

'The Greeks fought heroically'

A history of Greek history textbooks



Jurgen Broeders

Master's thesis in the field of Political History

Radboud University Nijmegen

2008

‘The Greeks fought heroically’

A history of Greek history textbooks

Jurgen Broeders

‘The Greeks fought heroically’

A history of Greek history textbooks

Master’s thesis in the field of Political History

Radboud University Nijmegen
Supervisor: Dr. W.P. van Meurs
2008

© 2008 Jurgen Broeders

'The Greeks fought heroically.' A history of Greek history textbooks.

E-mail: Jurgen_broeders @ hotmail . com

Image on the cover page: The Greek history war battlefield: Greeks fighting in a television debate on 'mistakes in the history textbook' for the sixth grade of primary school. Source: Youtube.com [<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JbTVb0PlcjQ>, accessed 19-09-08].

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	7
Introduction	9
History Wars	19
Greek history textbooks since 1974	35
History textbooks for the primary school.....	39
History textbooks for the gymnasium	43
The Greek ‘Self’ and its ‘Others’	49
The Turks: Greece’s most prominent ‘Other’	50
The Church and the myth of the Secret School.....	60
The divided ‘Self’: Civil War in Greece	66
The Macedonian Question	70
Conclusion.....	77
References	81

Acknowledgements

My interest in Greece has grown since I spent a spring semester in 2006 as ERASMUS student in Thessaloniki, Greece's second largest city, as part of my Bachelor program in History. During these months I travelled around the country and, amongst others, visited the tombs of Philip II of Macedon in Vergina. I was confronted with the importance of history and national pride in the daily life of many Greeks. It was something completely different that I was used to in The Netherlands. It fascinated me.

Back in The Netherlands I did an internship at the secretariat of EUROCLIO – The European Association of History Educators. At the organization's office based in The Hague, Executive Director Joke van der Leeuw-Roord and her colleagues run projects to make history education more multiperspective, less nationalistic. This work gave me a lot of inspiration and gave me a better insight into different ways to see and use history.

When I read something about a controversy on a history textbook in Greece on the internet, I wanted to learn more about it. Quite impulsively I decided to improve my Modern Greek and write my Master's thesis in the field of Political History about history education in Greece. It was an excellent opportunity to combine both my interest in Greece and history education.

I would like to thank my supervisor at the Radboud University Nijmegen, Dr. W.P. van Meurs, and all the people who helped me with my thesis. Especially, I considered it as a great honor to speak with Maria Repousi in a personal interview in which she talked very openly about the controversy on her textbook.

Jurgen Broeders
Nijmegen
2008

Introduction

A striking paradox of national historical narratives is that, despite their claims to the contrary, they change over time. They claim to tell *the* history, but in reality their contents are, mostly behind the screens, subject of political discussion and changes. This is especially true for history schoolbooks. History textbooks have an aura of objectivity and knowledge, certainly when they are state-published. They are read in the institutionalized setting of the classroom and create a common knowledge, shared by all fellow citizens of the generation. History textbooks therefore are an important corner stone of popular historical culture and collective memory.¹ Together with historical monuments, museums, national holidays, etcetera, they define how a people sees the past, but also its future. This makes history textbooks an interesting means of political guidance and, therefore, subject of political rivalry.

The dispute is most often fought inside education ministries and other institutions, but sometimes a public discussion on the way history must be taught breaks out. In Greece, such a public controversy broke out after the publication of a new history textbook for the sixth and last grade of primary school in 2006. The textbook war lasted for more than a year. The book's contents were discussed in hot-tempered multi-split-screen TV-debates and everybody, from the man in the kiosk to the Archbishop of Athens and the Prime-Minister, took a stand in the quarrel.

'They say it tries to undermine the foundations of Greek identity,' summarized Maria Repousi, the head of the authors' team, the criticism on her new textbook after it was issued in September

¹ Christina Koulouri, 'Introduction' in C. Koulouri (ed.) *Clio in the Balkans. The politics of history education* (Thessaloniki 2002) 25.

2006.² The intention of Repousi and her team was to write an innovative history book, which is in line with professional historiography and stimulates pupils to work critically with historical sources. National myths and existing stereotypes were omitted. These innovations were not equally appreciated by everyone and provoked a stream of criticism from nationalist circles. These people criticized the book because it would embellish Greek-Turkish relations and downplay the role of the Greek Orthodox Church during the period of Ottoman domination in the Balkans and during the Greek Revolution. They said it undermined the characteristics of Greek identity on costs of political correctness and European integration. The Greek Church and nationalist politicians asked for the withdrawal of the book. After the general elections in September 2007 and talks at the highest political level, the book was indeed withdrawn by the new Minister of Education and the previous book, dating from 1988, was reissued.

This controversy raises the question whether the contents of history textbooks in Greece are determined by political interference. Do they serve as a means of propaganda, used by political parties in order to realize their own political goals? Can a correlation between political developments and the narrative of the past be observed?

Textbook research is an increasingly popular branch amongst scholars in last decennia, carried out by researchers from several disciplines and many scholars have acknowledged the power of history textbooks as an important contributor in the process of identity creation. Different 'types' of textbook research can be distinguished, which mainly differ in the goals of the researchers. The first type is most often carried out in the light of reconciliation processes after conflict situations and aims to indicate undesirable aspects in textbooks in the light of the process of appeasement and change them. The research concentrates on contents of textbooks

² George Gilson, 'Battle royal over history book', *Athens News* (23-03-07) [http://www.athensnews.gr/athweb/nathens.print_unique?e=C&f=13227&m=A12&aa=1&eid=5], accessed 23-08-08]

with the underlying assumption that the way history is presented can either stir up, or prevent inter- and intrastate conflict. Researchers investigate whether books are nationalistic or give a hostile image of other nations. The second type of textbook research must be categorized under nationalism research. The goal of researchers in this field is to get insight into the very process of identity creation and the self-image of people. It takes a postmodern approach and concentrates on the creation of 'imagined communities' from a more theoretical point of view.

The first type of research is mostly done by international NGOs, and often compares textbooks of two or more countries. It looks for nationalistic elements in textbooks in order to change them and has a relatively long history, in which two big waves can be observed internationally. The first one is in the period after the Second World War, when The Council of Europe and UNESCO recognized the political sensibility and the power of history education in reconciliation processes. These organizations have encouraged evaluation and revision of the textbooks and encouraged a discussion on the possibility to write a common European history from the late 1940s on. Since the 1950s and 1960s structural research projects into the content of textbooks were also set up by the Georg Eckert Institute in Braunschweig in Germany.³ Partly because of the efforts of these institutions textbook changes in Western Europe took place and contributed to a less hostile portrayal of the neighboring people in textbooks. It could be argued that the recent publication of the common German-French, state-initiated history textbook *Histoire/Geschichte* is a result of the reconciliation process that started sixty years ago.⁴

The second wave started in 1989 after the fall of the Wall. The re-union of Europe that followed was a reason for the foundation of several new organizations and the start of new comparative

³ Council of Europe: www.coe.int, Unesco: www.unesco.org, George Eckert Institute: <http://www.gei.de>.

⁴ Ilas Körner-Wellershaus and Françoise Fougeron (eds), *Histoire/Geschichte – Europa und die Welt vom Wiener Kongress bis 1945*(Stuttgart/Leipzig 2007).

research projects. Also the wars in the countries of Former Yugoslavia in the 1990s and a general interest in history created a 'momentum' for research in textbooks as a political tool in identity creation.⁵ Examples of this kind of initiatives are the EUSTORY Project by the Körber-Stiftung, several projects by EUROCLIO, the European Association of History Educators, and the Southeast European Joint History Project of the Center for Reconciliation and Democracy in Southeast Europe (CRDSEE) in Thessaloniki.⁶

In Greece, the amount of research on textbooks took a rise in the second part of the 1970s, after the fall of the colonels' regime. Teaching materials were criticized from a sociological and educational point of view and a beginning was made to form collections of textbooks.⁷ The political developments in the Balkans in the 1990s also increased the interest in textbooks in Greece. For instance, the Greek history professor Christina Koulouri became chair of the History Education Committee of the CRDSEE and edited two volumes with comparative research on history books of the Balkan countries, published by this organization.⁸ The main criticism of the researchers is that textbooks are manipulative. The conclusion they usually draw is that Greek textbooks are, as in many other countries, nationalistic in nature. The narrative presents the history of the Greek nation as continuity from ancient times to the present, while there is little attention for non-Greek history. Another common conclusion is that the account of the neighboring countries in the book is quite hostile. Especially the Turks are presented as

⁵ Koulouri, 'Introduction' .

⁶ EUSTORY: http://www.koerber-stiftung.de/internationale_verstaendigung/eustory/, EUROCLIO: www.euroclio.eu, and Southeast European Joint History Project: <http://www.cdsee.org/jhp/index.html> [accessed 31-08-08].

⁷ Christina Koulouri, 'Research on Greek textbooks: a survey of current trends' in *Paradigm* 14 (1994).

⁸ Christina Koulouri, *Teaching the history of Southeastern Europe* (Thessaloniki 2001). Christina Koulouri (ed.), *Clio in the Balkans. The politics of history education* (Thessaloniki 2002).

‘barbarians’, whose ‘aggression’ has to be ‘fought heroically and victoriously’ by the Greeks.⁹

The second type of research on textbooks consists of scholarly work carried out by historians, anthropologists and social scientists. Since the ‘linguistic turn’ scholars in these sciences not only try to find out ‘what actually happened’ in the past, but are much more interested in the analysis of discourses, that are believed to exercise power. The historical discourse itself has become object of research here. Historical narratives as an instrument in nation-building have been placed in a central position in many publications in the constructivist tradition that followed on Anderson’s *imagined communities* and Hobsbawm’s *invented traditions*. The volume *Historians as Nation-Builders*, edited by Dennis Deletent and Harry Hanak, for instance, is an example of this kind of work investigating the role of historiography in the creation of nations.¹⁰ Examination of history education is a more specific interpretation of the same kind of research.

Also the growing interest in the concept of ‘collective memory’ plays a role and stimulates textbook research. In the late 1970s and early 1980s scholars in different disciplines rediscovered memory as an object of study.¹¹ They fell back on the work of Maurice Halbwachs in the 1920s, who is usually considered to be the first to employ the term ‘collective memory’. Although no consensus exists on the exact meaning of the term, it always refers to the image of the past shared by a group, which is important for the identity of that specific group. The works of Pierre Nora and David Lowenthal, and Peter Novick have also inspired others for further research into the importance of history in identity formation.

⁹ See for instance Efi Avdela, ‘The teaching of History in Greece’ in *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18 (2000) 239-253.

¹⁰ D. Deletant and H. Hanak, *Historians as Nation-Builders; Central and South-East Europe* (London 1988).

¹¹ J.K. Olick and J. Robbins, ‘Social Memory Studies: From “Collective Memory” to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices’ in *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998) 107.

Scholars active in this second type of research agree on the fact that history education and textbooks play a prominent role in identity formation. However, which role they play exactly is subject of discussion. The first position in this debate assumes that textbooks are a tool in the top-down process of identity creation. For instance, nationalism researcher Ernest Gellner paid attention to the socializing role of education: ‘At the base of the modern social order stands not the executioner but the professor. Not the guillotine, but the (aptly named) *doctorate d’état* is the main tool and symbol of state power. The monopoly of legitimate education is now more important, more central than the monopoly of legitimate violence.’¹² The state thus uses history education in an attempt to create good and obedient citizens.

In the international scholarly world James V. Wertsch takes this approach in his study into the development of history textbooks in the Soviet Union and post-communist Russia. According to Wertsch, the state is the most effective ‘active agent’ in the creation of collective memory, in which history education plays an important role. However, it is not the only agent in this process, which causes a discrepancy between collective memory and the official narrative of history.¹³ In Greece, this position is defended by Maria Adamou who believes that Greek history education is used to produce docile and submissive citizens.¹⁴ Very recently, Leda Glypsis followed Adamou in this belief: ‘It is the state’s attempt to claim its national pedigree in the eyes of domestic elites and international players, to justify structures and practices and also reproduce a culture, that is, in turn, in itself supportive to this claim.’¹⁵ A weak point of arguing that

¹² Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (1983) 34.

¹³ James V. Wertsch, *Voices of Collective Remembering* (2002).

¹⁴ M. Adamou, *Το εκπαιδευτικό σύστημα στην υπηρεσία του εθνικού κράτους. Η ελληνική περίπτωση 1950-1976 [The educational system in service of the nation state 1950-1976]* (Athens 2002) 13. Cited in Leda Glypsis, ‘Love, truth and national identity prescriptions: recounting the 1919-1922 war in Greek school textbooks’ in *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 29 (2007) 106.

¹⁵ Glypsis, ‘Love, truth and national identity prescriptions’, 115.

history textbooks are an instrument in the hands of the state is that the concept of ‘the state’ remains vague.

A second position in the debate is a more complex one; it argues that history textbooks can not be simply seen as an instrument of indoctrination used by the state to teach people the official version of history. One of the main representatives of this position is Christina Koulouri, in her book *Dimensions idéologiques de l'historicité en Grèce (1834-1914)*. She shows how the Greek national narrative was developed and implemented in state-monopolized textbooks in the decades preceding the First World War. In this process, she sees the ‘manuel scolaire comme représentatif de la société qui le produit.’¹⁶ According to this position, history textbooks are a product of the entire society that produces them. In such an approach the discrepancy between official and collective memory as described by Wertsch becomes impossible. A similar position is taken by Yannis Hamilakis in his contributions to the volume *The Usable Past; Greek Metahistories*, in which he examines the role of Ancient Greece in nowadays’ Greek textbooks. Hamilakis argues that the Greek national imagination and narrative are grounded in social processes, in which it is ‘difficult to distinguish between state and non-state initiatives.’¹⁷

A third approach places national history textbooks in the context of a globalizing world, in which communities and connections become more and more transnational. Maria Grever and Siep Stuurman, for instance, noticed that ‘in a globalizing world, politicians regarded history as a valuable instrument to bolster national identity.’¹⁸ This development causes tension between proponents of ‘old national canons’ and ‘new’ approaches to history, trying to integrate national history in an entangled international

¹⁶ Christina Koulouri, *Dimensions idéologiques de l'historicité en Grèce (1834-1914)* (Frankfurt am Main 1991) 495.

¹⁷ K.S. Brown and Y. Hamilakis (editors), *The Usable Past; Greek Metahistories* (2003) 59.

¹⁸ Siep Stuurman and Maria Grever, ‘Introduction: old canons and new histories’ in M. Grever and S. Stuurman (ed.), *Beyond the canon. History for the twenty-first century* (Basingstoke 2007) 1-16.

perspective. Heavy public ‘history wars’ are the result of these frictions. Antonis Liakos applied this very same approach to the Greek textbook controversy of 2006 and 2007 and showed that it is only one example of a more general trend of ‘cultural wars centered on history’, which have broken out in many countries since the 1990s.¹⁹ According to him, the dispute in Greece was a clash between academic historians, who attempt to disassociate history from the nation, and the national public sphere, where the nationalist history is still the dominant one.

