαν και έφυγαν. Στην πόρτα, ο μεγαλύτερος με τα ψαρά μαλλιά γύρισε και χάιδεψε το ξανθό κεφάλι της Μαριάνθης. Εκείνη αποτραβήχτηκε φοβισμένη κι έβαλε τα κλάματα. Ο Ιταλός της έβγαλε από την τσέπη μια σοκολάτα και πλησίασε να της τη δώσει. Η αδερφή μου σταμάτησε το κλάμα, τον κοίταξε απορημένη, σαν να μην το πίστευε. Ο πειρασμός όμως ήταν μεγάλος. Στο τέλος νίκησε το φόβο της και άρπαξε τη σοκολάτα.' Psarafti 2011: 26-7.
'Μόλις η διοίκηση της πόλης πέρασε στα χέρια των Ιταλών, ο αέρας έγινε πιο ελαφρύς. «Οι Ιταλιάνοι είναι σαν εμάς τους Έλληνες, αλέγκροι τύποι. Ούνα φάτσα ούνα ράτσα» λέει ο παππούς. «Και το σπουδαιότερο: Δεν τρέφουν κανένα μίσος για εμάς τους Εβραίους» συμπληρώνει.' Kliafa 2011: 76.
466 '«Οι Ιταλιάνοι είναι σαν εμάς τους Έλληνες, αλέγκροι τύποι. Ούνα φάτσα ούνα ράτσα» λέει ο παππούς.' Ibid.
467 'Η συνθηκολόγηση της Ιταλίας στις αρχές Σεπτεμβρίου ήταν για όλους ένα πανηγύρι. Έλληνες και Ιταλοί, ενωμένοι στη χαρά, ξεχυθήκαμε στους δρόμους και τις πλατείες. Γέμισαν τα μπαλκόνια ελληνικές σημαίες, τα σήμαντρα των εκκλησιών διαλαλούσαν το μεγάλο νέο, και οι Ιταλιάνοι, οι χθεσινοί μας εχθροί, πυροβολούσαν από ενθουσιασμό στον αέρα, μας αγκάλιαζαν και φώναζαν «Βίβα Γκρέτσια».' Ibid.: 147.

Of course, the image of the *Italiano bravo* could not be left out of this picture. In Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's novel *Τραγούδι για τρεις* (Song for Three, 1992), Gianni is a young Italian soldier who finds shelter in the house of young Elisavet following Italy's capitulation to the Allies. Kind and obliging, Gianni fraternises with the family and becomes their trusted friend. He also falls in love with Olga, a young girl who works for the Greek Resistance. Hiding in a small room and with the war outside growing fiercer and bloodier, the nice Italian's mind is set on his darling girl. It goes without saying, of course, that this *Italiano bravo* is also anti-Fascist: 'Olga *mia*, if you love me a little, after the war, you and I get married, we go to Italy, we have lots of *bambini*. Me not Fascist.'[468]

In her novel *Τσόκο Μπλοκ* (Tsoko Block, 2010), Eleni Priovolou offers a different version of the *Italiano bravo* figure. The nice Italian here is Nino, a young boy who enjoys an easy life alongside his father General Fratziolo. For all his comforts, Nino suffers from depression, isolated as he is within the four walls of his wealthy home, as General Fratziolo is determined to shield his son from the unpleasant realities of the war. Having an aptitude for music, Nino convinces his father to let him join a band. There he meets Tsoko and the two boys become instant friends. Tsoko introduces Nino to a world of which the young Italian had been completely ignorant. He talks to him about his executed friends, about starving children and the Soldiers of Peace, a clandestine organisation that fights for the liberation of Greece. Shocked and

468 '-Όλγκα μία, αν αγκαπάς εμένα λιγκάκι, μετά το πόλεμος παντρευτούμε, πάμε σε Ιταλία, κάνουμε πολλά μπαμπίνι. Εγκώ ντεν είναι φασίστα!' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou op. cit.: 134.

hurt, Nino struggles to digest the idea that his father is also responsible for all this suffering. He soon, however, becomes a Soldier of Peace himself, determined to do everything he can to relieve his Greek friends of the heartbreak of the war. Nino becomes a true *Italiano bravo* when he helps Tsoko sneak into his father's office and steal important military documents. The documents are passed to the secret organisation, the mission is successful and General Fratziolo is called back to Italy to be put on trial for his failure to prevent the sabotage. With his father facing execution, Nino is relieved to return to a quiet life away from the ugliness of the war. Before he leaves for Italy, he reassures Tsoko that their secret is forever safe with him: 'A Soldier of Peace could never become a traitor.'[469] And neither could a true *Italiano bravo*.

This is more or less how the Italian occupiers are portrayed in the books published during the period under review. Inefficient as soldiers, harmless as occupiers and *bravi* as humans, it is clear that their representation continues to subscribe to popular cultural stereotypes about Italians and long-held (mis)perceptions of Italian Fascism as a 'lesser evil' than Nazism.[470] Authors of this period were not particularly keen to experiment with alternative types of Italian enemies other than the figure of the victimised, anti-Fascist and *bravo* individual. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, the subject of the foreign foes was no longer relevant for the authors of the post-Cold War period.

---

469 '«Ένας Στρατιώτης της Ειρήνης δε γίνεται ποτέ προδότης», είπε και πήρε όρκο τιμής.' Priovolou op. cit.: 62-3.
470 See also Ben-Ghiat 2004: 137-53.

The interest had now shifted to other, more controversial, more exciting and hitherto unexplored aspects of the Greek 1940s.

MORE SKELETONS IN THE CLOSET: COLLABORATION

As was also the case with most other European countries, after the collapse of the Cold War divisions Greece witnessed an upsurge of historiographical and public interest in the 1940s. The post-1989 period saw the emergence of a new generation of historians who challenged old interpretations of the past and put a new set of previously ignored questions at the heart of their research agenda.[471] Having remained an open wound for decades, the question of the extent of Greece's collaboration with its occupiers was one of the main areas that attracted widespread interest in the post-Cold War period.

The scholarly preoccupation with the subject intensified in the early 2000s following the appearance of the so-called 'new wave' or 'post-revisionist' school. Focusing on the micro-level, scholars of the 'new wave' investigated different aspects and manifestations of collaborationism. One of their main contributions to interpreting the collaboration phenomenon in Axis-occupied Greece was to explore the relationship between collaborationism and leftist violence.[472] Though heavily criticised on both ideological and methodological grounds, the work of the 'post-revisionists' undoubtedly opened up the field, inspiring many young scholars to carry out further research in this area. This became apparent in the summer of 2004 when Greece hosted its first conference dealing exclusively with the topic of collaboration during 1941-

471 See also chapter 1 in this Part.
472 See for example the ten-point manifesto of the 'new wave' school published by S. Kalyvas and N. Maranztidis in the newspaper *Ta Nea* on 20.03.2004, also available at http://ellinikosemfilios.blogspot.com/2012/03/n.html Also, Kalyvas 2000: 142-83 and Kalyvas 2008: 129-42.

1944.[473] Subsequently a number of studies, collective volumes and doctoral dissertations started to appear one after another, shedding new light on the subject, a trend which is still going strong to this day.[474]

Young people's fiction of the period 1990-2014, however, remained rather indifferent to these developments. For the most part the authors of this period continued to focus their representations on the misdeeds of a small group of wartime *fout*. Far from being original or subversive, the image of the *fout* in the texts of this period continued to conform to the same representational tropes and clichés that have been discussed in Parts I and II. Traitors, for example, are depicted as evil-looking, cold-blooded monsters;[475] the *mavragorites* are 'merciless, inhumane monsters' who profiteer at the expense of their starving compatriots;[476] while the role of 'horizontal collaborator' is once again played by female characters of ill repute and loose morals.[477]

---

473 The conference was held on the island of Samothraki in the summer of 2004. For the published proceedings see Michailidis, Nikolakopoulos and Fleischer (eds.) 2006.

474 See Kostopoulos 2005, Dordanas 2006, Hondromatidis 2008, Kousouris 2014 and Lymberatos and Profis 2019. The above list is, of course, not exhaustive.

475 See, for instance, 'Ανάμεσα σ' αυτές τις γκρίζες στολές, διαβαίνει ένας μαύρος λεκές. Ένας πολίτης! Μαύρα μαλλιά, μαύρο μουστάκι, μαύρα μάτια. Είναι φανερό πως προσπαθεί να φαίνεται φυσικός κι ανεπιτήδευτος. Όμως η ματιά του παίζει, περιμένει διαταγές, η στάση του γεμάτη υποταγή, δουλοπρέπεια και φόβο. […] «Στην άκρη γεροξεκούτη! Φύγε!» ούρλιαξε ο Ζάππας και τον έσπρωξε με τόση δύναμη, που παρ' ολίγο να πέσει. […] Ο παλιάνθρωπος, ούτε μια στιγμή το παγωμένο του χαμόγελο δεν ζεστάθηκε. Καμία συγκίνηση δεν γλύκανε το πρόσωπό του.' Nikolaou 1998: 49-54.

476 For instance, 'Ήταν άτιμη φάρα οι μαυραγορίτες, συνεργάτες των Γερμανών οι περισσότεροι που έπεφταν δίπλα τους και κονομούσαν ολόκληρα φορτία τρόφιμα. Μια οκά αλεύρι την πουλούσαν μια χρυσή λίρα. Μια οκά λάδι γινόταν ανταλλαγή με ένα ασημένιο σερβίτσιο. Μια κονσέρβα κρέας ένα χρυσό ρολόι. Όλοι εκείνοι οι γερμανόφιλοι, οι σπιούνοι, οι κλέφτες, αγρίμια χωρίς έλεος, χωρίς ανθρωπιά, γέμιζαν τα σπίτια τους με λίρες, σακούλια με χρυσαφικά, χαλιά, πίνακες αξίας, ακόμα και πιάνα πανάκριβα.' Psarafti 2011: 72.

477 '[…] να σου και καταφθάνει ξαναμμένη η Γκάμπυ, για να μας πει πως στον δρόμο συνάντησε την Έλενα, την κόρη της κυρίας Ποντικάκη, αγκαζέ με έναν Ιταλό αξιωματικό. «Η αναίσχυντη. Να δεις πόζα… Ίδια η μαντάμ Σουσού. Μιλούσε και χαριεντιζόταν λες και δεν έτρεχε τίποτα». «Άκουσα πως τη σπίτωσε» είπε χαμηλώνοντας τη φωνή η γιαγιά. «Δυστυχώς, είναι αλήθεια» επιβεβαίωσε με μουρμουριστή φωνή η Γκάμπυ.' Kliafa 2011: 92-3.

A largely unaddressed subject in the young people's fiction from the early *metapolitefsi*, the question of armed collaboration was no longer a taboo topic for the authors of the 1980s, as I have discussed in Part II. Authors writing in the period 1990-2014 continued to address the issue in their stories, albeit admittedly with less intensity and frequency. As regards the role of the Security Battalions, the most extensive reference is found in Litsa Psarafti's 2011 novel *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου* (The Fugitives of the Castle Tower).

> -What are these Security Battalions now? my mother asked.
>
> -They're the scum of the earth, said grandfather. They approached the Germans, much to their satisfaction. They armed them, they dressed them in German uniforms, they fed them and had them fighting the communists. Some did it for ideological reasons, dazzled as they had been by the ideals of Fascism. Others because they had a bad history with the communists and saw the Germans as protectors, but mainly, because they wanted to take revenge on their personal enemies.[478]

There is, however, one small but quite important detail that is omitted from the above passage as well as from all other passages or references to the Security Battalions and their collaborationist activities during the Occupation. Contrary to the impression that is given in all of the books under examination, the reality is that the Security Battalions were not formed by the Germans or

---

A different version of this type is found in Eirini Marra's 1996 novel *Το άδειο μπουκάλι* (The Empty Bottle). Maria is a good-natured young girl who becomes the mistress of a German soldier. The blame, however, for Maria's moral corruption is laid on her parents, who not only benefit from their teenage daughter's relationship with the German soldier but also send her to work as a flower girl in German nightclubs, thus forcing her into prostitution.

478 '-Τι 'ναι πάλι αυτά τα Τάγματα Ασφαλείας; απόρησε η μάνα μου.
-Αποβράσματα της κοινωνίας, είπε ο παππούς. Έπεσαν δίπλα στους Γερμανούς, κι εκείνοι άλλο που δεν ήθελαν. Τους όπλισαν, τους έντυσαν με γερμανικές στολές, τους τάιζαν για να πολεμούν τους κομμουνιστές. Μερικοί το έκαναν από ιδεολογία, θαμπωμένοι από τα φασιστικά ιδεώδη. Άλλοι γιατί είχαν προηγούμενα με τους κομμουνιστές και ζητούσαν προστασία από τους Γερμανούς, αλλά κυρίως για να μπορέσουν να εκδικηθούν τους εχθρούς τους.' Psarafti op. cit.: 61.

some other foreign agent. In fact, their creation was decided by Greek quisling Prime Minister Ioannis Rallis and his collaborationist government that ruled Greece from April 1943 until the Liberation in October 1944. I will come back to the reasons for this omission later.

Published in 2011, Maroula Kliafa's *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα* (A Ballad for Rebecca) is the first Greek book for young readers featuring a Jewish protagonist. Set in the town of Trikala, Thessaly, the novel refers to the terrorising tactics and practices of the Roman Legion, a pro-Romanian, pro-Italian collaborationist organisation of the Occupation with a secessionist agenda, envisaging the creation of a so-called 'Principate of Pindus' that would include the Vlach community of Thessaly.[479] Besides the Roman Legion, Kliafa also talks about the infamous 'National Union of Greece'–also known as 3E–a Fascist, anti-communist and anti-Semitic political formation of the inter-war period that was revived in the early 1940s following Greece's subjugation to the Axis. One of the most notorious collaborationist organisations of Northern Greece, the members of the 3E played an active role in the persecution of the Greek Jews of Thessaloniki with many of them also being heavily involved in the expropriation of Jewish property.[480] Though the novel devotes several pages to talk about the pro-Nazi ideology and anti-communist ferocity of the so-called *3Epsilites*,[481] the anti-Jewish dimension of their collaborationist

479 On the Roman Legion see Papagiannis 2004 and Hondromatidis op. cit.
480 For more on the 3E see Dordanas op. cit. and Pistola 2014. The latter is also available at http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/135187/files/GRI-2014-13178.pdf
481 That is the members of the 3E organisation.

activity is a topic that remains oddly suppressed. The reasons for this silence will be explored in the last part of this chapter.

A difficult subject that has only recently started to attract interest from historians and other scholars of the Greek 1940s, the question of wartime collaboration was a central theme in fictional explorations and representations of the past in young people's books throughout the period from 1974 to 2014. From the misdeeds of a few *fout* to the reality of armed collaboration, in all the texts that have been discussed up to now the authors' engagement with the issue has revolved exclusively around these two aspects of collaboration. In the next part of this chapter I will conclude the discussion by looking into the main taboos that still permeate young people's fiction on the subject and have dictated a blank ban on discussing some the most disturbing forms of collaboration that took place in occupied Greece.

The first of these lies in the concealment of the fact that from April 1941 until Greece's liberation in October 1944 the country was under the control of three successive collaborationist governments. All three Athens-based puppet governments cooperated with the German occupation authorities in different ways and for different purposes, and particularly in order to promote their shared anti-communist agenda, aiming at the suppression of the EAM-led resistance movement that was meanwhile growing stronger and fiercer. It was in this spirit that conservative politician Ioannis Rallis ordered the formation of the Security Battalions, even making their creation a precondition of his

accepting the Germans' proposal to set up a new government.[482] Yet, as mentioned earlier, this is a detail that has been left out of all references to the formation and collaborationist activities of the Security Battalions. Taking a unanimous stance on the matter, throughout the period 1974-2014 authors eschewed all discussion of the existence of a collaborationist regime in Axis-occupied Greece, with many of them conveniently shifting the focus to the legitimate Cairo-based Greek government-in-exile and its contribution to the Allied war effort. Regardless of the authors' ideological orientations or personal involvement in the events narrated, the idea that is repeatedly and consistently promoted in all the books I have examined so far is that, with the exception of a few collaborationist groups and some other isolated *fout*, the whole nation had turned against its occupiers putting up one of the world's most formidable resistance movements. With school historiography still struggling to admit to the uncomfortable reality of a Greek quisling regime that cooperated with the occupiers, this topic has also remained one of the most resilient taboos in the young people's fiction of the period 1974-2014.

Another hugely taboo topic in Greek fiction for young readers, and at the same time a massive taboo in post-war Greek society in general, is the question of Greek Christian collaboration in the persecution of Greek Jews during the Holocaust. Mirroring an international trend, the authors'

---

482 Gerolymatos 1985: 17. Ioannis Rallis was the third and last appointed Prime Minister of the Hellenic State, the official name of the German-controlled collaborationist regime during the Axis occupation of Greece. Rallis succeeded Konstantinos Logothetopoulos (December 1942-April 1943) who had in turn replaced Georgios Tsolakoglou (April 1941-December 1942) as head of the Athens-based puppet government.

preoccupation with the Holocaust intensified after the mid-1980s. Since then the subject has become a frequent, albeit mostly marginal, theme in young people's fiction about WWII.[483] In the remaining part of this chapter I will look into how authors dealt with the issue of Greek Christian responses to the persecution of Greek Jews.

While some authors had their Jewish characters disappear from the scene after taking the 'wise' decision to flee to safer places before it was too late,[484] others took the opportunity to talk to their young readers about the tragic fate that awaited those who fell into the hands of their persecutors. What is remarkable here is that in all these stories the arrest and deportation of the Jews is presented as a horrible event that just 'happened'.[485] The sole culprits for this tragedy are the Nazis who, as the young reader is reassured over and

---

483 This topic will be discussed further in a subsequent chapter.

484 '-Κι η Ρουθ τι γίνηκε;
-Δε μάθαμε. Είχανε κρατήσει μυστική την αναχώρησή τους. Δίπλα τους είμαστε και δεν πήραμε χαμπάρι.
-Γιατί;
-Τι να σου πω; Μας αγαπούσαν. Τόσα και τόσα είχαμε περάσει εδώ στη γειτονιά. Τότε είχαν απλωθεί παντού τα μαύρα πέπλα του φόβου. Άκουγες πολλά, που σε τρόμαζαν. Τέτοιες δύσκολες ώρες, αλλάζουν οι άνθρωποι. Νύχτα φόρτωσαν τους μπόγους και τις βαλίτσες τους σε κάποιο καμιόνι κι εξαφανίστηκαν, για να μην τους πιάσουν οι Γερμανοί, που πλησίαζαν στην Αθήνα. Δεν τους είδαμε ξανά. Λες κι άνοιξε η γη και τους κατάπιε.' Tsiros 1988: 51-2.
'Άρχισαν να τους μαζεύουν οι ατσάλινοι στρατιώτες, να τους στοιβάζουν στα τρένα και να τους στέλνουν στη δική τους πατρίδα. Θα τους κάνουν κακό, Ανθούσα. Κάτι γνώριζε ο κύριος Ναούμ που πήρε νωρίς την οικογένειά του και πήγε στο Ναϊρόμπι. Δεν ξέρουμε αν είναι καλά εκεί, όμως τουλάχιστον είναι ζωντανοί.' Priovolou 2010: 153.

485 See, for instance:
'Από τη Θεσσαλονίκη πήραν χιλιάδες οικογένειες. Τα τρένα έφυγαν το ένα πίσω απ' το άλλο κατά το βοριά. Κανένας δεν ξέρει πού τους πήγαν και τι τους έκαμαν…' Psarafti 1987: 57-8.
'Μια ιστορία τραγική, αφού ο Αλκαλάι μέσα σε μια μέρα είχε χάσει όλους τους δικούς του: μάνα, πατέρα, αδέρφια, ξαδέρφια, θείους και παππούδες. Τους μάζεψαν όλους οι Γερμανοί, τους έβαλαν μέσα σ' ένα τρένο και τους έστειλαν στη Γερμανία. Ο Αλκαλάι ήταν σίγουρος πως όλοι είχαν πεθάνει. Εκείνος γλίτωσε γιατί έφυγε νωρίτερα.' Papamoschou 1995: 221.
'Μέναμε στη Θεσσαλονίκη, μα, μόλις ξέσπασε ο πόλεμος, κατεβήκαμε στην Αθήνα. Ελπίζαμε ότι θα ήταν καλύτερα. Αλλά δε βαριέσαι. Κι εδώ μάς βρήκανε. Μας πήρανε όλους, εκτός από το Αστεράκι και τα παιδιά της. Είχανε πάει βόλτα στην Ακρόπολη, γλιτώσανε από σύμπτωση.' Marra op. cit.: 140.

over again, acted alone in the execution of their Final Solution plans. At worst, the perpetrators were assisted by a few unspecified traitors, who gave them information about Jews in hiding.[486] The one and only occasion in which these traitors are given an actual identity is in Maria Lambadaridou-Pothou's 2014 novel *Συνέντευξη με το φάντασμα του βάλτου* (Interview with the Phantom of the Swamp): 'Dimitra told me that they were going to deport them. They have gathered twenty-nine people, all Jews, who were betrayed [to the Germans] *by our own folks.*'[487] This is the only passage in the entire corpus of the texts under examination that hints at the close collaboration between certain Greeks and the German occupiers in the persecution and deportation of Greek Jews.

But, again, this is a unique exception. In all the other books we find stories about compassionate Greeks who offered shelter to their persecuted Jewish friends and neighbours or helped them flee to remote villages,[488] about representatives of the official authorities and the Church who tried to save as many Jewish lives as possible,[489] and about the pivotal role of the Resistance in the protection and rescue of Greek Jews.[490] Consequently, the young reader becomes comfortably convinced that Greek society showed nothing but universal solidarity and a 'remarkable generosity of spirit' towards its

---

486 'Ξημερώματα, λίγες μέρες μετά τη φυγάδευση της Μύριαμ, ήρθε ένα φορτηγό των Γερμανών. *Μετά από προδοσία* πιάσαν μια οικογένεια Εβραίων, που κρυβόταν δίπλα στο σπίτι μας παράνομα.' Vogiatzoglou 1982: 60. Emphasis added.
487 'Από τη Δήμητρα έμαθα πως θα τους μπαρκάρουν. Έχουν συγκεντρώσει είκοσι εννέα άτομα, Εβραίους, που *τους κάρφωσαν οι δικοί μας*.' Lambadaridou-Pothou 2014: 92. Emphasis added.
488 Vogiatzoglou op. cit.: 57-60, Rodopoulou 1984: 64-6, Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1992: 86 and Kliafa op. cit.: 208-9.
489 Priovolou op. cit. and Kliafa op. cit.: 169.
490 Especially in Kliafa's novel.

persecuted Jews.[491] As comforting and reassuring as they may be, however, these tales of Greek Christian solidarity completely fail to explain why almost 86% of the native Jewish population perished during the Nazi occupation of Greece.[492]

The narrative of the good Greek Christian, the complacent idea that most Greek citizens helped their Jewish compatriots escape death or at least did nothing to contribute to their suffering, is one of the most deep-rooted and long-lived myths of post-war Greek society and still dominates collective perceptions and official national interpretations of Greek Christian responses to the Holocaust.[493] Since the post-war period, Greece has been portraying itself as a country that, unlike most other European nations, can only congratulate itself on its wartime stance towards its Jews.[494] Greece continued to hold on tight to the complacent myth of Greek Christian solidarity with the persecuted Jews even when the rest of the continent was starting to take its

---

491 Mazower 1993: 259. Mazower concludes his appraisal of Greek Christian responses to the Holocaust with the extremely favourable, and also highly undeserved, comment that 'overall, Orthodox Greeks showed a remarkable generosity of spirit towards the Jews which bears comparison with that of any other group in Europe.' Recent historical research has started to dismiss such generalisations as just another post-war national myth.

492 According to the official record of the Central Board of Jewish Communities in Greece, available at https://kis.gr/en/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=411&Itemid=74
It should also be noted here that the local rates of Jewish extermination/survival diverged sharply between regions. Thessaloniki, for example, a city with a vibrant pre-war community of Sephardic Jews lost 96% of its Jewish population during the Holocaust for a combination of reasons that is not possible to analyse here. At the same time on the other side of the country, the entire Greek Jewish community of Zakynthos was saved thanks to the efforts of the local authorities and the support of the native Christian population. For the fate of Jewish communities in different regions of Greece during the Holocaust see Kavala 2015, also available at https://repository.kallipos.gr/handle/11419/4437.

493 Antoniou and Moses 2018: 7. See also the sources cited in the current Greek school history textbook by Koliopoulos et al. for pupils in the last year of the *Lykeio*, pages 131-2.

494 Apostolou 2007, also available at https://forward.com/opinion/10385/greece-must-acknowledge-its-complicity-in-the-shoa/

skeletons out of the closet, engaging in a series of introspective debates about the role of their non-Jewish populations in supporting or facilitating the implementation of the Nazi designs for the extermination of the European Jewry. With the post-war state and Greek society in general showing very little interest in memorialising the drama of their own Jews, let alone embarking on a discussion about Greece's inherent responsibilities for the crimes that were perpetrated on its soil, the question of Greek Christian collaboration and indifference during the Holocaust became a massively taboo subject in public discourse, a topic that was not easily discussed except behind closed–mainly Jewish–doors.[495] The absence of any national or public discussion of the matter created an atmosphere that did not quite encourage the development of academic research into the Greek Jewish genocide. On the contrary, until very recently the subject has remained a minor and mostly marginal field in the historiography of the Greek 1940s.[496]

This situation, however, has recently started to change. In the past few years, the history of Greek Jews, and especially the tragic fate of the Jewish community of Thessaloniki during WWII, has started to attract considerable academic and public interest.[497] Evaded persistently for decades, the question

---

495 See further Apostolou 2010: 138-65.

496 For a comprehensive review of the historiographical, testimonial and literary output on the Greek experience of the Holocaust see Varon-Vassard 2008: 289-343. Varon-Vassard's article covers the period from the mid-1940s until the late 2000s.

497 See, for example, the works by Varon-Vassard 2012, Lampsa and Sibi 2012, Benveniste 2014, Molho 2015 and Antoniou and Moses (eds.) 2018. The latter is the first volume on the Holocaust in Greece published in English.
Particular mention should be also made of former mayor of Thessaloniki Giannis Boutaris and his unflagging efforts to embrace and highlight the Jewish heritage of the city. As a mayor, Boutaris has been very vocal about the genocide of the Thessalonican Jews, even wearing a Star of David at his re-election swearing-in ceremony in 2014. The devastating fate of the

of Greek Christian collaboration in and indifference to the suffering of the Greek Jews is now beginning to play a more central part in the academic and public discourse on the Shoah in Greece.[498] And although Greek society is still far from confronting the skeletons in its closet, the recent decision to build a Holocaust Memorial Museum and Educational Centre in the city of Thessaloniki has provided strong foundation for the emergence of a new commemorative culture seeking, moreover, to open up a more honest and unprejudiced discussion about the Greek experience of the Holocaust, about, to borrow the words of Thessaloniki's former mayor Giannis Boutaris, 'everything that happened, everything we did and, most importantly, everything we could not or did not want to do, all of us, natives and refugees, leftists and rightists, during and after the War.'[499] And maybe, when that happens, it will also open the door to a more honest treatment of the subject in books for young readers.

---

city's Jewish community was also the theme of Manousos Manousakis's 2015 film *Cloudy Sunday* (original title *Ouzeri Tsitsanis*), based on George Skabardonis's 2001 novel of the same title. The film was a commercial success attracting over 75.000 viewers during the first two weekends of its release.

498 See, for example, Carabott 2011: 253-94, Molho op. cit., Saltiel 2017 and Antoniou and Moses op. cit. For an earlier discussion on the subject see Apostolou 2000: 165-96.

In November 2014, during the inauguration of a long-overdue commemorative monument on the site of the destroyed ancient Jewish cemetery that is now the home of the main campus of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Boutaris openly and candidly addressed the issue saying that 'today [the city] can admit its shame for all those Thessalonicans who collaborated with the occupiers, for all those who seized the properties of their Jewish neighbours, for all those who betrayed their Jewish compatriots who tried to escape.' Boutaris's speech is also available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k1-ADWkujgU

499 See Boutaris's speech on the commemoration of the National Day of Remembrance for Victims and Heroes of the Holocaust on 28.01.2018, also available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OYLjBqFv86Y

THE MANY FACES OF THE RESISTANCE

Four months before the cataclysmic events of November 1989, Greece experienced its own transition to the post-Cold War era. As has been mentioned in a previous chapter, this transition took the form of an unlikely, and for many 'unholy', political alliance between the forces of the Left and the Right. Loaded with symbolism, the 1989 coalition government that saw power shared between the two old Civil War rivals was regarded as marking the end of the Cold War era in Greece.[500]

As also happened in most other European countries, the collapse of the Cold War divisions in Greece was followed by an upsurge of historiographical and public interest in the 1940s. The post-1989 period saw the emergence of a new generation of historians and other scholars of the Greek 1940s who challenged old historiographical certainties and put new questions at the heart of their research agenda. Radically challenging PASOK's narrative of a united National Resistance, a large part of the historiographical discourse was now about the internal disunities of the 1941-1944 struggle for liberation. The interest in the ugly aspects of the Resistance also extended to the public sphere, reviving old controversies and sparking new debates among professional and self-proclaimed historians, intellectuals and the general public. The memory of the 1940s continued to cast a long shadow over Greek society throughout the period 1990-2014 and became one of the main historical prisms through which crisis-stricken Greeks viewed their current

500 See chapter 1 in Part II.

predicament. This chapter sets out to explore whether these developments were also reflected in the representation of the Resistance in books for young readers published between 1990 and 2014.

As I have shown in Parts I and II, the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* painted an essentially depoliticised picture of the Resistance. In their stories there is no massive resistance movement, only a few patriotic 'organisations' or isolated individuals engaging in subversive activities against the occupiers. In line with the new national narrative about the Resistance, the authors of the second period of the *metapolitefsi* shifted their focus from the individual hero onto the 'people' (λαός). Whether the Resistance had been led by EAM or the Greek 'people' in general, the idea that it had been a patriotic movement for liberation that united the entire nation forms a common ideological thread running through the stories of this period. Another observation that has been made in these chapters is that, with the exception of EAM and its affiliates, the contribution of all other major or minor resistance organisations remained completely unacknowledged in the books published between 1974 and 1989. As I will go on to show next, however, this was not the case with the young people's fiction of the period 1990-2014.

In Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's 1992 novel *Τραγούδι για τρεις* (Song for Three) Philippos and Christina are two teenage friends who work on a school presentation about the Nazi Occupation of Greece and the National Resistance. While working on their project, Philippos and Christina meet Lefteris, a former resistance fighter who befriends the children and offers to help them with their research. When Christina asks Lefteris about his

experience of the Resistance, she is surprised to hear that there had been quite a large number of organisations that had fought for the liberation of Greece:

> Were there many who fought in the Resistance? Of course! They could make up an entire army, considering how many organisations there were back then. -What do you mean? Christina asked surprised. But I thought that there were just two or three? EAM, EDES… No, he says. Those were the biggest ones, but there were also many other organisations, he can't remember the exact number. There was PEAN, the Sacred Brigade, National Action, ESAS, PAN… There was also ELAS in the mountains and EKKA and so many other organisations, smaller or bigger, but all equally admirable.[501]

Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's novel is not the only book on the list that acknowledged the contribution of the minor organisations and armed groups that operated in the Resistance. From EDES and its guerrilla warfare in the mountains of Epirus[502] to the underground network of Lela Karagianni,[503] and from Ioannis Tsigantes's Midas 614 organisation[504] to the heroic action of Rosalia/Augusta, the so-called crazy lady of Exarcheia,[505] the authors of the period 1990-2014 talked extensively about the contribution of the lesser-known figures and groups of the Resistance whose memory had been largely marginalised in the post-1974 period, as a result of the excessive glorification and widespread national preoccupation with the EAM epic.

---

501 'Αν ήταν πολλοί στην Αντίσταση; Και βέβαια ήταν. Στρατός ολόκληρος, αν τις υπολογίσεις όλες μαζί τόσες πολλές οργανώσεις! -Πολλές; ξαφνιάζεται η Χριστίνα. Μα δυο τρεις δεν ήταν μονάχα; Το ΕΑΜ, ο ΕΔΕΣ… Όχι, της λέει. Αυτές ήταν οι μεγαλύτερες, αλλά υπήρχαν κι άλλες πολλές, δε θυμάται ακριβώς πόσες. Η ΠΕΑΝ, η Ιερή Ταξιαρχία, το Ενωτικό Κόμμα, η Εθνική Δράση, η ΕΣΑΣ, η ΠΑΝ… Ήταν και ο ΕΛΑΣ στα βουνά, και η ΕΚΚΑ, κι άλλες ένα σωρό, μικρές ή μεγάλες, αλλά όλες θαυματουργές.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1992: 99.
502 See Kliafa 2011 and Psarafti 2011.
503 See Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1992 and Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 2006.
504 See Lambadaridou-Pothou 2014.
505 See Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 2007.

This 'favouritism' in respect of the commemoration of the left-wing Resistance was also reflected in the books of the previous decades. As has been pointed out in Parts I and II, when not focusing on EAM or one of its affiliates, authors writing in the period 1974-1989 spoke generally and vaguely of some secret patriotic 'organisations' and other resistance 'groups'. In other words, if not associated with EAM and the left-wing movement these 'organisations' were condemned to anonymity and historical obscurity.

However, this changed largely after 1989. Without belittling EAM and its leading role in the national liberation struggle, the authors of the period 1990-2014 offered a wider and much more balanced picture of the Resistance, a picture which also paid tribute to the contribution of the minor or lesser-known organisations, armed groups and clandestine cells of the non-EAM bloc that fought for the liberation of Greece. The fact that this shift came about at a time when the investigation of the memory of the non-EAM Resistance was becoming one of the biggest trends in the historiography of the Greek 1940s is another tangible manifestation of the relationship between changing national perspectives on the Resistance and the representation of this period in books for young readers.[506]

Another topic that invites discussion is the question of women's participation in the Resistance. As has been pointed out in previous chapters, in earlier stories the female characters are presented as helping the resistance effort mostly by undertaking tasks of an auxiliary character and that are

506 For a presentation of the non-EAM organisations of the Resistance see Fleischer 1995: 11-66, Lymberatos 2007: 9-67 and Chatzivasileiou 2008: 255-85.

within the accepted boundaries of their traditional gender role. As I will go on to show next, however, this image changed radically in the books written between 1990 and 2014.