This last way of approaching history textbooks is a very interesting one. Globalization increased in the last decennia, but education remains mainly a matter organized on the national level. How do these two things relate to each other? An analysis of the official state-published Greek history textbooks for the primary school and lower secondary school from 1974 until 2007 can provide an answer to this question. This period is interesting, since it was one of Greek integration into Europe, after the fall of the dictatorship in 1974. The two main political parties competing for power in Greece since the return to democracy are the center-right New Democracy and the socialist PASOK.

A sample of eight history textbooks is the basis for the analysis. It consists of four textbooks for the sixth grade of Greek primary school (*Dimotiko*) and four books for the third class of the lower secondary school, the gymnasium (*Gymnasio*). These books all treat the history of modern times, which is most interesting because of the political sensibility of recent history. Memories of the period described in these books are still alive and political actors playing a role in the historical narrative are often still present in society and thus have their interests in the presentation of their past in schoolbooks. Both the primary school and the gymnasium are

¹⁹ Antonis Liakos, ‘History Wars: notes from the field’. Paper at the Annual Conference of the International Society for History Didactics ‘Public Uses of History’, 19-21 September 2007, Thessaloniki.

obligatory in the Greek education system. The books included in the sample are:

Primary school books:

- Textbook 1: E. Kafentzi, *Ιστορία των νεωτέρων χρόνων. Τάξη ΣΤ' δημοτικού [History of the modern times. 6th class of primary school]* (Athens 1977).
- Textbook 2: N. Diamantopoulou and A. Kyriazopoulou, *Ελληνική ιστορία των νεωτέρων χρόνων. ΣΤ' δημοτικού [Greek history of modern times. 6th grade of primary school]* (Athens 1985).
- Textbook 3a: D. Aktypis, A. Velalidis, *Στα νεότερα χρόνια. Ιστορία ΣΤ' δημοτικού [In modern times. History for the 6th grade of primary school]* (Athens 1993).
- Textbook 3b: D. Aktypis, A. Velalidis, *Στα νεότερα χρόνια. Ιστορία ΣΤ' δημοτικού [In modern times. History for the 6th grade of primary school]* (Athens 2007). 1997 revised edition of the previous book.
- Textbook 4: M. Repousi, C. Andreou, *Στα νεότερα και σύγχρονα χρόνια. Ιστορία για την ΣΤ' Δημοτικού [In modern and contemporary times. History for the 6th grade of primary school]* (Athens 2008).

Gymnasium books:

- Textbook 5: Georgias P. Koulikourdi, *Νεώτερη Ευρωπαϊκή ιστορία από τον 15 αι. μ. Χ. ως σήμερα [Modern European History from the 15th century until today]* (Athens 1975).
- Textbook 6: V. Kremmydas, *Ιστορία νεότερη – σύγχρονη. Ελληνική και Ευρωπαϊκή [Greek and European modern and contemporary history]* (Athens 1984).
- Textbook 7: V. VI. Sfyroera, *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη [Modern and contemporary history]* (Athens 1991).

Textbook 8: E. Louvi and D. Xfaras, *Νεότερη και σύγχρονη ιστορία [Modern and contemporary history]* (Athens 2007).

The aim of the analysis is to find out whether the contents of these books have changed over time or not and if there is a relationship between Greek and international political developments and the contents of the books. In the first chapter it will be set out why history education is a complex business in which different fields come together. This can even lead to serious controversies of national importance: ‘history wars’. Conservative traditional and progressive revisionist camps publicly fight over the contents of history books in these wars. The textbook controversy in 2006 and 2007 in Greece was such a history war. The process of textbook renewal in Greece since 1974 is discussed in the second chapter. Who is responsible for the eight official, state-published history textbooks during this period? Does a relation between the character of the books and the political party in power exist? The contents of the textbooks are analyzed in the third chapter. Is there a correlation between political developments in Greece and abroad and the contents of Greek history textbooks? The presentation of four politically sensitive historical matters in the textbook throughout the years will be analyzed here.

Chapter 1

History Wars

Several public quarrels over history textbooks have been fought out in different countries during the last decennia.²⁰ These controversies were all about the interpretation of national history. History education is an effective way of passing on a specific way of remembering the past to a next generation. Creating a shared knowledge, history education is an important part of historical culture, defined by Kees Ribbens as:

‘(...) the material and immaterial traces of the past, references to the past, and the ways in which individuals and groups in society relate to the past.’²¹

All references made to the past in memorials, museums, comic books, movies, historical websites, etcetera, are part of historical culture.²² Historical culture defines where people see themselves and their ancestors in historical developments, but also who they see as their ancestors. It is thus an important factor in the creation of

²⁰ For instance: ‘Textbook wars; Slovakia’s history’ in *The Economist* (29-03-2008) 37. ‘Huge Japan protest over textbook’, *BBC News website* (29-09-07) [<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/7020335.stm>, accessed 31-08-08].

²¹ Kees Ribbens, “‘Another Brick in the Wall.’ Historical Culture and History Teaching’ in M. Grever and S. Stuurman (ed.), *Beyond the Canon. History for the Twenty-First Century* (Basingstoke 2007) 64.

²² Antonis Liakos, ‘History Wars’. Ribbens, ‘Another brick in the wall’. M. Grever and S. Stuurman, ‘Introduction: Old canons and new histories’ in M. Grever and S. Stuurman (ed.), *Beyond the Canon. History for the Twenty-First Century* (Basingstoke 2007) 1-16.

identity. Therefore, history education is subject of political debate and the discourse on history education is an integral part of the political discourse, which is broader than only parliament. Like in all political discussions, different camps can also be distinguished in the discussion on how to look to the past. The main camps here are, on the one hand, people supporting multiculturalism and internationalization, and, on the other hand, the more nationalist group of people. Friction between the two sides causes quarrels over the meaning and right interpretation of history. However, there is another factor that complicates the discussion on history textbooks: the contrast between professional historiography and popular historical culture. The relation between these two fields has changed over the past decennia. The two fields, each with its own dynamics, come together in history education. History wars, fights over the interpretation of national history, are the result of this double opposition.²³ The controversy in Greece over the history textbook for the sixth grade of primary school was such a history war.

Professional history writing developed in close relationship with the nation-state during the nineteenth century, the age of nationalism. The first historians were dependent on the state, but also identified with it, which transformed them into ‘apologists for the nation-state’. They reacted against the universalism of the Enlightenment and searched for the origins of their nation. Historians in different countries all emphasized the uniqueness and superiority of their own nations.²⁴ They constructed continuities throughout time and tried to appoint the foundational dates of their nation to show the self-evident existence and old origins of it. The idea was that the further the roots of the nation could be traced back, the more important and worthy the nation was. Historiography thus served to legitimize the nation-state as a natural unity and intended to show why the own nation was superior to other nations, which served as counter-example to fund

²³ Grever and Stuurman, ‘Introduction’. Liakos, ‘History wars’. S. Macintyre, *The history wars* (2004).

²⁴ Stefan Berger, *The search for normality. National identity and historical consciousness in Germany since 1800* (New York and Oxford 2002) 8.

this claim. The foundations on which the claim of superiority was based differed in all countries. For instance, German and Italian historians put emphasis on cultural supremacy of their nations, while the English and French underlined continuity in their political systems.²⁵

History used to be political history for a long time. Statesmen, national heroes, established political institutions, and the power struggle between states or between parties inside nation-states played a central role in these political histories.²⁶ Sources from state archives were used to support the narrative, but also the claim of objectivity that characterized early professional historiography. Historians were supposed to reconstruct ‘the past’, or, to find out ‘*wie es eigentlich gewesen*’. Objectivity as opposed to subjectivity was what historians were striving to; they tried above all to write the final work on historical events.

Political historiography with its central place for the nation-state and claim to objective presentation remained dominant for a long time. However, during the last decennia historiography has undergone some important changes and proved to be very dynamic. In the first place, national narratives were slowly pluralized since 1945. The horrors of the war had made clear what blind nationalism could lead to and almost everywhere in Western Europe historians recognized the need provide a less nationalist view on history. No wonder why countries with a national socialist past like Germany and Italy were frontrunners producing pluralist histories.²⁷ Besides that, also the rise of new schools in historiography and the decline of political historiography drew the attention away from the nation-state. Influenced by the American scientific methods of economics, sociology, and political sciences the interest in social and economic

²⁵ S. Berger, M. Donovan and K. Passmore, ‘Apologies for the nation-state in Western Europe since 1800’ in S. Berger, M. Donovan and K. Passmore (ed.), *Writing national histories. Western Europe since 1800* (London 1999) 3-14.

²⁶ Remieg Aerts, ‘De uilen van Lyotard; over postmodernisme en politieke geschiedenis’ in *Ex tempore – Verleden Tijdschrift* 25/3 (2006) 204.

²⁷ Berger, Donovan and Passmore, ‘Apologies for the nation-state’, 11.

history began to grow, especially since the 1960s. This meant a shift of attention from political activity towards social circumstances and everyday life. Political history became even more marginalized under influence of the French *Annales* School. The democratization of the notion culture in the 1980s and 1990s made it compatible with the existing social history, which also has an eye for every-day-life, as opposed to high-politics. Since this ‘cultural turn’ the popularity of cultural history is growing.

More recently, political history makes a come back, but in an adapted form. The notion of politics has broadened and came to include political culture, which consists amongst others of political discourses, political customs, and extraparliamentary action.²⁸ Because of the globalization and the emergence of transnational organizations like the United Nations and the European Union, the concept of the nation is not always satisfactory anymore for historians. Some of them look for ways to describe transnational realities through historical comparison, political transfers and *histoire croisée*-approaches.²⁹

Secondly, the claim on the absolute truth was abandoned by historians under influence of postmodern thought. The desire for and possibility of knowing the truth has been abandoned since the ‘linguistic turn’ in the philosophy of science and ‘narrativism’ is gaining support since the 1980s. The linguistic turn changed the relationship between identifier and the identified. While in the positivist approach language refers to an absolute concept, an unquestionable reality, in the postmodernist understanding of language, the reality only exists because it is referred to by language.

²⁸ Aerts, ‘De uilen van Lyotard’, 203-25.

²⁹ H. Kaelble, ‘Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?’ in *H-Soz-u-Kult* 08.02.2005 [<http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/id=574&type=diskussionen>, accessed 21-07-2008]. H. te Velde, ‘Political Transfer. An introduction’ in *European review of history* 12/2 (2005) 205-221. J. Kocka, ‘Comparison and beyond’ in *History and Theory* 42 (2003) 39-44. M. Werner and B. Zimmerman, ‘Beyond comparison. Histoire croisée and the challenge of reflexivity’ in *History and Theory* 45 (2006) 30-50.

Language thus creates a reality. It assumes that every historian creates, instead of 'recreates', a composed story out of a past chaos of historical facts. A historian composes a consistent narrative out of a past reality, which has no direction or intrinsic connections.³⁰ Where historians in the positivist tradition tried to find the objective truth, historians come to believe more and more that they write just one of the possible views on history, while there are many more possibilities, which are no less 'right' or 'wrong'. Objectivism has thus now been opposed to relativism and opening a discussion is often considered more important than writing the final version of history by historians nowadays.

Popular historical culture is quite another discourse. It has its own specific dynamics and activity and reacts differently on the developments in the modern world like globalization, migration, and multiculturalism. While historiography for the greater part followed these evolvments, popular historical culture seems to a large extent to retain, or even to revert to, the nation as the most important unit in remembrance. In a time of European integration and the growth of the European Union, many people and politicians consider their nation and national identity to be under threat.³¹ Some observers argue that, as a counter reaction to globalization and internationalization, national identity is more and more emphasized. A good example of this development is the election of the greatest person in national history as it took place recently in several countries, but also the foundation of a national history museum in 2006 and the installation of a committee to develop a national history canon, both in the Netherlands.³² So, the nation, as an essentialist unity, remains the central point of reference in the field of popular historical culture. This essentialism is characterizing historical culture; people want to know where they are coming from and the relativism of philosophy of history does not contribute to that aim. Also the daily press is not interested in the philosophical foundations

³⁰ Aerts, 'De uilen van Lyotard', 208-9.

³¹ Berger, Donovan and Passmore, 'Apologies for the nation-state', 3.

³² Grever and Stuurman, 'Introduction', 2.

of historiography and research activities of historians, but rather sees historians as representing historical sources, whose citations can decorate news items.³³

The renewals in professional historiography meet popular historical culture in the field of history education. The convergence of these two opposed approaches, combined with the political division between conservative nationalists and progressive forces, causes friction and leads to public history wars over which interpretation of history must be taught to the next generation. Two very well documented contests over the content of history lessons are those battled out in Australia and the United States. In Australia, a dispute over textbooks was part of a real Australian *Historikerstreit*. Two groups had been fighting since the 1980's over the way to look to Australian history. One of the main points of discussion was whether the arrival of Europeans in Australia had to be called an 'invasion' or 'settlement'. The word 'invasion' had been used in the school curriculum, which led to an attack from conservatives and neoconservatives in the early 1990s. They accused progressive circles of political correctness and argued for being proud of the nation's history instead of feeling guilty of it. This led to a public discussion which was closely covered by the media. Changes were made in the curriculum after state elections and the change of government.³⁴

Another controversy took place in the United States in 1994, when the National History Standards were released, which outlined targets of history education and contained guidelines and teaching suggestions for history teachers in secondary education. The National History Standards were innovative in the sense that they did not see history as a set account of the past, but rather as an ongoing debate. They 'encouraged students not only to identify the who, what, where, and when of the past but also,' as the composers put it,

³³ Macintyre, *The history wars*, 1-14.

³⁴ Anna Clark, 'What do they teach our children?' in S. Macintyre, *The history wars* (2004) 171-190.

‘to shape such raw evidence into patterns of meaning and thereby make sense of history.’³⁵ History had to be discussed rather than learned by heart. The standards were heavily criticized by conservatives for being too politically correct and providing too dark a view on American history. They were attacked by talk-show hosts because, from a conservative point of view, they demoted national heroes as George Washington and victimized minorities. In the end, the National History Standards were dismissed.³⁶

A generalizing comparison shows that two camps can be observed in the different history wars. They have some shared characteristics. The camp of the traditionalists, on the one hand, advocates a kind of history education in which the nation remains an unquestioned unit and which instills a proud and patriotic feeling. History education teaches children to love their country and national pride is the central theme in it. It provides an image of a homogeneous people living in a stable national space and there is no or only a very limited place for critical notes on the own nation. Central to this way of teaching history, when it comes to methodology, is the memorization of important historical facts and national heroes. In short, this camp advocates a national narrative, to be learned by heart. The revisionists, on the other hand, dismiss national history as satisfactory in times of globalization, multiculturalism and migration. They advocate a broad and inclusive view on the past, an entangled history which links developments in different countries to each other. Instead of good patriots this camp wants to educate critical citizens, which are able to judge competing versions of history in a critical way. That is, as they argue, of great importance in nowadays complex society. The memorization of fact is less important for the revisionists; developing critical skills by using a variety of historical sources is what they promote.

Another similarity in all history wars is that mass media and politicians play an important role. The media cover the conduct of

³⁵ Gary B. Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn, *History on trial: culture wars and the teaching of the past* (New York 2000) 191.

³⁶ Nash, Crabtree, Dunn, *History on trial*, 188-193.

politicians, while politicians make use of the media to profile themselves in the debate on schoolbooks. History wars are not only an ideological struggle; contests over history textbooks are also a political strategy.³⁷

The controversy in Greece in 2006 and 2007, caused by the publication of Maria Repousi's history book in March 2006, was such a history war. Traditional, nationalist forces fought successfully against the introduction of the new textbook, a product of the revisionist camp.

Like in other countries, professional historians in Greece created a national narrative based upon historicist assumptions during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Serving to legitimize the newly established state, a narrative that traced back the origins of the Greek nation was created and an unbroken continuity between Ancient Greece and contemporary Greeks was composed. This narrative of unbroken continuity and unity of the Greek nation during Antiquity, the Byzantine times, Ottoman occupation and the Greek state that was founded after the national resurrection in the revolution was created step by step and completed in the course of the twentieth century.³⁸

Emphasizing this continuity remained an important feature of Greek history writing for a long time. The changes introduced in Western European historiography after the Second World War, did not take place in Greece. Up to 1974, most historical works written in Greece were mainly descriptive in nature and followed the nationalist tradition of unbroken continuity, describing ideologically insensitive issues.³⁹ Greek historiography did not adopt new approaches but kept on being devoted to the old manners. However, Greek historians abroad, mainly in France and England, learned new ways of writing history and adopted the new methodologies and

³⁷ Clark, 'What do they teach our children?', 182.

³⁸ Richard Clogg, 'The Greeks and their past' in D. Deletant and H. Hannak (ed.), *Historians as nation-builders* (London 1988) 15-31.

³⁹ Alexander Kitroeff, 'Continuity and change in contemporary Greek historiography' in *European history quarterly* 19/1 (1989) 274.

philosophies of history. These émigré historians played an important role in introducing new historiographical methods in Greece itself after the fall of the junta in 1974.⁴⁰ The influence from abroad meant a revolution in Greek historiography and brought it more in line with international standards. In the first place, political history based on state archive documents was pushed aside by social history, which came up in the years after the junta. The so-called school of social 'New History' categorized itself as a social science and was interested in the average person and society as a whole.⁴¹ This new focus and a growing number of comparative studies meant a shift away from the nation-state, although there are still a number of research institutions that did not do away with the traditionalist political and diplomatic history.⁴² Also postmodern thought found ground and Greek historians started questioning positivism in historiography.⁴³

In Greek popular historical culture, on the other hand, none of these developments took place. History plays an extremely important role in the country's popular culture. Much more than in Western European countries, national identity in Greece is based upon historical legacy; upon the perceived direct relation between ancient and modern Greeks. Consequently, history is considered an area open not only to academic historians, but also to journalists, politicians, and activists. The line between university historians and those outside the university is unclear. Especially during the turbulence of the 1990s mass media became a radiating force to promote national history. While the main Greek historical journals remained outside nationalist reasoning, references to national history in the popular historical discourse increased in this period and

⁴⁰ Kitroeff, 'Continuity and change', 272.

⁴¹ Antonis Liakos, 'Modern Greek Historiography (1974-2000). The era of transition from dictatorship to democracy' in Ulf Brunnbauer (ed.), *(Re)Writing History. Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster 2004) 362-4.

⁴² Kitroeff, 'Continuity and change', 281.

⁴³ Liakos, 'History wars'.

became a powerful communication instrument in the national political discourse.⁴⁴ As Antonis Liakos explains:

‘The ethnic community sets boundaries for historical discourse in a succession of crises, where two senses of history are in opposition. In Greece, there has been a long series of such crises since last century, when the public has been confronted with conflicting historical interpretations.’⁴⁵

The 2006-2007 history textbook war was the heaviest of these crises.⁴⁶ The author, Maria Repousi, and her authors’ team belonged to the camp of the revisionists. The ideology of the book aimed to offer a multi-perspective and inclusive view on history. It introduced some innovations in pedagogical and historiographic perspective compared to its predecessors by presenting shorter texts with a comparative and critical approach, instead of longer texts to be memorized and repeated. Secondly, the team wanted to avoid the use of politically sensitive stereotypes and national myths and bring the book more in line with professional historiography. As happened in other history wars, the attempt to renewal in this direction was met with strong criticism from the more traditional camp. One of the first public critics of the textbook was the Archbishop of Athens and Greece, Christodoulos, who ventilated his discontent with the book in the beginning of September 2006. According to him, the new textbook did not pay enough attention to the Greek Revolution, the Catastrophe of Minor Asia, and the role of the church in the Greek Revolution was not enough emphasized. ‘We have got our objections. A special committee of the Church examines the voids and weaknesses and very soon we will address the Ministry’, he

⁴⁴ Liakos, ‘Modern Greek historiography’, 353-4.

⁴⁵ Liakos, ‘Modern Greek historiography’, 353-4.

⁴⁶ See for descriptions of the Greek history war: Liakos, ‘History wars’.

Maria Repousi, ‘New History Textbooks in Greece. The chronicle of an ideological war on the national past’

[<http://users.auth.gr/~marrep/html/intro/articles/New%20History%20Books%20in%20Greece.pdf>, accessed 21-07-2008].

said.⁴⁷ The New Democracy Minister of Education, Maria Giannakou, replied that ‘the books are not going to be changed because one or another wants that to happen.’⁴⁸ The books were still in the evaluation phase at that moment.

Opponents of the textbook, in the meantime, gathered virtually on the website www.antivaro.gr, which is described by its webmasters as a forum for discussion on Greek national issues. The new textbook controversy became one of the most prominent of these national issues in the second half of 2006 and 2007. The website published a first critical article about the new history book in March 2006, written by a history teacher who visited a seminar.⁴⁹ Later on, the website offered the possibility to sign a petition against the book and collected more than 9000 online signatures.⁵⁰

The criticism intensified in the end of 2006 and continued until the general election on 16 September 2007. Maria Repousi and her author’s team were accused of downplaying the role of the Greek Orthodox Church during the Greek Revolution, painting a too black picture of Greek history by dropping or underrating the role of national heroes and self-sacrifice for the Greek nation, de-Hellinization and serving foreign interests and subordination to political conjuncture dictated by a Greek-Turkish détente by

⁴⁷ ‘Ενστάσεις για τα νέα σχολικά βιβλία έχει η Εκκλησία’ [The church has objections against the new schoolbooks], *In.gr News* (12-09-06) [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=737870>, accessed 21-07-2008].

⁴⁸ ‘Ενστάσεις μπορεί να υπάρχουν, τα βιβλία δεν αλλάζουν, δήλωσε η υπουργός Παιδείας’ [There may be objections, the books do not change, said the Minister of Education], *In.gr News* (14-9-06) [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=738628>, accessed 21-07-2008].

⁴⁹ Antivaro website, http://www.antivaro.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=72:antidraseis&catid=63:text&Itemid=109, accessed 21-07-08.

⁵⁰ List of subscribers: <http://palio.antivaro.gr/upografontes.php>, accessed 21-07-2008.

presenting a rosy image of the Turks.⁵¹ Archbishop Christodoulos fueled the controversy in a speech at the University of Athens:

‘How can you show the children an impure history? Some European Authorities must not renounce what we are. Why shouldn’t we, the Greeks, honor the richness of our history?’
 ‘We have history and tradition and it is a crime of extreme betrayal trying to abolish these things for which our fathers fought. (...) The national consciousness is inflicted and those responsible for it are seriously endangering the national characteristics. We are about to sacrifice everything the progressive forces tell us to do.’⁵²

With the elections upcoming, Christodoulos soon got support from nationalist political parties. One of the most prominent amongst them was the Member of Parliament Papatthemelis, who just founded a new political rightwing party and cooperated in parliament with New Democracy. Papatthemelis asked the Minister Giannakou in January to withdraw the controversial textbook, because it should contain ‘historical inaccuracies’.⁵³ Also the rightwing party LAOS and the communists of the KKE, who said that the book promoted European capitalism, wanted the book to be withdrawn. Through the press, also some academics chose the nationalist side in the debate. For instance, Constantinos Romanos, professor of philosophy at the University of the Aegean, commented that the book “limits the Greek revolution to a few lines and just mentions the names of a few leaders without any

⁵¹ M. Repousi, ‘Politics question history education. Debates on Greek History textbooks’, Paper presented to the International Conference of ISHD in Tallinn, 27-30 September 2006.

⁵² ‘Θυσίες στο βωμό της ελληνoturρκικής φιλίας’ [Sacrifices on the altar of Greek-Turkish friendship], *In.gr News* (23-01-07).

⁵³ Manos Charalambakis, ‘Γιαννάκου: «Δεν αποσύρεται το βιβλίο Ιστορίας της ΣΤ’ Δημοτικού»’ [Giannakou: The book for the sixth grade will not be withdrawn], *TA NEA Online* (29-01-2007)

[<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=7600>, accessed 21-07-08].

special reference to what they did.”⁵⁴ Opponents compared the book to another history textbook, which was published by the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation of Southeast Europe (CDRSEE) and edited by Christina Koulouri. This book comprises additional teaching materials, intended to be used in all counties of Southeastern Europe, and funded, amongst others, by UNDP, the Open Society Foundation and USAID. The Greek language edition was presented on the 6th of November 2006.⁵⁵ Like Repousi’s book, this one was also accused to be an instrument of interference by foreign powers in Greek affairs.

On the other hand, Maria Repousi’s book got support in parliament from the biggest party in the opposition PASOK, and the leftist party ARIS, which wanted the book to be introduced without any changes. Another leftwing party, SYRIZA, only wanted some minor changes based on scientific knowledge.⁵⁶ A considerable group of around 500 academics signed a petition in support of the new textbook and protested against a possible withdrawal.⁵⁷ This group also wrote opinion articles in the newspapers and commented in TV-shows on the issue. Spokesmen of this group were, for example, professor of modern history at the University of Athens Thanos Veremis and emeritus history professor Vasilis Kremmydas.

⁵⁴ ‘History book divides opinion’, *Kathimerini Newspaper English edition* (6-3-07) [http://www.ekathimerini.com/4dcgi/w_articles_politics_100012_06/03/2007_80873, accessed 21-07-2008].

⁵⁵ CDRSEE website, http://www.cdsee.org/jhp/activities_greece.html, accessed 20-6-07.

⁵⁶ Giannis Protonotariou, ‘Η Αριστερά και το βιβλίο της Ιστορίας’ [The left and the history textbook], *TA NEA Online* (10-4-07) [<http://ta-nea.dolnet.gr/Article.aspx?d=20070410&nid=3903711>, accessed 21-07-2008].

⁵⁷ ‘Εκπαιδευτικοί ζητούν να μην αποσυρθεί το βιβλίο Ιστορίας της Στ Δημοτικού’ [Teachers ask not to withdraw the history book], *In.gr News* (23-02-07) [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=781780>, accessed 21-07-08].

Under increasing pressure, Giannakou's reply to the debate in parliament and the media was that, in her opinion, the book needed some changes, but complete withdrawal of the book was not an option.⁵⁸ 'You can not write all the truths on 150 pages. The book has imperfections and we are going to do what is necessary, but I am not going to withdraw another book like it happened in the past with schoolbooks which contained obvious inaccuracies.'⁵⁹ She asked the Academy of Athens, an institution aiming to advance 'the cultivation and advancement of the Sciences, Humanities and Fine Arts, the conduct of scientific research and study, and the offer of learned advices to the state in these areas'⁶⁰, to evaluate the book and come up with recommendations. Maria Repousi and her supporters considered the Academy an inadequate institution to analyze schoolbooks.⁶¹ However, the conservative Academy of Athens found 'serious omissions' in the book and came up with 70 points to be changed.⁶² 'The very same authors' team recognizes that it is necessary to make some improvements. It has the right to add pages and then we are not going to have any problem', explained the minister after a meeting on the issue with Prime Minister

⁵⁸ Charalambakis, 'Γιαννάκου: «Δεν αποσύρεται το βιβλίο Ιστορίας της ΣΤ' Δημοτικού»' [Giannakou: The book for the sixth grade will not be withdrawn], *TA NEA Online* (29-01-2007).

⁵⁹ 'Απάντηση Γιαννάκου στις ενστάσεις της Εκκλησίας για την Ιστορία της Στ' Δημοτικού' [Answer Giannakou on objections of the Church on the history book], *In.gr News* (26-01-07) [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=773484>, accessed 21-0708].

⁶⁰ Website Academy of Athens, <http://www.academyofathens.gr/echome.asp?lang=2>, accessed 20-6-07.

⁶¹ Maria Repousi, 'New history textbooks in Greece'.

⁶² «Σοβαρές παραλείψεις» βλέπει η Ακαδημία Αθηνών στο βιβλίο Ιστορίας της Στ' Δημοτικού' [The Academy of Athens sees 'serious omissions' in the history book], *In.gr News* (22-03-07) [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=789265>, accessed 21-07-08].

Konstantinos Karamalis in April 2007.⁶³ The authors' team indeed made some changes to the first edition of the book, without changing the underlying philosophy of it. These changes were made with the agreement of the authors' team, Minister Giannakou, and the Pedagogical Institute.⁶⁴ In the end of July the minister repeated that the case of the textbook was 'on the right way'.⁶⁵

In the mean time however, the date of the elections was coming closer and not all parties involved in the textbook controversy were satisfied with the changes made to the textbook. Papatthemelis, for instance, called the book in a televised debate between several party leaders still 'nor teachable, nor corrigible', and stated that complete withdrawal was the only solution in his view.⁶⁶ The history war ended with the installation of the new government after the elections. The new Minister of Education and Religion in this New Democracy government, Evripidis Stylianidis, announced the withdrawal of the book on 25 September 2007. The book that had been in use in the previous years was reissued and in the meantime, the Ministry of Education proclaimed to issue a new tender to find an author for a completely new book.⁶⁷ Christodoulos reacted delighted.

⁶³ Dionysis Nasopoulos, 'Βήμα βήμα υποχωρούν στη Δεξιά του Κυρίου' [Step by step receding to the right], *TA NEA Online* (05-04-07) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=16698>, accessed 31-08-08].