Starting with Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's *Τραγούδι για τρεις*, Olga is a young girl with plans to pursue higher education and become a teacher. Her dreams, however, are shattered when her family refuses to allow her to continue her studies. Instead, she is expected to conform to the traditional role that Greek patriarchal society demanded from all proper, marriageable girls of the 1940s: '"enough school for you" [aunt Ilectra] kept telling her. "Your duty now is to help with the housework", "it's time to start preparing your dowry" and other things like that that made Olga crazy.'[507] Free-spirited and with a thirst for life, Olga breaks free from social confinements and takes control of her life through her participation in the Resistance. Her struggle is one for both national liberation and emancipation: 'At least in the Resistance she would be able to do a lot more than "dowries" and things like that.'[508]

Olga participates in all the major protests and demonstrations of the Resistance, she shelters an Italian fugitive, transports missives and guns to the underground forces and undertakes various clandestine activities in collaboration with Theodosis, who is a member of EAM, and his brother Menelaos, who is organised in the rival EDES. Both in love with her, the two

---

507 '«Φτάνει πια τόσα γράμματα» της έλεγε κάθε τόσο. «Να βοηθάς περισσότερο τώρα στο σπίτι, που είμαστε έτσι πολλοί», «ώρα να φτιάξεις την προίκα σου» κι άλλα τέτοια που τη νευρίαζαν.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 1992: 95.
508 'Στην Αντίσταση, τουλάχιστον, θα έκανε κάτι πολύ πιο σημαντικό από «προίκες» και τέτοια.' Ibid.

men pressurise Olga to join their respective organisations and forbid her from collaborating with each other's political rivals. Olga, however, completely disregards Theodosis and Menelaos's attempts to exercise their male authority over her and continues to assist both organisations without them knowing it. When someone asks her 'which organisation was she working for after all? Was she with Menelaos or with Theodosis?' Olga exclaims that she is 'with Greece! […] With all Greeks, no matter where they belong. […] I am with everyone.'[509]

By refusing to align herself with one particular organisation or political side, Olga embodies the spirit of National Resistance which, according to the national narrative, managed to unite all Greeks in a patriotic consensus against the occupiers. It is worth noting here that while Theodosis and Menelaos's motives for joining their respective organisations are primarily political, Olga's stance originates in what Janet Hart calls 'defensive nationalism', a genuine love of one's homeland and determination to defend it against outside invasion, which Hart found to be the most commonly-cited motives in her interviews with women veterans of the Greek Resistance.[510]

---

509 Ήθελα, ωστόσο, να μάθω ένα πράγμα: Εκείνη για ποια οργάνωση δούλευε τελικά; Με το Μενέλαο ήταν ή με το Θεοδόση; -Με την Ελλάδα! μου απάντησε και τα μάτια της άστραψαν. Με όλους τους Έλληνες, όποιοι κι αν είναι. Κι άσε το Μενέλαο και το Θεοδόση να νομίζει ο καθένας τους πως είμαι μόνο μαζί του. Εγώ είμαι με όλους.' Ibid.: 95-6. One could say that Olga's words here recall the words of Ilectra Apostolou, an iconic figure of the left-wing Resistance who was tortured and murdered by Greek collaborators in July 1944. Apostolou is especially remembered for her patriotic answers to her interrogator: '-Από πού είσαι; -Από την Ελλάδα! -Πού κατοικείς; -Στην Ελλάδα! -Πώς σε λένε; -Είμαι Ελληνίδα! -Ποιοι είναι οι συνεργάτες σου; -Όλοι οι Έλληνες!' Recorded in Bartziotas 1983: 255.
510 Hart 1990: 56.

Olga's story, however, does not end happily. After a series of fatal misunderstandings, Olga is arrested by the German authorities when she is revealed to have been sheltering an Italian fugitive. In an interesting blending of history and fiction, Petrovits-Androutsopoulou has her heroine die heroically next to Lela Karagianni, an iconic figure of the Greek Resistance who was executed by German firing squads on September 8, 1944.[511] Following the example of the legendary *Souliotisses*, Olga, Lela Karagianni and the other arrested women of the Resistance accept their destiny with formidable bravery and perish one after another, singing and dancing before the firing squad.[512]

History and fiction are also blended together in the scene of Anthousa's death in Eleni Priovolou's 2010 novel *Τσόκο Μπλοκ* (Tsoko Bloc). Anthousa is a feisty young girl who works for the Resistance from the ranks of a fictitious organisation with the symbolic name 'Soldiers of Peace'. Anthousa devotes herself to the national liberation cause, undertakes dangerous missions, participates in acts of sabotage and works as a volunteer nurse for the Red Cross. As the resistance movement grows bigger and fiercer, Anthousa decides

---

511 For Lela Karagianni and her action in the Greek Resistance see Zaousis 2004.

512 'Ήτανε, λέει, μαζί και η Μπουμπουλίνα, που έστελνε με καΐκια στη Μέση Ανατολή Εγγλέζους κι Έλληνες αγωνιστές. Ναι, κι εκείνη μαζί με την Όλγα στα πολυβόλα μπροστά, κι άλλες τρεις τέσσερις κοπέλες και άντρες πολλοί… «Σταθείτε περήφανοι σαν Έλληνες» είπε η Μπουμπουλίνα στους άντρες. «Πιαστείτε να χορέψουμε σαν τις Σουλιώτισσες» φώναξε ύστερα στις γυναίκες. Κι έτσι, χορεύοντας, έσβησαν μία μία. Έτσι. Χορεύοντας.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou op. cit.: 166. Lela Karagianni was also known as the 'Bouboulina' of the Greek Resistance. 'Bouboulina' is also the name that Karagianni gave to her resistance group in honour of Laskarina Bouboulina, a heroine of the 1821 Greek War of Independence.

According to the national narrative, during the Souliote War in 1803, the women of Souli (*Souliotisses*) decided to take their own and their children's lives rather than surrender to Ali Pasha's troops. Legend has it that they did so by throwing themselves off a cliff while singing and dancing. Since then, the self-sacrificing *Souliotisses* have become a national symbol of defiance, freedom and female honour.

to flee to the mountains and become an *andartissa*. When she reveals her plans to her little brother, Tsoko, he tries to convince her to stay at home with the argument: 'But you are a girl!' to which Anthousa responds: 'Yes, but with the heart of a lion.'[513]

Anthousa returns from the mountains deeply disheartened by the discord that had begun to plague the resistance movement. Committed to the cause of national liberation, she participates in the mass demonstration of July 1943 against the German plans to expand the Bulgarian zone of occupation into central Macedonia. Her death in the demonstration is one of a true heroine:

> A flame, a girl that looked like a flame, broke away from the human chain and stood before the tank, with her bare arms up in the air.
>
> 'Come back' we shouted.
>
> But the girl thought that she was a mountain. That she was Mount Olympus, immortal, like its immortal Gods. And the tank ran over her. It crushed her. People started to cry and shout 'Peace'. And then another girl, I couldn't see her very well, they were saying that she approached the tank and…
>
> 'Look' I heard people saying. 'The girl jumped on the tank like a feline!'
>
> 'She is hitting the driver on the head with her shoe.'
>
> And then I heard my father's voice:
>
> 'Anthousa, get down! Anthousa, get down from there! Anthousaaaaa….'
>
> And then the sound of gunfire. My God, no. Anthousa, my dear sister.[514]

---

513 '«Πού θα πας, Ανθούσα;»
«Στα ψηλά βουνά, σοκολατάκι. Στις ελεύθερες βουνοκορφές, να πολεμήσω για την ειρήνη».
«Μα είσαι κορίτσι», βρήκα επιχείρημα.
«Με καρδιά λιονταριού όμως», απάντησε.' Priovolou 2010: 133.
514 'Μια φλόγα, μια κοπέλα που έμοιαζε με φλόγα, ξέκοψε από την αλυσίδα και πυρωμένη ύψωσε τα γυμνά της χέρια και στάθηκε μπροστά στο τανκ.

Blurring the boundaries between history and fiction, Anthousa's death pays homage to the memory of Koula Lili, the actual girl who was shot dead in the demonstration of July 22 after she tried to attack the German driver of the armoured vehicle with her shoe.[515] This is another occasion in which a real historical event becomes woven into the fictional plot, blurring the boundaries between history and fictional retellings of the past.

Besides their courage, uncompromising devotion to the struggle for liberation and heroic deaths, Olga and Anthousa share one more common characteristic. Both heroines become symbols of the united National Resistance, Olga through her determination to assist the collective struggle by working secretly for two antagonistic resistance organisations and Anthousa through her death. Bringing to mind Olga's words 'I am with Greece!', Anthousa dies in the arms of her loved ones, uttering 'mother, don't cry for me, I am Greek.'[516] In one of the last scenes of the novel, Anthousa's funeral is attended by all the representatives of the 'Soldiers of Peace', who put aside their political differences and come together to bid their heroine farewell, singing songs of freedom over her coffin.

«Γύρνα πίσω», της φωνάζαμε.
Όμως εκείνη θαρρούσε πως ήταν βουνό. Πως ήταν ο Όλυμπος ο ίδιος, άτρωτος όπως οι θεοί του. Και το τανκ πέρασε από πάνω της. Τη συνέθλιψε.
Όλοι έκλαιγαν και φώναζαν «Ειρήνη». Και μετά ένα άλλο κορίτσι, δεν το διέκρινα καλά, το ύψος μου δε βοηθούσε, έλεγαν πως πλησίασε το τανκ και… «Κοιτάξτε!» ακούστηκε να λένε. «Το κορίτσι πήδηξε σαν αίλουρος πάνω στο τανκ!»
«Κοπανάει τον οδηγό του με το παπούτσι της στο κεφάλι».
Και ξαφνικά ακούστηκε η φωνή του πατέρα μου:
«Ανθούσα, κατέβα! Ανθούσα, φύγε από κει! Ανθούσαααααα…»
Κι έπειτα μια ριπή. Όχι, Θεέ μου. Ανθούσα, αδελφούλα μου.' Ibid.: 152.
515 The other murdered girl was Panagiota Stathopoulou. Stathopoulou's death is also alluded to in Pepi Daraki's 1983 novel *Τα περιστέρια του καμπαναριού*.
516 'Μανούλα, μη λυπάσαι, είμαι Ελληνίδα…' Priovolou op. cit.: 153.

Another example of a female character with agency is Rebecca, the young heroine of Maroula Kliafa's 2011 novel *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα* (A Ballad for Rebecca). Kliafa's novel is of particular interest because, among other reasons, it is the first Greek book for young people to feature a Jewish protagonist.

Rebecca is a Jewish girl who was raised in a supportive, enlightened environment. Contrary to Olga who is pressured to conform to the circumscribed role that her family and society expected from her, 'it's time to start preparing your dowry', Rebecca's family encourages her to carve her own path in life away from social conventions and rigid gender expectations: '"your dowry is your mind and hands. Rely on your own strengths. Always strive to be independent" [her father] used to tell her.'[517]

Living in a provincial town in Thessaly, one of the strongholds of the left-wing Resistance, Rebecca is one of the first members to join the local EPON branch. Like the other two heroines discussed previously, Rebecca throws herself to the struggle, she undertakes various missions, she distributes EAM pamphlets, writes slogans on the walls and participates in all the local protests against the occupying authorities.

Yet, unlike the other two heroines, in Rebecca's case it is not quite the experience of the Resistance that marks her passage into the realm of emotional adulthood. Rather, it is the deportation of her Jewish mother and brother and her own confinement in the attic of a watermill, where she spent

---

517 '«Προίκα σου είναι το μυαλό σου και τα χέρια σου. Στηρίξου στις δικές σου δυνάμεις. Μάθε να είσαι ανεξάρτητη» συνήθιζε να λέει.' Kliafa op. cit.: 107.

months in complete isolation hiding from the Germans, that set the heroine off on a painful journey of self-discovery to emotional maturity. I will come back to this topic in a subsequent chapter.

And while the last scene of the novel finds Rebecca free and ready to embrace her new life, the story ends bitterly for Dimitra, the heroine of Maria Lambadaridou-Pothou's 2014 novel *Συνέντευξη με το φάντασμα του βάλτου* (Interview with the Phantom of the Swamp). A time-slip novel, the book follows a young journalism student as she travels back in time, seeking to uncover the truth behind a series of events that took place during the Occupation and led to a number of devastating deaths. Using the diary of her late grandfather and an amber bead with supernatural powers, Dimitra travels back in time and witnesses the tragic love story between her great-grandmother, Dimitra, and Andrew.

Beautiful, well-educated and free-spirited, Dimitra has a central role in the development of the local resistance movement, which includes her collaborating closely with members of the British Intelligence Corps. The only woman of a small clandestine group, Dimitra works next to Andrew. Dimitra and Andrew fall in love and the heroine becomes pregnant with their child.

The young couple's relationship comes to a tragic end when Andrew is murdered by a group of Germans and local collaborators. Following Andrew's death and the revelation of her pregnancy, Dimitra is forced into an arranged marriage by her family. Loyal to Andrew's memory, Dimitra escapes the marriage and decides to raise her child alone. And while Olga and Anthousa die as true heroines of the Resistance, Dimitra dies alone and disavowed by

her family a few days after she has given birth to her daughter, murdered by a gang of right-wing extremists.

Decades after her death and while her family had doomed her to oblivion, young Dimitra vows to honour the memory of her great-grandmother by turning her story into a novel: 'I will mourn you. Three generations later, I will cry for you.'[518] Similarly, in *Τραγούδι για τρεις* Christina vows to keep Olga's memory alive after she learns about her heroic life and death: 'She wants to talk about Olga as much as possible. She wants to never forget about her.'[519]

Christina, however, is devastated to discover that both Theodosis and Menelaos have erased Olga from their memory. Despite their past feelings for Olga and Christina's persistent efforts to get them to talk about her and her participation in the Resistance, both men seem to have forgotten about her existence.[520] Moreover, the two men ridicule the idea that women had any significant part to play in the struggle for liberation: 'Well, there were a few women [in the Resistance] but their role was limited. […] These are the things you need to know about. Not about women's contributions and nonsense like

---

518 'Σβήνω τη λάμπα θυέλλης και πατώ στις μύτες των ποδιών, σφίγγοντας ακόμα το σάλι της όμορφης Δήμητρας στον κόρφο μου και κρατώντας τη φωτογραφία τους σαν το πιο ιερό κειμήλιο. Εγώ θα σε πενθήσω, της λέω. Τρεις γενιές μετά, εγώ θα κλάψω για σένα.' Lambadaridou-Pothou op. cit.: 63.
519 'Όμως η Χριστίνα θέλει τώρα να τον κάνει να μιλάει για κείνη όσο περισσότερο γίνεται. Θέλει να συζητούν για την Όλγα συχνά. Θέλει να μην την ξεχάσουν ποτέ.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou op. cit.: 161.
520 'Τώρα και των δύο η μνήμη την είχε καταδικάσει σε θάνατο. Και των δύο.' Ibid.: 184.

that.'[521] After all, as Menelaos points out to Christina, 'women are good for taking care of their homes and babies, not for taking up arms.'[522]

Seeking to subvert such prejudices, Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou, Eleni Priovolou, Maroula Kliafa and Maria Lambadaridou-Pothou have created some of the most interesting, complex and empowered female characters in the young people's fiction that engages with the Greek 1940s. Olga, Anthousa, Rebecca and Dimitra are all heroines who cross the boundaries of domesticity and enter the public space, challenging traditional perceptions of womanhood. Moreover, in sharp contrast to the texts of the two previous decades, these heroines' activities extend to all aspects of the resistance movement; from sabotage and espionage work to political activism to entering the battlefield, a traditionally 'masculine' field, and taking up arms against the enemies.

Reflecting modern cultural discourses on female empowerment, this trend for highlighting the role of the female actors of the Resistance coincided with the emergence of a new generation of women scholars who have gone on to engage extensively with this area. Historians Tasoula Vervenioti, Janet Hart and Margaret Poulos as well as documentary filmmaker Alinda Dimitriou, to name but a few, have devoted a significant portion of their work to issues of

---

521 '«-Ε, ήταν και γυναίκες, πώς δεν ήταν... Και πολλές και γνωστές. Προσωπικά όμως, δε θυμάμαι τίποτα το ιδιαίτερο να σας αναφέρω... Βοηθούσαν μερικές και στον τομέα μου, όσο γινόταν. Σε δευτερεύοντα πράγματα, όμως. Δε θυμάμαι τώρα κάτι συγκεκριμένο…» […] «-Α, ναι! Ε, είπαμε, λοιπόν... Ήταν και κάποιες γυναίκες. Αφοσιωμένες, δε λέω, αλλά με δράση περιορισμένη. […] Να! Αυτά πρέπει να βάλετε να σας πουν εκείνοι που τα έζησαν, για να δείτε τι τραβούσε ο κόσμος και τι σπατάλες γίνονται σήμερα! Όχι για γυναικείες προσφορές και κολοκύθια».' Ibid.: 158 and 182-3.
522 'Οι γυναίκες είναι για το σπίτι και τα παιδιά, δεν είναι για τα φισεκλίκια…' Ibid.: 180.

female mobilisation and participation in the Greek Resistance, a trend that began in roughly the mid-1990s and is still going strong to this day.[523]

Yet what is perhaps the most tangible manifestation of the relationship between changing perspectives on the Resistance and their impact on the representation of this subject in books written for young readers, is the breaking of the wall of silence that had previously shrouded the issue of the internal divisions in the Resistance. In line with the dominant national narrative, authors in the period 1974-1989 painted a rosy picture of the Resistance, emphasising its quasi-united character, while avoiding all discussion of the civil strife that broke out between the main resistance organisations. As has been discussed in the introductory chapter of this Part, this reassuring image of the Resistance was essentially dismantled in the 1990s and replaced by a new historiographical discourse that brought the less savoury aspects of the 1941-1944 struggle for liberation into the limelight of public interest and controversy.

Young people's fiction was extremely quick to respond to these developments. Published in 1992, Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's *Τραγούδι για τρεις* was the first book for young readers to deal with the subject of the wartime civil strife that broke out between the communist-dominated EAM movement and its strongest bourgeois rival, EDES. Adopting the classic

523 See, for instance, Vervenioti 1994, Hart 1996 and Poulos 2009. Dimitriou's documentaries are available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LaPDzGVJK5o and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hKseJ8_ty_o. The first, *Πουλιά στο βάλτο* (Birds in the Swamp), was released in 2008 and explores the role of women in the Greek Resistance, while *Η ζωή στους βράχους* (Among the Rocks) came out in 2009 and focuses on women's experience of the Civil War.

brother-against-brother trope, Petrovits-Androutsopoulou focused on the devastating effects that the internecine struggle for supremacy had on the lives of her characters. The main actors of the fratricidal drama here are Theodosis and Menelaos, two brothers who share a strong bond and an even stronger passion for national liberation. Their relationship, however, begins to suffer after Theodosis joins EAM, while Menelaos enlists in EDES.[524] The escalating tensions between the two antagonistic resistance organisations are reflected in the increasingly tense relationship between the two brothers, who start to become more and more aggressive towards each other:

> At first, they only raised their voices and their anger did not last for long. But as the months passed, their quarrels got worse. The two brothers exchanged heavy words: -You are traitors of the country, you and your friends, said Menelaos. -You are traitors, traitors and sellouts, Theodosis yelled back.[525]

Throughout the novel, Theodosis and Menelaos's relationship serves as the main prism through which the young reader gains historical insight into the central events and upheavals of the Resistance. Following the cooperation between ELAS and EDES in the preparations for the destruction of the Gorgopotamos Bridge, an event that came to symbolise the spirit of the united

---

524 'Ήταν αγαπημένοι εκείνο τον καιρό, τους πρώτους μήνες της Κατοχής. Πολλές φορές μιλούσαν κρυφά ή κοιτάζονταν με οι δυο τους με νόημα. Και στη ματιά τους ένιωθες το χνούδι της αγάπης. Έβγαιναν νύχτα μαζί και προσπαθούσαν να μάθουν νέα για τη μάχη που συνεχιζόταν στην Κρήτη. Κι όταν έπεσε και η Κρήτη στα χέρια των Γερμανών, μαζί αγωνιούσαν για τη γερμανική επίθεση στη Ρωσία. Ώσπου ήρθε το φθινόπωρο του '41. Και τότε άρχισαν οι καβγάδες.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou op. cit.: 47.

525 'Τον πρώτο καιρό ύψωναν μονάχα τη φωνή κι ο θυμός τους δεν κρατούσε πολύ. Όσο περνούσαν οι μήνες, όμως, τόσο οι τσακωμοί χειροτέρευαν. Κοφτερό μαχαίρι γινόταν το βλέμμα τους. Κι άλλαζαν τ' αδέρφια κουβέντες βαριές. -Είσαστε προδότες της πατρίδας, κι εσύ και οι φίλοι σου, έλεγε ο Μενέλαος. -Εσείς είσαστε οι προδότες κι οι πουλημένοι, του φώναζε ο Θεοδόσης.' Ibid.: 47-8.

National Resistance and whose significance is also emphasised in the novel,[526] the two brothers become reconciled and restore their relationship. Just as happened with the two rival organisations, however, their reconciliation proved to be short-lived. Their relationship is shattered for good following the execution of EKKA's leader Dimitrios Psarros by ELAS in April 1944, one of the darkest and most controversial events of the Greek Resistance.[527] The disagreements between the main resistance forces are transferred to the household of the two brothers, whose quarrels are now starting to take a much more aggressive form:

> The news spread that EKKA had clashed with ELAS in the mountains. EKKA's leader was killed. Theodosis and Menelaos came to blows. 'You are Fascists' said one, 'you are traitors' the other replied… They knocked over a chair, they broke a glass and Nefeli's porcelain doll fell down and cracked…[528]

Seeing the distress that their heated disagreements are causing to their family, Theodosis and Menelaos decide to flee to the mountains and fight the occupiers from the ranks of their respective organisations. And while the two brothers survive the hostilities and return to their peaceful lives after Liberation, life becomes even more complicated after the end of the Occupation

---

526 Philippos's school organises a celebration to commemorate the destruction of the Gorgopotamos Bridge. Lefteris, who had participated in the operation, is excited to hear about this initiative: '-Σπουδαία γιορτή αυτή, της Εθνικής Αντίστασης, ενθουσιάζεται. Μπράβο! Μπράβο που σκεφτήκατε τέτοια εκδήλωση!' However, Lefteris avoids giving a straightforward answer to Christina, who wants to know the name of his Resistance organisation. Instead, he replies: 'Το πιο σημαντικό είναι ότι εκεί, τότε [in Gorgopotamos] ήμασταν όλοι. Όλοι μαζί. Αυτό να θυμάσαι πάντα!' Ibid.: 189 and 212.

527 For Psaros's assassination and a portrait of EKKA see Lymberatos op. cit.: 43-6.

528 'Κι ήρθε ο Απρίλης. Και τρίτη μέρα του Πάσχα του 1944 έγινε στο σπίτι ο πιο μεγάλος καβγάς. Μαθεύτηκε ότι την προηγούμενη μέρα είχαν συμπλακεί στο βουνό η ΕΚΚΑ με τον ΕΛΑΣ. Τον αρχηγό της ΕΚΚΑ τον σκότωσαν. Κι ο Θεοδόσης με το Μενέλαο ήρθαν στο χέρια. «Είσαστε φασίστες» ο ένας, «είσαστε προδότες» ο άλλος… Αναποδογύρισε μια καρέκλα, έσπασε κάποιο ποτήρι, έπεσε κάτω της Νεφέλης η κούκλα και ράισε.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou op. cit.: 136.

for Nefeli, the young heroine in Eleni Dikaiou's 1996 novel *Αναζητώντας τους χαμένους ήρωες* (Looking for Lost Heroes).

Dealing mainly with the Civil War, Dikaiou's novel also touches upon the subject of the ideological polarisations and escalating political tensions in the Resistance that paved the way for the outbreak of the full-scale Civil War. Also adopting the brother-against-brother and friend-against-friend trope, Dikaiou tells the story of the internecine strife through the story of Athanasia and Angeliki, two childhood friends who also share a friendship with Nefeli. However, this changes dramatically after the emergence of the resistance movement, which brings out the girls' irreconcilable ideological differences and drives them further and further apart. Coming from a leftist background, Angeliki joins the EAM movement and pressures Nefeli to follow her example. Athanasia, on the other hand, warns Nefeli against involving herself with the communists and their evil plans to turn Greece into a Soviet state.[529] Refusing to take sides, Nefeli watches her friends as each turns into the other's most hated enemy, until she also gets caught up in the fratricidal drama.

Moving forward to 2010, Eleni Priovolou's *Τσόκο Μπλοκ* is another novel that did not shy away from showing the ugly face of the Resistance. The internecine strife for hegemony over the resistance movement is reflected in the fighting that breaks out between a group of schoolchildren, who are responsible for

529 'Στ' αλήθεια δεν μπορούσε να θυμηθεί η Νεφέλη πότε άρχισε αυτό, όμως σίγουρα ήταν μετά που ανέβηκαν ο Οδυσσέας κι ο Λουκάς, τα δίδυμα αδέρφια της Αγγελικής, στο βουνό, όταν φίλησε την Αθανασία για πρώτη φορά σαν αρραβωνιαστικός και χάθηκε ένα βράδυ κι ο Ορέστης. Τότε που άρχισε να φουντώνει η αντίσταση κι η Αγγελική τής έλεγε να οργανωθεί στην ΕΠΟΝ, μα η Αθανασία την έπαιρνε κρυφά και τη φόβιζε να μην ανακατευτεί με τους κομουνιστές, γιατί όταν θα 'φευγαν οι Γερμανοί, θα 'καναν ό,τι έκαναν και στη Ρωσία.' Dikaiou 1996: 16-7.

managing a soup kitchen. Working together at first, Tsoko's classmates soon split up into three rival groups and begin arguing over which team should be in charge of the soup kitchen. Their disagreements soon take a violent turn, which serves as a parallel to the violence that erupted between the main resistance forces:

> War in the middle of the war. Violence [broke out] among our classmates over which team should be in control of the soup kitchens. […] They ended up fighting over the soup kitchens. If they don't come to their senses, they will start slaughtering each other after the enemies leave. And the war among brothers is the worst kind of war.[530]

In a drastic departure from the 'happy-ever-after' stories of the early *metapolitefsi*, the authors of this period refused to give their readers the reassuring closure they might have hoped for. To return to Priovolou's novel, despite their brief reconciliation over Anthousa's coffin, the 'Soldiers of Peace' go back to fighting against each other, even after the country has been liberated and the occupiers are gone. In a bitter yet historically honest ending that would have been rather unthinkable thirty years earlier, the last scene of the novel finds Tsoko sitting on Anthousa's grave, talking to his dead sister about the fratricidal war that is now beginning to engulf the nation: 'It's autumn now, Anthousa. We can still smell the blood. But the chrysanthemums are blooming. The Steel Soldiers are gone… But the war is

---

530 'Πόλεμος στη μέση του πολέμου. Βία μεταξύ των συμμαθητών μας για το ποια ομάδα θα ηγείται στα συσσίτια. […] Έφταναν μέχρι το μπουνίδι και την κλοτσοπατινάδα, για να έχουν την αρχηγία στα συσσίτια και μόλις φύγει ο εχθρός, αν δεν έχουν βάλει μυαλό, θα αιματοκυλιστούν. Κι ο αδελφοσκοτωμός –εμφύλιο σπαραγμό τον έλεγε– είναι ο χειρότερος πόλεμος.' Priovolou op. cit.: 93 and 140.

not over, Anthousa. The Soldiers of Peace are fighting against each other. With real arms.'[531]

Almost twenty-five years after the critically acclaimed *Το διπλό ταξίδι* (The Double Voyage, 1987), Litsa Psarafti returned to the Greek 1940s with the rather controversial novel *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου* (The Fugitives of the Castle Tower, 2011). Published two years after the release of Pantelis Voulgaris's much-debated Civil War film *Ψυχή Βαθιά* (A Soul So Deep, 2009), the novel is set during the immediate post-liberation period and engages with the contentious subject of the so-called *pedomazoma*.[532] The novel divided critics with some of them accusing the author of conveying a blatantly anti-communist view of the Civil War in her book. I will return to this topic in the next chapter.

Starting in *medias res*, the opening scene of the novel follows fourteen-year-old Stelios and his little sister, Marianthi, as they are being taken away from their village by the communist guerrillas of DSE on a cold spring day of 1948. At this point a flashback scene transfers the reader back to the Occupation, offering him a glimpse of the events that led to the outbreak of the Civil War.

As was the case with the authors previously discussed, Psarafti traces the origins of the Civil War to the disunities within the Resistance. Accordingly, the novel deals extensively with the issue of civil strife that broke out between

---

531 'Είναι φθινόπωρο, Ανθούσα. Μυρίζει ακόμη αίμα. Αλλά τα χρυσάνθεμα άνθισαν. Έφυγαν οι ατσάλινοι στρατιώτες... Όμως ο πόλεμος δεν τελείωσε, Ανθούσα. Οι Στρατιώτες της Ειρήνης άρχισαν να πολεμούν μεταξύ τους. Με αληθινά όπλα.' Ibid.: 154. The last sentence clearly alludes to the *Dekemvriana*.

532 That is to say, the forced evacuation of Greek children from the communist-controlled rural territories and their relocation to neighbouring socialist countries of the Eastern Bloc.

the EAM/ELAS camp and EDES. What is interesting here, however, is that in Psarafti's book the two organisations' struggle for national liberation is completely overshadowed by their bloody efforts to destroy each other and pave the way for their future political dominance in post-war Greece.[533] In fact, the two major resistance organisations are shown to spend more time fighting against each other than fighting the common enemy. The only actual fight that takes place in Stelios's village during the Occupation is a battle between ELAS and EDES. In another scene, Stelios becomes deeply disappointed to find out that the ELAS *andartes* remained hidden in the nearby mountains watching the Germans torching his village and killing innocent civilians who refused to betray the guerrilla hideouts: 'Why didn't they defend us? Why didn't they open fire on the enemies, since their purpose is to fight them and rid us of their presence? But no one dared speak. Fear was keeping everyone's mouth shut.'[534]

The last sentence brings us to another subject which is a central theme in Psarafti's representation of the Resistance, that is to say, the subject of the so-called red terror. Stelios's village becomes flooded with fearsome, rifle-toting *ELASites*. Their presence sparks widespread fear among the villagers, who begin to resent the guerrilla's demands for shelter, food and blind

---

533 'Αλίμονο, όμως. Σύντομα θα βλέπαμε τους δύο στρατούς, αντί να μονιάζουν και να στρέφουν τα όπλα τους κατά του κοινού εχθρού, να χύνουν το αίμα τους ο ένας εναντίον του άλλου. […] - Καλά τα λες, Ευγενία, έλεγε ο παππούς. Ακόμα ο πόλεμος συνεχίζεται και οι δικοί μας βάλθηκαν να φάνε τα γένια και τα μουστάκια τους, ποιος θα κυβερνήσει την Ελλάδα όταν φύγουν οι κατακτητές.' Psarafti op. cit.: 34 and 46.

534 'Γιατί δε μας υπερασπίστηκαν; Γιατί ενώ ήταν διπλάσιοι στον αριθμό από τους Γερμανούς κι έβλεπαν τη φωτιά στο χωριό δεν έριξαν ούτε μια σφαίρα; Γιατί δεν έδωσαν μάχη με τους εχθρούς, αφού ο σκοπός τους ήταν να πολεμούν για να διώξουν τους κατακτητές; Κανένα στόμα όμως δεν τόλμησε ν' ανοίξει. Ο φόβος τα κρατούσε όλα κλειστά.' Ibid.: 57.

obedience to their orders.[535] Fearing the guerrillas' vengeance, Stelios's co-villagers suffer in silence while others resort to EDES for protection.

This situation creates an atmosphere of suspicion and mutual distrust that begins to tear apart the local community. Old family vendettas and personal hatreds resurface and drive the villagers to align themselves with this or that side in an attempt to settle personal scores with their enemies: 'Old passions and hatreds, disputes over land ownership, broken engagements, unrepaid debts, all these issues reawakened, causing people to change their ideas, to change their beliefs.'[536] While most of the authors previously discussed focused on the ideological and political aspects of the civil strife, Psarafti here touches upon the social dimensions of the conflict, suggesting that ideological alliances were quite often motivated by individual interests, local feuds and personal enmities.[537]

---

535 'Οι αντάρτες εγκαταστάθηκαν στο σχολείο μας, στο καμάρι του παππού και ολόκληρου του χωριού μας. Ως τότε γέμιζε κάθε μέρα με παιδιά, φωνές, βιβλία, τετράδια και μολύβια, και ακούγονταν γέλια και τραγούδια. Τις τελευταίες μέρες, όμως, μπαινόβγαιναν αγριωποί αντάρτες με όπλα και φυσεκλίκια, αλλά και χωριανοί με τα πόδια κομμένα από την πείνα και το φόβο, γιατί η διαταγή να παρουσιαστούνε στον καπετάνιο των ανταρτών μόνο για καλό δεν ήταν. Στο σχολείο μας στοίβαζαν οι αντάρτες και τα τρόφιμα που τους έδιναν οι χωριανοί. Σιγά σιγά όμως οι προσφορές λιγόστευαν, οι οικογένειες δύσκολα πια έβρισκαν φαγητό. […] Οι αντάρτες άρχισαν να χτυπούν τις πόρτες και να παίρνουν ό,τι υπήρχε, όσπρια, αλεύρι, λάδι, ακόμα και βελέντζες και παπλώματα. Κάποιες νύχτες ακούγαμε τα σκυλιά να γαβγίζουν και τα ζώα να βελάζουν στα κατώγια. Κανένας όμως δεν τολμούσε να βγει και να πιάσει τον κλέφτη. Την άλλη μέρα έλειπε πότε ένα κατσίκι πότε μια γίδα. Ξέραμε ποιοι τα είχαν πάρει αλλά δεν τολμούσαμε να μιλήσουμε σε κανέναν.' Ibid.: 48-9.