⁶⁴ Dionysis Nasopoulos, 'Μέχρι τον Καραμανλή έφτασαν οι διορθώσεις στο βιβλίο της Ιστορίας' [The improvements in the history book arrived up to Karamanlis], *TA NEA Online* (02-08-07) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=32880>, accessed 31-08-08].

⁶⁵ 'Σε οριακό σημείο για να είναι έτοιμο το βιβλίο της Ιστορίας' [Minor point before the history book is ready], *TA NEA Online* (26-07-07) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=31876>, accessed 21-07-08].

⁶⁶ 'Σε οριακό σημείο για να είναι έτοιμο το βιβλίο της Ιστορίας' [Minor point before the history book is ready], *TA NEA Online* (26-07-07).

⁶⁷ Marny Papamataiou, 'Το θρίλερ της Ιστορίας' [The history thriller], *To Vima Online* (30/09/2007)

PASOK's reaction on the other hand was that Karamanlis had handled 'for political benefits, without taking into account the responsibilities towards the next generation.'⁶⁸ The withdrawal was the end of the Greek fight over the new textbook. It was lost by the progressive forces striving for renewal. The Church's assaults, the support from nationalist politicians in a time of upcoming elections, and close media coverage turned out to be fatal for the new history textbook for the sixth grade of elementary school.

[http://tovima.dolnet.gr/print_article.php?e=B&f=15178&m=A40&aa=4, accessed 21-07-08].

⁶⁸ 'Βολές από την αντιπολίτευση, ικανοποίηση από την Εκκλησία για το τέλος του βιβλίου' [Shots from the opposition, satisfaction by the Church for the end of the book], *In.gr News* (25-09-07)

[<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=834707>, accessed 31-08-08].

Chapter 2

Greek history textbooks since 1974

It became clear that discussions on the way history must be taught are integrally part of the political discourse. Are the processes of textbook production and of textbook withdrawal also political processes? How are textbooks produced and who is responsible for them? Examination of the eight official Greek textbooks shows that these processes are indeed political ones and that the 2006-2007 history war was not the first textbook controversy.

A look to the institutional setting is the first step of the analysis. The educational structure that exists today in Greece dates back from the post-dictatorship period. After the fall of the dictator's regime in 1974 it was generally felt that the educational system was in need of a thorough reform. The first democratically elected New Democracy government of Konstantinos Karamanlis, besides purging the educational service from junta collaborators, introduced a new education law in 1976. The law discarded the *katharevousa*, purified Greek language and introduced the *dimotiki*, popular Greek language in primary and secondary schools. It also established a new educational structure, in which the former six-year-gymnasium was replaced by a gymnasium of three grades and a new lyceum, also consisting of three grades. So, from the school year 1976-1977 on, the Greek educational system consisted of a compulsory elementary school (ages 6-12), a compulsory lower secondary school, the gymnasium (ages 12-15), and a higher secondary school, the lyceum

(ages 15-18).¹ The Lyceum is not compulsory but in practice attended by almost all pupils. This system still exists today.

The 1975 founded Center for Educational Studies and In-Service Training (KEME) was given a great responsibility in implementing the new education law. It was charged with the tasks to develop and modernize the school curricula, organize in-service training for teachers of the primary and secondary school levels, conduct educational research and prepare new textbooks.² It is responsible for the production of educational materials for both primary and secondary education in Greece, which are state-published. The institution coordinates the writing of textbooks and subsequently orders the National Office for Publication of Textbooks to print the book, after which it is distributed to pupils free of charge. The institute operates under direction of the Minister of Education and Religious Affairs. KEME was renamed in 1985 and is since then called Pedagogical Institute.

Official school curricula are recorded in so-called analytical programs, which are produced by the consultants and the staff of KEME/Pedagogical Institute. They are based on a historiographic bibliography, but 'tradition is also taken into account'.³ The first post-junta analytical program was drawn up by the institute in 1977.⁴ This program sets out the aims and methods of history teaching. A distinction between two goals can be made. In the first place, children have to be taught the 'historical truth' in order to cultivate 'proper' historical thinking. Secondly, history education must contribute to national edification by stressing the continuity of the Greek people through history and the influence of Christianity on their historical path.⁵ The analytical program is very detailed and nominates the topics to be addressed in the textbooks for the

¹ Andreas M. Kazamias, 'The politics of educational reform in Greece: law 309/1976' in *Comparative education review* 22/ 1 (1978) 21-45.

² Kazamias, 'The politics of educational reform', 39.

³ Interview by telephone with the secretary of Mr. Papagregoriou, 27-06-2008.

⁴ Efi Avdela, *Ιστορία και σχολείο [History and school]* (Athens 1998) 24.

⁵ Avdela, *Ιστορία και σχολείο [History and school]*, 24-25.

different grades. It prescribes the teaching of Greek mythology in the third grade of elementary school, Greek Antiquity from pre-historic times to the Roman era in the fourth grade, medieval history from the recognition of Christianity until 1453 in the fifth grade and in the sixth grade the history of modern times until the present. The same periods – Antiquity, Medieval or Byzantine history, and Modern Times – are repeated in both the three classes of the gymnasium and the Lyceum alike.⁶ The analytical program has not been changed significantly ever since 1977. Any changes that have been made were all under the responsibility of the KEME/Pedagogical Institute.

At KEME/Pedagogical Institute, two separate committees have been coordinating history education in primary and secondary education. The first committee is responsible for history textbooks for the different grades of the primary school. This committee was first headed by Dionisios Melas, who was succeeded by Ioannis Papagrighoriou.⁷ The last one said about the goals of history education in primary school: ‘Is it nationalist to love your country and traditions? The aim is to instill love of country and a national conscience.’⁸ This phrase illustrates the way he thinks about history education: it has to promote a patriotic feeling. In his opinion, children in the last class of primary school are too young for critical thinking exercises. Papagrighoriou thus belongs to the camp of people with a traditional approach to history education. A second committee is responsible for history classes in the gymnasium and Lyceum. Fanouris K. Voros had been responsible at KEME or the Pedagogical Institute for the textbooks in secondary education since the foundation of the institution in 1975.⁹ In Voros’ opinion, ‘history is impartial. And it is not pedagogically correct nor nationally desirable

⁶ Triantafyllos Petridis and Maria Zografaki, ‘Greece’ in C. Koulouri, *Clio in the Balkans. The politics of history education* (Thessaloniki 2002) 487-94.

⁷ Interview by telephone with the secretary of Mr. Papagregoriou, 27-06-2008.

⁸ Gilson, ‘Battle royal over history book’, *Athens News* (23-03-07).

⁹ Biography on the website of Mr. Voros [<http://www.voros.gr/bio.html>], accessed 28-08-08].

to load teaching with emotion or ideological coloring.¹⁰ Indeed, history textbooks for secondary education present history in general in a more distanced way. The writing process of the last book was coordinated by Anastasia Kykini-Koutoula.

Although Voros expressed that he ‘never felt under political pressure’¹¹ and Papagrigoriou said that ‘no one outside the Pedagogical Institute can influence the textbooks’¹², the institution is clearly not independent from politics. One of the textbook authors said that the institute ‘does what the minister wants.’¹³ Researcher Efi Avdela concluded that this institute is a political institution that changes every time a new government comes to power.¹⁴ The selection of textbook authors, for instance, used to be a political procedure for a long time. Authors were directly selected and appointed by the Minister of Education. Only for the last generation of textbooks the procedure has changed, since authors were selected via a public tender. Indeed, the introduction and withdrawal of history textbooks are political decisions. This becomes clear by examining the process of the development of the successive modern history textbooks for the last classes of elementary school and the gymnasium since the Greek return to democracy in 1974.

Four different textbooks have been introduced for the sixth grade of primary school in the post-dictatorship period and another four books for the third class of the gymnasium. Some of these books are very traditional and nationalist in nature. Others are written by revisionists. Striking is that the two most revisionist books were both withdrawn for political reasons. These books were the gymnasium book written by Vassilis Kremmydas, in use from 1984 to 1991, and, of course, Maria Repousi’s primary school book.

¹⁰ Voros cited in Hamilakis, ‘Learn History’, 57.

¹¹ Voros cited in Hamilakis, ‘Learn History’, 59.

¹² Interview by telephone with the secretary of Mr. Papagrigoriou, 27-06-2008.

¹³ Mr. Kremmydas by e-mail, 14-05-2008.

¹⁴ Avdela, *Ιστορία και σχολείο* [History and school], 26.

History textbooks for the primary school

Despite the craving for educational renewal after the fall of the junta, the first history textbook on modern history in primary education after 1974 was a very traditional one. It was an existing book, published before the foundation of KEME, and written by E. Kafentzi.¹⁵ Its 118 pages (title pages and table of contents excluded) are almost entirely about Greek history, which is presented pretty one-sided. The book mainly contains texts, complemented with some questions at the end of each chapter. It has been divided into three parts: 35 pages describe the period of Ottoman domination ('Tourkokratia' in Greek), 62 pages are on the Greek Revolution, and 22 pages on the period of the 'free Greek state'. The book contains a very limited number of images, maps, photographs, and paintings.

The first book based upon the new analytical program produced by KEME was issued in 1979. This book, written by N. Diamantopoulou and A. Kyriazopoulou,¹⁶ is the most traditional and nationalist one of the whole sample of eight books. It is more nationalist in its approach than its precedent. The dominant opinion at KEME, that history education in primary education has to foster feelings of national pride and patriotism, has thus been worked out in this textbook. The book has the same tri-partition as the previous one. The first part on the Tourkokratia contains 46 pages, the second part about the Greek Revolution 98, and 38 pages are about the 'successive expansion of the Greek state'. Containing 182 pages, the book is more voluminous than the previous one, which can be partly explained by the increase in the number of illustrations.

Almost ten years later, in 1988, a new book was introduced.¹⁷ This book was written by a team of six authors, all

¹⁵ E. Kafentzi, *Ιστορία των νεωτέρων χρόνων. Τάξη ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [History of the modern times. 6th class of primary school] (Athens 1977).

¹⁶ N. Diamantopoulou and A. Kyriazopoulou, *Ελληνική ιστορία των νεωτέρων χρόνων. ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [Greek history of modern times. 6th grade of primary school] (Athens 1985).

¹⁷ D. Aktypis, A. Velalidis, *Στα νεότερα χρόνια. Ιστορία ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [In modern times. History for the 6th grade of primary school] (Athens 1993).

appointed by the Pedagogical Institute: Dionysios Aktypis, Aristeidis Velalidis, Maria Kaila, Theodoros Katsoulakos, Ioannis Papagrighoriou, and Kostas Choreanthis. The vision on history education of this team becomes clear from the reactions of the authors on Maria Repousi's textbook in 2006 and 2007. Papagrighoriou, who coordinated also the writing of Repousi's book, has already been cited above, but also Katsoulakos, for instance, was a clear opponent of Repousi's book. In a reaction on the withdrawal of the book, he said in a TV-interview that a historian has to tell the truth and present the historical reality, without making it better than it is. He was, thus, accusing Repousi of political correctness.¹⁸

The book these authors wrote was, not surprisingly, very traditional in character, although it is slightly less nationalist compared to the previous one. It contains considerably more pages than the previous books: 323. The number of images leaps out; there are many maps, photographs, and paintings, many of which cover full pages. In contrast to the short questions at the end of every chapter in the other books, the exercises that follow the narrative text of every chapter in this book are various. The same division into three parts that characterized the previous books is also used in this one, but the parts have been complemented with a new section on European history, which has only 6 pages. The part of the book on 'Hellenism after the fall [of Constantinople]' has 91 pages, the part on 'The Great Revolution' 92, and the last part on 'The independent state of Greece' has 118 pages. The number of pages on the history of the modern Greek state in the nineteenth and twentieth century has grown significantly.

In 1997 the book was revised by a team of three persons; Theodoros Katsoulakos, Anastasia Kyrkini, and Maria Stamopoulou. Some chapters have been rewritten, but the approach remained the same.

¹⁸ 'Αποσύρεται το βιβλίο Ιστορίας' [The history textbook withdrawn], *Website Sky TV* (25-9-2007) [http://www.skai.gr/master_story.php?id=60742, accessed 28-08-08].

The process of textbook renewal starting in 2003 was completely different compared to the former renewal procedures. The PASOK government in this year secured a grant from the European Union, which covered 75% of the costs of the development of a new generation of textbooks for all subjects in the primary and secondary school. Since the production of the books was partly paid by the European Union, European rules had to be followed in the selection of authors by the Pedagogical Institute: a public tender was announced. Authors were invited to hand in a sample of their work, which had to consist of twenty per cent of the final book. A group of independent experts evaluated these samples anonymously and decided which authors were given the task to write the textbooks.¹⁹ However, the authors were not completely free to write whatever they wanted, since they still had to follow the detailed analytical programme of the Pedagogical Institute.

The writing of the new history book for the sixth grade of the gymnasium was assigned to the authors' team headed by Maria Repousi, who has been a professor of history and pedagogy of history at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki since 1993. Her co-authors were Chara Andreadou, Aris Poutachidis, and Armodios Tsivas. Repousi's aims with the textbook were two-fold. She aimed to introduce a didactical renewal, consisting of a new method that stimulates a critical and comparative approach to history, instead of the previous methods which were built up out of longer text, meant for memorization. Besides that, she wanted to bring history education more in line with historiography by doing away with the ethnocentric narrative and national stereotypes and myths.²⁰ The textbook 'attempts to come to grips in a creative way with the Hellenocentrism of the History Curriculum and to transcend its ethnocentrism. It does not regurgitate stereotypes. It presents itself as a tool for historical literacy and historical culture, introducing methodological norms into teaching and learning in history.'²¹

¹⁹ Interview with Maria Repousi, 14-03-08.

²⁰ Interview with Maria Repousi, 14-03-08.

²¹ Maria Repousi, 'Politics questions history education'.

Right from the beginning of the writing procedure there were tensions between the authors' team and the coordinator at the Pedagogical Institute, Ioannis Papagrigoriou, one of the authors of the previous book. Maria Repousi tried to interpret the analytical program in a very creative way. For instance, the program prescribed which chapters and which topics had to be addressed in the book, but it did not say how many pages had to be spent on each topic. Maria Repousi and her team decided to write subchapters of three pages for the first chapter of the book, which is about Europe in Modern Times, and subchapters of only two pages for the rest of the book, which is on Greek history. In this way they tried to present a more entangled history. This initiative was not appreciated Papagrigoriou. He called the authors' team 'not so collaborative'. He continuously warned the authors and wanted them to follow as closely as possible the analytical program. His two objections against the book were that it stimulated critical thinking, for which in his opinion the pupils of the sixth grade of the primary school are too young, and, secondly, he foresaw that the book would cause political tumult.²²

The new book that was issued in September 2006 was indeed clearly a product of a revisionist authors' team. The texts in this book are shorter than in the former ones, while the number of additional sources is bigger. Also non-Greek history has been given a place. The book has not been divided into the traditional three parts, but, instead, it has five parts. The first part on 'Europe in Modern times' has 14 pages, the second part 'The Greeks under foreign rule' 21, the part 'The Great Revolution' 30 pages, the section 'Greece becomes an independent state' contains 22 pages, and the last part, 'Greece in the twentieth century', has 46 pages. As became clear in chapter 1, the book was withdrawn by the New Democracy Minister of Education, Styliani Stylianidis, after the textbook controversy and the elections of September 2007. The previous textbook was reintroduced in the 6th grade of the Elementary school and the second edition of the controversial textbook of Maria Repousi has been

²² Interview by telephone with the secretary of Mr. Papagregoriou, 27-06-2008.

published by its authors and is available in bookshops as alternative teaching material.²³ According to the Pedagogical Institute, a new tender will be issued to find a new authors' team to write another book.