536 'Παλιά μίση και πάθη, κτηματικές διαφορές, αρραβώνες που διαλύθηκαν, χρέη που δεν πληρώθηκαν, όλα ξαναφούντωναν και γίνονταν αιτία ν' αλλάζουν οι άνθρωποι ιδέες και πιστεύω.' Ibid.: 50.

537 This aspect has been extensively analysed by scholars of the so-called 'new wave' approach. See Stathis Kalyvas's seminal article discussing issues of red terror and leftist violence during the Occupation. Kalyvas 2000: 142-83.

In this chapter I have outlined the main trends and shifts in the representation of the Resistance in books for young readers published in the period 1990-2014. To summarise the main points of my discussion, the collapse of post-Cold War divisions in Greece and the ensuing explosion of interest in the 1940s, especially in its more unsavoury aspects, opened up new opportunities for the authors of this period, allowing them to engage with subjects that had been previously ignored or positively suppressed. As I have illustrated in this chapter, there were three main areas that attracted interest from authors in this period: the contribution of the non-EAM organisations to the Resistance, the role of women in the struggle for liberation and, last but not least, the internecine strife that broke out between the main Resistance forces and set the scene for the full-scale Civil War that followed a few years later.

These trends coincided with the emergence of new historiographical discourses on the Greek 1940s that challenged old national mythologies and engaged the Greek public in a series of introspective debates about the multifaceted character of the Resistance, its controversies, disunities and internal divisions. As I went on to show in this chapter, young people's fiction remained anything but indifferent to these developments.

BROTHER AGAINST BROTHER: THE CIVIL WAR

As I have discussed in previous chapters, the end of the Cold War in Greece was followed by an explosion of historiographic and public interest in the 1940s.[538] Having remained largely sidelined within the official national narrative of the *metapolitefsi*, the Civil War and its legacies attracted widespread interest from scholars and the general public alike in the period 1990-2014. Not always free from controversies and public disagreements, the new discourse focused on subjects that had been suppressed by the self-flattering mythologies of the first post-dictatorship decades (1974-1989). The aim of this chapter is to discuss the representation of the post-liberation period in books for young readers published between 1990 and 2014 as well as to provide important insights into the relationship between changing national perspectives on the Civil War and the memorialisation of this period in the books under examination.

Persistently avoided in the books of the early *metapolitefsi*, the subject of the *Dekemvriana* and the Civil War was no longer a forbidden topic for the authors of the 1980s. As I have shown in Part II, several of these authors continued to cling to the happy-ever-after endings that had become the norm in the books of the previous decade. At the same time, another group engaged extensively with the events of the divisive post-liberation period. In line with the general ideological climate of the 1980s, the latter's stories paint a one-sided picture of the Civil War, promoting a sanctified image of the Left as the

538 See chapter 1 in this Part.

pious victim of the conflict. As I will go on to show in this chapter, however, the authors of the period 1990-2014 moved away from these approaches, introduced new themes and offered their young readers a more complex view of the Civil War.

Iro Papamoschou's 1995 *Το γεφύρι της Ανατολής* (The Bridge of the East) is a novel about a family of uprooted *Samiotes* who were forced out of their island following the German invasion of Samos in 1943. Living in a refugee camp in the Middle East, young Mania and her family patiently wait for the day that they will be able to return to their homeland. Their hopes for repatriation, however, are shattered when they learn that their compatriots have now begun to slaughter each other in the liberated capital:

> The bad news from Greece arrived before Christmas.
>
> -Riots have erupted in Athens, people are getting killed.
>
> -Are the Germans back? Mania was trying to understand. But the allies have entered Germany, how is it possible that the Germans have returned to Athens?
>
> -Who said anything about Germans? said her mother.
>
> -Then who?
>
> -Us, it's our people who are killing each other.[539]

The echo of the December fighting soon reaches Mania's household. While Greece is sliding into a catastrophic civil war between the

---

539 'Και τα κακά μαντάτα ήρθαν από την Ελλάδα μαζί με τα Χριστούγεννα.
-Γίνονται ταραχές στην Αθήνα, σκοτωμοί.
-Ξαναγύρισαν οι Γερμανοί; η Μάνια έσπαζε το κεφάλι της να καταλάβει. Μα εδώ οι σύμμαχοι είχαν μπει μέσα στην ίδια τη Γερμανία, πώς ξαναγύρισαν στην Αθήνα οι Γερμανοί;
-Ποιος μίλησε για Γερμανούς; είπε η μητέρα.
-Τότε;
-Μεταξύ μας σκοτωνόμαστε.' Papamoschou 1995: 210.

government/monarchist coalition and the left-wing camp, Mania's father and his brother become entangled in a heated quarrel over the causes of the strife, with each of them shifting the blame to the 'other' side:

> -I blame them, he said to father, mentioning some names that Mania was hearing for the first time.
>
> -The blame lies with the others, father responded, listing some other names.
>
> -You are wrong.
>
> -History will decide who is wrong and who is not. All I know is that freedom was not properly shared out. And that what's got them fighting.
>
> -And all I know is that when scores are settled with guns, nothing good can come of it. […]
>
> -But freedom belongs to those who fought for it.
>
> -Freedom belongs to everyone.
>
> Who could have thought, father and uncle Christostomos were fighting.[540]

Adopting the classic brother-against-brother trope, Papamoschou seeks to offer an even-handed picture of the conflict that consumed the Greek capital for more than a month. Representing the two rival sides, Mania's father and uncle Christostomos are allowed to speak for themselves, each voicing the arguments, counter-arguments and grievances of his own side. Contrary to

---

540 '-Φταίνε αυτοί, είπε πιο ύστερα στον πατέρα κι ανάφερε κάτι ονόματα που η Μάνια τα 'κουγε για πρώτη φορά.
-Φταίνε οι άλλοι, είπε ο πατέρας κι ανάφερε άλλα ονόματα.
-Λάθος κάνεις.
-Το ποιος κάνει λάθος, θα το πει κάποτε η ιστορία. Εκείνο που ξέρω είναι πως δεν έγινε σωστά η μοιρασιά της λευτεριάς. Και πάνω κει φαγώθηκαν.
-Κι εγώ ξέρω πως όταν το ξεκαθάρισμα των λογαριασμών γίνεται με όπλα, καλό δεν μπορούμε να περιμένουμε. […]
-Όμως η λευτεριά ανήκει σ' εκείνους που γι' αυτήν πολεμήσαν.
-Η λευτεριά ανήκει σ' όλους.
Κοίτα που ο πατέρας κι ο θείος Χρυσόστομος είχαν αρπαχτεί.' Ibid.: 211.

the polarising representations of the previous decade, young readers here are presented with a more dispassionate approach, one that goes on to acknowledge the rights and wrongs on both sides. Papamoschou also eschews the use of political terms that have become identified with the two sides competing to gain control of liberated Greece. In the end, whether the battle of Athens was fought between monarchists and communists, between this and that political side, is of little importance here. What is emphasised, instead, is that the *Dekemvriana* was a devastating fratricidal conflict that pitted brother against brother, as illustrated by the stormy exchanges between Mania's father and uncle Christostomos.

Set mainly in the early post-Civil War years, Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou's *Ένα αγγελάκι στα Εξάρχεια* (A Little Angel in Exarcheia, 2006) is another novel that takes an even-handed approach to the events of the post-liberation period. In one of the novel's most memorable scenes, the young protagonist's parents invite their friends and relatives to celebrate the christening of their youngest daughter. With the Civil War still raging in the northern regions of Greece, the celebration soon explodes into a heated war of words that turns neighbours, friends and relatives against each other:

> -To the newly-baptised, the godfather raised his glass.
>
> -May she live in a society of laocracy, justice and equality, free from murderers, a left-wing neighbour added.
>
> -Killing is your specialty, a right-wing colleague of father's said. Our great actress, Eleni Papadaki, for example, what harm did she do to you, can you tell me? he shouted.
>
> -What about Svolos's wife? What did she do to you, why did you have to jail her, can you tell me that? the neighbour answered

back. Not to mention all the left-wing fighters that you execute every few days, he added.

-These bastards need to be eliminated! the bank clerk said in anger.

-Well, it's a good thing that Ladas was eliminated then, the neighbour said.

-Ladas's murder was an appalling crime! the godfather entered the conversation. Ladas was not a rightist, he belonged to the Centre, he was a man of Sofoklis Venizelos of the Liberal Party!

-Yes, but the executions were signed by him and that 'democrat' old-Sofoulis! the neighbour wouldn't give up.

-Your problem now is with the Moscow instruments! Why don't you tell us, instead, about all those innocent people that you took hostage to Krora in December 1944 and decimated them, what do you have to say about that? the other insisted. Or about the people's houses that you blew up to use them as barricades, are you going to apologise for that?

-We were fighting, we were not playing with dolls. We were fighting to get rid of the collaborators, the *mavragorites* of the Occupation and the puppets of the Anglo-Americans!

-You don't know what you're talking about! It is because of some fanatics like you that the country is bleeding again and you have the nerve to talk!

After that, the voices became louder, everyone started to talk, taking this or that side.[541]

---

541 '-Στην υγειά της νεοφώτιστης, σήκωσε πρώτος ο νονός το ποτήρι του.
-Να ευχηθούμε να ζήσει σε κοινωνία με λαοκρατία, δικαιοσύνη και ισότητα, χωρίς εκτελέσεις και δολοφόνους, συμπλήρωσε κάποιος γείτονας αριστερός.
-Οι δολοφονίες είναι δική σας ειδικότητα, πήρε αμέσως φωτιά ένας δεξιός συνάδελφος του μπαμπά. Η μεγάλη μας ηθοποιός Ελένη Παπαδάκη, για παράδειγμα, τι σας έφταιξε, μου λες; φώναξε έξαλλος.
-Κι εσάς η γυναίκα του Σβώλου, του καθηγητή, τι σας έκανε και τη ρίξατε στη φυλακή, μου λες; -έτοιμη την είχε την απάντηση ο γείτονας. Χώρια τόσους αριστερούς αγωνιστές που εκτελείτε κάθε λίγο και λιγάκι, συμπλήρωσε.
-Τα καθάρματα πρέπει να φεύγουν από τη μέση! αναψοκοκκίνισε ο τραπεζικός.
-Τότε ορθώς έφυγε από τη μέση ο Λαδάς, δε συγκρατήθηκε πάλι ο γείτονας
-Η δολοφονία του Λαδά ήταν αποτρόπαιο έγκλημα! μπήκε στη συζήτηση ο νονός. Ο Λαδάς δεν ήταν δεξιός, ανήκε στο κέντρο, άνθρωπος τους Σοφοκλή Βενιζέλου, του Κόμματος των Φιλελευθέρων!
-Ναι αλλά τις εκτελέσεις του λόγου του και ο «δημοκρατικός» γερο-Σοφούλης τις υπέγραφαν! – πού να το βάλει κάτω ο εξαγριωμένος γείτονας.
-Για τα όργανα της Μόσχας σε παίρνει τώρα ο πόνος, για τους αθώους ανθρώπους που σύρατε ομήρους στα Κρώρα το Δεκέμβρη του '44 και τους αποδεκατίστε τι έχεις να πεις; πείσμωσε ο

As was the case with Iro Papamoschou's novel discussed previously, Petrovits-Androutsopoulou allows her characters to voice their opinions, offering her young readers an insight into the motives, accusations, counter-accusations, grievances and wrongdoings of all the parties involved. No side is demonised as no side is idealised either. Instead, the author points to the atrocities committed by both warring camps; the assassination of famous stage actress Eleni Papadaki by the communist-controlled OPLA during the *Dekemvriana*, the hostage-taking, the reprisal murder of Justice Minister Christos Ladas, the imprisonment of Maria Svolou, a leading figure of the EAM-sponsored Political Committee of National Liberation, and the frantic persecution of thousands of veterans and supporters of the left-wing Resistance by the post-war regime. Contrary to the one-sided representations of the previous decade, both Papamoschou and Petrovits-Androutsopoulou offered a more balanced picture of the fratricidal drama, prompting their young readers to accept the idea that all sides were equally responsible for the eruption and violent escalation of the animosities that plunged Greece into the Civil War.

άλλος. Για τα σπίτια του κοσμάκη που ανατινάξατε στα καλά καθούμενα και τα κάνατε οδοφράγματα, τι απολογείσαι;
-Αγώνα κάναμε, δεν παίζαμε κούκλες! Αγώνα για να ξεφορτωθούμε τους πουλημένους γερμανοτσολιάδες, τους μαυραγορίτες της Κατοχής και τα όργανα των Αγγλοαμερικάνων!
-Δεν ξέρεις τι λες! Από κάποιους φανατικούς σαν κι εσένα αιματοκυλιστήκαμε ξανά πάλι τώρα, κι έχεις μούτρα και μιλάς!
Από κει και πέρα φούντωσαν οι φωνές από παντού, βάλθηκαν να μιλάνε όλοι μαζί, άλλος να παίρνει το μέρος τους ενός, άλλος του άλλου και να γίνεται φασαρία μεγάλη.' Petrovits-Androutsopoulou 2006: 43-4.

I will continue the discussion with two novels that deal exclusively with the Civil War, approaching the theme from two completely different perspectives. Published in 1996, Eleni Dikaiou's *Αναζητώντας τους χαμένους ήρωες* (Looking for Lost Heroes) is one of the most poignant novels for young people about the Civil War. Covering the period from Greece's liberation from the Axis occupation up to the last armed battles of the Civil War, the novel revolves around the story of Nefeli. Nefeli is a sixteen-year-old girl who lives in a provincial town in Northern Greece with her widowed mother and sisters. Shortly after Liberation, Nefeli falls in love with Rigas, a young romantic communist, former schoolteacher and fabled ELAS Captain. A victim of the 'white terror', Rigas joins the guerrilla struggle of the communist-led DSE. Nefeli helps Rigas escape the town and follows him to the mountains where she also ends up joining the ranks of the DSE.

Dikaiou devotes a large part of the novel to talk about the escalating political tensions of the immediate post-liberation period that paved the way for the outbreak of the Civil War. Following the end of the *Dekemvriana*, the government/monarchist camp went on to launch a campaign of violence against a large part of the population that had supported the left-wing resistance movement during the Occupation. Nefeli's town is no exception. Odysseas and Loukas, Nefeli's friends and former *ELASites*, are court-martialled and sentenced to death by their childhood friend Orestis, a former officer of the Greek Royal Forces in the Middle East and ideological adherent of the government/monarchist side, numerous right-wing gangs roam the

countryside attacking left-wing civilians,[542] while the whole town lives in fear of notorious former collaborator Ilias and others like him, who use their newly found authority to hunt down anyone suspected of harbouring anti-monarchist sentiments.[543]

Though attributing the causes of the Civil War to the reign of the 'white terror',[544] Dikaiou does not shy away from talking about the violent reprisals and other acts of vengeance perpetrated by the communist side. For all her feelings for Rigas, Nefeli cannot forgive the Captain for condemning her town to die of thirst by blowing up the local aqueduct or turn a blind eye to the violence exhibited by Rigas's group of irregulars: 'The guerrillas came to their town during the night. But only at night. Nefeli didn't know if *Kapetan* Rigas was with them. She wished he wasn't, because these *andartes* were no longer liberators, they were avengers.'[545]

The situation becomes more and more strained and the fear of execution draws the vulnerable *andartes* back to the clandestine mountains. Rigas leads

---

542 'Η πόλη τους είχε γεμίσει παρακρατικούς. Κατέβαιναν απ' τα γύρω χωριά πάνω στ' άλογα με τα όπλα περασμένα σταυρωτά στο στήθος, κάθονταν στο καφενείο του μπάρμπα-Κώστα, πίνανε με τον Ηλία τσίπουρο, μα κανένας δεν έλεγε πως δεν μπορούσαν να 'χουν όπλα ούτε αυτοί, αφού δεν ήτανε κανονικός στρατός, ούτε πως δεν είχαν κανένα δικαίωμα να τρομάζουνε τον κόσμο τριγυρνώντας στις γειτονιές, ξυπνώντας τον κόσμο μες στη νύχτα για να δουν αν έκρυβε στο σπίτι του φυγόδικους Ελασίτες. […] Λέγανε πως οι Μάηδες κρεμούσαν τους αριστερούς στις πλατείες των χωριών και στήναν γλέντι κάτω απ' τα κρεμασμένα σώματα ύστερα.' Dikaiou 1996: 85-7.

543 'Ύστερα, όταν έρχονταν στο κέφι ακόμα πιο πολύ, όταν μεθούσαν ολότελα με την παρέα του, ρίχνανε στον αέρα πιστολιές φωνάζοντας πως: «Όποιος δεν είναι εθνικόφρων και δεν είναι με το βασιλιά, θα πεθάνει!»' Ibid.: 81-2.

544 'Κάποιοι άρχισαν να ξεκόβουν τότε απ' τις πόλεις και τα χωριά. Δυο δυο, τρεις τρεις, ξέθαβαν όπλα κρυμμένα απ' τα χρόνια της Κατοχής και χάνονταν στα δάση, κρύβονταν προσπαθώντας να ξεφύγουν τις φυλακές, τις κατηγόριες, δίκαιες ή άδικες ποιος μπορούσε να πει, το θάνατο. Άρχιζαν τον πόλεμο μονάχοι.' Ibid.: 85.

545 'Τα βράδια κατέβαιναν κι αντάρτες στην πόλη τους καμιά φορά. Μονάχα τα βράδια. Δεν ήξερε η Νεφέλη αν ήταν κι ο καπετάν Ρήγας μαζί μα δεν θα ήθελε να 'ναι, γιατί αυτοί οι αντάρτες δεν ήταν ελευθερωτές πια, τιμωροί ήταν.' Ibid.: 86-7.

a small group of guerrillas and Nefeli joins his unit, driven more by her feelings for the Captain and fear of execution for sheltering a wanted communist than by ideology or any real political commitment to the rebels' cause.[546]

The second part of the novel follows Nefeli as she experiences the atrociousness and ugliness of the Civil War. In a drastic departure from the hagiographic approaches of the previous decade that presented the Left as the victim of the Civil War, Dikaiou here offers a more balanced picture of the conflict, prompting her young readers to realise that violence was not exclusive to either side and that both sides were equally responsible for indulging in excess. Addressing a number of issues that had been suppressed in the books of previous decades, Dikaiou also talks about the violent practices of the DSE guerrillas, their coercive conscription practices,[547] and, most poignantly, the forcible recruitment of children and young adolescents to serve in the DSE's ranks.[548]

I argued earlier that Dikaiou's novel offers one of the most balanced representations of the Civil War that we can find in all of young people's fiction

---

546 'Γιατί τι σόι καταιγίδα την είχε διώξει άραγε μακριά απ' το σπίτι της αυτή; Κανένας δεν την είχε πάρει με το στανιό. Κανένας δεν την κυνηγούσε σαν τον καπετάνιο εκείνη. Και το χειρότερο, δεν είχε προλάβει να πιστέψει σ' αυτό που οι άλλοι πίστευαν ή κάνοντας την ανάγκη φιλότιμο λέγανε πως το πιστεύουν.' Ibid.: 161-2.

547 'Κάπου μέσα της το 'ξερε πως αν ο καπετάν Ρήγας δεν κρατούσε όπλο, μπορεί να μην τον ακολουθούσαν ποτέ.' Ibid.: 162.

548 '«Τα παιδιά... Ποια απ' όλα άραγε;» συλλογίστηκε η Νεφέλη. [...] Άκουγε τα λόγια και τα παρακάλια υπομονετικά. Άκουγε για προίκες, για χωράφια αθέριστα, για το μακαρίτη που την είχε αφήσει μονάχη με πέντε κορίτσια της παντρειάς... Ύστερα γύριζε αργά αργά, κάρφωνε πάνω στον πρόεδρο τ' ανταριασμένα μάτια του κι έλεγε: -Τη μικρή τη Βασιλικούλα τότε, πρόεδρε. Που δεν είναι ακόμα της παντρειάς, αλλά μπορεί να 'ρθει μαζί μας μάχιμη. Τα 'χει κλείσει, δεν τα 'χει κλείσει τα 16; [...] Κι ο κατάλογος μάκραινε, μάκραινε, ένας από κάθε οικογένεια, γιατί σήμερα ήταν μεγάλο το χωριό κι η Νεφέλη δεν προλάβαινε να σηκώσει τα μάτια απ' το χαρτί να δει άλλο μίσος, μονάχα κάτι κλάματα της έφταναν στ' αυτιά πού και πού ώσπου πάψανε κι αυτά, κάποιος είχε ρίξει για «εκφοβισμό» μια ριπή στον αέρα...' Ibid.: 164-6.

written between 1974 and 2014. The essence of Dikaiou's approach lies in the recognition and even-handed representation of the suffering experienced by both sides, without, at the same time, de-ideologising the motives of her characters or sliding into easy interpretations that point to 'foreigners' as the source of all evil. In other words, what makes Dikaiou's book stand out is the idea, so delicately conveyed in the novel, that the drama of 'those' and the drama of 'others' are two aspects of the same fratricidal drama that too often came to blur the line between victims and victimisers.

This idea is further accentuated in one of the novel's last scenes, which is based on a real event that took place in the Agrafa mountains during the peak of the Civil War and has gone down in history as the 'tragedy' or 'reconciliation' of Niala. On April 12, 1947, after managing to cross the dangerous Niala col amid a terrible blizzard, a small group of DSE fighters got separated from their unit and stumbled upon the tents of government soldiers who had camped there, while waiting for the storm to pass. There, inside the same tents, guerrillas and government soldiers spent the night side by side, trying to survive the extreme cold, before departing the next morning and going back to killing each other.[549]

As mentioned previously, Dikaiou gives a fictionalised version of the Niala reconciliation in her book. In order to escape the government forces that had

549 The reconciliation in Niala is also the subject of Dimitris Chatzis's 1966 short story 'Ανυπεράσπιστοι' (Defenceless). Chatzis's sympathetic portrayal of government soldiers caused the wrath of a several left-wing critics, who accused the author of 'yielding to the ideological pressures of the bourgeoisie […] in the name of a misguided conciliatory spirit.' See Apostolidou 2010: 75.

started to surround his unit, Rigas is ordered to head his men and their persecuted families to a nearby guerrilla-controlled village. The group begins to climb a dangerous mountain path amid a severe snowstorm that leads dozens of guerrillas and civilians to their deaths. As the blizzard worsens, Nefeli, Rigas and a few others from their group lose sight of their comrades and end up taking a different path that leads them to a tent. The exhausted guerrillas enter the tent and surrender to sleep. After some time, Nefeli wakes up next to Rigas only to discover that they all this time they had shared the same tent with a group of government soldiers.

Puzzled by the Captain's reaction, Nefeli and the other guerrillas realise that Rigas has no intention of using his rifle to turn the situation to their advantage.[550] The death of a young guerrilla, who falls frozen at the feet of a government soldier with whom he had shared the same blanket all night, puts an end to their agonising wait, sealing in the most devastating way the 'odd peace that was decided by the Captain.'[551] Addressing both his men and the government soldiers, Rigas tells them that 'it seems that someone got sick of us, patriots. Someone got sick of us and set us all up tonight.'[552] The common identification of both sides as 'patriots' by the Captain encourages them to approach each other with sympathy, setting aside all other differences.

---

550 'Μα τι έκανε λοιπόν; Είχε σκοπό να μείνει έτσι εκεί; Η νύχτα και το σκοτάδι τούς είχαν ξεγελάσει, μα τώρα ήτανε πρωί. Η Νεφέλη μπορούσε να δει ολοκάθαρα την απορία και την έκπληξη στα μάτια των δικών τους.' Dikaiou op. cit.: 194.
551 '[…] λες κι ο θάνατος του αγοριού είχε σφραγίσει οριστικά εκείνη την πρωτόγνωρη ειρήνη που αποφάσισε μονάχος του ο καπετάνιος!' Ibid.: 195.
552 '-Κάποιος μου φαίνεται μας βαρέθηκε πατριώτες. Μας σιχάθηκε κι έστησε ενέδρα και σε σας και σε μας απόψε!' Ibid.: 194.

Guerrillas and soldiers start to chat, a few of them discover that they come from nearby villages, a soldier passes around some cognac and a young guerrilla offers her raisins to the soldiers as a token of appreciation for letting them pass the night inside their tent.

And while the Civil War is raging in the outside world, inside the tent the arms have given way to an atmosphere of fraternity and mutual empathy for the drama of the 'others'. As the guerrillas get ready to depart, a soldier pulls out his flask and offers it to Rigas: 'For the journey, Captain. Cognac. For the girls.'[553] Guerrillas and government soldiers wish each other 'good luck' before they part ways and continue with what each side had to do.

Seeking to emphasise the essential fraternity that united the two warring camps, despite their ideological differences, Dikaiou's version of the next day is a far cry from the actual events that followed the night of reconciliation in Niala and ended with the assassination of Commander D. Alevras by Captain G. Papaioannou and the capture of thirty guerrillas.[554] When she was asked to elaborate on the reasons that prompted her to omit the violent events of the next day from her novel, Dikaiou replied that her intention was to 'keep the focus on the human being and his humane aspect, to keep the focus on hope. It would be "inhumane" on our part to kill that hope, especially through the pages of a book that is, first and foremost, addressed to young people.'[555]

---

553 'Για το δρόμο, καπετάνιε. Κονιάκ. Για τα κορίτσια.' Ibid.: 197.
554 For more on the Niala reconciliation and the bloody events of the next day see Psimmenos 1983: 96-110 and Arvanitis 2000: 493-501.
555 Τι αυτό επέλεξα για το τέλος του κεφαλαίου λίγες μόνο προτάσεις οι οποίες βάζουν τον αναγνώστη στην σκληρή συνέχεια του πολέμου προκειμένου να μείνουμε όσο το δυνατόν περισσότερο στον άνθρωπο και στην ανθρωπιά, στην ελπίδα την οποία θα ήταν «απάνθρωπο» να

The last scene of the novel finds Nefeli and Rigas, the only survivors of their group, running in the woods, trying to escape the government forces that were sweeping the mountains searching for guerrillas. There, in the woods, and with the soldiers getting closer and closer, Nefeli confronts Rigas:

> she knew now that all this time she was right to believe that there was nothing heroic in this war. […] Where had the [Communist] Party and the Captain been leading them all this time? Why did Maria have to die? Why did Aristea and Foteini have to die when the rest of Europe, the rest of the world, was trying to heal the wounds of war? Why did that soldier have to die next to their abandoned machine gun? Who knows, maybe he was the same soldier who gave them his flask that morning… 'For the journey. For the girls, Captain…' Nefeli wondered in horror if she was the one who had shot him.[556]

Unable to answer her questions and having himself realised the pointlessness of the ongoing fratricide, Rigas sacrifices his life to save Nefeli from the fire of the government soldiers. As the soldiers start to approach her, Nefeli comes to a painful realisation:

> She thought of Athanasia and Angeliki. Orestis, Ilias… Her mind became filled with faces, not notions. Real people, not ideas […] ideas alone cannot kill. That's who was really responsible for this war, then! Not only the Big of the world but also the little people, extremely little people, who hid behind their ideas, who hid behind the label of 'right-wing' or 'left-wing', because they didn't have the courage to look beyond those labels, they didn't have the courage to be–above all–humans! […][557]

την εκτελέσουμε με την σειρά μας και μάλιστα μέσα από τις σελίδες ενός βιβλίου το οποίο κατ' αρχάς απευθύνεται σε νέους ανθρώπους.' From a private conversation with Eleni Dikaiou, reproduced with her permission.

556 Το χειρότερο ήταν που το 'βλεπε πια καθαρά ότι είχε δίκιο απ' την αρχή να σκέφτεται πως δεν υπήρχε στον πόλεμο εκείνο τίποτα το ηρωικό. […] Πού τους οδηγούσε τόσο καιρό το κόμμα κι ο καπετάνιος λοιπόν; Γιατί θα 'πρεπε να πεθάνει η Μαρία; Γιατί θα 'πρεπε να πεθάνει η Αριστέα κι η Φωτεινή την ίδια ώρα που η Ευρώπη, ο κόσμος ολόκληρος γιάτρευε τις πληγές του απ' τον πόλεμο; Γιατί θα 'πρεπε να πεθάνει εκείνος ο φαντάρος πλάι στο παρατημένο οπλοπολυβόλο τους, μπορεί να 'ταν ο ίδιος που τους έδινε το παγούρι του με το κονιάκ κάποιο άλλο πρωί… «Για το δρόμο. Για τα κορίτσια, καπετάνιε…» Η Νεφέλη αναρωτήθηκε με φρίκη αν τον είχε χτυπήσει αυτή.' Dikaiou op. cit.: 203-9.

557 Στο μυαλό της ήρθαν η Αθανασία κι η Αγγελική. Ο Ορέστης, ο Ηλίας… Πρόσωπα, όχι έννοιες. Άτομα, όχι ιδέες […] οι ιδέες από μόνες τους δε σκοτώνουν! Να ποιοι φταίγανε στ' αλήθεια

The above passage encapsulates the essence of Dikaiou's approach. Without dismissing the role of the 'foreign factor', Dikaiou resists subscribing wholeheartedly to the view that foreigners had been entirely responsible for the Civil War. As I have shown in this chapter, in Dikaiou's novel responsibility for the Civil War is attributed to all sides; the foreigners, the government/monarchist camp, the rebels, the communist leadership, and even 'ordinary' people, who had compromised their humanity and taken up arms against their own brothers for the sake of a poorly understood ideology.[558] Above all, Dikaiou's novel avoids easy heroisations. As suggested by the book's title, the main idea permeating the novel is that in a fratricidal war there can be no heroes, only victims, and in the Greek Civil War, victims and wrongdoers could be found on both sides.

Litsa Psarafti's *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου* (The Fugitives of the Castle Tower, 2011) is a novel that engages with the subject of the so-called *pedomazoma*.[559] The novel centres on the story of young Stelios and his sister, Marianthi, and their forced evacuation to a children's camp in the Socialist Republic of Albania in the spring of 1948. A brief introduction at the beginning of the book informs young readers that the story they are about to read is

---

γι' αυτό τον πόλεμο λοιπόν! Όχι μονάχα οι Μεγάλοι της γης μα και κάτι μικροί, τόσοι δα, που βάζανε τις ιδέες μπροστά γιατί δεν είχανε καρδιά, κρύβονταν πίσω απ' τις ιδέες κολλώντας στον εαυτό τους την ετικέτα του δεξιού ή του αριστερού, γιατί δεν είχαν το κουράγιο να 'ναι πέρα απ' αυτές, πάνω απ' αυτές, πρώτα απ' όλα άνθρωποι!' Ibid.: 212-13.

558 'Τιατί η Νεφέλη δεν μπορούσε να 'ναι σίγουρη πως είχαν διαβάσει, πως είχαν καταλάβει τον Μαρξ όλοι εκείνοι οι χωριάτες που παρατούσαν τα σπίτια και τα χωράφια τους, γιατί ο καπετάν Ρήγας τούς ζητούσε να τον ακολουθήσουν.' Ibid.: 162.

559 Originally referring to the Ottoman practice of *devshirme*, the word *pedomazoma* (literally child-gathering) has been employed to describe the evacuation of approximately 20.000 children from the DSE-controlled regions of Northern Greece to Eastern Bloc countries in 1948-'49, during the peak of the Civil War.

based on the, allegedly, real story of Stylianos, a former child of the Civil War who approached the author and asked her to write a novel based on his experience of those difficult years.

Published in the wake of the heated public debate that followed the release of Pantelis Voulgaris's 2009 Civil War film *Ψυχή Βαθιά* (A Soul So Deep), Psarafti's novel caused a stir among critics, with some of them praising the author's efforts to 'give a picture of the Civil War as dispassionate and objective as possible'[560] and others accusing Psarafti of reawakening anti-communist ghosts.[561] In a 2011 interview entitled 'Authors ought to be honest', Psarafti revealed that the main reason she had been prompted to write a novel about the Civil War was the realisation that 'until now, every children's book that has been written on the subject was seen from a perspective that served the author's ideology. I thought it was time to present the events objectively; more than sixty years have passed [since the end of the Civil War] and we now have a clearer view of the [past] mistakes and passions [of our nation].'[562]

Despite the author's declarations of objectivity, a notion that is itself highly problematic, *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου* is a book that makes little effort to

---

560 See Iraklis Kallergis's review, available at https://diastixo.gr/kritikes/efivika/146-oi-drapetes-tou-kastropirgou.

561 See Nikos Theodosiou's review, available at https://theodosiou.wordpress.com/2011/06/03/drapetes_tis_istorias/. In his extremely polemical review, Theodosiou also points to the, admittedly striking, similarities between Psarafti's novel and an older fictional narrative for young people entitled *Γυρισμός στη γαλάζια Ελλάδα* (Return to Blue Greece). A blatantly anti-communist book, the latter was published in 1951 by the conservative religious organisation Zoi and was widely circulated among the national-minded youth of the early post-Civil War years.

562 Όσα παιδικά βιβλία είχαν γραφτεί ως τώρα με το ίδιο θέμα ήταν όλα ιδωμένα από την πλευρά που εξυπηρετούσε την ιδεολογία του συγγραφέα. Σκέφτηκα λοιπόν ότι είναι καιρός να ειπωθούν τα γεγονότα αντικειμενικά –έχουν περάσει πάνω από εξήντα χρόνια και όλα έχουν αποσαφηνιστεί για τα λάθη και τα πάθη του λαού μας.' From Litsa Psarafti's interview to Despoina Savvopoulou, available at http://www.patakis.gr/images/files/14474.pdf

resist its ideological biases. As I will go on to show in the remainder of this chapter, Psarafti's novel promotes a certain view of the Civil War, one that is anchored in the post-war narrative of the so-called 'three rounds'.

This becomes apparent quite early in the novel. With their school having remained closed for months, Stelios and his classmates are happy to return to their classes, especially when they find out that their new teacher is the young and beautiful Ms. Georgia. Strong-willed and outspoken, Georgia is a devoted communist who fascinates her students with stories about the Russian Revolution and its contribution to the building of a new socialist world. A supporter of the EAM movement, Georgia also urges the villagers to join the struggle for liberation:

> It's time for us to take action. To get organised and fight the Germans until they are all gone. And then, to ensure that power passes into the hands of the people [λαός]. So that the people can govern with justice. So that our children can eat well and receive a proper education. So that our children can live in a better world.[563]

And while the villagers support Georgia's–and accordingly, EAM's–national liberation ideals, they are strongly opposed the communists' vision of a socialist Greece ruled by the people (λαοκρατία):

> -Tell us, how will the property of the rich pass into the hands of the poor? In the same way as it happened in Russia? The rebels there seized the power by slaughtering the Tsar and the local squires.