History textbooks for the gymnasium

Textbooks for the gymnasium have in general a broader scope than the textbooks for the elementary school. There is more space for European and world history compared to the books used in primary education. Like in the sixth grade of the primary school, four different textbooks have been issued for the third grade of the gymnasium since 1974.²⁴

The first post-dictatorship textbook in the last year of gymnasium was, like the first primary school book, an already existing book.²⁵ The book, written by Georgias P. Koulikourdi, had been revised several times during the years of the junta. It has 328 pages of content which are divided over five sections. The first 97 pages handle the period from the 15th century until the Peace of Westphalia; the second section is on the era between the Peace of Westphalia and the Peace of Paris in 1815 (68 pages). Thirdly, the next 72 pages are on Greek history from the middle of the 17th century until the foundation of the Greek State (1831). The last two sections are successively about the period from the Peace of Paris until the outbreak of World War I (46 pages) and from the outbreak

²³ M. Repousi, C. Andreou, *Στα νεότερα και σύγχρονα χρόνια. Ιστορία για την ΣΤ' Δημοτικού [In modern and contemporary times. History for the 6th grade of primary school]* (Athens 2008).

²⁴ Dimitris K. Mauros Koufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία στη δευτεροβάθμια εκπαίδευση (1975-1995) [School history in secondary education 1975-95]* (Thessaloniki 2003) 93-94.

²⁵ Georgias P. Koulikourdi, *Νεώτερη Ευρωπαϊκή ιστορία από τον 15 αι. μ. Χ. ως σήμερα [Modern European History from the 15th century until today]* (Athens 1975).

of World War I until ‘our times.’ (36 pages) The texts are quite long and illustrated with pictures and maps. The book was criticized for containing some historical errors and not breaking with the dictatorship.²⁶

Therefore, it was decided to appoint Vasilis Kremmydas to write a new textbook in April 1983, which was introduced in the academic year 1984-85. A committee of three persons was appointed at KEME to supervise the writing process, with Fanouris Voros as the direct supervisor of the author.²⁷ The decision to appoint Kremmydas was made by the PASOK Minister of Education, Kaklamanis.²⁸ Kremmydas was one of the leading figures of the so-called school of ‘New History’, which came up in the years after the fall of the junta and was a merge of ‘the *Annales* School plus Marxism’.²⁹ Kremmydas was the single author of the textbook; he wrote it on his own. He took a radical revisionist approach to history education and introduced a very critical and entangled view on history. Illustrative is his attempt in negotiations with KEME to give his book a title which had to emphasize his world history approach.³⁰ He lost the negotiation and the final book was entitled *Greek and European modern and contemporary history*.³¹ It was in use from 1984 until 1991, although small corrections and ‘improvements’ were made over the years by the Pedagogical Institute.

The book was not subdivided into separate sections, like the former book, but only into ten chapters. The first three chapters describe European history from the 15th until the 18th century (together 129 pages). Chapters 4 and 5 are about the Greeks under Ottoman rule and the way towards the creation of the Greek state (together 67 pages). Chapter 6 describes the organization of

²⁶ Mauroskoufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 97.

²⁷ Mauroskoufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 213. Vasilis Kremmydas, by e-mail, 14-5-2008.

²⁸ Vasilis Kremmydas by e-mail, 14-5-2008.

²⁹ Antonis Liakos, ‘Modern Greek Historiography’, 362-363.

³⁰ Mauroskoufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 232.

³¹ V. Kremmydas, *Ιστορία νεότερη – σύγχρονη. Ελληνική και Ευρωπαϊκή [Greek and European modern and contemporary history]* (Athens 1984).

capitalism in Europe in the period 1800-1914 (29 pages). Chapter 7 is on the growth of the Greek state (20 pages), while chapter 8 treats the First World War, the interwar period and the Second World War (31 pages). The sciences, thought and arts of the second half of the 19th and the 20th century are the subject of chapter 9 (14 pages). Chapter 10 describes Greece in the 20th century (23 pages). The book has slightly more images than the former one.

Kremmydas' textbook was criticized by the right side of the political landscape, for being politically biased. It was said that the book was written in an anti-scientific, anti-historic, anti-pedagogic, and Marxist style. According to the critics, the book contained errors and did not put enough emphasis on Greek history. Criticism on the book had also been expressed by New Democracy Ministers of Education in the different governments of 1989 and 1990; it was said to express the Marxist ideology.³² For instance, Minister Despotopoulou sent a letter to the Pedagogical Institute to instruct the institute to restructure the material.³³ After the elections of April 1990, after which New Democracy formed a government, Despotopoulos, who stayed in office as Minister of Education, decided to withdraw the book for its 'political one-sidedness' and replace it by another one, with more attention for Greek history.³⁴

The author that was appointed to write the new book was a history professor at the University of Athens, Vassilis Sfyroeras. There had been some discussion in the Pedagogical Institute about the selection of a co-author. The director of the Pedagogical Institute proposed a writer to work on the book, but Voros protested, saying that 'at this moment, at which after a political initiative the book of Kremmydas was withdrawn due to political bias, the assignment of a writer for the new book, appointed by Daskalopoulos [director of the Pedagogical Institute] is not advisable, I believe that it seems to tend to the other political end.'³⁵ In the end, Sfyroeras wrote the textbook alone. The book indeed pays considerably more attention to Greek

³² Mauros Koufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 100-102.

³³ Mauros Koufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 288.

³⁴ Mauros Koufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 291-2.

³⁵ Mauros Koufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 296.

history than Kremmydas' materials. It is more voluminous than the two previous books, and is richly illustrated with images and additional sources.³⁶ At first sight, the 24 chapters contain very much European and world history; nineteen of them have titles that refer to general European history and there are even some chapters on American and Chinese history, while only five chapters are entirely on Greek history. However, a closer look makes clear that the chapters on Greek history have much more pages than the other ones. Together the five chapters make up more than 190 pages, which is more than half the book.

A new textbook for the gymnasium was initiated in 2003, as part of the same renewal program to which Maria Repousi's book belonged. The authors were selected in the same way as the team that wrote the controversial primary school book; they were chosen after an open competition in which a sample of twenty per cent of the final book was evaluated by independent specialists. The final book consists of three parts.³⁷ The first part handles the period from the French revolution to the end of the nineteenth century (72 pages). This book thus does not include most of the Ottoman period. The second part is about the first half of the twentieth century, ending with the Second World War (55 pages). The last part describes the history from the end of the Second World War until the end of the twentieth century (46 pages). Although the Greek past is the principle subject of the book, it gives an entangled view on history, in which world history also has a place. The book definitely belongs to the revisionist camp. The book did probably not stir such a controversy as the primary school book, because it does mention sensitive subjects, albeit in a nuanced way, as will become clear in the next chapter.

The very processes of textbook renewal and withdrawal are thus political proceedings. Greek history textbooks are state published

³⁶ V. Vl. Sfyroera, *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη [Modern and contemporary history]* (Athens 1991).

³⁷ E. Louvi and D. Xfaras, *Νεότερη και σύγχρονη ιστορία [Modern and contemporary history]* (Athens 2007).

and the initiative to introduce new books comes from politicians. Politicians on the highest level are involved in the decision to issue or withdraw a textbook. The quarrels over the textbooks written by Vassilis Kremmydas and Maria Repousi show very clearly the involvement of the Minister of Education. In both cases the Minister decided to withdraw a revisionist book shortly after the general elections. A link between political parties in power and the type of history books issued can be observed; both Kremmydas' and Repousi's books were the result of a process initiated by the socialist PASOK party. They were both withdrawn and replaced by a more traditional book under responsibility of New Democracy Ministers of Education and Religious Affairs. However, this link is not absolute, because New Democracy Minister Giannakou defended Repousi's book, while her successor and fellow New Democracy member Stylianidis withdrew this very same book.

The practice of publication of history textbooks can lead to strange situations. For instance, during the mid-eighties both the most traditional book and the most revisionist book were in use at the same time. In primary school a version of history was taught in which actions of the Greek nation were uncritically praised in Diamantopoulou and Kyriazopoulou's New Democracy initiated primary school book. Three years later, in the last class of the gymnasium, an almost opposed version was taught the same pupils in the most critical book of all, the one of Kremmydas that was initiated by PASOK.

Furthermore, it is apparent that books written by authors of the revisionist school cause more criticism than traditional books. Traditional books have more public support than revisionist ones. Apparently, people prefer to hear positive and heroic things about their nation over negative affairs.

Chapter 3

The Greek 'Self' and its 'Others'

In the previous chapters it was shown that discussions on history textbooks are part of the political discourse and that processes of textbook renewal are political processes in Greece. Progressive revisionist textbooks replaced nationalist or traditional ones and vice versa. But how nationalist are these books? And did the contents of the different textbooks change significantly over time? If they have changed, were these changes related to political developments? Does a link between political developments and the contents of history books exist? An analysis of the presentation of four sensitive historical topics or events in the different textbooks must clarify these questions. All these topics contribute to the formation of the Greek identity and world view.

The concepts of the 'Self' and the 'Other', both extremely important in the definition of one's identity, serve as guiding principles in this chapter. The first concept defines 'who we are', where 'we' are coming from and what characteristics 'we' have. The concept of the 'Other' defines 'who we are not', who does not share 'our' distinctive character. Since the 'Self' can only exist when it is contrasted to something else, the 'Other' will be firstly discussed. The Greek campaign in Asia Minor and the encounter with the Turks in the so-called 'Catastrophe of Smyrna' in 1922 have been selected for this purpose. Secondly, the representation of the Greek 'Self' is analyzed. The accounts on the role of the Greek Orthodox Church during the Ottoman domination have to shed light on this matter. The third topic is the divided Greek 'Self' during the Civil War. Finally; what happens if another nation contests the Greek national identity

by claiming the same origins and symbols? An analysis of the narrative on the Macedonian Question must provide an answer to this question.

The Turks: Greece's most prominent 'Other'

Several 'Others' are included in Greek history textbooks; all of them are contrasted to the Greek 'Self'. Anna Frangoudaki has investigated which are the most important 'Others' in these books. In the first place, the occupiers of Greece during the Second World War are prominent 'Others'. The German Nazis, Italian Fascists, and the Bulgarians, are reported to have caused hard times for the Greek population. Secondly, the European Great Powers are presented as unreliable partners for Greece. The most important 'Others' in the Greek history books, however, are the Ottomans and Turks.¹ They are presented as a continuous threat, 'a historically permanent "other" in the Greek national narrative.'² Their ethical values are considered to be questionable. Several encounters in history between Turks and Greeks are used to prove the danger of Turkish brutality. The 'fall' of Constantinople in 1453 is seen as the beginning of the 'occupation' of the Greek lands and the start of the period known in Greece as 'Tourkokratia', which literally translated means 'Turkish Rule'. However, in the Greek popular use of the word it has

¹ Anna Frangoudaki, «Απόγονοι» Ελλήνων «από τη μυκηναϊκή εποχή»: η ανάλυση των εγχειριδίων ιστορίας [‘Descents’ of the Greeks ‘from the Mycenaean period’: analysis of history teaching materials] in Anna Frangoudaki and Thaleia Dragona (ed.), «Τι είν' η πατρίδα μας;» *Εθνοκεντρισμός στην εκπαίδευση* [‘What is our fatherland?’ *Ethnocentrism in education*] (Athens 1997) 367.

² Vasilisa Lilian Antoniou and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soysal, ‘Nation and the Other in Greek and Turkish history textbooks’ in Yasemin Nuhoglu Soysal and Hanna Schissler, *The nation, Europe, and the world: textbooks in transition* (New York/Oxford 2005) 116.

overtone of dark years of bondage.³ This image is strengthened by the fact that Greeks during this period are structurally called 'enslaved people' in the textbooks. Although the Ottoman period lasted for almost four centuries, the space dedicated to it in the textbooks is relatively small. The period is of minor importance in the national narrative, since it is perceived as a period of 'passive' Greekness, in which Greek culture was conserved by underground groups. According to the narrative, these groups countered the force of the Turks who tried to Islamize the Greeks living in the Ottoman lands.

Also after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire the Turks continue to be a danger to the Greek nation, according to the national narrative. The account on the 'Catastrophe of Smyrna' in 1922, which followed on the Greek campaign in Asia Minor, confirms these hazards. The event has been visualized both in the Mausoleum of Atatürk in Ankara and in the National History Museum of Greece in Athens, where similar paintings can be found in an eminent place. The images show how Greek refugees try to escape from Smyrna, which is covered under palls of smoke. However, the caption is completely different in both countries. In Turkey it represents a victory; in Greece it shows the barbarism of the Turks.

The presented image of a continuous and characteristic brutality of the neighboring nation does have consequences for the present and even the future.⁴ Firstly, the narrative funds Greek claims on cultural rights and land and property that now belong to the Turkish Republic. The Greek textbooks present the Tourkokratia as a dark period in which many Greeks in the Ottoman lands suffered and were, under high pressure, converted into Muslims. In this way, the Greek origins of the Turks are 'proven' and implicitly a claim on the lands is made. The fact that Greeks still use the name Constantinople to signify the city Istanbul illustrates this. In the second place, the responsibility for the underdevelopment of Greece nowadays is

³ Hercules Millas, 'History Textbooks in Greece and Turkey' in *History Workshop Journal* 31/1 (1991) 23.

⁴ Millas, 'History textbooks in Greece and Turkey', 30.

ascribed to the Turks. By creating the image of suppressed Greeks during the dark period of Ottoman occupation, it is easy to hold that the Turks are guilty of the underdevelopment of the Greeks.⁵ These accusations of the neighbor do not promote stable bilateral relations.

Especially because of these consequences for the present and future the image of the neighbor has, several scholars have investigated the portrayal of the Turks in Greek history textbooks. It is well investigated subject. All authors noticed that the image of the Turks in Greek history textbooks is changing over time; however, they disagree over the degree of change. Hercules Millas, a political scientist at the University of Athens, is most pessimistic of all authors; he sees only ‘marginal changes’ in the image of the Turks. He made a comparison between Greek and Turkish textbooks and investigated what schoolchildren in both countries learn about each other.

‘Greeks and Turks have been educated to become antagonists and opponents. For generations they have been fed with aggressive ideologies, with prejudices against the other side, with one-sided information and with historical distortions and exaggerations, as if they were armies already marshaled, being exhorted before the last deadly charge.’⁶

This was the case in the past, and according to Millas it was still the case in 1991, when his article was published. Leda Glypsis takes a similar stand in this question. She argues that the misleading and wrong national identity model is being upheld, regardless of historical inaccuracy.⁷

A completely different development took place according to Vasilia Lilian Antoniou and Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal, who, like

⁵ Dimitrios Theodossopoulos, ‘Introduction; the “Turks” in the Imagination of the “Greeks”’ in *South European Society & Politics* 11/1 (2006) 12.

⁶ Millas, ‘History textbooks in Greece and Turkey’, 23.

⁷ Leda Glypsis, ‘Love, truth, and national identity prescriptions: recounting the 1919-1922 war in Greek school textbooks’ in *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 29 (2007) 115.

Hercules Millas, compared the image of the Turks in Greek schoolbooks and vice versa. They argue that, both in Greece and Turkey, textbooks have changed significantly as a result of the Europeanization of the two countries. The entrance of Greece into the European Union shaped a new image of the 'other' and fostered the debate on the introduction of global pedagogical trends. They observe a new ethos and new approach towards history as a school subject amongst officials and politicians in Greece and argue that the process towards reform has been opened. 'Recently, both Greek and Turkish governments have shown a commitment to amend and reappraise history textbooks and curricula.'⁸ How exactly they fund their claim that real changes occurred does not become clear in the article.

Changing bilateral political relations between Greece and Turkey are often mentioned as the cause of changes in history books. Agreements between the Turkish and the Greek governments are often said to have led to change and to have made the image of the neighboring country less negative and hostile. The bilateral relations between Greece and Turkey have, generally speaking, been tense over the whole period since the fall of the dictatorship in July 1974, with some relaxations and, on the other hand, some moments that the countries were on the brink of war. The first Prime Minister after Greece's return to democracy, Konstantinos Karamanlis, worked to avoid war with Turkey and to secure the accelerated accession of Greece to the European Community. His successor Andreas Papandreou, however, used strong rhetoric against Turkey. In 1982, for instance, he was the first Greek Prime Minister to visit Cyprus, which worsened the relations between the two countries. The relations between Greece and Turkey continued to be fraught and the countries were on the brink of war in 1987, when Turkey intended to explore the Aegean for oil, and 1996 after a quarrel over the small rocky islet of Imia.

The relations became again extremely tense after Abdullah Öcalan fled into Greece in 1999, but it also became clear then that

⁸ Antoniou and Soysal, 'Nation and the Other', 118.

the new minister of Foreign Affairs, Georgios Papandreou, did not choose for a confrontational style.⁹ The earthquakes that struck both Turkey and Greece later on in the same year and the mutual exchange of humanitarian help that followed on them, opened the way for what became known as the ‘earthquake diplomacy’.¹⁰ The Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs Georgios Papandreou and his Turkish counterpart Cem initiated friendly talks, which resulted in a number of bilateral agreements. As part of a broader cultural agreement it was amongst others arranged to ‘appoint a joint committee to review history and geography textbooks of both countries in order to remove nationalist and chauvinist elements cultivating hatred between the two peoples’.¹¹ Georgios Papandreou declared that he wanted Greece to be the ‘locomotive’ that would help Turkey into the European Union. This policy was continued since then; also the succeeding New Democracy governments did not oppose Turkey’s candidacy for membership of the European Union.

The agreement between Papandreou and Cem played an important role in the controversy over the new textbook in 2006 and 2007. Opponents of the book used the agreement between the two Ministers of Foreign Affairs as an argument to show that the Greek identity was under treat of foreign powers promoting European integration. ‘The Karamanlis government is hostage to the Papandreou-Cem agreements and poisons the spirit of the Greek youth. The obsessive protection of Ms. Repoussi and the rest of the leftists who cooperated in the publication of this historic monstrosity will have consequences that will reach the ballot box,’ said the leader of the right-wing party LAOS, George Karatzaferis, trying to grab

⁹ Richard Clogg, *A concise history of Greece. Second edition* (Cambridge 2007) 166-238.

¹⁰ Theodossopoulos, ‘Introduction’, 10.

¹¹ ‘Greece, Turkey build a bridge over the sea with schoolbooks’, *Athens News* (27-10-1999)

[http://www.athensnews.gr/athweb/nathens.print_unique?e=C&f=12485&m=A01&aa=3&eid=A, accessed 23-08-08].

votes from the governing New Democracy in the elections.¹² Also the later Minister of Education and Religion, who in the end withdrew the textbook for the 6th grade, claimed that the new book was a result of the agreement.¹³ On the other hand, the Greek member of the committee that reviews the Greek and Turkish textbooks in the light of the agreement, former Greek ambassador to Turkey Dimitris Nezeritis, said that no changes have been made so far as a result of the committee's work.¹⁴ Maria Repousi and the Pedagogical Institute both deny that the Papandreou-Cem agreement influenced their work. The Pedagogical Institute stresses that their independence from political development, while Repousi emphasizes the autonomy of the authors' team from the Pedagogical Institute.¹⁵

Does a relation between the Cem-Papandreou agreement and the contents of Greek history textbooks exist? If that is the case, textbooks must have changed significantly since the late 1990's and show a much friendlier image of the Turks since that time. This hypothesis can be evaluated by analyzing the pages about the Greek campaign in Asia Minor, which started in 1919 and resulted into the incident in Smyrna in 1922.

Such a change can not be observed in primary school books. In the 1974 textbook, indeed, Greeks are victimized and Turks presented as aggressors. The Greek army fought 'heroically', while the Turkish forces, under leadership of Mustafa Kemal, committed serious aggression. The description of the Catastrophe of Smyrna is as follows:

¹² Ariana Ferentinou, "'Commotion" on the doorsteps of Greek history', *Turkish Daily News* (6-8-2007) [<http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?newsid=80200>, accessed 23-8-08].

¹³ Interview with Evripidis Stylianidis, *ERT Online* (12-09-07) [<http://tvradio.ert.gr/radio/interviews.asp?nid=340616&id=6>, accessed 23-08-08].

¹⁴ Gilson, 'Battle royal over history book', *Athens News* (23-03-07)

¹⁵ Interview with Ms. Repousi, 14-03-08. Interview by telephone with the secretary of Mr. Papagrigoriou. 27-06-2008.

‘Many thousands of Greek soldiers were killed or taken as prisoners. The Greek population, living on that land since thousands of years, was uprooted and forced to take refuge in Greece. More than one and a half million refugees retrenched in Greece.’¹⁶

Also the exchange of populations following on the Treaty of Lausanne is described:

‘...the entire Asia Minor and Anatolian Thrace until the river Evros, were retaken by the Turks. The Greeks from these places and the Turks of Macedonia were compelled in exchange and only in Eastern Thrace Turks stayed as compensation for the Greeks who stayed in Constantinople.’¹⁷

The 1979 textbook is even more hostile towards the Turks. It mentions that Greeks, referred to as ‘we’, had to leave Asia Minor in a very dramatical way. The book does not mention the exchange of populations after the war, in which also Turks had to leave their houses:

‘...we lost all our war materials and these beautiful places,’ and: ‘Millions of these Greeks were slaughtered or resorted completely exhausted as refugees to Greece. More than one and a half million of refugees came to Greece. This big national tragedy, which we know as “Catastrophe of Asia Minor”, wounded the pride of the nation and the army.’¹⁸

The 1988 textbook is also very traditional in its approach. The image of the Turks in 1922 has not been changed significantly. Interesting

¹⁶ Textbook 1, 119.

¹⁷ Textbook 1, 119.

¹⁸ Textbook 2, 168.

is the continuity between past and present that is stressed in the text, which proves the continuous threat of the Turks:

‘With the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), which is still valid today, Greece lost Asia Minor, the islands Imvo and Tenedo, and the Eastern part of Thrace, until the river Evros. At this moment also the necessary exchange of populations took place: 1.300.000 Greeks of the suppressed who lived in Turkey were exchanged against 500.000 Turks from Greece. An exception was made for the Moslems of Eastern Thrace and the Greeks of Constantinople, Imvos and Tenedos, they were not moved. In the decades that followed, the Greeks of these areas experienced suppression and harassments and today only a few still remain there.’¹⁹

The text of this 1988 book about the campaign in Asia Minor was rewritten in 1997, but the narrative remained pretty much the same as in the previous version. The message of it did not change. Repousi’s book, on the other hand, would have changed the image of the Turks significantly. Most important, adjectives like ‘heroic’ or ‘aggressive’ had been dropped. The initial version of the new textbook mentioned the 1922 events in Smyrna as ‘waterfront crowding’ of the Greek population. However, after fierce criticism on this phrase and a visit of the prime minister to the Refugees Museum as a gesture to the refugees,²⁰ the authors’ team was compelled to change the passage into:

‘Hundred thousands of Greeks were driven in dramatic circumstances to leave their houses and to search desperately a way to leave for Greece.’²¹

¹⁹ Textbook 3a, 262.

²⁰ Antonis Liakos, ‘History Wars’.

²¹ Textbook 4, 100.

Primary school books thus remained pretty much the same, certainly after the withdrawal of Repousi's book. The differences between the different gymnasium textbooks are bigger. But no clear line or connection with the Cem-Papandreou agreement can be observed in the development of the image of the Turks. Instead, a negative image is interchanged with a more positive one, and vice versa. This will be clarified by an examination of the presentations of the Greek campaign in Asia Minor, the description of Mustafa Kemal, and the description of the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece following the incidents.

The 1975 textbook provides a traditional approach. It says that the Greek campaign was organized in order to realize the Great Idea. Mustafa Kemal 'dethroned the sultan and renounced democracy' in Turkey. It is mentioned that Greeks and Turks were exchanged and that Greeks had to leave Asia Minor, 'where Hellenism had its roots and had flourished since Antiquity.'²² The 1983 version of the story is extremely critical towards the Greek campaign in Asia Minor. It 'did not only aim to protect the region of Smyrna', but the Greek army also 'started to fight in order to occupy Ankara outside the area that was given to Greece.' Like in the previous book, Kemal is said to be the founder of Turkish democracy; he was fighting for 'national independence of his country against the Greek invasion forces' and for 'democracy'. The exchange of populations is sketched in a very neutral way.²³ Children attending gymnasium between 1991 and 2006 were taught that 'the Greek army disembarked in Smyrna to protect the Christian population of the region until the sign of the final treaty of peace with Turkey,' and that Kemal is representing 'Turkish nationalism' and 'systematically started fighting against the Greeks.'²⁴ The book is more traditional than its predecessor. According to the text, 'Turkey took Eastern Thrace (the Evros River was set as the border), Imvros and Tenedos' in the Treaty of Lausanne, which led to the

²² Textbook 5, 306.

²³ Textbook 6, 312-4.

²⁴ Textbook 7, 316-28.

immigration of 1.500.000 refugees into Greece. This flux of immigrants into Greece had a positive effect on the economic development of the country, according to the book. The 2006 introduced textbook provides the most multi-perspective view of all. According to this book, the war in Asia Minor was a conflict between:

‘...two communities, a Greek and a Turkish one, where the realization of national dreams of the one met with frustration of the national dreams of the other.’²⁵

Mustafa Kemal is neither a clear establisher of democracy, nor a brutal attacker of the Greeks. The exchange of populations is mentioned with an emphasis on the political process and less attention for humanitarian elements.

A distinction between the books of the primary school and the gymnasium must be made in order to draw a conclusion. The evaluation of primary school books shows that the textbooks did not change significantly. Especially since the new textbook for the 6th grade was withdrawn, the traditional presentation of the Turks was preserved. The textbooks for the gymnasium, which are in general more nuanced than the books used in primary education, did change, but without a clear direction. The first and very traditional book was replaced by a very critical one, which was subsequently replaced by a more traditional book. The latest book provides a multi-perspective approach. A plain correlation between political development and the contents of textbooks does not exist. What can be said is that the much referred-to agreement between Papandreou and Cem did not influence the writing of textbooks at all. The allegations from nationalist forces of Turkish influence on textbook writing during the history war do not hold.

²⁵ Textbook 8, 100-110.

The Church and the myth of the Secret School

Opposed to the concept of the 'Other' is the concept of the 'Self'. This concept defines a sense of authentic national identity. The definition of the national 'Self' specifies the origins or descent of the nation and the characteristics of it. These characteristics are usually perceived to differ from other nations' characteristics in a positive way. The understanding of the Greek national 'Self' is based upon two main components. On the one hand, identification with the Hellenic past identifies the descent of the nation, while, on the other hand, Greek Orthodox Christianity is a clear characteristic. The first component is used to establish the nature of the 'true Self', the authenticity of the Greek collectivity. The Golden Age of the Hellenic period kindles the imagination and affirms the dignity and destiny of the nation.²⁶ This component is beyond the scope of this thesis.²⁷ The second element, Greek Orthodoxy, on the other hand, will be discussed here. Many Greeks believe that the Greek Orthodox Church has been the most important pillar of Greek national consciousness and that the Greek nation does not have a future without it.²⁸ According to official data, more than 95% of the population of Greece belongs to the Greek Orthodox Church.²⁹ The fact that there seems to be a contradiction between these two components of Greek identity, the polytheistic Antiquity and the

²⁶ Anthony Smith, 'The "Golden Age" and national renewal' in G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin (ed.), *Myths and nationhood* (London 1997) 49-52.

²⁷ It is investigated in Yannis Hamilakis, "'Learn history!'" Antiquity, national narrative, and history in Greek educational textbooks' in K.S. Brown and Y. Hamilakis (ed.), *The Usable Past. Greek Metahistories* (Oxford 2003) 39-68.

²⁸ Vasilios N. Makrides, 'Orthodoxie, griechische Ethnie und Nation, griechischer Nationalstaat und Nationalismus: Mythen und Realitäten' in I. Keul, *Religion, Ethnie, Nation und die Aushandlung von Identität(en). Regionale Religionsgeschichte in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa* (Berlin 2005) 69.

²⁹ Clogg, *A concise history of Greece*, table 5a 'religious affiliation' on page 263.

monotheistic Orthodox faith, does not keep them from forming a narrative of an uninterrupted Hellenism.