563 '-Καιρός να σηκώσουμε κι εμείς κεφάλι. Να οργανωθούμε για να πολεμήσουμε και να διώξουμε τους Γερμανούς. Και ύστερα να πάρει ο λαός στα χέρια του την εξουσία. Να κυβερνήσει με δικαιοσύνη. Να φάνε ψωμί τα παιδιά μας, να μορφωθούν όλα και να ζήσουν σ' έναν καλύτερο κόσμο.' Psarafti 2011: 36.

> -You cannot expect to have a revolution without blood. But it had to be done for the sake of future generations, she said.[564]

Speaking explicitly of a revolution, Georgia's words echo the narrative of the three rounds, suggesting that the communists had harboured plans of seizing power from the outset. Mrs. Georgia is sent into exile and EAM wages a twofold struggle, targeting both the foreign enemies and its main political rivals. Shortly after the country's liberation from the foreign yoke, the Greek capital descended into the violence of the *Dekemvriana*. Psarafti devotes several paragraphs to talk about the events of the thirty-three-day battle of Athens. The topic is first addressed in a didactic passage informing young readers about the causes, main events and aftermath of the December conflict:

> Hardly two months [after liberation] the bad news struck our village like a thunderbolt. Georgios Papandreou, Greece's Prime Minister, called for the dissolution of ELAS. EAM refused to accept this and called on the people of Athens to protest on December 3. Despite the government banning the demonstration, a large crowd gathered outside the Prime Minister's house on Vassilisis Sofia's Street and at Syntagma Square. The police opened fire in order to prevent the eruption of riots. People fell dead on the streets. The next day a protest was held again at the Square. The people wanted to protest for the victims. The arms spoke again and the fire that had been burning slowly all this time now flared up. […] A brutal fight soon broke out between ELAS and the government forces. The British army was also there and fighting broke out in the streets of Athens. Churchill, the Prime Minister of England, visited Greece secretly on Christmas Eve in 1944. This raised the morale of the British who managed to defeat ELAS with the help of the Greek forces. But the massacre had lasted for more than a month. Many people lost their lives during those days. Civilians were taken hostage by ELAS's retreating forces on the outskirts of the capital. Those who did not die from exhaustion were executed. In February 1945, EAM was forced to sign a

564 '-Και πώς, κυρα-δασκάλα, θα δώσουν τις περιουσίες τους οι πλούσιοι στους φτωχούς; Με τον ίδιο τρόπο που έγινε και στη Ρωσία; Τον τσάρο και τους τσιφλικάδες τους έσφαξαν οι επαναστάτες για να τους πάρουν την εξουσία.
-Επανάσταση χωρίς αίμα δε γίνεται. Αλλά άξιζε να γίνει για τις γενιές που έρχονται, έλεγε εκείνη.' Ibid.: 37.

> humiliating treaty in Varkiza. The Treaty ordered that the guerrillas had to surrender their weapons and return to their villages. The guerrillas returned to their homes defeated and humiliated. The people [λαός] could breathe easy again. Hope returned to the people's hearts, who wanted to live peacefully again after four years of war.[565]

Psarafti returns to the *Dekemvriana* a few pages later. This time the events are given from the perspective of Stelios's cousin, Vangelis, a young communist and member of the EAM movement:

> -Grandpa, no human mind can conceive of the atrocities that happened in Athens. May Greece never see days like those of December '44 again. Athens became a battlefield. On one side, there were the ELAS guerrillas, on the other side there were the Government Army, the gendarmerie and the British. Houses were blown up and turned into barricades, British tanks were patrolling the streets shooting people in cold blood. But ELAS didn't sit on its hands. By December 4, our forces had occupied all the local police and gendarmerie stations. In the battles that followed, they left no one alive. […] But the worst was the crowd of people who were forced to follow ELAS out Athens after we lost the battle. Thousands of innocent civilians, men, women, elderly, even children were taken hostage by ELAS's retreating forces. Most of them died as they were forced to walk for days

565 'Δεν πέρασαν δυο μήνες και τα κακά μαντάτα έφτασαν στο χωριό σαν αστραπή. Ο Γεώργιος Παπανδρέου, ο πρωθυπουργός της χώρας, ζήτησε από τον ΕΛΑΣ να διαλυθεί. Το ΕΑΜ αρνήθηκε και κάλεσε στις 3 Δεκεμβρίου το λαό σε παναθηναϊκό συλλαλητήριο διαμαρτυρίας. Η κυβέρνηση το απαγόρεψε, αλλά πλήθος κόσμου μαζεύτηκε μπροστά στο σπίτι του πρωθυπουργού, στην οδό Βασιλίσσης Σοφίας και στην πλατεία Συντάγματος. Η αστυνομία φοβήθηκε μήπως γίνουν ταραχές και άρχισε να πυροβολεί. Έπεσαν κορμιά στους δρόμους. Την άλλη μέρα έγινε ξανά συγκέντρωση στην πλατεία. Ο λαός ήθελε να διαμαρτυρηθεί για τους σκοτωμένους, Και πάλι μίλησαν τα όπλα, και η φωτιά που τόσο καιρό ήταν έτοιμη ν' ανάψει φούντωσε… […] Το κακό δεν άργησε να ξεσπάσει ανάμεσα στον ΕΛΑΣ και στις κυβερνητικές δυνάμεις. Υπήρχε κι ο αγγλικός στρατός, και άρχισαν μάχες στους δρόμους της Αθήνας. Τα Χριστούγεννα του 1944 ήρθε μυστικά στην Ελλάδα ο πρωθυπουργός της Αγγλίας, ο Τσόρτσιλ. Οι Εγγλέζοι, με αναπτερωμένο το ηθικό τους και με τη βοήθεια των ελληνικών δυνάμεων, κατάφεραν να νικήσουν τον ΕΛΑΣ. Το μακελειό όμως κράτησε πάνω από ένα μήνα. Εκείνες τις μέρες πολλοί άνθρωποι έχασαν τη ζωή τους. Όσο για τον ΕΛΑΣ, υποχωρώντας έσερνε απλούς πολίτες έξω από την πρωτεύουσα ως ομήρους –κι απ' αυτούς άλλοι πέθαναν από τις κακουχίες κι άλλοι εκτελέστηκαν. Στις αρχές Φεβρουαρίου του 1945, το ΕΑΜ αναγκάστηκε να υπογράψει στη Βάρκιζα μια ταπεινωτική συνθήκη. Έπρεπε να παραδώσει όλα τα όπλα που είχαν οι αντάρτες, και οι άντρες να επιστρέψουν στα χωριά τους. Νικημένοι και ταπεινωμένοι γύρισαν στα μέρη τους. Ο λαός ανάσανε. Γι' άλλη μια φορά, η ελπίδα ξαναγύρισε στις καρδιές. Οι απλοί άνθρωποι ήθελαν να σταματήσουν οι πόλεμοι και να ξαναζήσουν ειρηνικά ύστερα από τέσσερα χρόνια πολέμου.' Ibid.: 62-5.

> on end in the mountains, far from Athens, at the heart of winter.[566]

The representation of the *Dekemvriana* in the passages quoted above invites particular attention. Starting with the description of the fateful demonstration of December 3 that signalled the beginning of the battle of Athens, Psarafti here introduces the rather paradoxical idea that the police opened fire on the protesting crowd in order to prevent the eruption of violence. This admittedly awkward view has been criticised by Nikos Theodosiou, who accused the author of 'performing historical acrobatics in order to support her bigoted story.'[567] In the same passages it becomes clear that in Psarafti's novel the battle of Athens is represented as a communist-led revolt against the legitimate Greek government, a fight between EAM/ELAS and the Greek government/British forces, which ended with the humiliating defeat of the insurgents, much to the relief of the 'people' (λαός).

Unlike the dispassionate approaches discussed in the books of Papamoschou, Petrovits-Androutsopoulou and Dikaiou, in Psarafti's novel all the violence, all the atrocities and all the savagery is attributed almost exclusively to the rebels –'they left no one alive.' What is particularly

---

566 '-Παππού, στην Αθήνα έγιναν αγριότητες που δεν τις χωράει ο νους του ανθρώπου. Μακάρι η Ελλάδα να μην ξαναδεί μέρες σαν εκείνες του Δεκέμβρη του '44. Μάχες γίνονταν στους δρόμους της Αθήνας. Από τη μια οι αντάρτες μας, του ΕΛΑΣ, κι από την άλλη ο κυβερνητικός στρατός, οι χωροφύλακες και οι Εγγλέζοι. Σπίτια ανατινάζονταν για να γίνουν οδοφράγματα, τα εγγλέζικα τανκς περιπολούσαν στους δρόμους κι έριχναν στο ψαχνό. Αλλά και ο ΕΛΑΣ δεν έμεινε με σταυρωμένα χέρια. Ως τις 4 Δεκέμβρη οι δυνάμεις μας είχαν καταλάβει όλα τα αστυνομικά τμήματα καθώς και τα τμήματα της χωροφυλακής στις συνοικίες. Στις μάχες που έγιναν δεν άφησαν κανέναν ζωντανό. […] Εκείνο όμως που δεν μπόρεσα ν' αντέξω ήταν το ανθρωπομάνι που πήρε ο ΕΛΑΣ με τη βία από την Αθήνα, όταν χάσαμε τη μάχη της Αθήνας. Χιλιάδες άνθρωποι, αθώοι, άντρες, γυναίκες, γέροι, ακόμη και παιδιά πάρθηκαν όμηροι όταν υποχωρούσαμε. Οι περισσότεροι πέθαναν στο δρόμο καθώς περπατούσαν μέρες στα βουνά, πέρα από την Αττική, μέσα στο καταχείμωνο.' Ibid.: 73-4.
567 Theodosiou op. cit.

emphasised in the novel is the capture and forced evacuation of thousands of civilians by ELAS, following its defeat in the battle of Athens. This is one of the darkest aspects of EAM/ELAS's action during the *Dekemvriana*, a largely unsettling reality that had remained silenced in the 1980s books seeking to promote a sanctified image of the Left as the martyred victim of the conflict.

Contrary to everyone's hopes, however, the Varkiza Agreement did not bring peace and stability to the country. Instead, there followed a two-year period of 'white terror' that saw the intense persecution of thousands of former EAM/ELAS fighters and sympathisers by the government/monarchist camp, supported by large numbers of people who saw the situation as an opportunity to settle scores with their personal enemies.[568] The rebels, however, did not abandon their plans to gain control of Greece. As uncle Thymios tells Stelios's grandfather, the Treaty of Varkiza was only a 'break' that bought the rebels and communist leadership the time they needed to organise their next attempt to seize power.[569] The opportunity came with the outbreak of the Civil War in

---

568 Ὑπήρχαν σπιούνοι ανάμεσά μας. Αλλιώς δεν μπορούσαμε να εξηγήσουμε γιατί κάθε τόσο οι χωροφύλακες καλούσαν στο τμήμα χωριανούς για να τους ανακρίνουν για τις συζητήσεις που γίνονταν στο καφενείο. Άλλους, πάλι, τους ρωτούσαν για τους συγγενείς τους που είχαν περάσει στα γειτονικά κομμουνιστικά κράτη, την Αλβανία και τη Γιουγκοσλαβία. Χώρια που όσους ήταν πριν στο αντάρτικο τους τρομοκρατούσαν με την παραμικρή αφορμή. Αν κάποιοι πρώην αντάρτες είχαν παλιούς λογαριασμούς, αρκούσε μια καταγγελία στους χωροφύλακες κι εκείνοι τους έκαναν τη ζωή μαρτύριο. Όλο το 1945 πέρασε μέσα στην ένταση και την ανησυχία. Μαθαίναμε ότι ένοπλες ομάδες ακροδεξιών ξεφύτρωναν από παντού, στην Πελοπόννησο και στη Θεσσαλία. Γύριζαν στα χωριά και με την ανοχή της χωροφυλακής έκλεβαν και σκότωναν χωρίς έλεος. Αρκούσε μια καταγγελία, ψεύτικη πολλές φορές, ένας ψίθυρος, μια υποψία ότι κάποιος ήταν κομμουνιστής για να μη τον ξαναδούν οι δικοί του.' Psarafti op. cit.: 68-9.

569 '-Θύμιο, σας βλέπω με κομμένα τα φτερά σας. Πώς σας κατάφεραν και υπογράψατε συνθήκη που υποχρεώνει τους αντάρτες να παραδώσουν τα όπλα τους; Πού πήγε ο ηρωισμός και τα σχέδιά σας να κυβερνήσετε την Ελλάδα;

-Πατέρα, τίποτα δεν τελείωσε. Πίσω έχει η αχλάδα την ουρά. Ο αγώνας μας θα συνεχιστεί. […] Νομίζεις, πατέρα, ότι μας έπιασαν κορόιδα οι Εγγλέζοι και η κυβέρνηση του Πλαστήρα του προδότη; Η συνθήκη ήταν ένα διάλειμμα για να μπορέσουμε να ετοιμαστούμε πιο καλά τη δεύτερη φορά και να νικήσουμε.' Ibid.: 65.

1946. As Stelios's grandfather points out, 'the communists have decided that it is now or never. This is the opportunity they've been looking for all these years to seize power.'[570]

As the Civil War reaches its peak, in the early spring of 1948 the guerrillas begin to evacuate thousands of children from the communist-controlled territories of Northern Greece and transfer them to special children's camps in Eastern Bloc countries. Stelios's village suffers the same fate as all families are ordered to hand their children over to the guerrillas. The guerrillas declare that their intention is to save the children from the violence 'of the Americans and the monarchofascists of the National Army' as well as to educate them in communist ideology so that one day they could return to Greece and fight 'for the liberation of the people.'[571]

As Stelios's grandfather suspects, however, the humanitarian aspect of the forced evacuation operation was only a pretext. In reality, the goal of the guerrillas was to take the children away from their country and families and indoctrinate them with communist ideals, ultimately aiming at building an ideological army of young fanatical communists who would later be sent back to Greece to enable the rebels' plans for a communist takeover.[572] These fears are confirmed when Stelios and Marianthi are transferred to a children's camp

---

570 '-Ή τώρα ή ποτέ αποφάσισαν οι κομμουνιστές. Είναι η ευκαιρία που ζητούσαν τόσα χρόνια να πάρουν στα χέρια τους την εξουσία.' Ibid.: 81.
571 '-Γιατί ρωτάς; Αφού το ξέρεις, τα είπαμε εδώ και μέρες. Ένα μόνο να θυμάσαι. Τα παίρνουμε για να τα γλιτώσουμε από τις βόμβες των Αμερικάνων κι από τους μοναρχοφασίστες του Εθνικού Στρατού. Στις γειτονικές λαϊκές δημοκρατίες θα τελειώσουν το σχολείο και το πανεπιστήμιο, θα γίνουν καλοί κομμουνιστές και θα γυρίσουν ν' αγωνιστούν για τη λευτεριά των λαών.' Ibid.: 16.
572 '-Κόρη μου, αυτοί φαίνεται ότι έχουν κάνει τα σχέδιά τους εδώ και καιρό. Θέλουν να πάρουν τα παιδιά, να τα κάμουν κομμουνιστές. Θα γεμίσουν τα μυαλά τους με τις ιδέες και τα πιστεύω τους και όταν μας τα γυρίσουν πίσω θα είναι φανατισμένοι γενίτσαροι.' Ibid.: 124.

in the Socialist Republic of Albania together with hundreds of other abducted children.[573] In addition to their efforts to indoctrinate the children by forcing them to attend daily brainwashing sessions, Stelios realises that the communists were also aiming to alienate the children from their nation, language and families by 'filling their heads with lies and hatred for [their] motherland.'[574]

Contrary to the guerrilla's promises to the children's parents, the conditions in the camp are appalling; the children are undernourished and suffering from various diseases, they are made to perform long hours of forced labour, while their letters to their families are systematically withheld by the camp's staff. This situation drives even the most compliant children to protest at their poor treatment, comparing their living conditions to those enjoyed by their peers who were transferred to the childtowns (παιδουπόλεις) of Queen Frederica:[575]

> -Comrade, this is not what the *andartes* had promised us back in the village. We were promised plenty of food, new clothes, shoes and proper schools. Instead, we are starving, we have lice and scabies and, instead of receiving a proper education, we are made to listen to your theories that go in one ear and out the

573 'Οι αντάρτες βρήκαν αφορμή ότι κακοπερνούσαμε στο χωριό μας και μας έφεραν εδώ. Ο σκοπός τους όμως ήταν να μας πάρουν από τους γονείς μας και να μας κάμουν κομμουνιστές, και όταν γυρίσουμε πίσω, ν' αγωνιστούμε για να γίνει η Ελλάδα κομμουνιστική.' Ibid.: 135-6.

574 'Δεν ήξερα τι θα πει καθοδηγητής, με τον καιρό όμως έμαθα ότι θα μας γέμιζε τα κεφάλια με ψέματα και με μίσος για την πατρίδα μας. […] -Μαριάνθη, αυτοί εδώ οι Αρβανίτες έχουν κακό σκοπό. Θα μας κάνουν να ξεχάσουμε την πατρίδα μας, τη γλώσσα μας και τους δικούς μας. […] -Αναστάση, μην τους αφήσεις να διαλύσουν το μυαλό σου, γιατί αυτό θέλουν, να σε ποτίσουν μίσος, να σε κάνουν να μισήσεις το γονιό σου γιατί τάχα είναι φασίστας, προδότης, εχθρός της πατρίδας.' Ibid.: 131,134-5 and 139.

575 In 1947, just a few months after her coronation, Queen Frederica launched a war-relief campaign aimed at saving the children of Greece from both the dangers of the ongoing Civil War and the communist threat. Part of her salvation program was the evacuation of some 18.000 children from their war-stricken villages to special children's homes, the so-called childtowns of Frederica. The enterprise was labelled *pedophylagma* (literally child-protection) and was promoted as the antidote to the *pedomazoma* that was being carried out by the communist side. For more on the two evacuation projects see Baerentzen 1987: 127-58, Voutira and Brouskou 2000: 92-110, Vervenioti 2005: 101-123 and Danforth and Van Boeschoten 2012.

> other. I am tired of working every day like a dog. I'd rather have gone with the other kids in the Queen's childtowns. Their parents could see them whenever they wanted and the kids said that they had good food, plenty of meat, butter, marmalade, clothes and shoes, they went on excursions, they had fun and could attend proper schools.[576]

Psarafti returns to the subject of Queen Frederica's childtowns several times throughout the novel. Contrary to the children's lives in the camps of Eastern Europe, life in the childtowns is depicted in a generally favourable light. The young reader learns that the children who were placed in Queen Frederica's homes were well-fed and cared for, they could continue their education and maintain regular contact with their families until they could safely return to their villages after the end of the war. As for those children who had been orphaned by the war, the childtowns were the best alternative to a life of misery, starvation and social marginalisation.[577]

Without evading the question of the children's indoctrination with anti-communist propaganda and their education in the ideals fostered by the

---

576 '-Σύντροφε, αλλιώς μας τα έλεγαν οι αντάρτες στο χωριό. Μας υπόσχονταν μπόλικο φαγητό, καινούρια ρούχα και παπούτσια και κανονικά σχολεία. Αντί για όλα αυτά, εμείς πεινάμε, είμαστε γεμάτοι ψείρες και ψώρα, και αντί να μάθουμε γράμματα ακούμε όσα μας λες εσύ, που από το ένα αυτί μπαίνουν και από το άλλο βγαίνουν. Βαρέθηκα να δουλεύω κάθε μέρα σαν γαϊδούρι. Καλύτερα να πήγαινα με τα άλλα παιδιά στην παιδούπολη της βασίλισσας. Οι γονείς τους μπορούσαν να τα βλέπουν όποτε ήθελαν και τα παιδιά έλεγαν ότι είχαν καλά φαγητά, κρέατα, βούτυρα, μαρμελάδα, ρούχα και παπούτσια, εκδρομές, διασκέδαση, και πήγαιναν και σε κανονικά σχολεία…' Psarafti op. cit.: 145.

577 'Εκείνες τις μέρες έφταναν ειδήσεις και για ένα άλλο μάζεμα παιδιών. Άνθρωποι της βασίλισσας Φρειδερίκης γύριζαν στα χωριά και ζητούσαν από τους γονείς να δώσουν τα παιδιά τους για να ζήσουν στις παιδουπόλεις που είχε δημιουργήσει η βασίλισσα. Πολλοί γονείς, βασανισμένοι από τον πόλεμο, το φόβο και την πείνα, έδιναν πρόθυμα τα παιδιά τους. Έλεγαν ότι περνούσαν καλά, είχαν καθαρά ρούχα, παπούτσια, καλό φαγητό, πήγαιναν σχολείο, και τα μεγαλύτερα μάθαιναν μια τέχνη, μαραγκοί, σιδεράδες, μηχανικοί ενώ όσοι έπαιρναν τα γράμματα θα συνέχιζαν τις σπουδές τους στα πανεπιστήμια. Οι γονείς μπορούσαν να τα βλέπουν, να ρωτούν τους υπεύθυνους και να παρακολουθούν την πρόοδό τους. Έπαιρναν και παιδιά ορφανά, παιδιά ανταρτών που ο πατέρας ήταν στα βουνά, η μάνα στην εξορία και οι φτωχοί παππούδες δεν μπορούσαν να τα τρέφουν. […] Για όσα παιδιά όμως δεν έχουν τους γονείς τους, δεν έχουν στενούς συγγενείς, πεινούν και κινδυνεύουν να γίνουν κλέφτες για να ζήσουν, οι παιδουπόλεις είναι μια λύση.' Ibid.: 125-6.

government/royalist camp, life in Queen Frederica's camps is presented as the lesser of two evils for the reasons mentioned earlier.[578] Most importantly, the children would grow to love and defend their country, unlike their peers in Eastern Europe who were trained to become traitors to their own nation.

Ultimately, in Psarafti's novel the evacuation of children to Queen Frederica's childtowns is perceived as an act of saving young innocents from death, hunger and, most importantly, the lurking communist threat. The *pedomazoma*, on the other hand, is presented as an act of national treason, an orchestrated campaign aimed at the complete de-Hellenisation of the abducted children and their transformation into Soviet agents.

A central theme in post-war right-wing propaganda, the children's salvation from the claws of the guerrillas has served as a powerful symbol for the nation's salvation from the communist threat. This idea is also reproduced in one of the last scenes of Psarafti's novel. After they manage to escape the camp, Stelios and Marianthi spend several days wandering in the mountains trying to find their way back to their village. When they finally cross the Greek-Albanian borders, Stelios knocks on the door of the first house he sees and asks for shelter. The woman who answers the door breaks the good news to them:

-Who are you; What are you doing here?

578'-Μαριάνθη, τα παιδιά πρέπει να μένουν με τους γονείς τους. Εκείνοι θα κάνουν τα αδύνατα δυνατά για να τα ταΐσουν και να τα μεγαλώσουν. Νομίζετε ότι και στις παιδουπόλεις της βασίλισσας δε θα γίνεται στα παιδιά η ανάλογη διαπαιδαγώγηση; Θα κατηγορούν τους αντάρτες ότι είναι προδότες, εγκληματίες, συμμορίτες, εχθροί της πατρίδας. Για όσα παιδιά όμως δεν έχουν τους γονείς τους [...] οι παιδουπόλεις είναι μια λύση. Είναι καλύτερο να μείνουν στην Ελλάδα και να γυρίσουν στα χωριά τους όταν τελειώσει το κακό, παρά να σκορπιστούς στις λαϊκές δημοκρατίες και να ξεχάσουν τους γονείς και την πατρίδα τους...' Ibid.: 126.

> -We are Greeks and we are afraid that the guerrillas will find us and send us back to Albania.
>
> -The guerrillas? Haven't you heard? The war is over!
>
> I couldn't believe my ears. I wanted to give this woman a hug as if she were our mother.
>
> -Who won? The question was burning on my lips.
>
> -Greece, my dear children… Greece…[579]

The next and last scene of the novel finds Stelios and Marianthi back in their village. The siblings learn that during their absence their village was emptied by the National Army in, what is perceived as, another humanitarian effort of the government/monarchist camp to save civilians from the hazards of war.[580] The next day Stelios is overjoyed to see his grandfather, mother and the rest of his co-villagers returning to their homes. The novel closes with Stelios thinking: 'Life had returned to the village along with freedom, happiness and hope.'[581]

The nightmare is over, the siblings have managed to escape the terrible fate of becoming communist janissaries and Greece has been saved from falling

---

579 '-Ποιοι είστε; Τι θέλετε τέτοια ώρα;
-Έλληνες είμαστε και φοβόμαστε μήπως μας πιάσουν πάλι οι αντάρτες και μας στείλουν στην Αλβανία.
-Οι αντάρτες; Δε μάθατε ότι ο πόλεμος τελείωσε;
Δεν πίστευα στ' αυτά μου. Ήθελα ν' αγκαλιάσω την άγνωστη γυναίκα σαν να ήταν η μάνα μας.
-Και ποιοι νίκησαν; Η ερώτηση έκαιγε στα χείλια μου,
-Η Ελλάδα, παιδάκια μου… Η Ελλάδα..' Ibid.: 168-9.

580 '-Δε βλέπεις τι έγινε εδώ; Χαλασμός κόσμου… Βομβαρδισμοί, μάχες, σκοτωμοί… Ο κυβερνητικός στρατός μπήκε στο χωριό, οι αντάρτες αποσύρθηκαν στα ψηλώματα που είχαν τα οχυρά τους. Ο στρατός βοήθησε τους χωριανούς να πάνε σε μέρη που δεν κινδύνευαν. Όπου να 'ναι θα αρχίσουν να γυρίζουν. Μαθαίνουμε ότι είναι όλοι καλά.' Ibid.: 171. Part of its counterinsurgency strategy, in 1947 the government side adopted a policy of mass population displacement, evacuating thousands of peasants from their mountainous villages to refugee camps located on the outskirts of cities and towns. Justified on humanitarian grounds, the actual purpose of the operation was to weaken the position of the guerrillas by minimising their access to sources of supplies and fresh recruits.

581 'Η ζωή ξαναγύριζε στο χωριό, μαζί με τη λευτεριά, τη χαρά και την ελπίδα…' Ibid.: 174.

into the wrong–that is to say, communist–hands. And while in Dikaiou's novel young readers are prompted to understand that in a fratricidal war there can be no heroes or winning sides, in *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου* they read that the country emerged victorious from a devastating war that pitted brother against brother, leaving thousands dead and countless more displaced, imprisoned or exiled.

Far from presenting events 'objectively', Psarafti's representation of the Civil War closely echoes the post-war narrative of the victors: the theory of the three rounds, the allegations that the communist rebels had a secret agenda to cede part of Greek Macedonia to the Slavs,[582] the horrors of the *pedomazoma* and the positive evaluation of the government/Crown's campaign for the protection of the young and the innocent, all these were central components of the anti-communist narrative put forward by the victors of the Civil War. As I have shown in this chapter, they were also central themes in Litsa Psarafti's representation of the Civil War in *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου*.

A once forbidden topic, the Civil War attracted considerable interest from the authors of the period 1990-2014, as I have shown in this chapter. Adopting a more even-handed approach, Iro Papamoschou, Loti Petrovits-Androutsopoulou and, most notably, Eleni Dikaiou offered some of the most poignant and balanced representations of the Civil War in their respective

582 This is also addressed in Psarafti's novel: '-Δεν ντρέπεσαι, βρε; Ξέρεις γιατί ο Τίτο βοηθάει τους Έλληνες κομμουνιστές; Έχει βάλει στο μάτι ένα κομμάτι της Ελλάδας. Θέλει να δημιουργήσει τη «Μακεδονία του Αιγαίου» και γι' αυτό καλοπιάνει το Μάρκο και το ΚΚΕ. Δε βλέπεις ότι ξεπουλάτε την πατρίδα μας; Δίνεται δικαιώματα στους Σλάβους και στους Βούλγαρους να βγουν στο Αιγαίο και να φτάσουν τα σύνορά μας στη Θεσσαλία.' Ibid.: 95-6.

novels. Broaching a number of discomforting truths about the Left's role in the 1944-1949 fratricide, a subject that had been largely suppressed in the books of the 1980s, their novels encourage young readers to understand that the rival sides were both responsible for plunging the nation into the Civil War, both sides indulged in violence and both sides had their own victims to mourn. Published at a time when the Civil War was in the limelight, Litsa Psarafti's *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου* is a novel that steered away from the even-handed approaches of the 1990s and 2000s. Nearly thirty years after Nick Gage's *Eleni*, Psarafti's engagement with the *pedomazoma* divided critics and readers, with the author stating in an interview that her book had caused such strong reactions because the memories of the Civil War were still alive, even six decades after the end of the hostilities.[583] And if anything, the events of the turbulent period 2008-2014 only confirmed the truth of this statement.

583 See Litsa Psarafti's interview to Maria Topali, available at https://www.kathimerini.gr/866694/article/proswpa/synentey3eis/yarayth-ta-paidia-antexoyn-prepei-na-3eroyn

IMAGES OF JEWS AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE HOLOCAUST IN GREEK FICTION FOR YOUNG READERS (1974-2014)

To say that the 1980s saw an upsurge of interest in the Holocaust and its memory would be an understatement. Originally broadcast in the USA in 1978, *Holocaust* was a successful–and no less controversial–television miniseries that gripped millions of viewers worldwide and made the memory of the Holocaust the growing focus of international public attention. Regarded by many scholars as the starting point for the 1980s memory boom in America and West Germany,[584] the US-made miniseries raised public awareness and catalysed changes in the culture of Holocaust remembrance like no other event before.

Throughout the 1980s the Holocaust and its legacies continued to attract widespread public attention, followed by a series of much-publicised political scandals that broke out in several Western European countries[585] and a heated *Historikerstreit* that divided German intellectuals over the question of proper historisation and memorialisation of the Holocaust. Europe's preoccupation with the Holocaust intensified during the early 1990s. The collapse of the bipolar Cold War world led other countries that once formed part of the Eastern Bloc to take a more critical stance towards their past under Nazi rule. Although some countries were less willing than others to engage in national soul-searching about the crimes that were perpetrated on their soil

584 See, for instance, Kansteiner 2006: 124 and Reynolds 2018: 210.
585 Like the Bitburg controversy in West Germany or the Waldheim affair in Austria.

against their Jewish citizens and, most upsettingly, about the role of their non-Jewish population in the suffering of their Jewish neighbours, the memory of the Holocaust came to take centre stage in the post-Cold War collective Western consciousness.

The memory boom continued well into the following years on both sides of the Atlantic. The 1990s saw the release of various TV documentaries, films, novels and other cultural products about the Jewish experience during WWII, the mass publication of Holocaust survivor memoirs, the erection of Holocaust memorials and museums around the world and the organisation of a number of national commemorative events that culminated in 1995, on the fiftieth anniversary of the end of WWII.[586]

That same year, in May 1995, Athens hosted an international conference entitled 'Greece in 1936-1949: Dictatorship-Occupation-Civil War. Continuities and Discontinuities'. The first Greek-held conference to include the Civil War in its programme, it encompassed more than twenty presentations, none of which, however, dealt with the issue of the Greek Jewish experience of the Holocaust.[587] This absence was indicative of the research priorities in the Greek academic community of the early 1990s. With a few notable exceptions, scholarship on the Holocaust in Greece remained

586 The upsurge of interest in the subject was also reflected in the growing number of Holocaust-themed books published for a young–predominantly English-speaking–audience during this period. In his 1999 resource guide *The Holocaust in Literature for Youth*, Edward Sullivan listed six hundred works, including English translations from other languages, published between the 1970s and the 1990s. See Sullivan 1999.

587 For the published proceedings see Fleischer (ed.) 2003. The only presentation loosely related to the subject was Fragiski Abatzopoulou's paper discussing the image of the Jew in Greek fiction from the period 1930-1950. Abatzopoulou was one of the first scholars of the Holocaust in Greece during the 1990s.

limited during the 1990s as historical literature on the Resistance and the Civil War was growing more voluminous than ever.[588]

The lack of academic interest in the genocide of Greek Jews was symptomatic of the wider indifference exhibited by the post-war Greek state and society towards the drama of its Jews. Although almost 86% of the Greek Jewish population perished during WWII, the Holocaust in Greece was never integrated into a coherent national narrative. Struggling to cope with its 'own' traumatic memories of the Civil War and its bitter legacies, the post-war Greek society had little sympathy or energy to spare for the tragedy of its Jewish others. When addressed, the subject was revisited through the lens of the good Greek Christian narrative, a complacent myth with impressive durability that has only recently started to be deconstructed both within academic circles and–to a lesser extent–in the public sphere.

This chapter sets out to explore the representation of the Greek Jewish experience of the Holocaust in books for young readers published between 1974 and 2014. So far there has been very little scholarly inquiry into the subject, which does not extend beyond a small number of articles, focusing largely on the same novels.[589] Generally, one forms the impression that, for the most part, authors of books for young readers in Greece have avoided

588 See chapter 1 in Part III.

589 See Karakitsios 2013 and Goulis 2013, also available at http://keimena.ece.uth.gr/main/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=61&Itemid=97. Both articles appeared on a special issue of *Keimena*, an online journal dedicated to the study of children's and young adults' literature in Greece. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only Holocaust-dedicated issue that has been organised by a scholarly journal in the field during the period under study.

touching upon the subject of Jewish suffering and annihilation during WWII, a reluctance which is linked to the protracted inability of the Greek society to accommodate the memory of this tragedy into its 'own' national past.[590]

Contrary to this perception, this chapter aims to show that the subject of the Greek Jewish experience of the Holocaust has been steadily on the agenda of Greek authors since the early 1980s. Although the theme has remained largely peripheral and the Jews that feature in these narratives are almost exclusively secondary characters, authors have dealt with the issue of the Greek Jewish genocide in various ways, and it is this that I propose to explore here.

Of course, this chapter does not aspire to provide comprehensive coverage of the subject. This would require a separate study that would also have to engage in a discussion about the educational, ethical and other theoretical considerations that surround the issue of writing Holocaust literature for young readers. Since these issues have been thoroughly analysed by several renowned scholars around the world,[591] I will eschew such a discussion which, in any case, falls beyond the scope of this chapter.

The present chapter is divided into two sections. The first section discusses the representation of the Jewish characters that appear in the texts under examination. The main question underlying the discussion here is whether the literary construction of the image of the Jew confirms or undermines

590 Goulis ibid.: 16-7.
591 Most notably by Hamida Bosmajian (2002), Adrienne Kertzer (2002) and Lydia Kokkola (2003).

popular cultural stereotypes of Jews and their perceived otherness.[592] The second section looks at the Jewish characters' experience of the Holocaust. This subject has been to some extent discussed in chapter 4, Part III. As mentioned there, most authors had their Jewish characters escape their persecutors after managing to flee to safer places, often with the help of their larger-than-life Christian friends. In this section I focus on those characters that were not so fortunate and came to experience the horrors of the camps or the agonies of living in hiding.

The first Jewish character that appears in the corpus of the texts under examination is Miriam in Stella Vogiatzoglou's 1982 novel *Καβάλα σε δύο φεγγάρια* (Riding on Two Moons). A Sephardic Jew of Thessaloniki, Miriam is a widowed mother and an old neighbour of the protagonist's family. When Miriam first enters the scene she is described as a nice, poor Jewish woman who struggles to make ends meet on the factory floor. Subverting the stereotype of Jewish wealth, Miriam sometimes does not even have enough food to sustain her little boy and turns to her Christian neighbours, who are always willing to share the little they have with them. The only signifiers of Miriam's otherness are her distinctive Greek accent and occasional use of Ladino words, a feature that reveals the author's efforts to offer a historically accurate portrayal of Thessaloniki's Sephardic community.

592 Fragiski Abatzopoulou's ground-breaking study of the construction of the image of the Jew in contemporary Greek fiction has proved a major contribution to this field and also an important source of inspiration for this chapter. See Abatzopoulou 1998.

Miriam, however, is a minor character with no real agency or subjectivity. Besides depending the survival of her family on the benevolence of her Christian neighbours, when news spread that the Germans have ordered the gathering of the city's Jews, Miriam runs to her neighbours once again, asking them to tell her what to do. The family comes up with a plan to smuggle Miriam and her son to some relatives in a remote village, while Miriam, who is simply an observer and has no active involvement in her own rescue, shows her gratitude by kissing the hands and feet of her Christian saviour, despite the latter's humble protests.

Without discarding the author's well-intentioned efforts to memorialise the suffering of Thessaloniki's Jews through the suffering of her Jewish heroine, it seems that Miriam's character serves mostly to highlight the 'goodness' of the main protagonists and, by extension, the 'goodness' of the Greek Christian society towards its persecuted Jews. This is further illustrated by the fact that we never get to learn what happened to Miriam and her son, besides a brief sentence reassuring us that they managed to escape deportation thanks to the efforts of their Christian neighbours.

Soula Rodopoulou, on the other hand, gives proper closure to the story of Raoul, the young Jewish hero of her 1984 novel *Τα σαράντα κόσκινα* (The Forty Sieves). Raoul is an orphaned Jewish boy from Athens who spends most of the Occupation hiding in a small village, enjoying a relatively normal life under the protection of his late father's Christian friends.

When Raoul is first introduced to us, our attention is immediately drawn to his unique physical appearance. An exotic blend of stereotypically Jewish and

non-Jewish characteristics, Raoul has ginger hair, bright grey eyes and a delicate nose. His attractive appearance is complemented by an equally attractive personality. Good-natured and unusually mature for a ten-year-old boy, Raoul, moreover, has a talent for woodcarving, a thirst for knowledge and an aptitude for science. Raoul's uniqueness is also underscored by his ability to comprehend the world around him in a different way than most other people,[593] a trait also attributed to several other Jewish characters as I will show later.

The above description brings us to a question that becomes central when discussing the construction of Jewish characters in post-war narratives for young readers. As is the case with Soula Rodopoulou here, sometimes in their efforts to counteract traditional negative stereotypes about Jews and Jewishness in their writings, the authors under examination went to the other extreme, investing their Jewish characters with extraordinary traits and qualities. The result is that too often the young readers are presented with portrayals of Jews as angelic or exotic others, something that prevents rather than encourages identification with these characters. I will return to this topic later.

Rodopoulou's efforts to prompt her young readers to reject anti-Semitic stereotypes have a more profound effect in a scene in which Raoul cuts his knee while playing with his friends. Anna, Raoul's only Christian friend who

593 '-Αν τελειώσει ο πόλεμος, του 'λεγε ο Σωτηράκης.
-Θα τελειώσει, είμαι σίγουρος. Το 'λεγε με σιγουριά σαν μικρός προφήτης, κι έκανε το σημάδι της νίκης.' Rodopoulou 1984: 78.

knows about his Jewish identity, wipes off the blood. The narrator then comments:

> Anna could not understand why the Germans were after the Jews and why they wanted to kill Raoul. They said that Jews belonged to a dirty and inferior race. But there was nothing dirty or inferior in her friend. […] There was nothing dirty in his blood. His blood looked the same as hers.[594]

The question of Raoul's otherness is brought up on several other occasions throughout the novel. During his time in hiding, Raoul is home-schooled by Anna's father. Instead of instructing him in the traditional school curriculum, the man uses the Bible to teach Raoul about his race, encouraging him to feel proud of being a Greek Jew.[595] A few pages later Raoul is shown to participate in the village's Christmas celebrations alongside his Christian friends, even though the country has been liberated and there is no reason for him to hide his identity anymore. Shortly after Christmas, a representative of the Jewish community of Athens comes to the village to take Raoul to Palestine where, according to the narrator, the boy could find 'love and protection living among his own people.'[596] Raoul's friends farewell him with a gift, a Greek flag to remind him that he is a Jew but also Greek 'since [his] grandparents, [his] parents and [he] were born in Greece.'[597] The last one to bid him farewell, Anna's father wishes Raoul a life of 'happiness and peace alongside [his]

---

594 'Η Άννα δεν μπορούσε να εξηγήσει, γιατί οι Γερμανοί κυνηγούσαν τους Εβραίους και γιατί σώνει και καλά, έπρεπε να σκοτώσουν το Ραούλ. Έλεγαν πως ήταν βρώμικη φυλή, κατώτεροι άνθρωποι. Αυτή όμως δεν έβλεπε τίποτα το βρώμικο ή το κατώτερο στο φίλο της. […] Δεν είδε τίποτα βρώμικο στο αίμα του. Ήταν ίδιο με το δικό της.' Ibid.: 65.
595 'Του μίλαγε για τη φυλή του, μέσα απ' την Αγία Γραφή και το 'κανε να νιώθει περηφάνεια, που ήταν Ελληνοεβραίος.' Ibid.: 78.
596 'Ο μικρός θα 'βρισκε αγάπη και προστασία κοντά στους δικούς του.' Ibid.: 117.
597 'Είσαι Εβραιόπουλο λέει, αλλά, είσαι κι Έλληνας λέει, αφού εδώ γεννήθηκαν οι παππούδες σου λέει, οι γονείς σου κι εσύ λέει.' Ibid.: 117-8.

compatriots', continuing with the rather insensitive and inappropriate comment: 'You have suffered so much!! You have learned what love and kindness truly is' and the advice: 'May you live in love and peace with the other peoples around you. I am sure, you will never treat others the way you have been treated.'[598]

The above makes Raoul the most confusing Jewish character that appears in the corpus of the texts under examination. Raoul is a Jew who celebrates Christmas, a Greek national who migrates to Palestine to live with his 'compatriots', a boy of Greek ancestry who belongs to a different race and ethnicity. Despite the author's efforts to portray Raoul as one of 'us', it seems that Greekness and Jewishness are two identities that cannot be easily, if at all, reconciled. Raoul's migration to Palestine provides a convenient solution to this identity puzzle and is welcomed by all characters in the novel and, most likely, by young readers, who are reassured that the little Jew (Εβραιόπουλο) would be able to enjoy a happy life in his new homeland, living among his 'own' people, where he probably truly belonged.

And while Raoul's Jewish heritage creates a lot of unresolved confusion as to whether he is one of 'us' or not, in Litsa Psarafti's *Το διπλό ταξίδι* (The Double Voyage, 1987) Sarah goes on a painful journey of self-discovery that has a transformative effect on her understanding of her Jewishness. Like Raoul, Sarah is a character invested with exceptional traits. The first thing we learn

598 '-Λοιπόν, Ραούλ, στο καλό. Ευτυχία και γαλήνη εύχομαι να έχεις, μαζί μ' όλους τους πατριώτες σου. Υποφέρατε τόσο!! Εσείς μάθατε τι πάει να πει αγάπη και καλοσύνη. Με αγάπη και ειρήνη, να ζήσετε με τους άλλους λαούς γύρω σας. Το ξέρω, εσείς ποτέ δε θα φερθείτε, όπως σας φέρθηκαν.' Ibid.: 118.

about her is that 'she was different from all the other girls in the class, different in her appearance and bearings.'[599] A good friend of the novel's main protagonist, Vangelitsa, Sarah is a beautiful girl with blond hair and a delicate complexion, a silky girl (μεταξένια) as her teacher affectionately calls her. Sarah is also extremely gifted in music, confirming the western literary stereotype that represents Jewish characters with a special talent for the arts.[600] Seeking to spend her time in solitude rather than mingling with her peers, Sarah is also described to have a special connection with the elements of nature.[601]

Depicted as an exotic, angelic, fairylike figure, Sarah establishes her otherness early in the novel. Her almost otherworldly nature makes her particularly attractive in Vangelitsa's eyes. The two girls share a strong friendship despite their different religious upbringing. With their families also sharing a bond, Smaragda, Vangelitsa's maid, is the only character who objects to this unholy Christian-Jewish friendship:

> Did you go to the house of those Antichrists [αντίχριστους] again? Do you know what Jews do to little children? They put

599 'Η Σάρα ήταν αλλιώτικη από όλα τα κορίτσια της τάξης, όχι μόνο στην εμφάνιση αλλά και στα φερσίματα.' Psarafti 1987: 54.
600 See Gans and Leerssen 2007: 205.
601 Όταν πηγαίναμε εκδρομές με το σχολείο, έφευγε από κοντά μας και τριγυρνούσε μόνη της εδώ κι εκεί.
-Γιατί προτιμάς να μένεις μονάχη; την ρωτούσα. Έλα να παίξουμε. Σε λίγο αρχίζει το κυνήγι του θησαυρού…
-Δεν είμαι μόνη. Έχω συντροφιά μου τη μουσική….
-Δεν ακούω τίποτα.
-Όλα ολόγυρα είναι μουσική. Τα βατράχια που κουβεντιάζουν, η ανάσα της γης, τα βουητά των εντόμων, η ανατριχίλα των φύλλων που τα χαϊδεύει ο αέρας, το τρέμουλο των αστεριών…' Psarafti op. cit.: 55.

> them in barrels with nails and then roll them so they can get their blood out of them and drink it![602]

Psarafti here takes the opportunity to ridicule popular anti-Semitic canards by attributing these views to an illiterate and deeply superstitious woman whose limited knowledge of the world makes her susceptible to anti-Jewish conspiracy theories. Smaragda's blood libel accusations are angrily dismissed by Vangelitsa's mother who orders her to 'stop talking nonsense' and defends Sarah's parents, 'the purest and kindest people in the neighbourhood.'[603] This is also the attitude of the rest of the neighbourhood towards the Jewish family. Loved among their neighbours, the Mizrahi family is fully assimilated into Greek society and culture. Contrary to Raoul, Sarah's Jewishness is perceived as a matter of religion rather than race or ethnicity. As Vangelitsa points out, 'Sarah was born in Samos like me, she spoke Greek, Samos was her homeland, her home, her school, her friends who loved her, everything was there.'[604]

Sarah also views herself as a Greek Jew. This, however, changes after she is transferred to Auschwitz. When Sarah's mother dies at the camp, Rosa takes the girl under her wing. A Sephardic Jew of Thessaloniki, Rosa is a devout Zionist who makes consistent efforts to instil Jewish consciousness in Sarah and get her to re-envision her identity in terms of not only religion but

---

602 '-Πάλι σ' αυτούς τους αντίχριστους πήγες! Ξέρεις τι τα κάνουν οι Εβραίοι τα μικρά παιδιά; Τα βάζουν μέσα σ' ένα βαρέλι με καρφιά και τα κυλάνε, για να βγει το αίμα τους και να το πιούνε!' Ibid.: 56.
603 '-Σμαράγδα, τι βλακείες λες στο παιδί; Οι Μισραχήδες είναι οι πιο αγαθοί και καλόκαρδοι άνθρωποι στη γειτονιά μας, την απόπαιρνε η μάνα μου.' Ibid.
604 Ή Σάρα είχε γεννηθεί στη Σάμο, όπως κι εγώ, μιλούσε ελληνικά, εκεί ήταν η πατρίδα της, το σπίτι της, το σχολείο της, οι φίλοι της που την αγαπούσαν.' Ibid.: 200.

also ethnicity. Resisting at first–'Samos is my homeland… When we become liberated, father and I will go back to our home and live on the island forever'– Sarah soon embraces Rosa's vision of a new life in their ancestral homeland, where all Jews could live free and safe after enduring centuries of hate, persecution and death.[605] With her newly found Jewish ethnic consciousness fully developed, the dream of post-war resettlement in Israel becomes Sarah's *raison d' être*, giving her the will to survive the horrors of Auschwitz.

Almost four decades after their separation, Vangelitsa meets Sarah in Jerusalem while on a trip there. Now a renowned violinist, Sarah invites her childhood friend to her home where she talks to her about her horrific experience from Auschwitz and the hardships of her first years in Israel. This is when we realise that Sarah has metamorphosed into someone 'other' who has nothing in common with the Greek Jewish girl from Samos. Speaking in the first-person plural, 'we set down roots, we acquired land, we built homes', Sarah now calls Israel her homeland and the Jewish people her people.[606] A committed Zionist, Sarah expresses her complete lack of compassion for the drama of the displaced Palestinians with a roughness that reminds nothing of the warm-hearted little girl who was always happy to share her precious toys with her friends.

---

605 '-Εμένα πατρίδα μου είναι η Σάμος… Όταν λευτερωθούμε, θα γυρίσουμε με τον πατέρα στο σπίτι μας και θα ζήσουμε για πάντα στο νησί.
Η Ρόζα όμως δεν το 'βαζε κάτω. Κάθε βράδυ ξετύλιγε μπροστά στα λαίμαργα μάτια μου το όραμα μιας καινούριας ζωής, στάλαζε στην καρδιά μου την ελπίδα. Κι εγώ, συνεπαρμένη, ρουφούσα τα λόγια της σαν νεοφώτιστη και σιγά σιγά άρχισα ν' αγαπάω αυτόν τον τυραννισμένο λαό και να τον νιώθω δικό μου…' Ibid.: 231.
606 'Σιγά σιγά ριζώσαμε, αποκτήσαμε γη, χτίσαμε σπίτια.' Ibid.: 235.

This causes an instant rift between the two friends. With her other childhood friend, Rasmijia, in prison for her involvement in the Palestinian Resistance, Vangelitsa attacks Sarah, holding the Jewish people collectively responsible for the tragedy that befell the Palestinian nation: '-You put down roots by uprooting others.'[607] The two women eventually become reconciled after Sarah confides in her old friend her inability to bear children, a bitter result of the tortures she suffered during her internment at Auschwitz.

Psarafti is not the only author who drew parallels between the experience of the Jewish persecution during WWII and the Palestinian Nakba. Although less explicitly, the same idea is also conveyed in Soula Rodopoulou's *Τα Σαράντα Κόσκινα*: 'You have suffered so much!! [...] May you live in love and peace with the other peoples around you. I am sure, you will never treat others the way you have been treated', says Anna's father to Raoul before the boy departs for Palestine. In *Το διπλό ταξίδι* Vangelitsa accuses Sarah of her indifference to the ordeal of the dispossessed Palestinians: '-How can you say this? You, who have experienced first-hand the anguish of the persecuted who have no roots, no homeland?'[608]

And although it would probably be a commonplace to say that such analogies are problematic by definition insofar as they attempt to compare two inherently incomparable historical events, our concern does not stop there. Both Raoul and Sarah are expected to rise above their traumatic experience

607 '-Εσείς ριζώσατε! Ξεριζώσατε όμως άλλους.' Ibid.
608 '-Εσύ μιλάς έτσι; την έκοψα. Εσύ που γνώρισες την αγωνία του κυνηγημένου που δεν έχει γη και πατρίδα;' Ibid.

and derive a positive lesson from it. Having known suffering themselves, they are also expected to get on with their lives as ethical subjects par excellence, internalising the moral imperative dictating that they shall not treat others the way they have been treated.

I will conclude this discussion with an excerpt from Ruth Klüger's memoir *Still Alive: A Holocaust Girlhood Remembered*, which is strikingly relevant to my considerations here. A Holocaust survivor, Klüger recounts her encounter with 'some advanced Ph.D. candidates' in Germany when one of them 'report[ed] how in Jerusalem he made the acquaintance of an old Hungarian Jew who was a survivor of Auschwitz, and yet this man cursed the Arabs and held them all in contempt.' Much like Sarah. The young scholar, Klüger continues, wondered 'how can someone who comes from Auschwitz talk like that?' Much like Vangelitsa's accusations against her Jewish friend: 'How can *you* say this?' Klüger confronted the young man with the following oft-quoted statement:

> Auschwitz was no instructional institution […] you learned nothing there, and least of all humanity and tolerance. Absolutely nothing good came out of the concentration camps […] and he expects catharsis, purgation, the sort of thing you go to the theatre for? They were the most useless, pointless establishments imaginable.[609]

This, however, is an idea that goes completely unexplored in Rodopoulou's and Psarafti's novels. Already portrayed as exceptional individuals, Raoul and Sarah are expected to transform their traumatic experience into some sort of valuable moral lesson for the future, an opportunity to ascend to a new level

609 Klüger 2001: 65.

of ethical awakening. It is perhaps needless to say that here lurks the danger that the impressionable young reader is driven to perceive the Holocaust as a redemptive experience that purges the integrity of the human spirit, a danger that inhabits any impulse to derive positive lessons from the catastrophe, as so many prominent Holocaust survivors and scholars have cautioned us.[610]

Ruth from Spyros Tsiros's 1988 novel *Οι πήλινες μούσες* (The Clay Muses) is another character to add to the group of exotic and angelic Jewish others. Confirming a set of pervasive literary stereotypes of Jewish women, Ruth is an extremely beautiful sixteen-year-old girl with big eyes and long ebony black hair.[611] As was the case with Raoul and Sarah, Ruth is endowed with exceptional qualities; she was compassionate and generous, a motherly figure with a heart made of gold, according to the young protagonist's grandmother who knew Ruth and her two brothers before their sudden disappearance from their neighbourhood one night during the war. Like the two other Jewish heroes, Ruth has a divine talent for music and a special relationship with the creatures of nature that transcends human understanding.[612] As Ruth's old neighbour describes her in a nutshell, that girl was 'a true angel'.

---

610 Like Elie Wiesel, Saul Friedlander and Lawrence Langer, to mention but a few.

611 On the stereotypical representation of Jewish women in terms of a 'dark' Oriental beauty in modern Greek fiction see Abatzopoulou op. cit.

612 '[...] είχε πιάσει φιλίες μ' ένα χελιδόνι. Πραγματικό χελιδόνι, μ' ολόμαυρη ράχη, λευκή κοιλιά, σπαθάτες φτερούγες κι ουρά ψαλιδωτή, από κείνα που φτιάχνουν την άνοιξη και φεύγουν το φθινόπωρο για τα μέρη τα ζεστά του Νότου, να γλιτώσουν την παγωνιά του δικού μας χειμώνα. -Η Εβραιοπούλα είχε πιάσει φιλίες μαζί του; απόρησα. Γίνονται αυτά;
-Γίνονται, απάντησε χαμογελώντας. Την είχα δει που του μιλούσε, σαν να ήταν άνθρωπος. Κι εκείνο τιτίβιζε χαρούμενα, ξεθάρρευε, στροβιλιζόταν στον αέρα και μετά κατέβαινε κι αναπαυόταν στ' απλωμένα χέρια της...' Tsiros 1988: 24-5.

The last comment intrigues the young hero's curiosity who asks to learn more about Ruth's Jewish heritage: '-Do Jews have angels?' he asks his grandmother who replies: 'I don't know. Maybe they do. It's their business.'[613] The dividing line that is drawn here between 'us' and 'them', between a dominant Christian in-group and the Jewish others remains firm throughout the novel. The young boy also learns that Ruth and her brothers were extremely wealthy, leading a privileged life away from the prying eyes of their Christian neighbours. Their wealth, which comes in stark contrast to the young hero's poor family living conditions, further underscores the unbridgeable divide between 'us' and 'them'. Yet, as his grandmother remarks, 'these [privileges] have no real value compared to humanity and kindness' of which Ruth also had plenty.[614]

In general, as other scholars have also pointed out, though positive and sympathetic, the image of Jews in Tsiros's novel is constructed around a profound division that places 'us' in the centre of the universe and the Jewish others in the centre of a different, parallel realm.[615] Even when the terrible truth is revealed, the Jew is still viewed as other, a suffering other who deserves our sympathy, yet whose drama is observed from a privileged distance:

---

613 '[…] Σωστός άγγελος.
-Έχουν αγγέλους οι Εβραίοι, γιαγιά;
-Δεν ξέρω, αποκρίθηκε συγκινημένη. Μπορεί και να 'χουνε. Δικός τους λογαριασμός.' Ibid.: 23.
614 'Δε βαριέσαι. Αυτά δεν έχουν αξία, μπρος στην ανθρωπιά και στην καλοσύνη. […] Αγάπη πλημμύριζε την καρδιά της… […] σιχαινότανε την κακογλωσσιά, τόνισε μια μια χωριστά τις τελευταίες της λέξεις για να δείξει τον καλό χαρακτήρα και την αθωότητά της.' Ibid.: 23-4.
615 Goulis op. cit.: 6-9.

> Not to tell you what the Jews suffered in their [Nazi's] hands. They made it their aim to leave no one alive…
>
> -Why?
>
> -How should I know, my boy? my mother mumbled. But what I do know is that they hated the poor Jews… […] They put them in furnaces and burned them alive, as if they were not people like them, like us.[616]

Alkalai is a minor character of Iro Papamoschou's 1995 novel *Το γεφύρι της Ανατολής* (The Bridge of the East). A Greek Jewish officer from Thessaloniki, Alkalai lives in the same refugee camp that hosts Mania's family along with hundreds of other war-stricken islanders who fled to the Middle East, following the German conquest of the Dodecanese in 1943. Alkalai and Mania's father become good friends, exchanging news and thoughts about the war which seems to be approaching its end.

However, not everyone in Mania's family shares her father's fondness for the 'Greek officer with the name that sounded anything but Greek.'[617] Least of all grandmother Katerina, who resents Alkalai's daily visits to the family and insists on referring to him as 'the Jew'. Her son's protests–'for the love of God, mother. He is Greek too'–go unheeded, as for Mania's grandmother Greekness and Jewishness represent two inherently incompatible identities: 'Yes, but he

---

616 Άσε πια τι τράβηξαν οι Εβραίοι από δαύτους. Είχανε βάλει στόχο να τους ξεκάνουν και βουλή να τους ξεκληρίσουν…
-Γιατί;
-Πού να ξέρω, αγόρι μου; μουρμούρισε η μητέρα μου. Όμως ξέρω, πως μισούσαν τους δύστυχους Εβραίους… […] Κι ακόμη τους πετούσαν μέσα σε φούρνους και τους έκαιγαν, λες και δεν ήταν σαν εμάς και σαν αυτούς.' Tsiros op. cit.: 60.
617 'Ένας Έλληνας αξιωματικός που μόνο ελληνικό όνομα δεν είχε.' Papamoschou 1995: 220.

is a Jew.'[618] In a nutshell, Alkalai is an unwelcome other, at least for grandmother Katerina.

This, however, changes after it becomes known that Alkalai lost his entire family in the Holocaust, while he barely managed to escape deportation himself. Once his tragic story is revealed, Alkalai's Jewishness loses its previous negative connotations and acquires new meaning and significance. Consequently, the notion of Jewishness is reconceptualised in the context of Holocaust destruction and becomes a synonym for extreme suffering. This knowledge opens up a new space of contact between 'the Jew' and grandmother Katerina, who abandons her old prejudices and accepts Alkalai into her family as if he were her own son.[619]

In Eirini Marra's *Το άδειο μπουκάλι* (The Empty Bottle, 1996), on the other hand, Yakoumi's revelation about his experience of the Holocaust creates an awkward distance between him and his co-worker, Theofani. One of the novel's main characters, Theofani struggles to raise her two sons alone working as a cleaner at the tavern of a *mavragoritis*. Yakoumis also works at the tavern and the two heroes bond over their shared loathing of their exploitive boss. When Theofani compares her difficult situation to that of Yakoumis, complaining that he is in no position to understand her plight,

618 '-Για όνομα του Θεού, μητέρα, συγχυζόταν ο πατέρας, Έλληνας είναι κι αυτός. Και μάλιστα Έλληνας αξιωματικός.
-Ναι, αλλά εβραίος (sic.).' Ibid.: 221.
619 '-Κακόμοιροι άνθρωποι! έφριξε η γιαγιά Κατερινιώ. Κακόμοιρο παιδί! έκλαψε για τον Αλκαλάι και ξέχασε εντελώς την αντιπάθειά της. Από κει και πέρα, κάθε φορά που ο Αλκαλάι άνοιγε την πόρτα, η γιαγιά Κατερινιώ άνοιγε την αγκαλιά της.' Ibid.

Yakoumis decides to reveal something about himself that he was hiding from Theofani all this time:

> -What's my name, Theofani?
>
> -Yakoumis.
>
> -Which means?
>
> -Which means that your name is Yakoumis.
>
> -No. It means that my name is Jacob. And what kind of name is that, Theofani?
>
> -Jewish.
>
> -Exactly.[620]

The revelation of Yakoumis's Jewish identity instantly distances him from all that is known and familiar, leading Theofani to re-observe him through different lens: 'She looked at him again with new eyes.'[621] The man also reveals that almost everyone in his family perished in a Nazi concentration camp and that he would have died there too had he not managed to smuggle himself out of the camp. The only surviving male member of his family, Yakoumis is now responsible for looking after his sister and nieces who are hiding in their home, living with the constant fear that they will be discovered and send to their death.

---

620 '-Πώς με λένε, κυρα-Θεοφανή;
-Γιακουμή.
-Που θα πει;
-Θα πει Γιακουμής.
-Όχι. Θα πει Ιακώβ. Και τι όνομα είναι το Ιακώβ, κυρα-Θεοφανή;
-Εβραίικο.
-Ακριβώς.' Marra 1996: 139.
621 'Ξανακοίταξε τον άντρα με άλλα μάτια.' Ibid.

However, Yakoumis's experience of the Holocaust is a minor theme that goes almost completely unexplored in the novel. Instead, it could be argued that his story serves as a kind of moral yardstick for measuring human suffering, an unsettling reminder that there were others who had been through a lot worse, as Theofani comes to realise: '[she] remained silent. What was there to say? You start to talk about your pains only to hear that someone else has suffered worse.'[622]

As with the Jewish heroes discussed previously, Yakoumis is a figure with minimal agency and character depth. His role is limited to one scene in which he, a persecuted camp survivor, comforts Theofani and uses his experience to teach her an empowering lesson about the importance of resilience and courage, just when she is about to lose hers. Their encounter–again, her encounter with a persecuted camp survivor–leaves Theofani 'relieved' after Yakoumis tells her what she so desperately wanted to hear, namely, that 'their ordeal' (το μαρτύριό μας) will soon come to an end.[623] This is exactly what happens at the end of the novel for Theofani and her sons. Yet, whether this is also what happened for Yakoumis and his remaining Jewish family is something that we never get to find out.

I will conclude this section with Maroula Kliafa's *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα* (A Ballad for Rebecca, 2011), a compelling coming-of-age novel about

---

622 'Η Θεοφανή δε μιλούσε. Τι να πει; Πας να πεις τον πόνο σου και βρίσκεις τα χειρότερα.' Ibid.: 141.
623 '-Γι' αυτό σου λέω, κυρα-Θεοφανή. Στις μέρες αυτές που ζούμε, το πιο σημαντικό είναι να κρατηθούμε ζωντανοί. Αγάντα, κι όπου να 'ναι, θα τελειώσει το μαρτύριό μας. [...] Έφυγε από το καφενείο ανακουφισμένη. Δεύτερη φορά που άκουγε το μήνυμα. Θα φύγουν, θα γλιτώσουμε.' Ibid.: 141-2.

a Jewish girl living in a small provincial town of Greece during the Occupation. The first Greek book for young readers to feature a Jewish protagonist, Kliafa's novel stands out from all the other narratives discussed so far for a number of other reasons.

As I have discussed in this section, Greek fiction for young readers has a long tradition of constructing images of Jews in terms of their otherness–be that their exotic beauty, extraordinary gifts, saintly personalities, heavy accents or puzzling ethno-racial origins that renders them 'almost Greek'.[624] This places the Jewish characters above and beyond the sphere of familiarity into the margins of an imagined, beguiling, almost fetishised otherness.

Yet, in Kliafa's novel there is nothing exotic or strangely unique about the Jewish heroine. Instead, Rebecca is a perfectly ordinary girl who simply happens to be Jewish. Like many other Jewish characters, Rebecca is represented with an aptitude for music and an inclination towards the arts; however, this is interpreted to be the result of her musical upbringing and personal hard work rather than a heavenly gift firmly embedded in her Jewishness.

---

624 I borrow the notion from Madelyn Travis's monograph *Jews and Jewishness in British Children's Literature*. Discussing the representation of the uneasy relationship between Britishness and Jewishness and the possibility of a hybrid identity, Travis has argued that 'British children's literature demonstrates that Jews inhabit a liminal space in British society, neither wholly within nor without that reserved for those who "belong". I contend that literature for young people demonstrates that Jews have been, and to an extent continue to be, considered "almost English", a phrase which brings to mind Homi Bhabha's description of colonised peoples' relationship to the colonisers as "almost the same but not quite".' Travis 2013: 3.

The above renders Rebecca a relatable character, allowing a high level of narrative empathy and identification with the heroine on the part of the young reader. Relating to this, another striking difference is that Rebecca is the only Jewish character with agency and voice. Rather than being externally observed by an omniscient narrator or one of the main characters, as is the case with the Jewish heroes discussed previously, Rebecca is internally focalised. This is another strategy that fosters narrative empathy, as it grants readers unmediated access into Rebecca's inner thoughts and emotions.

Having a Jewish character as the protagonist and focalising hero of the story is a strategy that automatically transcends the dividing line between 'us' and 'them', inviting young readers to question popular assumptions about Jews and their perceived otherness. In *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα* Kliafa revisits the image of the Jewish other, deconstructs it and rebuilds it into something that feels close and familiar.

Rebecca, for example, is the fruit of love between Asher and Eleni/Esther, a Christian woman who converted to Judaism to marry the love of her life. Her parents' elopement raised eyebrows in both families, with some relatives voicing strong opinions against this inappropriate union. The two families became reconciled once and for all after Rebecca's birth and, despite some occasional grudges, religion was no longer a point of conflict between Rebecca's grandparents.

Rebecca, in her turn, grows up to perceive her Jewishness in terms of a divided identity rather than an integral element of selfhood: 'Sometimes, the fact that I am half-Christian and half-Jewish makes me feel somewhat like I'm

hanging. It's a strange feeling. Like I'm in the middle of the ocean with my feet planted on two different boats', the heroine admits to herself.[625] Raised in a tolerant interfaith environment, Rebecca is encouraged to explore her relationship with Judaism with an open mind and a critical gaze, rather than blindly clinging to its sacred texts and teachings.[626] Rebecca's sometimes uneasy relationship with her Jewishness further establishes her as a relatable character in the eyes of young readers, who often find themselves experiencing similar struggles in defining their relationship with an inherited faith.

Rebecca's Jewishness, however, is not perceived as simply a matter of faith. More importantly, it is a matter of cultural heritage and tradition. Kliafa's novel is the only book that offers an insight into the cultural aspect of Jewish life and religion; the kippah, the shofar, the observance of Sabbath, the culinary customs, the celebrations of Purim, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, to mention but a few, are all traditions of a religious culture that the young reader is invited to explore, not as an external observer but from 'within', through the lens of the Jewish protagonist.

In addition to the above, another employed strategy that is particularly effective in reversing preconceived notions of Jewish otherness is the

---

625 'Κάποιες φορές, το γεγονός πως είμαι μισή χριστιανή και μισή Εβραία με κάνει να νιώθω λιγάκι ξεκρέμαστη. Είναι ένα παράξενο συναίσθημα. Σαν να βρίσκομαι στη μέση του ωκεανού, με το ένα πόδι μου να πατάει σε μια βάρκα και το άλλο σε μια δεύτερη.' Kliafa 2011: 22.
626 'Το καλό είναι πως κανένας από τους δυο γονείς μου δεν είναι φανατικός με τη θρησκεία, αλλά και κανένας απ' τους παππούδες μου δεν προσπάθησε ποτέ να με προσηλυτίσει. Αυτό βοηθάει να υπάρχει μια ισορροπία ανάμεσα στα δυο σόγια. Όσο για μένα, διαβάζω με το ίδιο ενδιαφέρον τόσο την Παλαιά όσο και την Καινή Διαθήκη. […] Η ιστορία της Εσθήρ, όπως είπα, είναι η αγαπημένη μου. Αντίθετα, η ιστορία του Αβραάμ δε μου αρέσει καθόλου μα καθόλου. Τι κι αν ο Αβραάμ είναι ο γενάρχης της εβραϊκής φυλής; Εγώ τον αντιπαθώ. Ακούς εκεί να ετοιμάζεται να σφάξει τον γιο του Ισαάκ, για να αποδείξει την πίστη του στον Θεό! Πιο ανατριχιαστική ιστορία δεν έχω ξανακούσει στη ζωή μου.' Ibid.: 23.

description of the town's Jewish neighbourhood. In a passage that addresses directly the implied reader, Rebecca comments:

> The Jewish neighbourhood is located in the heart of the town. Careful! One should not think of a secluded neighbourhood where long-bearded, kippah-wearing Jews are strolling its streets and dead-end alleys. No, not all. It's nothing like what we see in the cinema. The Jewish neighbourhood of Trikala is not a ghetto. True, most of the households are Jewish, but there are also many Christians living among us, most of whom are our friends. Grandma Sarina can confirm that we've always had good relationships with our Christian neighbours.[627]

This is not to say that Kliafa paints an idyllic picture of Jewish-Christian coexistence. Far from it, despite the amiable climate between the two communities, anti-Jewish superstition was running deep in the local society: 'Some mean-spirited people insist on spreading stories about Jews who put Christian children in barrels with nails in order to extract their blood.'[628] This is a theme that, as we already saw, has also been addressed by other authors; yet, the difference here is that Kliafa creates an opportunity for fostering narrative empathy by shifting the perspective to the recipient of these fictitious and hurtful rumours:

> Even Avra, my best friend, once asked me if it is true that we make our unleavened bread with blood. 'This is nonsense and you are stupid for even thinking that' I answered. 'Alright, don't

627 Ἡ εβραϊκή συνοικία απλώνεται στην καρδιά της πόλης. Προσοχή. Μη φανταστεί κανείς μια γειτονιά απομονωμένη, όπου στους δρόμους και τα αδιέξοδα σοκάκια της κυκλοφορούν Ιουδαίοι με μακριές γενειάδες και την παραδοσιακή κιπά στο κεφάλι. Μπα, όχι. Καμιά σχέση με όσα βλέπουμε στον κινηματογράφο. Η εβραϊκή συνοικία στα Τρίκαλα δεν είναι γκέτο. Μπορεί τα περισσότερα σπίτια να είναι εβραϊκά, ανάμεσά μας όμως ζούνε και πολλοί χριστιανοί, που είναι αληθινοί φίλοι. Η γιαγιά Σαρίνα βεβαιώνει πως πάντοτε είχαμε καλές σχέσεις με τους χριστιανούς.' Ibid.: 43.