The sense of continuity of the Greek nation throughout history is supported by ‘invented traditions’ and national myths, in which the Church plays an important role. The concept of invented traditions has been brought forward by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger and is defined as ‘a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past.’³⁰ These traditions thus construct continuity with the past and define which elements of the constructed past are important to be remembered. A good example of an invented tradition in the Greek case is the celebration of the 25th of May, when the Greek Independence Day and the important Orthodox Feast of the Annunciation are celebrated at the same time. Symbols of the Greek Revolution are on this day displayed in churches, where also the national hymn is sung.³¹

A national myth is ‘a set of beliefs, usually put forth as a narrative, held by a community about itself. Centrally, myth is about perceptions rather than historically validated truths (in so far as these exist at all).’³² Myths are key instruments in the creation of collectives and they make the transmission of (political) messages to the collective simpler. One example of such a myth is the narrative of the Secret School, which claims that priests, although the Ottomans suppressed Greek education, taught the Greek children secretly during the night in underground schools during the early Ottoman period. The Church is presented as the main protector against the ‘aggression’ and ‘suppression’ of the Turks. This image

³⁰ Eric Hobsbawm, ‘Introduction: Inventing Traditions’ in E. J. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, *The invention of tradition* (Cambridge 1983) 1.

³¹ Victoria Clarck, *Why angels fall. A portrait of Orthodox Europe from Byzantium to Kosovo* (London 2000) 180-1.

³² George Schöpflin, ‘The functions of myth and a taxonomy of myths’ in G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin (ed.), *Myths and Nationhood* (London 1997) 19.

is supported by popular poems, a children's song, and a famous painting by Nikolaos Gyzis, which shows a priest teaching a group of children around a candle. However, it has been proven that the story of the Secret School was constructed in the late nineteenth century and that there is no historical evidence that such a Secret School has ever existed. The first sources mentioning it date from the post-Ottoman period.³³ The narration of the Secret School is thus a myth.

Despite the lack of any historical sources and evidence, the myth of the Secret School was incorporated in history textbooks. Both the books for the primary school and the gymnasium contained the myth:

‘As soon as the Turks had occupied Greece, they closed the Greek schools and prohibited the Greeks to learn their language. They believed that the Greeks after some time would forget their language and their history and slowly turn into Mohammedans. Because of that they chased and caught strictly those who managed to learn the language.’

‘Neither the prohibitions, nor the danger of the cruel sanctions could wipe away the eagerness of the enslaved Greeks for the Greek language. In the churches and in the monasteries, devoted and brave monks secretly collected the children of the enslaved in the nights and under the weak light of the candle they taught them to read and write and the basic principles of the Christian faith and of the national history.

These schools were named ‘Secret Schools’ (...).’³⁴

³³ Antonis Danos, ‘Nikolaos Gyzis’s The Secret School and an ongoing national discourse’ in *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 1/2 (2002) [http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/autumn_02/articles/dano.shtml, accessed 26-07-08].

³⁴ Textbook 1, 20-1.

‘In the first centuries of the hard yoke, the Church achieved with the secret school the continuation of the language, the faith, and the tradition.’³⁵

Clearly, in both above cited books the Church acts as protector of the Greek nation against the aggression and threat of the Turks, who chase after the innocent Greeks. It is because of the Church that the Turks did not succeed in assimilating the Greek inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. This narrative was challenged for the first time in educational materials in Kremmydas’ textbook for the gymnasium in 1984, which does not mention the Secret School. In his version of history the Patriarchate of Constantinople was given privileges and rights by the Turkish law:

‘(...) the acknowledgement and the protection of the Patriarchate and the assignment of privileges by the Turkish state was a measure of the law.’³⁶

The threat of assimilation of the Greeks by the Turks has thus been taken away here and that has consequences for the heroic role of the Church, as it was presented in the previous book. It now cooperates with the Turks and only coordinates the communities of the Greeks instead of saving them.

Although the Church lost its heroic role in the textbook, the institution was not the main criticizer of Kremmydas’ book in the controversy that led to the withdrawal of it in 1991. Especially nationalist politicians criticized the book, for it did not contain enough Greek history. In the last controversy on Repousi’s book, on the other hand, the church was in the vanguard to spout its accusations. Kremmydas himself postulated that the main reason for this different position of the church was the fact that in the 1980s and early 1990s another Archbishop of Athens was in office.³⁷ Indeed, a

³⁵ Textbook 5, 97.

³⁶ Textbook 6, 151.

³⁷ Vassilis Kremmydas, “Όλες οι παρεμβάσεις έχουν τις ίδιες υπογραφές” [All the interferences have the same signature] in *TA NEA Online*, 19-05-

new phase of more active interference of the Church in ‘national issues’ started in 1998, when Archbishop Seraphim died and Christodoulos succeeded him.³⁸

The confessional character of Greece is under pressure of globalization and the European Union, in which the Orthodox Greeks are a relatively small minority. In reaction to this development, Archbishop Christodoulos made the Greek Orthodox Church start to act more and more as the keeper of Greek national interests.³⁹ He tries to preserve and reinforce Greek national identity and a ‘healthy sense of patriotism’. Christodoulos’ new active interference in matters of national interest resulted in a controversy on an issue that ultimately concerns national identity: the case of identity cards. The dispute has its origins in 1991, when the New Democracy government announced the plan to replace the mandatory declaration of religion on identity cards by an optional declaration. The Church took a firm stand against the removal of religion from the identity cards, especially after Christodoulos took over the office of Archbishop. In 2000 he organized a national campaign against the Minister of Justice’s plan to proceed with the complete deletion of religion from the documents. Eventually, the highest administrative court of Greece decided that the statement of religion on identity cards was unconstitutional. It was now definitively removed from the cards. Christodoulos asserted that the government had been under strong international pressure and had given way.⁴⁰

He used the very same rhetoric in the textbook controversy in 2006 and 2007, in which the role of the Church during the Ottoman period and its role in the Greek Revolution were main

2007 [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=30&ct=19&artid=22432>, accessed 25-07-08].

³⁸ Lina Molokotos-Liederman, ‘Identity Crisis: Greece, Orthodoxy, and European Union’ in *Journal of contemporary religion* 18/3 (2003) 292. Makrides, ‘Orthodoxie, griechische Ethnie und Nation’, 72.

³⁹ Heinz Gstrein, ‘Politische Kultur in Südosteuropa: Griechenland’ in A. Mosser (ed.), *Politische Kultur in Südosteuropa. Identitäten, Loyalitäten, Solidaritäten* (Frankfurt am Main 2006) 186-7.

⁴⁰ Molokotos-Liederman, ‘Identity Crisis’, 296.

topics of discussion. According to the Church and its supporters, its role was downplayed and narrations, like that of the Secret School, which are extremely important for national consciousness, were missing in Maria Repousi's book. Indeed, Repousi and her authors' team were the first authors of a primary school textbook to omit the myth of the Secret School. They do not mention it, but instead argue that Greek education was not threatened by Turkish rule; 'the school does not disappear' in the Ottoman period, they wrote.⁴¹ Christodoulos was furious. According to him, the Church was not enough honored in the book, while the important and difficult work of clergymen during the hardships under Ottoman rule must never be forgotten, for they are very significant for the national Greek Orthodox character. According to the Church, of course, the importance of Orthodoxy for the Greek nation has to be emphasized, especially in a time of, what the Church sees as, threats from abroad. Greece and its Orthodox nature have to be protected against international interference in the national affairs of the Greeks, a people, as Christodoulos argues, that has distinguished itself throughout history. Therefore, narratives that construct national-religious identity must not be forgotten:

'There is a need for Hellenism (...) to rally in defense of the vital flame by which our fathers lived, which was created in this place by them and now has become the object of ridicule and renunciation through the apostasy of those who try to remove the transcendental principles and values on the basis of which this nation found its feet from the character of this people in the name of so-called "modernization". Today we live in an era when faith is renounced, national symbols are ridiculed and an attempt is underway to break down the defenses of the believer and of the citizen.'⁴²

⁴¹ Textbook 4, 22.

⁴² Christodoulos during a ceremony at the University of Athens. [Website of the Holy Synod, http://www.ecclesia.gr/greek/holysynod/holysynod.asp?id=721&what_sub=

Vasilis Kremmydas supported Repousi, by saying in a reply to the criticism of the Archbishop of Athens that ‘if the book should really refer to the role of the church, it should have written how negative it was.’⁴³

Despite Kremmydas’ support, the book was withdrawn and Archbishop Christodoulos won the battle on contents of the primary school book. His active interference in national affairs was successful this time and the myth of the Secret School continues to be part of the narrative in school books. In the books for gymnasium, on the other hand, the myth did not return. With the introduction of Kremmydas’ book, it was dropped and the books since then are quite critical towards the role of the Church. While the Church is still portrayed as the savior of the Greek unity and collectivity in primary school books, the teaching materials for the third grade of the gymnasium are thus more critical.

The divided ‘Self’: Civil War in Greece

The ideas of continuity and unity of the Greek nation throughout history are important ingredients of the Greek national narrative and cornerstones of national identity. Internal strife and division are in general considered to be negative characteristics of a nation and do not fit in a positive and uncritical image of the ‘Self’. How to cope with Civil War in history textbooks?

During the Second World War, several resistance organizations were active in Greece. The most important ones were

d_typou, accessed 23-0808] Translation by Repousi in Repousi, ‘Politics question history education’.

⁴³ Giorgos Kerelia, ‘Ένα βιβλίο, μια ιστορία και πολλοί (αδιάβαστοι) «ιστορικοί»’ [One book, one history, and many (self-proclaimed) historians], *Elevtherotypia ENET* (26-01-07)

[http://www.enet.gr/online/online_hprint?q=%CA%F1%E5%EC%EC%F5%E4%E1%F3&a=&id=13739620, accessed 21-07-08].

the National People's Liberation Army (ELAS), the military arm of the originally communist National Liberation Front (EAM), and the non-communist National Republican Greek League (EDES). However, tensions between these groups led to a struggle within the resistance movement. After the liberation this strife between communists and non-communists went on and the country slid towards Civil War between the communist Democratic Army and the official Greek state army. While the Civil War ended in 1949, it led to a long-lasting and fundamental division of post-war Greece between communist and anti-communists.⁴⁴ This division was slowly overcome after the collapse of the dictatorship in 1974. In 1989, a government of the right and left, enemies in the Civil War, was formed. Historian Liakos argues that 'forgetting, not remembering was now the game.'⁴⁵

The first textbooks after 1974 in both primary school and gymnasium do not mention the Civil War at all. The Civil War was probably too fresh, especially because these textbooks had already been in use before 1974. According to the primary school book, 'Greece breathed the vivifying air of freedom again' after the country's liberation.⁴⁶ Also in the gymnasium book the Civil War is unmentioned. Instead of a divided nation, Greece is presented as a unity. According to this book, 'the Greek army fought with bravery' during the Second World War and 'the Greek victories, the first in Europe against the axis, were astonishing and made the whole world enthusiastic.'⁴⁷

From the second generation of books on, the Civil war is included in all books, but a clear difference between primary school and gymnasium books can be observed. In primary school books, which have to promote a patriotic feeling and create good Greek citizens, the Civil War is presented as an unnatural deviation of the normally continuously united Hellenism. A short description of the

⁴⁴ Clogg, *A concise history*, 122-41.

⁴⁵ Liakos, 'Modern Greek historiography', 353.

⁴⁶ Textbook 1, 122-3.

⁴⁷ Textbook 5, 322-3.

tensions in Greek society in the post-war period is followed up by an edifying sermon of the author in order to advocate national unity:

‘(...) the national resistance did unhappily not remain united. There started to be friction with the result that conflict was created between the brigades themselves.’⁴⁸

The author continues that such an opposition in the Greek society must be prevented at all cost, because: ‘Our brilliant history compels a brilliant present and even more brilliant future.’ Also the 1988 introduced textbook contained such a sermon:

‘By this civil anguish the country got literally ruined. There were many thousands of victims and the catastrophes incalculable. The worst thing was that the hate caused by the Civil War poisoned the relationships of the Greeks and they continued to poison them for many years. The unity, which the country needed to advance, was missing.’⁴⁹

This version of the story returned unchanged to the schools after the withdrawal of Repousi’s book,⁵⁰ which did not include such a sermon. In her version of history it was said that the country:

‘(...) has to cope with serious political and civil problems, which make the process of reconstruction more difficult. Much of that has to do with the Civil War, and its repercussion. The Greeks remain divided in winners and losers.’⁵¹

Textbooks for the gymnasium present a more distanced view on the Civil War and do not lecture a sermon. The Civil War was included

⁴⁸ Textbook 2, 180-1.

⁴⁹ Textbook 3a, 285.

⁵⁰ Textbook 3b, 249.

⁵¹ Textbook 4, 115.

in the narrative from 1984 on. So, Kremmydas was the first to mention it:

‘The Civil War had essentially begun during the Occupation between the EAM and the other resistance groups, especially between the EAM and EDES; these were two organizations with different civil and ideological bases.’⁵²

The two successors of Kremmydas’ book did not essentially change the presentation of the civil war. They both describe that society was divided as well. The 2006 introduced book, for instance, says:

‘The Civil War left behind around 50.000 killed, around 80.000 political refugees, who had moved to the countries of Western Europe, 700.000 people who had to abandon their houses and enormous material damage. Moreover, the Civil war opened a deep gap in Greek population which stamped the post-war Greek society.’⁵³

The Civil War has thus been introduced in the second generation of textbooks, but the way it is treated is very different in primary and secondary school books. The Civil War as a recent negative experience in Greek history is used in books for the primary school to stress the importance of unity of the Greek nation in the present. It was only a temporary interruption of this unity and feeling of a common destiny for the Greek people. The war was not forgotten, but used to learn a unifying lesson from. In gymnasium books such a lesson is missing and the Civil War is presented in a more neutral way.

⁵² Textbook 6, 320-4.

⁵³ Textbook 8, 152.

The Macedonian Question

In the case of the Civil War, two supposed characteristics of Greek identity, continuity and unity of Hellenism, were questioned from the inside, by a division of the Greeks themselves. What if the identity is questioned by an outsider? This is what happened in the beginning of the 1990s, when Yugoslavia fell apart and its former republic of Macedonia began to seek international recognition as the 'Republic of Macedonia'. The use of a name and national symbols which Greeks considered to be theirs by the newly independent country caused a fervent conflict between the two neighboring countries. The fear of the Greeks for territorial aspirations of their new northern neighbor soon became a debate on whom the name Macedonia and Macedonian history belong to.⁵⁴

During the Yugoslav period, the existence of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia inside Yugoslavia was not considered to be problematic by the Greeks. Before the break-up of Yugoslavia a common Greek position was that Macedonia was a geographic region, spreading over several countries. Macedonia did not refer to a single nationality, for there were Greek Macedonians, but also Yugoslav Macedonians.⁵⁵ The Macedonian Question seemed to be a matter of the past which had lost its political sensibility. The Greek position changed radically after the independence of Macedonia in the beginning of the 1990s. Greek commentators now reasoned that the emergence of a country calling itself Macedonia meant a direct threat for Greece, because the new country would lay a territorial claim on the northern Greek province of Macedonia. The fact that the new northern neighbor used the sun of the ancient Macedonian kings, found at the tombs in Vergina in Greek Macedonia and ascribed to Philip of Macedon, on their national flag fuelled the anger even more.⁵⁶ Greeks now started to argue that Macedonia is

⁵⁴ Clogg, *A concise history*, 209.