628 Βέβαια, όλες αυτές οι ευεργεσίες των ομοθρήσκων μας δεν εμποδίζουν μερικούς κακόπιστους να διαδίδουν πως τάχα οι Εβραίοι αρπάζουν τα χριστιανόπουλα και τα χώνουν σε βαρέλια με καρφιά για να πάρουν το αίμα τους.' Ibid.: 44.

get mad, I only asked you a question' she said and apologised.
But the truth is that I get hurt every time I hear such rumors.[629]

In conclusion, with Rebecca, Kliafa has managed to create the most rounded, realistic and relatable Jewish character that appeared in a fictional narrative for young readers in the period under consideration. More importantly, in *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα* Kliafa has managed to de-otherise the Jewish other and place them back into the realm of familiarity. To put it in different words, Kliafa has managed to transform the image of the Jew from a fetishised, imagined other to 'our' Jew next door.

This brings us to the next part of this chapter discussing the representation of the Greek Jewish experience of the Holocaust. As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, most authors had their Jewish heroes escape deportation and death by either concealing their identity or fleeing to safer places, often with the help of their Christian friends. In this section, I focus on four books that take on the difficult task of telling the story of what happened to those who were less fortunate.

Spyros Tsiros's *Οι πήλινες μούσες* is set in the early post-war years. The protagonist of the story is a young boy who grows up next to an abandoned mansion that used to be the home of a wealthy Jewish family. The unsuspecting boy is curious to know what happened to the mysterious residents who disappeared suddenly from the neighbourhood a few years ago.

---

629 'Ακόμα και η φιλενάδα μου η Αύρα με ρώτησε μια φορά αν είναι αλήθεια πως φτιάχνουμε τα άζυμα με αίμα.
«Αυτά είναι βλακείες κι εσύ είσαι ηλίθια» της απάντησα.
«Εντάξει, μη θυμώνεις, μια απλή ερώτηση έκανα» είπε η Αύρα και μου ζήτησε συγγνώμη.
Η αλήθεια είναι πως πολύ στεναχωριέμαι όταν ακούω αυτές τις συκοφαντίες.' Ibid.

His persistent questions are met with silence, lies or unconvincing half-answers, as no one in his family–or in the post-war society for that matter–was willing to tell a story that they themselves were trying to forget.[630] Halfway through the novel, the hero's mother finally decides to lift the veil of secrecy and reveal the horrific truth that laid underneath:

> Not to tell you what the Jews suffered in their [Nazi's] hands. They made it their aim to leave no one alive…
>
> -Why?
>
> -How should I know, my boy? my mother mumbled. But what I do know is that they hated the poor Jews... They hunted them down, they dragged them out of their hideouts and rounded them up, they loaded them on cattle cars, like animals and sent them to the camps, places where there was nothing but horror and death for them. They put them in gas chambers where they died after taking a few breaths. They put them in furnaces and burned them alive.[631]

With his mother unable to provide an informative answer as to what led to the Jewish catastrophe, the hero's mind becomes fixated on the fate of the beautiful Ruth: '-And Ruth? What happened to her? […] -Did Ruth survive?' he keeps asking his mother whose answer implies more than what is allowed to be admitted: 'How should we know? No one has set foot in their house since

---

630 '-Θέλω να μάθω κι άλλα για τη Ρουθ.
-Α, μην έχεις παράπονο. Δεν ξέρω άλλα.
-Και πότε κλείσανε το σπίτι τους κι απόμεινε σαν την καλαμιά στον κάμπο;
-Δε θυμάμαι, φώναξε κοφτά και, μπαίνοντας, άναψε το χλωμό φως της κουζίνας.
Μου έκρυβε την αλήθεια. Θυμόταν και παραθυμόταν. Το μαρτυρούσε η στάση της και το φανέρωνε η έκφρασή της Όμως, δεν ήθελε να προχωρήσει παραπέρα, ν' αφηγηθεί τη συνέχεια και να μ' οδηγήσει στην έξοδο του Λαβύρινθου, σαν να τη συγκρατούσε και να την εμπόδιζε μια δύναμη αόρατη.' Tsiros op. cit.: 25-6.

631 Άσε πια τι τράβηξαν οι Εβραίοι από δαύτους. Είχανε βάλει στόχο να τους ξεκάνουν και βουλή να τους ξεκληρίσουν… -Γιατί; -Πού να ξέρω, αγόρι μου; μουρμούρισε η μητέρα μου. Όμως ξέρω, πως μισούσαν τους δύστυχους Εβραίους… Τους καταδίωκαν, τους έβγαζαν από τις κρυψώνες τους, τους μάζευαν, τους φόρτωναν -σαν τα ζώα- σε καμιόνια και τρένα και τους έστελναν σε στρατόπεδα, σε μέρη όπου τους περίμεναν φρίκη κι ο θάνατος. Σε θαλάμους με δηλητηριώδη αέρια τους έβαζαν και πέθαιναν, οι δύστυχοι, με τις πρώτες αναπνοές. Κι ακόμη τους πετούσαν μέσα σε φούρνους και τους έκαιγαν.' Ibid.: 60.

then, no one in the neighbourhood has received a letter from them… Their house is still as it was when they left that wild night of agony…'[632]

The terrible revelation leaves the young boy struggling with nightmares. His dreams are inhabited by emaciated figures of Holocaust victims emerging from the ashes, 'reaching their hands out to the living and begging for someone to give them back their lost peace.'[633] Among them, Ruth appears ethereal, bathed in sunlight and holding white flowers in her hands. Her ghostly appearance along with the fact that she remains silent to the hero's agonising questions: 'tell me that you got away, tell me that you escaped their claws',[634] only come to confirm what both the protagonist and the reader most probably already knew.

Discussing the much-debated issue of narrative closures and the possibility of happy endings in Holocaust literature for young readers, Adrianne Kertzer has famously noted that 'if we persist in thinking that children need hope and happy endings (and I must confess that I believe that they do), then the stories we give them about the Holocaust will be shaped by those expectations', continuing with the observation that 'we need to consider narrative strategies […] that give child readers a double narrative, one that simultaneously respects our need for hope and happy endings even if it teaches us a different

---

632 '-Κι η Ρουθ τι γίνηκε; […] -Γλίτωσε η Ρουθ; ψιθύρισα. -Πώς να μάθουμε; Κανένας δεν ξαναπάτησε στο κατώφλι τους από τότε και κανένας στη γειτονιά δεν πήρε γράμμα τους… Τ' αρχοντικό τους είναι όπως τ' άφησαν εκείνη την άγρια νύχτα της αγωνίας…' Ibid.: 61.
633 'Φιγούρες αλλόκοτες, πρόσωπα σκελετωμένα, φυσιογνωμίες τραγικές ξεπηδούσαν από στάχτες κι ερείπια, κι άπλωναν τα χέρια παρακλητικά, λες και πρόσμεναν, ικέτευαν κάποιους να τους χαρίσουν τη χαμένη τους γαλήνη.' Ibid.: 62-3.
634 '«Ώστε, ξέφυγες, σώθηκες από τα νύχια τους εσύ;» τη ρώτησα με λαχτάρα. Τίποτα. Δεν αποκρινόταν. Πότε πλησίαζε και πότε ξεμάκραινε στο βάθος του ορίζοντα και γινόταν όνειρο.' Ibid.: 63.

lesson about history.'[635] Hamida Bosmajian has introduced the term 'enabling rhetoric' to describe such a strategy that allows authors to present the events of the Holocaust in a manner that is truthful and respectful to the memory of the victims, while maintaining an affirmative stance towards life. As Bosmajian has shown, a common strategy for achieving this is through the use of binaries such as death/rebirth, lost/found, experience/meaning, with the first term signifying Holocaust trauma while the second term encouraging a restorative, life-affirming vision for the future.[636]

This type of enabling rhetoric is also employed by Tsiros, who closes his story with an optimistic, forward-looking scene. A few months after the traumatic revelation, the young hero discovers that the abandoned Jewish house next door has now become home to a family of swallows. The swallows, with which Ruth had a special connection, left after the disappearance of the Jewish family and did not come back for many years. And now, 'they were returning to rebuild their old half-ruined nest, to close its gaps and heal its wounds.'[637] Applying Bosmajian's model of binaries to Tsiros's story, it is evident that the empty Jewish home serves as a metonym for Holocaust destruction and death, while the return of Ruth's swallows becomes a symbol for hope and rebirth. This is a characteristic example of the enabling rhetoric strategy that allows the author to talk to his young readers about the ultimate human tragedy that was the Holocaust while satisfying his audience's need

635 Kertzer op. cit.: 74-5.
636 Bosmajian op. cit.: 126.
637 'Κουβαλούσανε λάσπη και χορταράκια με το ράμφος τους, συμπλήρωναν τη μισογκρεμισμένη φωλιά, κλείνανε τα κενά και γιάτρευαν τις πληγές της…' Tsiros op. cit.: 69.

for hopeful closures, as is also illustrated by the book's closing line: 'but now I knew that tomorrow everything was going to be better.'[638]

Published in 1987 and 2014 respectively, Litsa Psarafti's *Το διπλό ταξίδι* and Maria Lambadaridou-Pothou's *Συνέντευξη με το φάντασμα του βάλτου* (Interview with the Phantom of the Swamp) are two books that take us down to the 'eerie, silent world of gas, ashes and flames' to borrow Eric Kimmel's words. To quote Kimmel again, 'lower than this we cannot go, for this is the world of the camps.'[639]

In Litsa Psarafti's *Το διπλό ταξίδι*, Vangelitsa runs into Sarah in a concert in Jerusalem. Sarah invites her old friend to her home where, upon Vangelitsa's insistence, she tells the story of what happened to her and her family after their sudden disappearance from Samos, forty-five years earlier. From that point on, the perspective shifts to Sarah as she begins to narrate her story in harrowing detail.

Following their unsuccessful attempt to escape to Turkey, Sarah and her parents were arrested and taken to the cattle cars along with hundreds of other Greek Jewish families. This is when horror starts to become an experienced reality for Sarah as she realises that the train was taking them 'there', to the place of Jewish suffering that the grown-ups called Auschwitz.[640]

---

638 'Όμως εγώ, τώρα πια ήξερα πως αύριο θα πήγαιναν όλα καλύτερα.' Ibid.: 70.
639 Kimmel 1977: 91.
640 'Τη νύχτα, όταν τα παιδιά πέφταμε αποκαμωμένα, οι μεγάλοι ξαγρυπνούσαν και κουβέντιαζαν. Ξυπνούσα από τα σφυρίγματα του τρένου κι αυτά που έπαιρνε τ' αυτί μου ήταν χειρότερα κι από τους εφιάλτες που έβλεπα στον ύπνο μου. Μιλούσαν για στρατόπεδα εργασίας που ήταν χειρότερα κι από την κόλαση, για φούρνους όπου έκαιγαν τους Εβραίους... [...] Πηγαίναμε πάντοτε κατά το βοριά κι όταν κοντεύαμε να περάσουμε και την Τσεχοσλοβακία, όλοι έλεγαν πια με σιγουριά πως μας πήγαιναν «εκεί». Τότε πρωτάκουσα να μιλάνε για το Οσβιέτσιμ,

After Sarah's arrival at Auschwitz-Birkenau, we are introduced to the horrors of the concentration camp universe. The representation of a Holocaust story told from the perspective of the concentration camp victim is extremely rare in Greek fiction for young readers, as authors have traditionally avoided taking their readers down into the nightmarish world of the camps.[641] Psarafti here walks the thin line between exposing her audience to the grim realities of camp life while, at the same time, shielding her impressionable readers from too frightening an experience that would perhaps leave them emotionally brutalised and lost. Psarafti achieves this by employing a strategy that allows her to present her material in an 'ebb and flow' manner, alternating between scenes of extreme suffering and death, followed by scenes of individual bravery and courage.

Upon their arrival at Auschwitz, Sarah and her mother are separated from her father by a group of SS officers. The scene of their separation is one of the most emotionally challenging parts of her story, as the reader becomes painfully aware that although the heroine managed to survive in the end, her loved ones did not: 'This was the last time we ever saw father', Sarah recalls.[642]

το Άουσβιτς όπως το έλεγαν οι Γερμανοί, τον τόπο του μαρτυρίου μας στους κατοπινούς μήνες…' Psarafti op. cit.: 216.

641 This reluctance is also observed in other national literatures for young readers. In 1977, when writing his seminal article on the representation of the Holocaust in American fiction for young readers, Eric Kimmel was able to trace no more than one novel written from within the perspective of the concentration camps. Although since then the number of novels with a concentration camp setting has increased significantly, at least in the American book market, these works continue to represent the 'rarest type' of Holocaust literature for young readers, according to David Russel. See Russel 1997: 274. Also, Kertzer op. cit.: 279.

642 'Από τότε δεν ξανάδαμε πια τον πατέρα.' Psarafti op. cit.: 217.

Sarah's gaze moves to reveal the unspeakable tragedy that is taking place around her; families being separated from their sick and elderly who are sent to their deaths, husbands being torn away from their wives, little kids being ripped out of their mother's arms and thrown 'inside the building with the tall chimney that was belching black smoke.'[643] Psarafti does not spare her young readers descriptions of the ultimate horrors encountered by the Jews upon their arrival at the concentration camp nor does she attempt to soften human suffering and death with beautifying metaphors. The landscape of the camp is one of senseless death and destruction and Psarafti does not shy away from representing it as such.

After her separation from her father, Sarah and her mother are transferred to Birkenau to work as forced labourers in the camp's sewing workshop. There they meet Rosa, a Greek Jew from Thessaloniki, who befriends the two women. Their work at the workshop and their friendship with Rosa are the only things still capable of filling their lives with some sense of meaning, giving them the strength to cope with the daily nightmare that was their life in the concentration camp: 'The sewing workshop was a kind of a refuge for me and my mother, a place that kept us away from the *kapo*. It took our minds away from our ordeal, it gave us the courage to hold on to life', Sarah recollects her experience of her days at Birkenau.[644]

---

643 '[...] άρπαξαν τα μωρά και τα μικρά παιδιά και τα πήγαν αριστερά, μέσα σ' ένα τουβλόχτιστο κτίριο με ψηλή καμινάδα που έβγαζε μαύρο καπνό.' Ibid.: 218.

644 'Το ραφείο ήταν για μένα και τη μητέρα μου καταφύγιο, γλιτώναμε από τις αγγαρείες και τους εξευτελισμούς της κάπο. Με τη δουλειά ξεχνούσαμε την κατάντια μας, παίρναμε κουράγιο να κρατηθούμε στη ζωή.' Ibid.: 221.

Yet, the camp world is a savage one and Psarafti does not refrain from representing its grimmest aspects. As Sarah recalls, humanity was not part of the camp universe, not even among the inmates: 'In the camp, I came to experience the brutality of the human soul. Rarely would you find a woman who maintained her humanity. There was no hand to support you, no mouth to offer you a word of consolation.'[645] With their spirits almost completely broken, the ashes and the horrible smell that fill the air over the camp is another constant reminder of their precarious existence, as Rosa cynically points out.[646]

This, however, is a horrific reality that Sarah has not been fully exposed to yet. Death, in fact, reaches her through Rosa who, despite her mother's protests, tries to open the girl's eyes to the horror of mass extermination that is taking place around them:

> and on top of this, to have to listen to Rosa talking about gas chambers, about thousands of women and children who are murdered with Zyklon, about the furnaces where they burn the dead bodies, about people dying from starvation and exhaustion in the camp's factories.[647]

Death becomes a witnessed reality for Sarah when she is made to watch the execution of three prisoners who were arrested for attempting to escape the

---

645 'Μέσα στο στρατόπεδο, παιδί ακόμα, γνώρισα όλη την αγριότητα της ανθρώπινης ψυχής. Σπάνια συναντούσες γυναίκα που διατηρούσε την ανθρωπιά της. Δεν έβρισκες ένα χέρι να σε στηρίξει, δεν άκουγες μια κουβέντα παρηγοριάς.' Ibid.

646 'Θα δουλέψουν πάλι οι καμινάδες, κουνούσε το κεφάλι της η Ρόζα και δεν ξεκολλούσε τα μάτια της από το ανοιχτό παράθυρο. Από κει μέσα θα περάσουμε όλες, συνέχισε. Δείτε τον καπνό που βγαίνει ανακατωμένος με στάχτες. Δε σας μυρίζουν τα καμένα μαλλιά, η ψημένη σάρκα που καίγεται με το λίπος; και το βλέμμα της έδειχνε πως ήταν κοντά στα σύνορα της τρέλας.' Ibid.: 222.

647 'Και να 'χεις και τη Ρόζα να σου μιλάει για τους θαλάμους αερίων, για τις χιλιάδες γυναικόπαιδα που θανατώνονταν με το κυκλώνειο, για τους φούρνους όπου έκαιγαν τα πτώματα, για τα εργοστάσια καταναγκαστικής εργασίας, όπου πέθαιναν οι εργάτες από την πείνα και τις εξοντωτικές συνθήκες δουλειάς.' Ibid.: 221.

camp. As other scholars have pointed out, death is something that normally occurs off-stage and away from the focaliser's view in most Holocaust narratives for young readers.[648] Psarafti here pushes these boundaries by depicting death directly, in all its graphic detail. The arrested women are executed by hanging and Sarah is forced to watch along with other prisoners. The young girl instinctively closes her eyes before the macabre sight. This, however, the protective shielding from the disturbing reality of death, is a luxury that the author cannot afford to either her heroine or her readers. With Rosa behind her whispering: 'watch, remember', Sarah's gaze aligns with this of the reader as she opens her eyes to look at the raw, savage face of death.

At this point, the author strategically interrupts Sarah's narration and transfers us back to the comfort of her living room in the safe present, as the perspective shifts to Vangelitsa who struggles to digest the dreadful story she has just heard. After a much-needed pause, Sarah picks up the thread of her unfinished story with a question that is arguably addressed to both Vangelitsa and the implied reader: 'Can you bear to hear the rest?'[649]

The next scene finds Sarah working with her mother and Rosa in a secret organisation that helped the inmates of Birkenau to communicate with their relatives at Auschwitz through messages that the women stitched into the prisoners' clothing. Her involvement in the organisation pulls Sarah out of her despair and gives her the strength to cope with the cruel conditions of the

---

648 See Bosmajian op. cit.: 133 and Tal 2013: 5.
649 '-Αντέχεις ν' ακούσεις και τη συνέχεια;' Psarafti op. cit.: 224.

camp.[650] Yet, the camp world was one in which survival did not depend upon one's wits, bravery or inner strength and Psarafti is careful to prevent her readers from reaching such conclusions.[651]

Keeping up with the 'ebb and flow' construction of Sarah's story, the next scene finds the heroine struggling with the most devastating loss of all. The death of her mother, and a little later of her father, leaves Sarah emotionally numb. This is when Rosa comes to take Sarah under her wing and provide new hope on which to establish a *raison d'être*. Rosa's Zionist vision of a safe, prosperous future in the Jewish ancestral homeland gives Sarah a reason to hold onto life until the nightmare is finally over and the two women are free to start a new life in Israel.

Maria Lambadaridou-Pothou's *Συνέντευξη με το φάντασμα του βάλτου* is another book that looks down at the bottomless pit of horror that was the world of the concentration camp. A time-slip novel, the story follows a young journalism student who finds the diary of her late grandfather and uses it to travel back in time where she witnesses the tragic love story between her great-grandmother, Dimitra, and Andrew.

After she finishes her quest, young Dimitra discovers that the diary includes one last section which her grandfather, Michelis, has titled 'for Alberto'.

---

650 'Είχαμε βγει από την απάθεια και τη μοιρολατρία που βασίλευε στο στρατόπεδο. Η ζωή μας είχε αποκτήσει κάποιο νόημα, όλες αυτές οι μυστικές δραστηριότητες ήταν σαν διεγερτικό, ατσάλωναν τη θέλησή μας να επιζήσουμε.' Ibid.: 226.

651 For all her resilience, Sarah is fully aware that survival in the camp was a matter of pure luck and that every day carried with it the same expectancy of death: 'Σε κάθε προσκλητήριο περίμενα, λουσμένη στον ιδρώτα, ν' ακούσω τα ονόματά μας. [...] Τα προσκλητήρια είχαν γίνει ο καθημερινός εφιάλτης μας. Πέφταμε το βράδυ στο αχυρένιο στρώμα κι ευχαριστούσαμε το Θεό που μας είχε χαρίσει μια ακόμα μέρα ζωής.' Ibid.: 226-7.

Dimitra begins to read and we are transferred back to the early post-war years when Michelis travels to Athens to visit his old Jewish friend, Alberto. A concentration camp survivor, Alberto now lives in a Red Cross hospice alone and having lost all will to live. Sensing that his end is near, Alberto has asked to see Michelis so that he could thank him for the old engraved ring that he put in his hand years ago, just before the Nazis loaded him into the car that transported the Jews of their island to the death trains.

Alberto takes out the ring and begins to tell the story of how this odd artefact helped him retain his faith in life and hope, when life and hope were no longer an option past the barbered wire of the concentration camp. Yet, unlike Sarah, Alberto refuses to delve into the nightmarish details of his experience from the camp world:

> I am not going to describe to you what I suffered back then, I don't want to remember the atrocities and the unspeakable horrors that we experienced every day in the camp. I will only tell you the story of the ring. The secret power of its engraved symbols.[652]

What we have here is a characteristic example of what Bosmajian calls 'protective censoring' in Holocaust books for young readers. As Bosmajian has shown, oftentimes, authors who choose to write about the Holocaust feel the urge to conceal or limit the site of represented atrocious history with reader-protective strategies designed to shield young readers from being exposed to more gruesome a reality than they are ostensibly capable of dealing with.[653]

---

652 'Δεν θα σου διηγηθώ τα μαρτύρια της ζωής εκείνης, δεν θέλω ούτε εγώ να θυμηθώ ξανά τις αγριότητες και τον μέχρι θανάτου τρόμο που ζούσαμε καθημερινά. Θα σου πω μόνο την ιστορία του δαχτυλιδιού. Τη δύναμη που έκρυβαν τα σύμβολα της εγγραφής.' Lambadaridou-Pothou 2014: 154-5.
653 Bosmajian op. cit.: xiv-xv.

Considered from this perspective, Alberto's inability to cope with his traumatic memories–and, consequently, his inability to communicate his nightmarish experience–is part of a strategy that spares both the author and her readers from descriptions of the ultimate horrors encountered by those who passed the gates of the concentration camp.

Yet, this grim reality is not entirely omitted from the novel. Lambadaridou-Pothou employs a strategy which allows her to 'show' what cannot be expressed in words. When Alberto enters the scene our attention is immediately drawn to his fragile physical and mental condition:

> He was skinny, almost skeletal. He turned his face and looked at me, without realising who I was. His eyes had lost their sparkle. His skin was yellow and dull, stretching over his bones. He was practically dead […] I held him in my arms. His body felt like a bunch of broken twigs. But he was laughing. His whole face was laughing. Maybe this is the first time he has laughed since then, I thought, as I started to laugh with him. But his laughter quickly turned into tears.[654]

If in Tsiros's story the abandoned Jewish house serves a metaphor for Holocaust destruction and death, Lambadaridou-Pothou here employs the figure of a camp survivor drained of all life as a metonymic symbol for the unspeakable pain suffered by the victims of the concentration camps. Too unimaginable to capture in words, Alberto's traumatic experience is represented through its lingering effects on his collapsing body and mind that leave the hero hovering at the border between life and death.

---

654 'Ήταν αδύνατος, σχεδόν σκελετωμένος. Όταν γύρισε το κεφάλι και με είδε, δεν κατάλαβε ποιος ήμουν. Τα μάτια του ήταν άφεγγα. Και η επιδερμίδα κίτρινη και θαμπή, κολλημένη πάνω στα κόκαλα. Τίποτα δεν μαρτυρούσε ένα ζωντανό πλάσμα. […] Το σώμα του έμοιαζε στα χέρια μου ένας σωρός από τσακισμένα κλαδάκια. Όμως γελούσε. Το πρόσωπό του ολόκληρο γελούσε. Μπορεί και να μη γέλασε από τότε, σκέφτηκα, και γελούσα κι εγώ μαζί του. Όμως γρήγορα το γέλιο του έγινε κλάμα.' Lambadaridou-Pothou op. cit.: 150-51.

The only possible way for Alberto to revisit his experience from the concentration camp is through the story of the ring. At only nine years of age, Alberto was transferred to the camp together with his aunt Elissavet. The little boy carried with him an old engraved ring that Michelis had slipped into his hand as the Nazis were rounding up the local Jews for deportation.

Alberto recounts how one night he noticed that the symbols of the inscription were actually letters. The next day, the boy showed the ring to aunt Elisavet who saw the situation as an opportunity for providing little Alberto with a mental escape from the bleak environment of death and destruction around them. Elisavet suggests that the engraved letters are part of an ancient prayer to some higher spiritual power. After that, the two make it their aim to piece together the letters of the inscription and decipher the meaning of the prayer.

Alberto's growing belief that there is some higher power protecting them from evil becomes an important coping mechanism which helps him find the strength to persevere.[655] It also enables him to escape the cruel realities of the camp by entering a pretend world of reversed experience: 'I didn't know if the power was coming from the ring or from within me', Alberto recounts, 'but I was feeling powerful, so powerful that I could see the enemy crumbling,

655 In the language of psychology, this coping mechanism is referred to as 'supernatural protection' and is one of the main coping strategies identified by Suedfeld et al. in their interviews with Holocaust survivors. See Suedfeld et al. 1997: 153-78.

vanishing, while I was climbing a beautiful mountain, breathing the fresh air and feeling happy.'[656]

Years after his release from the camp, telling the story of the ring acts as a kind of therapy that allows Alberto to work through his traumatic memories and reassert control over himself. His face, Michelis notices, starts to glow again and life returns to revitalise his wrecked body.[657] As Alberto begins to recite the prayer, a nurse comes to inform him that his lost sister has been found alive. As we find out later in the novel, Alberto managed to reunite with his sister and went on to live a full life, leaving the nightmares of his past behind him.

Moving on to Maroula Kliafa's *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα*, the last part of this chapter looks at a different aspect of the Jewish experience during the Holocaust; that is to say, the experience of living in hiding. Following their town's surrender to the Germans and the subsequent intensification of anti-Jewish measures, Rebecca's family flees to a remote village where they enjoy a relatively safe life under the protection of the local villagers and the partisans. A few weeks after their relocation, Rebecca's brother falls ill. Their mother decides to take the boy to see their doctor back in the town. Rebecca

---

656 'Δεν ήξερα αν η δύναμη πήγαζε από το ίδιο το δαχτυλίδι ή εγώ την είχα βρει μέσα μου, όμως ένιωθα τόσο δυνατός, που τον εχθρό τον έβλεπα συνέχεια να γκρεμίζεται, να αφανίζεται, και τότε εγώ ανέβαινα σε ένα όμορφο βουνό, σαν αυτό που ονειρεύτηκα χτες τη νύχτα, και ανάσαινα, ανάσαινα τον άνεμο που φυσούσε και ήμουν ευτυχισμένος.' Lambadaridou-Pothou op. cit.: 157.

657 'Η νοσοκόμα έφερε το φαγητό και ο Αλβέρτος έφαγε με απίστευτη όρεξη. Έτσι που η νοσοκόμα απόρησε. «Έναν χρόνο τώρα αρνείται να φάει» είπε. «Τι έγινε;» […] Ο Αλβέρτος σταμάτησε να μιλά. Είχε ανάγκη να πάρει ανάσες. Μικρές πνιγμένες ανάσες σάμπως να είχαν μικρύνει τα πνευμόνια του. Όμως το πρόσωπό του έλαμπε τώρα. […] Το πρόσωπό του έλαμπε.' Ibid.: 153-7.

goes with them but opts to spend the night in the house of her Christian grandparents instead. The heroine wakes up in the middle of the night to the sound of the telephone ringing frantically. Rebecca hears her grandfather explaining in a quavering voice that her mother was arrested during a night raid on the town's Jewish quarter. Upon hearing the news, Rebecca passes out and wakes up three days later only to learn that both her mother and brother have been arrested and taken away, presumably to a Nazi concentration camp.

Following the deportation of his daughter and grandson, Rebecca's grandfather hides the heroine in the attic of a watermill, where she spends the next six months living alone and isolated from the rest of the world. Rebecca's experience of her long days and nights in hiding is described in the last two chapters of the novel. Written in the diary form, the first of these chapters can be seen as an intertextual nod to the world-famous Dutch diarist who has gone down in history as the universal symbol for the martyred youngsters of the Holocaust. Moreover, Rebecca's recorded experience shares some of the main themes that we find in the 'young diarist of the Holocaust' genre; the constant fear of being found out, for example, the care not to make sounds or leave traces that could give the heroine away, the endured boredom and the efforts to fill the endless hours of her solitude with reading and journaling.[658]

Unlike her Dutch counterpart, however, Rebecca suffers her ordeal alone and deprived of her family as a source of comfort and support. With her father

658 For an annotated collection of excerpts from diaries written by young Jewish victims of the Holocaust see Zapruder 2002.

fighting in the mountains and her mother and brother's fate fearfully unknown, Rebecca's diary entries reflect her agonising efforts to navigate a sea of thoughts and emotions that oscillate between hope, fear, despair, desire to survive and guilt at having escaped deportation. Another theme that runs through Rebecca's entries is her inability to cope with the memory of a cherished past. Despite her efforts to stop dwelling on the past: 'No more memories. That's it. *Verboten'*, memories of her previous happy existence come back to haunt her, plunging her deeper into the waters of grief and despair.[659]

Isolated from nearly all human contact and forced to stay out of sight at all times, Rebecca spends months on end without knowing what happened to the deported Jews. Shielded from the dreadful rumors of life and death in the Nazi camps, Rebecca's ignorance enables her to find relief in fanciful scenarios in which her mother and brother are allowed to return home after their captors realise what a terrible mistake they made by arresting them. As hard as she tries to convince herself that this is true, however, the young girl is painfully aware that her fantasies may be a far cry from what has happened in reality.[660] Eventually, Rebecca plucks up the courage and asks the owner of the watermill, the only person besides her grandfather who knows of her hideout,

---

659 'Με πνίγουν οι αναμνήσεις. Προσπαθώ να μη θυμάμαι τίποτα. Όμως ΘΥΜΑΜΑΙ. […] Δε φοβάμαι τα σκοτάδια. Φοβάμαι τις αναμνήσεις μου. Μερικές φορές νιώθω να με συνθλίβουν. Σήμερα το πρωί έδωσα στον εαυτό μου μια υπόσχεση. Να πάψω να θυμάμαι. Απαγορεύονται οι αναμνήσεις. Πάει τέλειωσε. Φερμπότεν. […] Υποσχέθηκα στον εαυτό μου να ξεχάσω το παρελθόν. Όμως αυτό, παρά τη θέλησή μου, έρχεται συνεχώς στο μυαλό μου και με βασανίζει. Δε θέλω να θυμάμαι.' Kliafa op. cit.: 214-15.

660 'Έκείνο το βράδυ, για μια ακόμα φορά αναρωτήθηκα ποια τάχα να ήταν η τύχη της μαμάς και του Οβαδία. Η σκέψη μου πολλές φορές τις ώρες της ξαγρύπνιας μου τρέχει κοντά τους. Φοβάμαι το χειρότερο και την ίδια στιγμή πείθω τον εαυτό μου πως, δεν μπορεί, οι Γερμανοί σίγουρα θα έχουν καταλάβει το λάθος τους και θα τους έχουν αφήσει ελεύθερους. Σκαρώνω με τη φαντασία μου τα πιο απίθανα σενάρια σωτηρίας.' Ibid.: 219.

about the fate of her loved ones. His answer: 'Unfortunately, my child, no one knows what happened to the arrested Jews',[661] implies more than what Rebecca can bear to hear. The man goes on to explain that the Jews were transferred to special concentration camps that the Nazis had created for them.

The traumatic realisation that her mother and brother may have perished in the camp creates an unfilled gap in Rebecca's life. Seeking to spare each other from additional pain, Rebecca and her grandfather avoid talking about their deported loved ones during the latter's visits to his hiding granddaughter. Instead, they develop a defence mechanism that allows them to enter a world of protective denial, a world in which there is no deportation, no death, no loss to endure, a world in which there is no 'before or after', as Rebecca poignantly comments.[662]

The heroine manages to come to terms with the painful realities of her life in the last chapter of the novel entitled 'The Beginning of a New Life' (Η αρχή μιας καινούριας ζωής). After spending several days in agony wondering why she is not hearing from her rescuers, Rebecca is visited in her hideout by the caretaker of the watermill. The man, who as Rebecca finds out knew about

---

661 'Τη στιγμή που ετοιμαζόταν να με αποχαιρετήσει, βρήκα επιτέλους το κουράγιο να τον ρωτήσω για όλα αυτά ου τόσο καιρό με έκαιγαν. «Τι απόγιναν οι δικοί μου; Μάθατε κάτι;» ρώτησα. Κοντοστάθηκε λιγάκι ξαφνιασμένος. Για να κερδίσει χρόνο ξερόβηξε μια δυο φορές, κι ύστερα τα μάτια του, μέσα από τους χοντρούς πρεσβυωπικούς φακούς, με κοίταξαν με οίκτο. «Δυστυχώς, παιδί μου, κανένας δε γνωρίζει τι απόγιναν οι συλληφθέντες Εβραίοι. Ακούστηκε πως τους πήγαν στη Λάρισα και από εκεί τους φόρτωσαν σε τρένα και τους μετέφεραν κάπου στη Γερμανία».' Ibid.: 220-21.

662 'Στις συζητήσεις μας αποφεύγουμε και οι δυο να αναφερθούμε στη σύλληψη των Εβραίων. Καμωνόμαστε πως στη ζωή μας δεν υπάρχει το πριν και το μετά.' Ibid.: 223.

her situation all along, breaks the news to her that the Germans are finally gone and that she is now free to return to her home.

Ecstatic to be in the outside world again, Rebecca rushes to the house of her Christian grandparents where she also finds her Jewish grandparents waiting for her. After the first tears of joy, Rebecca's grandmother remembers that she has something for her; a piece of sheet music entitled 'A Ballad for Rebecca' created by Konstantinos, Rebecca's love interest from her days of hiding in the village.

Rebecca grabs the sheet music and runs to her family home. As she opens the door, however, she realises that her house has been looted. Dark, silent and lifeless, Rebecca's empty family home becomes a recognisable metonym for Holocaust trauma and loss. The only item still standing inside the cold, void home–and consequently, Rebecca's only material link to her past–is her mother's piano. In a scene steeped in symbolism, Rebecca sits at the piano and starts to play the ballad. A divine melody then begins to fill the empty house, a hymn to life that 'explodes in a cadence of joy and triumph.' As she hits the final notes, however, Rebecca realises that one of the piano keys is broken, causing her ballad to remain without closure.[663]

Discussing the issue of narrative endings in Holocaust literature for young readers, Lydia Kokkola has distinguished between structural and psychological closures. The purpose of the first, Kokkola notes, is to bring the

663 'Κι ύστερα το φινάλε. Μια συγχορδία χαράς και θριάμβου. Ξάφνου τα χέρια μου μένουν μετέωρα. Μια νότα είναι χαλασμένη. Τη χτυπάω, την ξαναχτυπάω... τίποτα. Δε βγάζει κανέναν ήχο.' Ibid.: 231.

plot to a satisfactory conclusion, whereas–the rarer–psychological closures are intended to bring the protagonist's personal conflicts into balance.[664] Kliafa's novel is the only text that offers psychological closure to the story of the Jewish heroine. To return to the last scene of the novel, after a few moments of hesitation Rebecca decides to play her ballad again from start to finish, reconciling herself to the realisation that the gap in her mother's piano keyboard–and consequently, the gap in her life–will always be there to remind her of her losses. The novel closes with Rebecca thinking: 'I now feel ready to start a new life' as she lets herself indulge in the beautiful melody.[665]

In this chapter, I have examined the construction of the image of the Jew and the representation of the Jewish experience of the Holocaust in Greek fiction written for young readers from 1974 to 2014. To sum up the main points of the discussion, in the first section I demonstrated that Jews are represented in terms of their otherness–whether in terms of their exotic beauty, extraordinary gifts or puzzling ethno-racial origins–something that renders them similar to but not quite the same as the rest of 'us'. With Greekness so closely intertwined with Orthodox Christianity, the representation of Jewishness in terms of a multifaceted identity that transcends carefully drawn boundaries between 'us' and 'them' is something that Greek young people's fiction is still struggling to come to grips with.

---

664 Kokkola op. cit.: 154-5.

665 'Στο πιάνο υπάρχει ένα κενό. Όπως και στη ζωή μου, σκέφτομαι. Για μια στιγμή διστάζω. Ύστερα αποφασίζω να παίξω την μπαλάντα μου από την αρχή. Δεν έχει σημασία που στο πιάνο λείπει μια νότα. Εγώ μπορώ να την ακούω νοερά. Η μουσική γλιστράει κάτω από τα δάχτυλά μου. Τη νιώθω να κυλάει μέσα μου. Να με κατακλύζει. Κι εκείνη ακριβώς τη στιγμή συνειδητοποιώ πως είμαι έτοιμη να αρχίσω μια καινούρια ζωή.' Kliafa op. cit.: 23.

Maroula Kliafa's *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεββέκα* is a break from this norm. The first Greek book for young readers to feature a Jewish protagonist, Kliafa's novel is also significant for having managed to normalise the image of the Jews and put them back into the realm of the familiar.

In the second section, I discussed the representation of the Jewish experience of the Holocaust. The limited number of books that deal with this subject by comparison with the number of books that engage with other aspects of the Greek 1940s–the Occupation, for example, the Resistance or the Civil War–and the fact that even in these books the story of the Greek Jewish genocide is treated as a minor episode in the bigger picture of Greek suffering during the 1940s brings us back to the observations made at the beginning of this chapter; that the memory of the Holocaust in Greece has yet to find its way into 'our' national memory.

CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis I have examined a wide range of fictional narratives for young readers, written between 1974 and 2014 and dealing with different aspects of the Greek 1940s. I will end this study by offering some overall conclusions as well as outlining some ideas as to the direction of (my) future research.

Regarding the representation of Greece's wartime enemies, the overall conclusion is that authors of books for young readers based their depictions on the stereotypical dichotomy between bad Germans and good Italians. Even after the early 1980s, when they began to address the issue of Nazism and distinguish between Germans and German Nazis in their stories, the depiction of Greece's wartime enemies continued to adhere closely to the post-war narrative elaborated by the victors of WWII. In this narrative, the universally acknowledged enemy was (Nazi) Germany and Austria was its first victim, forced into a war of aggression that no true Austrian had ever supported. A *brava gente*, the Italians, on the other hand, were victims of *Il Duce* and his Fascist regime. The nice Mediterraneans ran a restrained and more or less bloodless occupation regime, doing everything possible to protect the occupied peoples from the violence of the *cattivi Tedeschi* until they themselves fell victim to German savagery. As I have shown in this study, this is pretty much the story told in the narratives examined here. Several decades after the end of WWII, Greek authors writing for young readers continued to base their representations of the enemy on the same cultural stereotypes and myths that

allowed the post-war dominance in Western Europe of a narrative hinged on the image of the bad (German), the good (Italian) and the (Austrian) victim.

As regards the representation of wartime collaboration, the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* told a reassuring story orchestrated around the Greek version of the deGaullian myth about a handful of abject and worthless individuals who collaborated with the enemy. Over time, and as the changing politics of memory allowed more critical investigations into the past, they began to address the issue of organised collaboration in their stories. However, there are still two major aspects of the collaboration phenomenon that authors for young readers continued to shy away from; that is to say, the subject of puppet governments in Axis-occupied Greece and the issue of Greek Christian collaboration in the persecution of Greek Jews, one of the biggest skeletons in the closet of post-war Greek society.

The wartime Resistance, on the other hand, is one of the most widely represented aspects of the Greek 1940s in the books of the period 1974-2014. However, the authors' engagement with this subject differs sharply in each of the three periods under study. With the authors of the early *metapolitefsi* placing the focus on the individual hero and his contribution to the Resistance, in the 1980s the focus shifted to the Greek people as a whole (the λαός) and the left-wing movement for liberation, a trend that was in line with the new national interpretations of this period that predominated after PASOK's rise to power. In the books of the period 1974-1989, any memory of the unsavoury aspects of the Resistance was displaced by reassuring stories painting an idealised picture of the struggle for liberation. The end of the Cold

War divisions and the ensuing explosion of interest in this period gave the authors of books for young readers the opportunity to address new topics, the most notable among them being the contribution of the non-EAM resistance organisations, the subject of women's participation in the struggle for liberation and the internal divisions in the Resistance that paved the way for the outbreak of the Civil War.

Perhaps the most tangible manifestation of the relationship between the changing politics of memory and the authors' decision to include or exclude certain material from their stories is the representation of the Civil War. A blatantly suppressed subject in the books (and school textbooks) of the early *metapolitefsi*, the Civil War started to be addressed in the narratives published after the official recognition of the left-wing Resistance in the early 1980s. The story of the Civil War was told from the perspective of the victimised Left, with authors in the 1980s largely blaming the outbreak of that fratricidal war on foreigners. As Greek society began to publicly confront its civil war skeletons after the end of the Cold War, authors of books for young readers also began to take a more critical approach to the divisive events of the post-liberation period. Most of the authors from this period were even-handed in apportioning blame, while a few of them also went on to address some of the most contentious aspects of the Civil War, like the so-called *pedomazoma* and the red violence.

Lastly, in this study I have explored the representation of the Jews and the Holocaust in Greek fiction for young readers from 1974-2014. In this respect, another overall conclusion is that, with the exception of Maroula Kliafa, the

authors from this period portrayed their Jewish characters in terms of an imagined, beguiling, almost fetishised otherness that renders them similar to but not quite the same as 'us'. The limited representation of the Holocaust in Greek youth literature should be linked to the protracted inability of Greek society to incorporate this tragedy into its 'own' national past, as well as to the lingering myth of Greek Christian solidarity with the persecuted Jews. This is also illustrated by the large number of stories featuring selfless folks endangering their own lives to save the lives of their Jewish neighbours, as opposed to the limited number of narratives that go on to tell the story of what happened to those Jews who were less fortunate.

I will end this study with a question which I hope to answer in the years to come: Where can we go from here? As mentioned in the Introduction, this study fills an important gap in the existing literature regarding the relationship between the shifting politics of memory and the cultural representations of the Greek 1940s by extending the discussion to the field of literature for young readers. The next challenge would be to take this discussion further, through a comparative examination of the representation of the national experience of WWII in fiction for young readers from countries with a similar wartime experience to Greece, such as France, Belgium or Italy. This is a long-term and extensive project which cannot be undertaken here due to the limitations of the present thesis, but which I hope to embark upon in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

1974-1981:

Ferousis, D. (1980), *Ο Θανάσης και καρότσι του*, Athens: Dodoni.
Fildisi, S. (1978), *Νιότη χωρίς τραγούδια*, Athens: Minoas.
Fildisi, S. (1979a), *Ο μεγάλος μας αδερφός*, Athens: Minoas.
Fildisi, S. (1979b), *Το τραγούδι του πατέρα μου*, Athens: Synchroni Epochi.
Kanava, Z. (1981), *Το στοίχημα*, Athens: Argo.
Ravanis-Rentis, D. (1978), *Κι η θάλασσα ήταν τόσο κοντά*, Athens: Iridanos.
Sari, G. (1974), *Κόκκινη κλωστή δεμένη*, Athens: Kedros.
Sfaellou, K. (1979), *Μικροί αγωνιστές*, Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias.
Skandalis, Ch. (1979), *Ο βοριάς και τα λουλούδια*, Athens: Lychnos.
Tsimikali, P. (1979), *Ιστορίες της Κατοχής*, Athens: Kedros.
Varika-Moskovi, E. (1977), *Δυο παιδιά στην Κατοχή και άλλα διηγήματα*, n.p.

1982-1989:

Daraki, P. (1983), *Τα περιστέρια του καμπαναριού*, Athens: Synchroni Epochi.
Fotiadou-Balafouti, G. (1987), *Ποτέ ξανά*, Athens: Kastaniotis.
Kanava, Z. (1984), *Από κει βγαίνει ο ήλιος*, Athens: Akritas.
Kokoreli, A. (1987), Η *ζωή με τον πατέρα*, Athens: Kedros.
Kornilios, M. (1987), *Πολύ ωραίο τ' όνομά σου, Ελευθερία!*, Athens: Kastaniotis.
Papakou-Lagou, A. (1988), *Μην κλαις μικρούλα μου*, Athens: Mokas-Morfotiki.
Papamoschou, I. (1989), *Το πέτριvο σπίτι* (Vol. 1 and 2), Athens: Patakis.
Petala-Papadopoulou, L. (1985), *Καρτερώντας την άνοιξη,* Athens: Minoas.
Petrovits-Androutsopoulou, L. (1989), *Λάθος, κύριε Νόιγκερ!*, Athens: Patakis.
Psarafti, L. (1987), *Το διπλό ταξίδι*, Athens: Patakis.
Rodopoulou, S. (1984), *Τα σαράντα κόσκινα*, Athens: Drymos.
Rodopoulou, S. (1988), *Εκείνοι τότε…*, Athens: Mokas-Morfotiki.
Sakellariou, Ch. (1984), *Αντιστασιακά παιδικά διηγήματα*, Athens: Kedros.
Sari, G. (1983), *Οι Νικητές*, Athens: Kedros.
Sinou, K. (1989), *Το πάρτυ της Μιράντας*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Tsiros, S. (1988), *Οι πήλινες μούσες*, Athens: Kedros.

Vogiatzoglou, S. (1982), *Καβάλα σε δυο φεγγάρια*, Thessaloniki: A.S.E.

Vryakou-Geli, M. (1983), *Ανάμεσα στα βόλια*, Athens: Vasileiou.

1990-2014:

Dikaiou, E. (1996), *Αναζητώντας τους χαμένους ήρωες*, Athens: Patakis.

Kliafa, M. (2011), *Μια μπαλάντα για τη Ρεβέκκα*, Athens: Metechmio.

Lambadaridou-Pothou, M. (2014), *Συνέντευξη με το φάντασμα του βάλτου*, Athens: Patakis.

Marra, Ei. (1996), *Το άδειο μπουκάλι*, Athens: Patakis.

Nikolaou, Th. (1998), *Ο καβαλάρης της νύχτας*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Papamoschou, I. (1995), *Το γεφύρι της Ανατολής*, Athens: Patakis.

Petrovits-Androutsopoulou, L. (1992), *Τραγούδι για τρεις*, Athens: Patakis.

Petrovits-Androutsopoulou, L. (2006), *Ένα αγγελάκι στα Εξάρχεια*, Athens: Psychogios.

Petrovits-Androutsopoulou, L. (2007), *Ο καιρός της σοκολάτας*, Athens: Patakis.

Priovolou, E. (2010), *Τσόκο Μπλοκ*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Psarafti, L. (2011), *Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου*, Athens: Patakis.

Vakali-Syrogiannopoulou, F. (1997), *Αγαπάει Γιάγκο, αγαπάει...*, Athens: Angyra.

SCHOOL HISTORY TEXTBOOKS:

For Pupils in the Final Grade of the *Dimotiko*:

Aktypis, D. et al. (1989), *Στα νεότερα χρόνια*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Aktypis, D. et al. (1997), *Στα νεότερα χρόνια* [revised edition], Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Diamantopoulos, N. and Kyriazopoulos, A. (1979), *Ελληνική Ιστορία των Νεωτέρων Χρόνων*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Diamantopoulos, N. and Kyriazopoulos, A. (1985), *Ελληνική Ιστορία των Νεωτέρων Χρόνων* [revised edition], Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Kafentzis, G. (1974), *Ιστορία των Νεωτέρων Χρόνων*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Koliopoulos, I. et al. (2012), *Ιστορία του νεότερου και σύγχρονου κόσμου*, Athens: ITYE Diophantus.

Repousi, M. et al. (2006), *Στα νεότερα και σύγχρονα χρόνια*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

For Pupils in the Final Grade of the *Gymnasio*:

Koulikourdi, G. (1975), *Νεώτερη Ευρωπαϊκή Ιστορία από τον 15ο αιώνα μ.Χ ως σήμερα*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Kremmydas, V. (1984), *Ιστορία Νεότερη-Σύγχρονη: Ελληνική-Ευρωπαϊκή και Παγκόσμια*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Louvi, E. and Xifaras, D. (2007), *Νεότερη και Σύγχρονη Ιστορία*, Athens: Patakis.

Sfyroeras, V. (1991), *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

For Pupils in the Final Grade of the *Lykeio*:

Koliopoulos, I. et al. (2007), *Ιστορία του νεότερου και του σύγχρονου κόσμου (από το 1815 έως σήμερα)*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

Skoulatos, V., Dimakopoulos, N. and Kondis, S. (1984), *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseon Didaktikon Vivlion.

REFERENCES:

Abatzopoulou, F. (1998), *Ο άλλος εν διωγμώ: Η εικόνα του Εβραίου στη λογοτεχνία: Ζητήματα ιστορίας και μυθοπλασίας*, Athens: Themelio.

Abbenhuis, M. and Buttsworth, S. (2010), 'Introduction: The Mundanity of Evil: Everyday Nazism in Post-War Popular Culture', in S. Buttsworth and M. Abbenhuis (eds.), *Monsters in the Mirror: Representations of Nazism in Post-War Popular Culture*, Santa Barbara: Praeger, xiii-xl.

Agnew, K. and Fox, G. (2001), *Children at War: From the First World War to the Gulf*, NY: Continuum.

Anagnostopoulos, V. D. (1996), *Τάσεις και εξελίξεις της παιδικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens: Oi ekdoseis ton filon.

Angelopoulou, V. and Valasi, Z. (1989), *Διαλέγουμε βιβλία για παιδιά. Για μια βασική βιβλιοθήκη*, Athens: Gutenberg.

Angelopoulou, V. (1998), *Τα βιβλία των παιδιών μας. Παράθυρα στον κόσμο*, Athens: Patakis.

Antoniou, G. and Marantzidis, N. (2008), 'Το επίμονο παρελθόν', in G. Antoniou and N. Marantzidis (eds.), *Η εποχή της σύγχυσης. Η δεκαετία του '40 και η ιστοριογραφία*, Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias, 11-52.

Antoniou, G. (2013), 'Οι γιορτές μίσους και οι πόλεμοι της δημόσιας μνήμης (1950-2000): από το τραύμα των ηττημένων στο τραύμα των νικητών', in N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou (eds.), *Εμφύλιος. Πολιτισμικό τραύμα*, Athens: Alexandreia, 215-49.

Antoniou, G. and Paschaloudi, E. (2014), '«Το άψογο πρόσωπο της ιστορίας θολώνει»: η αναγνώριση της εαμικής Αντίστασης και το πολιτικό σύστημα (1945-1995)', in V. Gounaris (ed.), *Ήρωες των Ελλήνων. Οι καπετάνιοι, τα παλικάρια και η αναγνώριση των εθνικών αγώνων 19ος-20ος αιώνας*, Athens: Idryma tis Voulis ton Ellinon [Hellenic Parliament Foundation], 257-331.

Antoniou, G. and Moses, D. A. (2018), 'Introduction: The Holocaust in Greece', in G. Antoniou and A. D. Moses (eds.), *The Holocaust in Greece*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-12.

Apostolidou, V. (2010), *Τραύμα και μνήμη. Η πεζογραφία των πολιτικών προσφύγων*, Athens: Polis.

Apostolou, A. (2000), 'The Exception of Salonika: Bystanders and Collaborators in Northern Greece', *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*: 14(2), 165-96.

Apostolou, A., 'Greece Must Acknowledge Its Complicity in the Shoah', *The Jewish Daily Forward*, 23.03.2007.
Available at https://forward.com/opinion/10385/greece-must-acknowledge-its-complicity-in-the-shoa/ (last access 07.04.2020)

Apostolou, A. (2010), 'Strategies of Evasion: Avoiding the Issue of Collaboration and Indifference during the Holocaust in Greece', in R. Stauber (ed.), *Collaboration with the Nazis: Public Discourse after the Holocaust*, London: Routledge, 138-65.

Arvanitis, P. (2000), 'Της Νιάλας η Ανθρωποθυσία', in K. Koutsoukis and I. Sakkas (eds.), *Πτυχές του εμφυλίου πολέμου 1946-1949*, Athens: Filistor, 493-501.

Athanasiadis, Ch. (2015), *Τα αποσυρθέντα βιβλία: Έθνος και σχολική ιστορία στην Ελλάδα, 1858-2008*, Athens: Alexandreia.

Avdela, E. (2000), 'The Teaching of History in Greece', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*: 18(2), 239-53.

Avgeridis, M., Gazi, E. and Kornetis, K. (eds.) (2015), *Μεταπολίτευση: Η Ελλάδα στο μεταίχμιο δύο αιώνων*, Athens: Themelio.

Baerentzen, L. (1987), 'The "Pedomazoma" and the Queen's Camps', in L. Baerentzen, J. O. Iatrides and O. L. Smith (eds.), *Studies in the History of the*

Greek Civil War (1945-1949), Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 127-58.

Baerentzen, L., Iatrides, J. O. and Smith, O. L. (eds.) (1987), *Studies in the History of the Greek Civil War (1945-1949)*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Bartziotas, V. (1983), *Εθνική Αντίσταση και Δεκέμβρης 1944: Ιστορικό δοκίμιο*, Athens: Synchroni Epochi.

Beaton, R. (2003), *George Seferis: Waiting for the Angel: A Biography*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Ben-Ghiat, R. (2004), 'A Lesser Evil? Italian Fascism in/and the Totalitarian Equation', in H. Dubiel and G. Motzkin (eds.), *The Lesser Evil: Moral Approaches to Genocide Practices*, London: Routledge, 137-53.

Benveniste, R. (2014), *Αυτοί που επέζησαν: Αντίσταση, εκτόπιση, επιστροφή: Θεσσαλονικείς Εβραίοι στη δεκαετία του 1940*, Athens: Polis.

Bodila, M. (2006), 'Ιστορικός και λογοτεχνικός λόγος. Η αναπαράσταση του δωσιλογισμού στη μεταπολεμική λογοτεχνική παραγωγή', in I. Michailidis, I. Nikolakopoulos and H. Fleischer (eds.), *Εχθρός εντός των τειχών: Όψεις του δωσιλογισμού στην Ελλάδα της Κατοχής*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 249-67.

Bodila, M. (2008), 'Η εξέλιξη της αφήγησης του ελληνικού εμφυλίου στα σχολικά βιβλία: καλλιέργεια ή χειραγώγηση της συλλογικής μνήμης;', in R. Van Boeschoten et al. (eds.), *Μνήμες και λήθη του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 331-47.

Bosmajian, H. (2002), *Sparing the Child: Grief and the Unspeakable in Youth Literature about Nazism and the Holocaust*, NY: Routledge.

Botz, G. (2015), 'Από «θύμα» «συναυτουργός»: Η πολιτική της μνήμης στη μεταπολεμική Αυστρία', in K. Gardika et al. (eds.), *Η μακρά σκιά της δεκαετίας του '40: Πόλεμος-Κατοχή-Αντίσταση-Εμφύλιος*, Athens: Alexandreia, 33-49.

Cadogan, M. and Craig, P. (1978), *Women and Children First: The Fiction of Two World Wars*, London: Gollancz.

Capelos, T. and Exadaktylos, Th. (2015), '"The Good, the Bad the Ugly": Stereotypes, Prejudices and Emotions on Greek media representation of the EU Financial Crisis', in G. Karyotis and R. Gerodimos (eds.), *The Politics of Extreme Austerity: Greece in the Eurozone Crisis*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 46–68.

Carabott, Ph. and Sfikas, Th. (eds.) (2003), *The Greek Civil War. Essays on a Conflict of Exceptionalism and Silences*, London: Ashgate.

Carabott, Ph. (2011), 'Στάσεις και αντιδράσεις της ελληνορθόδοξης κοινωνίας απέναντι στο διωγμό των Εβραίων συμπολιτών της στη διάρκεια της γερμανικής Κατοχής', in G. Antoniou et al. (eds.), *Το Ολοκαύτωμα στα Βαλκάνια*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 253-94.

Chandrinos, I. (2015), 'Εθνική Αντίσταση: Ιστορικές, πολιτικές και θεσμικές εννοιολογήσεις από το 1941 στο σήμερα', in K. Gardika et al. (eds.), *Η μακρά σκιά της δεκαετίας του '40: Πόλεμος-Κατοχή-Αντίσταση-Εμφύλιος*, Athens: Alexandreia, 191-213.

Charalambidis, M. (2014), *Δεκεμβριανά 1944: Η μάχη της Αθήνας*, Athens: Alexandreia.

Chatzivasileiou, E. (2008), 'Η επανεύρεση της πρωτεύουσας: Η βιβλιογραφία των μη Εαμικών αθηναϊκών οργανώσεων', in G. Antoniou and N. Marantzidis (eds.), *Η εποχή της σύγχυσης. Η δεκαετία του '40 και η ιστοριογραφία*, Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias, 255-85.

Chatzivasileiou, E. (2015), 'Ο μακρός εμφύλιος πόλεμος και η άρνησή του', in K. Gardika et al. (eds.), *Η μακρά σκιά της δεκαετίας του '40: Πόλεμος-Κατοχή-Αντίσταση-Εμφύλιος*, Athens: Alexandreia, 335-50.

Chatzivasileiou, V., 'Ο Εμφύλιος στοιχειώνει το μυθιστόρημα', *Eleftherotypia*, 30.10.2010.
Available at http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=218349 (last access 07.04.2020)

Chouliaras, G. (2003), 'Πολιτισμός και πολιτική–Εμφύλιος πόλεμος και «πολιτιστική ανασυγκρότηση» στην Ελλάδα', in H. Fleischer (ed.), *Η Ελλάδα '36-'49. Από τη Δικτατορία στον Εμφύλιο: Τομές και συνέχειες*, Athens: Kastaniotis, 428-38.

Close, D. H. (1993), 'The Legacy', in D. H. Close (ed.), *The Greek Civil War 1943-50. Studies of Polarization*, London: Routledge, 214-34.

Close, D. H. (2002), *Greece Since 1945: Politics, Economy and Society*, Harlow: Longman.

Close, D. H. (2004), 'The Road to Reconciliation? The Greek Civil War and the Politics of Memory in the 1980s', in Ph. Carabott and Th. Sfikas (eds.), *The Greek Civil War. Essays on a Conflict of Exceptionalism and Silences*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 257-78.

Danforth, L. M. and Van Boeschoten, R. (2012), *Children of The Greek Civil War. Refugees and the Politics of Memory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

De Haan, I. (2010), 'Failures and mistakes: Images of collaboration in postwar Dutch society', in R. Stauber (ed.), *Collaboration with the Nazis: Public Discourse After the Holocaust*, London: Routledge, 71-90.

Delonis, A. (1986), *Ελληνική Παιδική Λογοτεχνία 1835-1985. Από τις πρώτες ρίζες μέχρι σήμερα*, Athens: Irakleitos.

Delopoulos, K., 'Ένα βιβλίο που έχει το προνόμιο να προκαλεί ερωτήματα', *Diavazo*: 98, 44-6.

Demertzis, N. (2013), 'Εμφύλιος Πόλεμος: από τη συλλογική οδύνη στο πολιτισμικό τραύμα', in N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou (eds.), *Εμφύλιος. Πολιτισμικό τραύμα*, Athens: Alexandreia, 43-90.

Demertzis, N., Paschaloudi, E. and Antoniou, G. (2013), 'Πρόλογος των επιμελητών', in N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou (eds.), *Εμφύλιος. Πολιτισμικό τραύμα*, Athens: Alexandreia, 9-18.

Demertzis, N. (2016), 'The Drama of the Greek Civil War Trauma', in R. Eyerman, J. C. Alexander and E. Butler Breese (eds.), *Narrating Trauma: On the Impact of Collective Suffering*, NY: Routledge, 133-61.

Dimitriadis, F. (2004), *Σκιά πάνω από την Αθήνα-77 σκίτσα από τη ναζιστική κατοχή*, Athens: Modern Times.

Dinas, E. and Fouka, V., 'Το τέλος του τέλους της μεταπολίτευσης', *I Kathimerini*, 03.03.2019.
Available at https://www.kathimerini.gr/1012817/opinion/epikairothta/politikh/to-telos-toy-teloys-ths-metapoliteyshs (last access 07.04.2020)

Dordanas, S. (2006), *Έλληνες εναντίον Ελλήνων: Ο κόσμος των Ταγμάτων Ασφαλείας στην κατοχική Θεσσαλονίκη 1941-1944*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro.

Dordanas, S. and Michailidis, I. (2007), 'Κριτική θεώρηση της βιβλιογραφίας για τον Εμφύλιο Πόλεμο (1990-2006)', in I. Mourelos and I. Michailidis (eds.), *Ο ελληνικός Εμφύλιος Πόλεμος: Μια αποτίμηση. Πολιτικές, ιδεολογικές, ιστοριογραφικές προεκτάσεις*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 183-94.

Elefantis, A. (2002), *Μας πήραν την Αθήνα... Ξαναδιαβάζοντας μερικά σημεία της ιστορίας 1940-1950*, Athens: Vivliorama.

Ellinas, A. (2013), 'The Rise of Golden Dawn: The New Face of the Far Right in Greece', *South European Society and Politics*: 18(4), 543-65.

Enfield, E. (2011), *Greece On My Wheels*, UK: Summersdale Publishers.

Fleischer, H. (1988), *Στέμμα και Σβάστικα: Η Ελλάδα της Κατοχής και της Αντίστασης 1941-1944*, Vol. 1, Athens: Papazisis.

Fleischer, H. and Svoronos, N. (eds.) (1989), *Πρακτικά Α΄ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Σύγχρονης Ιστορίας. Η Ελλάδα 1936-1944: Δικτατορία-Κατοχή-Αντίσταση*, Athens: Morfotiko Instituto ATE.

Fleischer, H. (1995), *Στέμμα και Σβάστικα: Η Ελλάδα της Κατοχής και της Αντίστασης 1941-1944*, Vol. 2, Athens: Papazisis.

Fleischer, H. (2003), 'Μνήμες-και αμνήμονες', in H. Fleischer (ed.), *Η Ελλάδα '36-'49. Από τη Δικτατορία στον Εμφύλιο. Τομές και συνέχειες*, Athens: Kastaniotis, 11-23.

Fleischer, H. (ed.) (2003), *Η Ελλάδα '36-'49. Από τη Δικτατορία στον Εμφύλιο. Τομές και συνέχειες*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Fleischer, H. (2006), 'Authoritarian Rule in Greece (1936-1974) and Its Heritage', in J. W. Borejsza and K. Ziemer (eds.), *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes in Europe: Legacies and Lessons from the Twentieth Century*, NY: Berghahn Books, 237-75.

Fleischer, H. (2008), *Οι πόλεμοι της μνήμης: Ο Β΄ Παγκόσμιος Πόλεμος στη δημόσια ιστορία*, Athens: Nefeli.

Flitouris, L. (2008), 'Ο εμφύλιος στο «σέλιλοϊντ»: Ιστορία και μνήμη', in R. Van Boeschoten et al. (eds.), *Μνήμες και λήθη του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 387-404.

Focardi, F. (1996), '"Bravo italiano" e "cattivo tedesco": Riflessioni sulla genesi di due immagini incrociate', *Storia e Memoria*: 5(1), 55–83.

Focardi, F. and Klinkhammer, L. (2004), 'The question of Fascist Italy's war crimes: the construction of a self-acquitting myth (1943-1948)', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*: 9(3), 330-48.

Fogu, C. (2006), 'Italiani brava gente: The Legacy of Fascist Historical Culture on Italian Politics of Memory', in R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 147-76.

Fogu, C. and Kansteiner, W. (2006), 'The Politics of Memory and the Poetics of History', in R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 284-310.

Foot, J. (2009), *Italy's Divided Memory*, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Forlenza, R. (2012), 'Sacrificial Memory and Political Legitimacy in Postwar Italy: Reliving and Remembering World War II', *History and Memory*: 24(2), 73–116.

Förster, J. (1998), 'Complicity or Entanglement? Wehrmacht, War and Holocaust', in M. Berenbaum and A. J. Peck (eds.), *The Holocaust and History: The Known, the Unknown, the Disputed and the Re-examined*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 266-83.

Fytili, M. (2015), 'Λωτοφάγοι και Ηρόστρατοι: Μνήμες του '40 στον πολιτικό λόγο των κομμάτων κατά τη δεκαετία του '80' in M. Avgeridis, E. Gazi and K. Kornetis (eds.), *Μεταπολίτευση: Η Ελλάδα στο μεταίχμιο δύο αιώνων*, Athens: Themelio 29-39.

Gage, N. (1983), *Eleni*, London: Collins.

Gans, E. and Leerssen, J. (2007), 'Jews', in M. Beller and J. Leerssen (eds.), *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: A Critical Survey*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 202-8.

Gerolymatos, A. (1985), 'The Security Battalions and the Civil War', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*: 12(1), 17-27.

Gerolymatos, A. (2004), *Red acropolis, black terror: The Greek Civil War and the origins of Soviet-American rivalry, 1943-1949*, NY: Basic Books.

Giannakopoulos, G. (2013), 'Metapolitefsi: From the Transition to Democracy to the Economic Crisis, Athens, 14-16 December 2012', *Historein*: 13, 135-7.

Giovacchini, S. (2007), 'Soccer with the Dead: Mediterraneo, the Legacy of Neorealismo, and the Myth of Italiani Brava Gente', in M. Paris (ed.), *Repicturing the Second World War: Representations in Film and Television*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 55-69.

Goulis, D. (2013), 'Η σιωπή της Ρουθ και η φωνή της Ρεβέκκας: εικόνες Εβραίων και απόηχοι της Shoah στην ελληνική λογοτεχνία για παιδιά και νέους', *Keimena*: 17, 1-21.
Available at http://keimena.ece.uth.gr/main/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=61&Itemid=97 (last access 07.04.2020)

Haida, E. (2000), 'The Punishment of Collaborators in Northern Greece, 1945-1946', in M. Mazower (ed.), *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943-1960*, NJ: Princeton University Press, 42-61.

Hart, J. (1990), 'Women in the Greek Resistance: National Crisis and Political Transformation', *International Labor and Working-Class History*: 38, 46-62.

Hart, J. (1996), *New Voices in the Nation: Women and the Greek Resistance, 1941-1964*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Hayton, J. (2012), 'Digital Nazis: Genre, History and the Displacement of Evil in First-Person Shooters', in D. H. Magilow, E. Bridges and K. T. Vander Lugt (eds.), *Nazisploitation! The Nazi Image in Low-Brow Cinema and Culture*, NY: Continuum, 199-218.

Hellander et al. (2006), *Greece* (Lonely Planet Country Guides), Lonely Planet Publications.

Hondromatidis, I. (2008), *Οι δωσίλογοι της Κατοχής*, Athens: Periskopio.

Iatrides, J. O. (ed.) (1981), *Greece in the 1940s: A Nation in Crisis*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Iatrides, J. O. and Wrigley, L. (eds.) (1995), *Greece at the Crossroads: The Civil War and Its Legacy*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Judt, T. (2000), 'Preface', in I. Deák, J. T. Gross and T. Judt (eds.), *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, NJ: Princeton University Press, vii-xii.

Judt, T. (2002), 'The Past is Another Country: Myth and Memory in Post-War Europe', in J. W. Müller (ed.), *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 157-83.

Kallergis, I. (1995), *Προσεγγίσεις στην παιδική λογοτεχνία*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Kallergis, I., 'Οι δραπέτες του καστρόπυργου', diastixo.gr, 12.07.2012.
Available at https://diastixo.gr/kritikes/efivika/146-oi-drapetes-tou-kastropirgou (last access 07.04.2020)

Kallivretakis, L. (2017), *Δικτατορία και μεταπολίτευση*, Athens: Themelio.

Kalyvas, S. (2000), 'Red Terror: Leftist Violence during the Occupation', in M. Mazower (ed.), *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943-1960*, NJ: Princeton University Press, 142-83.

Kalyvas, S. and Marantzidis, N., 'Νέες τάσεις στη μελέτη του εμφυλίου πολέμου', *Τα Νέα*, 20.03.2004.

Available at http://ellinikosemfilios.blogspot.com/2012/03/n.html (last access 07.04.2020)

Kalyvas, S. (2008), 'Armed collaboration in Greece, 1941–1944', *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*: 15(2), 129-42.

Kalyvas, S., 'Το μετέωρο βήμα της Μεταπολίτευσης', *I Kathimerini*, 30.08.2015. Available at https://www.kathimerini.gr/828941/opinion/epikairothta/politikh/to-metewro-vhma-ths-metapoliteyshs (last access 07.04.2020)

Kansteiner, W. (2006), 'Losing the War, Winning the Memory Battle: The Legacy of Nazism, WWII, and the Holocaust in the Federal Republic of Germany', in R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 102-46.

Karagiannis, Th. (1999), *Θεματολογία Παιδικής Λογοτεχνίας*, Athens: Nikodimos.

Karakitsios, A. (2013), 'Οι αναπαραστάσεις του Εβραίου στην παιδική λογοτεχνία. Κυνηγώντας τις λέξεις και τα νοήματα', *Keimena*: 17, 1-8. Available at http://keimena.ece.uth.gr/main/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=61&Itemid=97 (last access 07.04.2020)

Karamanolakis, V., Nikolakopoulos, I. and Sakellaropoulos, T. (eds.) (2016), *Η μεταπολίτευση '74-'75: Στιγμές μιας μετάβασης*, Athens: Themelio.

Kavala, M. (2015), *Η καταστροφή των Εβραίων της Ελλάδας (1941-1944)*, Athens: Kallipos Publications E-Books. Available at https://repository.kallipos.gr/handle/11419/4437 (last access 07.04.2020)

Kazamias, A. (1978), 'The Politics of Educational Reform in Greece: Law 309/1976', *Comparative Education Review*: 22(1), 21-45.

Kertzer, A. (2002), *My Mother's Voice: Children, Literature, and the Holocaust*, Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.

Kimmel, E. (1997), 'Confronting the Ovens: The Holocaust and Juvenile Fiction', *The Horn Book Magazine*: 53, 84-91.

Kitroeff, A. (1997), 'Andreas G. Papandreou: A Brief Political Biography', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*: 23(1), 7-32.

Klüger, R. (2001), *Still Alive: A Holocaust Girlhood Remembered*, NY: Feminist Press.

Kokkinos, G. (1998), *Από την Ιστορία στις ιστορίες: Προσεγγίσεις στην ιστορία της ιστοριογραφίας, την επιστημολογία και τη διδακτική της ιστορίας*, Athens: Ellika Grammata.

Kokkinos, G., Gatsotis, P. and Lemonidou, E. (2012), 'Ο Β' Παγκόσμιος Πόλεμος στα σχολικά βιβλία Ιστορίας. Οι περιπτώσεις της Ελλάδας και της Γαλλίας', *Διεθνής και Ευρωπαϊκή Πολιτική*: 26, 217-42.

Kokkola, L. (2003), *Representing the Holocaust in Children's Literature*, NY: Routledge.

Kornetis, K. (2010), 'No More Heroes? Rejection and Reverberation of the Past in the 2008 Events in Greece', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*: 28(2), 173-97.

Kornetis, K. (2014), 'From Reconciliation to Vengeance: The Greek Civil War on Screen in Pantelis Voulgaris's A Soul so Deep and Kostas Charalambous's Tied Red Thread', *FILMICON: Journal of Greek Film Studies*: 2, 93-116.

Kostopoulos, T. (2005), *Η αυτολογοκριμένη μνήμη: Τα τάγματα ασφαλείας και η μεταπολεμική εθνικοφροσύνη*, Athens: Filistor.

Kouraki, Ch. (2008), *Αφήγηση και λογοτεχνικοί χαρακτήρες. Τα μυθοπλαστικά πρόσωπα στο πεζογραφικό έργο της Ζωρζ Σαρή (1969-1995)*, Athens: Patakis.

Kousouris, D. (2014), *Δίκες των δοσίλογων 1944-1949: Δικαιοσύνη, συνέχεια του κράτους και εθνική μνήμη*, Athens: Polis.

Koutsogiannaki, K. (2010), 'Ελένη: Τα άλλα θύματα του Εμφυλίου και οι αντιδράσεις της Αριστεράς', in V. Vamvakas and P. Panagiotopoulos (eds.), *Η Ελλάδα στη δεκαετία του '80: Κοινωνικό, πολιτικό και πολιτισμικό λεξικό*, Athens: To Perasma, 166-9.

Koutsoukis, K. and Sakkas, I. (eds.) (2000), *Πτυχές του εμφυλίου πολέμου 1946-1949*, Athens: Filistor.

Lagani, E. (2008), 'Η αντίσταση μέσα από τα εγχειρίδια ιστορίας της Ελλάδας και της Γαλλίας', in R. Van Boeschoten et al. (eds.), *Μνήμες και λήθη του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 349-70.

Lagrou, P. (2000), 'Introduction', in P. Lagrou, *The Legacy of Nazi Occupation: Patriotic Memory and National Recovery in Western Europe, 1945-1965*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-18.

Lambatos, G. (2016), 'Από τις εκτελέσεις των δωσίλογων στην ομηρία: διαστάσεις της αριστερής βίας τον Δεκέμβριο του 1944', in Th. Sfikas, L. Chasiotis and I. Michailidis (eds.), *Δρόμοι του Δεκεμβρίου: Από του Λίβανο στην Αθήνα, 1944*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 103-116.

Lampsa, K. and Sibi, J. (2012), *Η διάσωση: Η σιωπή του κόσμου, η αντίσταση στα γκέτο και τα στρατόπεδα, οι Έλληνες Εβραίοι στα χρόνια της Κατοχής*, Athens: Kapon.

Lathey, G. (1999), *The Impossible Legacy: Identity and Purpose in Autobiographical Children's Literature Set in the Third Reich and the Second World War*, NY: Peter Lang.

Lebow, R. N. (2006), 'The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe', in R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1-39.

Leech, J. (2010), '"Bravo italiano" and "cattivo tedesco"? Reconstructing the memory of the Italian occupation of Greece (1941-43) over the following decade

through secondary and primary sources', paper presented at the Istituto Nazionale per la Storia del Movimento di Liberazione in Italia, Milan. Available at https://www.academia.edu/3478252/2010_Bravo_italiano_and_cattivo_tedesco_Reconstructing_the_memory_of_the_Italian_occupation_of_Greece_1941-43_over_the_following_decade_through_secondary_and_primary_sources (last access 07.04.2020)

Le Goff, J. (1992), *History and Memory* [translated by S. Rendall and E. Claman], NY: Columbia University Press.

Lemonidou, E, (2013), 'WWII and the Greek Civil War in Cinema', in P. Tame, D. Jeannerod and M. Bragança (eds.), *Mnemosyne and Mars: Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-century Europe at War*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 219-37.

Liakos, A. (2003), 'Αντάρτες και συμμορίτες στα ακαδημαϊκά αμφιθέατρα', in H. Fleischer (ed.), *Η Ελλάδα '36-'49. Από τη Δικτατορία στον Εμφύλιο. Τομές και συνέχειες*, Athens: Kastaniotis, 25-36.

Liakos, A. (2007), *Πώς το παρελθόν γίνεται ιστορία;* Athens: Polis.

Lialiouti, Z. and Bithymitris, G. (2013),'"The Nazis Strike Again": The Concept of "The German Enemy", Party Strategies and Mass Perceptions through the Prism of the Greek Economic Crisis', in Ch. Karner and B. Mertens (eds.), *The Use and Abuse of Memory: Interpreting World War II in Contemporary European Politics*, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 155-72.

Locatelli, F. (2016), 'Migrating to the Colonies and Building the Myth of "Italiani brava gente": The Rise, Demise, and Legacy of Italian Settler Colonialism', in R. Ben-Ghiat and S. Malia Hom (eds.), *Italian Mobilities*, London: Routledge, 133-51.

Lymberatos, M. (2007), 'Οι οργανώσεις της Αντίστασης', in Ch. Hatziiosif and P. Papastratis (eds.), *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας του 20ού αιώνα. Β΄ Παγκόσμιος Πόλεμος, Κατοχή, Αντίσταση 1940-1945*, Vol. 3, Part 2, Athens: Vivliorama, 9-67.

Lymberatos, M. and Profis, Th. (2019), *Ο ένοπλος δωσιλογισμός και η 'αναίμακτη' απελευθέρωση: Τα γεγονότα του Κορωπίου 9/10/1944*, Athens: Taxideftis.

Mackridge, P. (2001), 'Macedonia and Macedonians in Sta mystika tou Valtou (1937) by P.S. Delta', *Dialogos: Hellenic Studies Review*: 7, 41-55.

Marantzidis, N. and Antoniou, G. (2004), 'The Axis Occupation and Civil War: Changing Trends in Greek Historiography, 1941-2002', *Journal of Peace Research*: 41(2), 223-31.

Marantzidis, N. (2012), 'Πρόλογος', in V. Dalkavoukis et al. (eds.), *Αφηγήσεις για τη δεκαετία του 1940. Από το λόγο του κατοχικού κράτους στη μετανεωτερική ιστοριογραφία*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 11-21.

Marantzidis, N. (2013), 'Το τριπλό τραύμα: Η μνήμη του Εμφύλιου Πολέμου στην κομμουνιστική Αριστερά', in N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou (eds.), *Εμφύλιος. Πολιτισμικό τραύμα*, Athens: Alexandreia, 161-86.

Margaritis, G. (1993), *Από την ήττα στην εξέγερση. Ελλάδα: Άνοιξη 1941-Φθινόπωρο 1942*, Athens: O Politis.

Mariolis, D. (2013), 'Εθνική ταυτότητα και ιδεολογία στα σχολικά εγχειρίδια ιστορίας της Στ΄ Δημοτικού της μετεμφυλιακής περιόδου 1950-1974', MA Thesis, Athens: Panteion University.

Mark, J., Townson, N. and Voglis, P. (2013), 'Inspirations', in R. Gildea, J. Mark and A. Warring (eds.), *Europe's 1968: Voices of Revolt*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 72-103.

Maronitis, D. N. (1976), '«Ο Τελευταίος Σταθμός» του Γ. Σεφέρη. Δοκιμή ανάγνωσης', *Filologos*: 9, 78-84.

Mavrogordatos, G., 'Η «ρεβάνς» των ηττημένων', *To Vima*, 10.09.1999. Available at https://www.tovima.gr/2008/11/24/opinions/i-rebans-twn-ittimenwn/ (last access 07.04.2020)

Mavroskoufis, D. (1997), *Η σχολική ιστορία στη Δευτεροβάθμια εκπαίδευση*, Thessaloniki: Afoi Kyriakidi.

Mazower, M. (1993), *Inside Hitler's Greece: The Experience of Occupation, 1941-44*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mazower, M. (1994), *Στην Ελλάδα του Χίτλερ. Η εμπειρία της Κατοχής* [translated by K. Kouremenos], Athens: Alexandreia.

Mazower, M. (2000), 'The Cold War and the Appropriation of Memory: Greece after Liberation', in I. Deák, J. T. Gross and T. Judt (eds.), *The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath*, NJ: Princeton University Press, 212-32.

Mazower, M. (2000), 'Military Violence and the National Socialist Consensus: The Wehrmacht in Greece, 1941-44', in H. Heer and K. Naumann (eds.), *War of Extermination: The German Military in World War II 1941-1944*, NY: Berghahn Books, 146-74.

Meyer, H. F. (2004), *Από τη Βιέννη στα Καλάβρυτα: Τα αιματηρά ίχνη της 117ης μεραρχίας καταδρομών στη Σερβία και την Ελλάδα*, Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias.

Michailidis, I., Nikolakopoulos, I. and Fleischer, H. (2006) (eds.), *Εχθρός εντός των τειχών: Όψεις του δωσιλογισμού στην Ελλάδα της Κατοχής*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Molho, R. (2015), *Το Ολοκαύτωμα των Ελλήνων Εβραίων: Μελέτες ιστορίας και μνήμης*, Athens: Patakis.

Naumann, K. (2000), 'The "Unblemished" Wehrmacht: The Social History of a Myth', in H. Heer and K. Naumann (eds.), *War of Extermination: The German Military in World War II 1941-1944*, NY: Berghahn Books, 417-29.

Nikolakopoulos, I., Rigos, A. and Psallidas, G. (eds.) (2002), *Ο εμφύλιος πόλεμος. Από τη Βάρκιζα στο Γράμμο, Φεβρουάριος 1945-Αύγουστος 1949*, Athens: Themelio.

O'Sullivan, E. (1990), *Friend and Foe. The image of Germany and the Germans in British Children's Fiction from 1870 to the present*, Tübingen: Narr.

O'Sullivan, E. (1995), 'Germany and the Germans as depicted in British Children's Literature from 1870 to the Present', in M. Nikolajeva (ed.), *Aspects and Issues in the History of Children's Literature*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 65-76.

O'Sullivan, E. (2008), 'Shifting Images: Germans in Postwar British Children's Fiction', in E. Goodenough and A. Immel (eds.), *Under Fire: Childhood in the Shadow of War*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 77-89.

Paivanas, D. (2010), 'Cold Wars after 1989: Thanasis Valtinos' Orthokosta and its Reception', *Études Helléniques/Hellenic Studies*: 18(1), 21-53.

Palikidis, A. (2013), 'Εισαγωγή', in A. Palikidis (ed.), *Κριτικές προσεγγίσεις του ναζιστικού φαινομένου: Από την ιστοριογραφία και την πολιτική θεωρία στη σχολική ιστορική μάθηση*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 7-16.

Palikidis, A. (2013), 'Ο Ναζισμός στα ελληνικά σχολικά εγχειρίδια Ιστορίας', in A. Palikidis (ed.), *Κριτικές προσεγγίσεις του ναζιστικού φαινομένου: Από την ιστοριογραφία και την πολιτική θεωρία στη σχολική ιστορική μάθηση*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 75-127.

Panagiotopoulos, P. (2013), 'Πολιτικές χρήσεις της ιστορίας 2010-2012: ριζοσπαστική Αριστερά και αλυσιτελής νοηματοδότηση του τραύματος', in N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou (eds.), *Εμφύλιος. Πολιτισμικό τραύμα*, Athens: Alexandreia, 251-87.

Papadogiannis, N. (2012), 'Between Angelopoulos and the Battleship Potemkin: Cinema and the Making of Young Communists in Greece in the Initial Post-dictatorship Period (1974-81), *European History Quarterly*: 42(2), 286-308.

Papadogiannis, N. (2015), *Militant Around the Clock?: Left-Wing Youth Politics, Leisure, and Sexuality in Post-Dictatorship Greece, 1974-1981*, NY: Berghahn Books.

Papagiannis, S. (2004), *Τα παιδιά της λύκαινας: Οι επίγονοι της 5ης Ρωμαϊκής Λεγεώνας κατά τη διάρκεια της Κατοχής 1941-1944*, Athens: Sokolis.

Papastefanaki, E. (2016), 'The Mountain Education -A Special Page in the Educational History of Greece', *Review of History and Political Science*: 4(2), 35-42.

Papastratis, P. (1984), *British policy towards Greece during the Second World War, 1941-1944*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Papathanasiou, I., 'Το ΚΚΕ να ανοίξει το αρχείο του', *I Kathimerini*, 01.03.2009. Available at http://www.kathimerini.gr/351153/article/epikairothta/politikh/to-kke-na-anoi3ei-to-arxeio-toy (last access 07.04.2020)

Paschalis, M. (2014), 'Σιωπές αγαπημένες της σελήνης. Ζητήματα διακειμενικότητας στον «Τελευταίο σταθμό» του Γιώργου Σεφέρη', *Kondyloforos*: 13, 111-31.

Paschaloudi, E. (2013), 'Η δεκαετία του 1940 στον πολιτικό λόγο: από την αμηχανία των νικητών στη «δικαίωση» των ηττημένων', in N. Demertzis, E. Paschaloudi and G. Antoniou (eds.), *Εμφύλιος. Πολιτισμικό τραύμα*, Athens: Alexandreia, 113-60.

Passerini, L. (1999), 'Memories of Resistance, Resistances of Memory', in H. Peitsch, Ch. Burdett and C. Gorrara (eds.), *European Memories of the Second World War*, NY: Berghahn Books, 288-96.

Persianis, P. K. (1978), 'Values Underlying the 1976-1977 Educational Reform in Greece', *Comparative Education Review*: 22(1), 51-9.

Pine, R., 'Tale of two brothers recalls the bitterness of Greece's civil war', *The Irish Times*, 12.11.2009.
Available at https://www.irishtimes.com/news/tale-of-two-brothers-recalls-the-bitterness-of-greece-s-civil-war-1.770192 (last access 07.04.2020)

Pistola, Ch. (2014), 'Η Οργάνωση "Εθνική Ένωσις Ελλάς" (Τρία Έψιλον)', MA Thesis, Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
Available at http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/135187/files/GRI-2014-13178.pdf (last access 07.04.2020)

Plakoudas, S. (2016), 'The debt crisis and Greece's changing political discourse', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*: 40(2), 307-14.

Poulos, M. (2009), *Arms and the Woman: Just Warriors and Greek Feminist Identity*, NY: Columbia University Press.

Psimmenos, T. (1983), *Αντάρτες στ' Άγραφα (1946-1950). Αναμνήσεις ενός αντάρτη*, Athens: Synchroni Epochi.

Raftopoulos, D. (2012), *Εμφύλιος και λογοτεχνία*, Athens: Patakis.

Ramsay, D. (2015), 'Brutal Games: Call of Duty and the Cultural Narrative of World War II', *Society for Cinema and Media Studies*: 54(2), 94-113.

Resis, A. (1978), 'The Churchill-Stalin Secret "Percentages" Agreement on the Balkans, Moscow, October 1944', *The American Historical Review*: 83(2), 368-87.

Reynolds, D. P. (2018), *Postcards from Auschwitz: Holocaust Tourism and the Meaning of Remembrance*, NY: New York University Press.

Richter, H. (1985), *British Intervention in Greece: From Varkiza to Civil War, February 1945 to August 1946*, London: Merlin Press.

Roberts, G. (2002), 'Beware Greek gifts: The Churchill-Stalin "Percentages" Agreement of October 1944', paper presented at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office seminar 'Churchill-Stalin', London.
Available at https://www.academia.edu/21832177/Beware_Greek_Gifts_The_Churchill-Stalin_Percentages_Agreement_of_October_1944 (last access 07.04.2020)

Rodogno, D. (2006), *Fascism's European Empire: Italian Occupation during the Second World War*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rori, L. (2008), 'Από το «δωσίλογο» Μητσοτάκη στη «νέα Βάρκιζα του '89»: η μνήμη της δεκαετίας του '40 στον πολιτικό λόγο του ΠΑΣΟΚ', in R. Van Boeschoten et al. (eds.), *Μνήμες και λήθη του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 293-309.

Ross, K. G. M. (1988), 'The Moscow Conference of October 1944 (Tolstoy)', in W. Deakin, E. Barker and J. Chadwick (eds.), *British Political and Military Strategy in Central, Eastern and Southern Europe in 1944*, London: Macmillan, 67-77.

Russel, D. L. (1997), 'Reading the Shards and Fragments: Holocaust Literature for Young Readers', *Lion and the Unicorn*: 21(2), 267-80.

Sakellariou, Ch. (1982), *Ιστορία της παιδικής λογοτεχνίας. Από την αρχαιότητα ώς τις μέρες μας*, Athens: Diptycho.

Sakellariou, Ch. (1984), *Η παιδεία στην Αντίσταση*, Athens: Philippotis.

Sakellariou, Ch. and Karagiannis, Th. (1986), *Οδηγός παιδικού και νεανικού βιβλίου 1986*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Sakellariou, Ch. and Karagiannis, Th. (1987), *Οδηγός παιδικού και νεανικού βιβλίου 1987*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Sakellariou, Ch. and Bartzis, G. (1988), *Οδηγός παιδικού και νεανικού βιβλίου 1988*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Sakellariou, Ch., Bartzis, G. and Karagiannis, Th. (1989), *Οδηγός παιδικού και νεανικού βιβλίου 1989*, Athens: Kastaniotis.

Sakellariou, Ch. (1997), *Πηνελόπη Δέλτα: Η ζωή-οι έρωτες- το έργο της*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Sakkas, J. (2013), 'Old Interpretations and New Approaches in the Historiography of the Greek Civil War', *Thetis*: 20, 425-39.

Sakkas, J. (2013), *Britain and the Greek Civil War, 1944-1949: British Imperialism, Public Opinion and the Coming of the Cold War*, Mainz: Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen.

Saltiel, L. (2017), 'Αντιδράσεις στους διωγμούς των Εβραίων της Θεσσαλονίκης, 1942-43', Ph.D. Thesis, Thessaloniki: University of Macedonia.

Samatas, M. (1986), 'Greek McCarthyism: A Comparative Assessment of Greek Post-Civil War Repressive Anticommunism and the U.S. Truman-McCarthy Era', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*: 13(3-4), 5-76.

Sandis, D. (2008), 'Children's Literature Research in Greece: The Situation Today', *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*: 33(3), 306-320.

Santarelli, L. (2004), 'Muted violence: Italian war crimes in occupied Greece', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*: 9(3), 280-299.

Sarafis, M. (ed.) (1980), *Greece: From Resistance to Civil War*, Nottingham: Spokesman.

Sarantini, E., 'Όταν ο ήρωας πατέρας επιστρέφει χωρίς άλογο', *Eleftherotypia*, 27.08.1997.

Shepherd, B. (2009), 'The Clean Wehrmacht, the War of Extermination, and Beyond', *The Historical Journal*: 52(2), 455–73.

Siani-Davies, P. and Katsikas, S. (2009), 'National Reconciliation After Civil War: The Case of Greece', *Journal of Peace Research*: 46(4), 559-75.

Skoupras, Ch. (2007), 'Η Ορθοκωστά του Θανάση Βαλτινού και η κριτική', *Nea Estia*: 1802, 198-211.

Sotirakopoulos, N. and Sotiropoulos, G. (2013), '"Direct democracy now!": The Greek indignados and the present cycle of struggles', *Current Sociology*: 61(4), 443-56.

Spanaki, M. (2004), *Βυζάντιο και Μακεδονία στο έργο της Π. Σ. Δέλτα*, Athens: Ermis.

Spiliotopoulou, M. (2016), 'Ο Δεκέμβρης του 1944 στην Αθήνα του 1945: η ιστορία με τα πτώματα', in P. Papastratis, M. Lymberatos and L. Sarafis (eds.), *Από την απελευθέρωση στα Δεκεμβριανά. Μια τομή στην πολιτική ιστορία της Ελλάδας: Πρακτικά συνεδρίου 19-23 Νοεμβρίου 2014*, Athens: Somateio Synchroni Istoria, 464-75.

Stephens, J. (1992), *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction*, London: Longman.

Striftobola, E. (2015), 'Μαθήματα δημόσιας ιστορίας από το ελληνικό Κοινοβούλιο. Η περίπτωση του νόμου 1285/1982 «Για την αναγνώριση της Εθνικής Αντίστασης του Ελληνικού Λαού εναντίον των στρατευμάτων κατοχής 1941–1944»', in A. Andreou et al. (eds.), *Η δημόσια ιστορία στην Ελλάδα: Χρήσεις και καταχρήσεις της ιστορίας*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 239-49.

Suedfeld, P. et al. (1997), 'Coping Strategies in the Narratives of Holocaust Survivors', *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*: 10(2), 153-178.

Sullivan, E. T. (1999), *The Holocaust in Literature for Youth: A Guide and Resource Book*, Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.

Svoronos, N. (1981), 'Greek History, 1940-1950: The Main Problems', in J. O. Iatrides (ed.), *Greece in the 1940s: A Nation in Crisis*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1-14.

Tal, E. (2007), 'How Much Should We Tell the Children? Representing Death and Suffering in Children's Literature about the Holocaust', Yad Vashem: The Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority.
Available at https://www.yadvashem.org/yv/pdf-drupal/de/education/tal.pdf (last access 07.04.2020)

Theodorou, V. (2003), 'Νοηματοδοτήσεις του Εμφυλίου πολέμου στα σχολικά εγχειρίδια Ιστορίας της περιόδου 1950-1991', *Synchroni Ekpaidefsi*: 131, 111-26.

Theodosiou, N., 'Οι δραπέτες της ιστορίας', theodosiou.wordpress.com, 03.06.2011.
Available at https://theodosiou.wordpress.com/2011/06/03/drapetes_tis_istorias/ (last access 07.04.2020)

Theotokas, G. (2005), *Τετράδια Ημερολογίου, 1939-1953* [edited by D. Tziovas], Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias.

Travis, M. J. (2013), *Jews and Jewishness in British Children's Literature*, NY: Routledge.

Triantafillou, M. (2010), 'Αβέρωφ-Τοσίτσας, Ευάγγελος: Ένας συντηρητικός ηγέτης στα χρόνια της αλλαγής', in V. Vamvakas and P. Panagiotopoulos (eds.), *Η Ελλάδα στη δεκαετία του '80: Κοινωνικό, πολιτικό και πολιτισμικό λεξικό*, Athens: To Perasma, 3-6.

Tziovas, D. (2017), 'Narratives of the Greek Crisis and the Politics of the Past', in D. Tziovas (ed.), *Greece in Crisis: The Cultural Politics of Austerity*, London: I.B. Tauris, 19-64.

Tzoukas, V. (2010), 'Εθνική Αντίσταση: Η αναγνώρισή της ως πράξη υπέρβασης του Εμφυλίου και ενίσχυσης του αντιδεξιού επιχειρήματος', in V. Vamvakas and P. Panagiotopoulos (eds.), *Η Ελλάδα στη δεκαετία του '80: Κοινωνικό, πολιτικό και πολιτισμικό λεξικό*, Athens: To Perasma, 133-6.

Uhl, H. (1997), 'The Politics of Memory: Austria's Perception of the Second World War and the National Socialist Period', in G. Bischof and A. Pelinka (eds.), *Austrian Historical Memory and National Identity*, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 64-94.

Uhl, H. (2006), 'From Victim Myth to Co-Responsibility Thesis: Nazi Rule, World War II, and the Holocaust in Austrian Memory', in R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner and C. Fogu (eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 40-72.

Vamvakas, V. and Panagiotopoulos, P. (2010), 'Εισαγωγή των επιμελητών: Η Ελλάδα στη δεκαετία του '80. Κοινωνικός εκσυγχρονισμός, πολιτικός αρχαϊσμός, πολιτισμικός πλουραλισμός', in V. Vamvakas and P. Panagiotopoulos (eds.), *Η Ελλάδα στη δεκαετία του '80: Κοινωνικό, πολιτικό και πολιτισμικό λεξικό*, Athens: To Perasma, xxxi-lxxi.

Van Boeschoten, R. (1997), *Ανάποδα χρόνια: Συλλογική μνήμη και ιστορία στο Ζιάκα Γρεβενών (1900-1950)*, Athens: Plethron.

Vanderwal Taylor, J. (1997), *A Family Occupation: Children of the War and the Memory of World War II in Dutch Literature of the 1980s*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Varon-Vassard, O. (2008), 'Η γενοκτονία των Ελλήνων Εβραίων (1943-1944) και η αποτύπωσή της: μαρτυρίες, λογοτεχνία και ιστοριογραφία', in G. Antoniou and N. Marantzidis (eds.), *Η εποχή της σύγχυσης. Η δεκαετία του '40 και η ιστοριογραφία*, Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias, 289-343.

Varon-Vassard, O. (2012), *Η ανάδυση μιας δύσκολης μνήμης: Κείμενα για τη γενοκτονία των Εβραίων*, Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias.

Vasilopoulou, S. and Halikiopoulou, D. (2015), *The Golden Dawn's 'Nationalist Solution': Explaining the Rise of the Far Right in Greece*, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vervenioti, T. (1994), *Η γυναίκα της Αντίστασης: Η είσοδος των γυναικών στην πολιτική*, Athens: Odysseas.

Vervenioti, T. (2005), 'Περί "παιδομαζώματος" και "παιδοφυλάγματος" ο Λόγος ή τα παιδιά στη δίνη της εμφύλιας διαμάχης', in E. Voutira et al. (eds.), *Το όπλο παρά πόδα: οι πολιτικοί πρόσφυγες του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου στην Ανατολική Ευρώπη*, Thessaloniki: University of Macedonia Press, 101-123.

Vletsas, S., 'Ο αντιγερμανισμός και οι μύθοι που τον τροφοδοτούν', tvxs.gr, 17.03.2012.
Available at https://tvxs.gr/news/apopseis/o-antigermanismos-kai-oi-mythoi-poy-ton-trofodotoyn-toy-spyroy-bletsa (last access 07.04.2020)

Voglis, P. (2007), 'Η δεκαετία του 1940 ως παρελθόν: μνήμη, μαρτυρία, ταυτότητα', *Τα Istorika*: 47(25), 437-56.

Voglis, P. (2008), 'Οι μνήμες της δεκαετίας του 1940 ως αντικείμενο ιστορικής ανάλυσης: μεθοδολογικές προτάσεις', in R. Van Boeschoten et al. (eds.), *Μνήμες και λήθη του ελληνικού εμφυλίου πολέμου*, Thessaloniki: Epikentro, 61-80.

Voglis, P. (2015) 'Διαμάχες για το παρελθόν; Η δεκαετία του 1940 ανάμεσα στη δημόσια ιστορία και την ιστοριογραφία', in K. Gardika et al. (eds.), *Η μακρά σκιά της δεκαετίας του '40: Πόλεμος-Κατοχή-Αντίσταση-Εμφύλιος*, Athens: Alexandreia, 351-368.

Voglis, P. (2017), 'Το παρελθόν ως διαρκές παρόν: Τα Δεκεμβριανά στη δημόσια σφαίρα, 1945-1956', in P. Voglis et al. (eds.), *Δεκέμβριος 1944: το παρελθόν και οι χρήσεις του*, Athens: Alexandreia, 239-59.

Voglis, P. and Nioutsikos, I. (2017), 'The Greek Historiography of the 1940s: A Reassessment', *Südosteuropa*: 65(2), 316-33.

Voulgaris, G. (2001), *Η Ελλάδα της μεταπολίτευσης 1974-1990: Σταθερή δημοκρατία σημαδεμένη από τη μεταπολεμική ιστορία*, Athens: Themelio.

Voulgaris, G. and Nikolakopoulos, I. (2014), 'Εισαγωγή: Ο εκλογικός σεισμός του 2012', in G. Voulgaris and I. Nikolakopoulos (eds.), *2012: Ο διπλός εκλογικός σεισμός*, Athens: Themelio, 9-31.

Voutira, E. and Brouskou, A. (2000), '"Borrowed children" in the Greek civil war', in C. Panter-Brick and M. T. Smith (eds.), *Abandoned Children*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 92-110.

Zaousis, A. (2004), *Λέλα Καραγιάννη. Η Μπουμπουλίνα της Κατοχής 1941-1944*, Athens: Okeanida.

Zapruder, A. (2002), *Salvaged Pages: Young Writers' Diaries of the Holocaust*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

WEBSITES:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bemQvjovsFc
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k1-ADWkujgU
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OYLjBqFv86Y
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E4dc_sI0IZc
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LaPDzGVJK5o
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hKseJ8_ty_o
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=5312069
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.rizospastis.gr/story.do?id=3741680
(last access 07.04.2020)

http://www.patakis.gr/images/files/14474.pdf
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://tvxs.gr/webtv/ntokimanter/o-ellinikos-emfylios-polemos
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://left.gr/news/alexis-tsipras-ftiahnoyme-oloi-mazi-enan-forea-dimokratiko-polytasiko-ployralistiko-vinteo
(last access 07.04.2020)

http://www.blod.gr/lectures/Pages/viewlecture.aspx?LectureID=2807
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.greeka.com/peloponnese/kalavryta/sightseeing/kalavryta-holocaust/
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.kalavrytanews.com/2014/12/13-12-1943-KALAVRYTA.html.
(last access 07.04.2020)

http://www.biblionet.gr/book/146697/%CE%A8%CF%85%CF%87%CE%AE_%CE%B2%CE%B1%CE%B8%CE%B9%CE%AC
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.kathimerini.gr/866694/article/proswpa/synentey3eis/yarayth-ta-paidia-antexoyn-prepei-na-3eroyn
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://kis.gr/en/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=411&Itemid=74
(last access 07.04.2020)

https://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g315841-d602250-Reviews-The_Municipal_Museum_of_the_Kalavryta_Holocaust-Kalavrita_Achaea_Region_West_Greec.html
(last access 07.04.2020)