⁵⁵ Loring M. Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict: ethnic nationalism in a transnational world* (Princeton 1995) 31.

⁵⁶ Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict*, 37.

‘one and only Greek’. Alexander the Great, they said, was a Greek, and because there is a direct racial and cultural link between the Ancient Greeks and nowadays Greeks, Macedonia and Macedonian history belong exclusively to the Greeks. The ‘Slavs from Skopje’ were accused of falsifying Greek history and creating an artificial ‘Macedonian nation’. Tito had given the name Macedonian to a mosaic of nationalities, according to these commentators.⁵⁷

Greece started a campaign against the international recognition of the neighboring country under the name Republic of Macedonia. The biggest demonstration against the recognition of the Republic of Macedonia by the European Community took place 1992 in Thessaloniki, where around a million people gathered around the Aristotle Square, but also the Greeks of the diaspora demonstrated in New York and Melbourne.⁵⁸ In Greece itself, ‘for three years, the wave of nationalism was so dominant that any other voice could scarcely make itself heard.’⁵⁹ One of the strongest voices in the name dispute was the nationalist politician Stelios Papatthemelis, who called Macedonia in 1992 ‘an inalienable and eternal possession of Hellenism, a piece of its soul,’⁶⁰ while he called the northern neighbors ‘a falsely named category of people who constitute the so-called ethnicity of Macedonians of the Skopian type.’⁶¹ His position on the issue did not change over time and his rhetoric is as strong nowadays as it was in the early 1990s.⁶² Still, the name dispute has not been solved.

⁵⁷ Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict*, 33.

⁵⁸ Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict*, 31.

⁵⁹ Antonis Liakos, ‘Modern Greek historiography (1974-2000). The era of transition from dictatorship to democracy’ in J. Revel and G. Levi (ed.), *Political uses of the past. The recent Mediterranean experience* (London 2002) 352.

⁶⁰ Papatthemelis cited in Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict*, 31.

⁶¹ Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict*, 33.

⁶² For instance: Stelios Papatthemelis, *Η αλήθεια για το σκοπιανό [The truth about the Skopian topic]*. Leaflet handed out to visitors of a demonstration against the recognition of the ‘Republic of Macedonia’ in Thessaloniki, 05-03-2008.

As becomes clear from the arguments used by Papatthemelis, history plays a prominent role in the name dispute. The leading role is given to Alexander the Great. He was included as a Greek in the national narrative during the nineteenth and twentieth century. During the early stages of the Greek nation-state he was not considered to be part of Greek classical tradition.⁶³ Also, in Ancient Times Alexander the Great was not automatically incorporated into the Greek culture; he was seen as a barbarian.⁶⁴ However, nowadays the inclusion of Alexander the Great as a Greek seems unquestioned in Greek historical culture. Hamilakis has shown which role the Ancient Macedonians play in history textbooks; they present them as Greeks. One of the books states that Alexander, ‘having full consciousness of his Hellenicity’, was trying ‘to help the southern Greeks in the fight against the Persians.’⁶⁵

Also in textbooks on modern history Macedonia is presented as if it has always been Greek. In the descriptions of the Macedonian Question, the quarrel between Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia over the region of Macedonia at the end of the nineteenth and in the beginning of the twentieth century, the Greekness of the region is unquestioned. According to the books the majority of the population in the area was Greek and the national hero Pavlos Melas, who died in the so-called Macedonian Struggle, plays an important role in most of the narratives. Pavlos Melas is presented as a good patriot and an example for the Greek youth. The first post-junta primary schoolbook says about the population in Macedonia that the ‘biggest part and the best were Greek,’ while ‘there were also Bulgarian peasants in the northern part and Serbs and some Macedonian Vlachs.’⁶⁶ These inhabitants are mainly under threat from the Bulgarians, who wanted to force them to subordinate to the Bulgarian Exarchate. The textbook for the gymnasium mentions that,

⁶³ Anna Triandafyllidou, ‘National identity and the “Other”’ in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21/4 (1998) 605.

⁶⁴ Ernst Breisach, *Historiography. Ancient, medieval & modern* (1994) 29-30.

⁶⁵ Hamilakis, ‘“Learn history!”’, 55.

⁶⁶ Textbook 1, 110-2.

‘...because they did not succeed by peaceful means, the Bulgarians organized armed bands, which entered the lands, killing and torturing the people that counteracted, to force the inhabitants to subordinate.’⁶⁷

The mixed population of Macedonia as it was presented in the first primary schoolbook was replaced in the succeeding 1979 published edition. This book takes the most extreme approach of all books in emphasizing the Greekness of Macedonia:

‘In 1878 Bulgaria became an independent hegemony under the rule of the sultan. From this point on, the Bulgarians, reliant on Russian support, wanted to create a big Bulgarian state in the Balkans, also including Trace and Macedonia, which had always been Greek lands and their inhabitants were purely Greek.’⁶⁸

The amount of text on the Macedonian Question is significantly longer than in the previous book and also the description of Pavlos Melas is more traditional and nationalist than in all the other books, He is praised to be ‘a fervent patriot,’ who ‘burned from desire to fight the [Bulgarian] bands.’

‘After a heavy battle he tried to break trough the blockade with his comrades and to leave. However, in this heroic exodus he was seriously wounded and in half an hour he died. The dead of Melas shocked the whole nation.’⁶⁹

In the 1988 primary school textbook the text on the Macedonian Question was shortened compared to its predecessor. However, the approach in this book is still nationalist and unbalanced. Macedonia is still presented as a solely Greek area:

⁶⁷ Textbook 5, 286-7.

⁶⁸ Textbook 2, 156.

⁶⁹ Textbook 2, 156.

‘Macedonia, like other Greek areas, was not part of the free Greek state, which was created in 1830. The enslaved Greeks of these regions, however, did not stop to seek freedom and their unification with Greece.’⁷⁰

In the 1997 revised edition of this textbook, the text did not change significantly; only some sentences were rephrased, without changing the contents.

That the Macedonian Question is a sensitive issue became very clear in the history war in 2006 and 2007. The Question was almost absent in Repousi’s textbook and that caused a lot of criticism. The essence of this criticism becomes clear in an article in the newspaper *Eleftherotypia* in March 2006:

‘A very minor reference, as a sub-sub-heading, to the Macedonian Question, leaves unanswered the question to whom Macedonia belongs. There is emphasis on the multicultural character of the Macedonia of that time. Its Greek identity, instead of being clearly demonstrated, is relegated to a footnote. When they examine our official historiography, the Skopjeans will be quite right to ridicule it. And they will use it as an unanswerable argument. The aim of the writers, proxies of the New Order, is crystal clear; preparing the generation who will accept the surrender of the name.’⁷¹

Criticizers of the book, which are very often the same persons uttering strong nationalist rhetoric in the Macedonian name dispute, perceived the absence of the confirmation of Macedonia’s Greekness as an offense to the Greek nation. For them, it was one of the reasons to ask for the withdrawal of the book.

⁷⁰ Textbook 3a, 229.

⁷¹ Cited by Repousi, ‘Politics questions history education’.

Differences between the different gymnasium textbooks are bigger than between the primary school books. A relation between the contents and political developments can be seen here. The first gymnasium textbook has only a small section on the Macedonian Question, mentioning that ‘Greek generals went to Macedonia and formed rebellious bodies to protect the villages against the clefts.’⁷² Kremmydas’ book is again very critical towards the Greek actions. According to him, the Greek campaigns during the Macedonian Question in Macedonia, as part of the realization of the Great Idea, served to conceal ‘discontent about the interior problems’ and finally they ‘brought national catastrophes.’⁷³ He does not mention the national hero Pavlos Melas in his text. In the 1991 published book of Sfyroeras, however, Pavlos Melas makes his return, ‘fighting heroically until his death’.⁷⁴

The text on the Macedonian Question takes a much more traditional approach than in the previous book, that is, without a critical note on the Greeks. A link between international politics, especially Greek foreign policy, and the return of the traditional more nationalist description in this textbook is likely. Although it is hard to prove the link for this specific book, it is clear that the Minister of Education influenced the teaching of the Macedonian Question. In the beginning of 1992, for instance, the New Democracy minister Souflias proposed to use an article from the newspaper *Kathimerini* about the Macedonian Question in history classes in the Northern provinces. Besides that, the conservative Society for Macedonian Studies in Thessaloniki was ordered by the Ministry of Education to write a publication about the Macedonian Question.⁷⁵ Also, Sfyroeras chapter on the Macedonian Question is the most traditional one of the chapters of his book analyzed here. One cause of that is probably the period the book was written in; the writing process had just started when the Republic of Macedonia

⁷² Textbook 5, 287.

⁷³ Textbook 6, 257-8.

⁷⁴ Textbook 7, 275.

⁷⁵ Mauros Koufis, *Η σχολική ιστορία [School history]*, 304.

declared its independence and the Greek government reacted with a campaign against it.

The newest textbook for the third class of the gymnasium, in use from 2006, gives a rather nuanced view on the matter:

‘Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbians claimed, based on the national aims of each of them, the incorporation of the whole, or of a part of Macedonia.’⁷⁶

This new book judges the Greeks according to the same standards as the Bulgarians and the Serbians. But it took some time to get there. International politics played a role. It seems that the rise of the Macedonian name dispute, rather than changing the contents of the textbooks, prevented them to change. Active involvement of the government and, on the other hand, public pressure secured the confirmation in the history textbooks that Macedonia belongs to the Greeks.

The account on the Macedonian Question probably was most directly linked to international political developments of all discussed topics. For other topics this link with developments in foreign relations is less clear. This can be partly explained by the fact that books are in use for several years and the process of writing a new book takes quite some time. The style of the author, appointed by the political party in power, is more important for the contents of history books than events in foreign politics.

⁷⁶ Textbook 8, 67-8.

Conclusion

History textbooks are important components of historical culture. Especially when state published, they have authority and are thought to represent the one and only truth. This feature makes history textbooks an interesting means of political guidance and, therefore, subject of political rivalry. It also makes them a favorite subject for researchers. Some researchers try to find nationalistic elements in textbooks with the purpose to change them. A multi-perspective view on the past in history education, in their opinion, leads to a tolerant society. Their work is thus part of conflict prevention or reconciliation. Other scholars examine history textbooks as part of nationalism research; they investigate which role history books play in the construction of identities without the aim to actually change the books. The image of 'Others' is a popular subject for researchers. In the Greek case, they repeatedly concluded that history textbooks are rather nationalistic and that the presentation of the Turks is hostile.

The way people think about their history determines for a major part their identity. This is especially the case in Greece. The two main components of Greek identity are a sense of continuity of Hellenism since Antiquity until the present and, on the other hand, Greek Orthodox Christianity. Confirmation and preservation of this Greek national identity takes place on two levels: on the level of political debate about history textbooks, and, secondly, on the level of textbooks themselves. On both levels foreign influence in Greek affairs is presented as dangerously threatening the national identity. Especially the Turks are seen as a threat to Hellenism in the Greek national narrative.

On the first level, rivalry over history textbooks can lead to so-called 'history wars', in which two camps fight over the interpretation of national history. Because of the political power of

history textbooks, discussions on how to teach history are an integral part of the political discourse in which nationalist and more progressive people are opposed. Besides this political opposition, another contrast plays a role. While the attention in professional historiography has shifted away from the nation state and historicist objectivism was replaced by a postmodern narrativism, these changes did not take place in popular historical culture. These two fields of popular historical culture and professional historiography clash when they come together in history education.

The two oppositions together cause history wars, which took place in different countries during last decennia. Two camps can be distinguished in all of them: traditionalists and revisionists. Traditionalists advocate memorization of national highlights and the celebration of national heroes in order to stimulate patriotism. Revisionists want a more nuanced, multi-perspective image of the past, in which criticism also has a place. According to them, history education has to encourage critical thinking. In all history wars mass media are involved. They create the battle field on which the war is fought and influence public opinion. Therefore, history wars are not only the result of a controversy on the interpretation of history, but also a political strategy.

The Greek textbook controversy in 2006 and 2007, which lasted until withdrawal of the textbook shortly after the general elections, clearly was such a history war. In the political discussion on history education, arguments of foreign threats that endanger the Greek national identity were very common and successful. Archbishop Christodoulos, for instance, used these arguments in his fight against the new textbook; a fight he won. The Greek Orthodox Church and its conservative allies stood up in public for the protection of Greek national identity in this textbook war. In times of further internationalization, national identity is, as they said, in danger of foreign influence. In the mean time, they accused revisionists of being under foreign influence and pressure. The revisionist attempt to introduce a new way of looking at the past was undone.

This 2006-2007 history war was the fiercest textbook conflict in recent Greek history, but not the only one. Because Greek history textbooks are produced and published by the state, their introduction and withdrawal are political processes. Politicians on the highest level are involved in these proceedings. Analysis of the processes of introduction and withdrawal shows that there is a link between the political party in power and the contents of the textbook it produces. The socialist party PASOK initiated the production of the most progressive and revisionist books. New Democracy Ministers of Education and Religious Affairs were responsible for the withdrawal of these books and for the introduction of most of the conservative and traditional books. Because of the competition between these two parties, there is no straight line in the development of textbooks; traditional books are replaced by progressive, and vice versa.

The traditional idea of Greek national identity is also reconfirmed in schoolbooks themselves. Paradoxically, Greeks are presented as heroes and victims at the same time in these books. They are victims of foreigners: the European Great Powers, foreign occupiers during the Second World War, and especially the Turks. All these external forces brutally endanger the Greek unity, with its glorious history of thousands of years. The Greeks are fighting these dangers, which they do heroically. It does not matter whether the hero wins or loses; also, or maybe especially, martyrs for the Hellenic case are praised for their deeds. This traditional presentation of the four analyzed topics has especially been preserved until today in the textbooks for primary education. Maria Repousi's attempt to change the presentation of several sensitive topics was unsuccessful. Turks remain barbarians, myths supporting the church are still included, Macedonia is still unquestionably Greek and the account on a divided society during the Civil War is used to promote unity.

The differences between the different books for the gymnasium are bigger. These books have evolved and are more nuanced nowadays than in the past. The difference between primary and secondary schoolbooks can be partly explained by the dominant opinion at the Pedagogical Institute that children in the sixth grade of

primary school are too young for critical thinking exercises. The evolution of the textbooks was not a step-by-step development. Kremmydas' introduction of a new, critical, and Europe oriented approach in the third grade of the gymnasium in 1984, turned out to be a too radical change. His book was followed up by books with much more emphasis on Greek history, but the nationalist descriptions of the pre-Kremmydas era did not return.

Remarkable is the absence of minorities in all textbooks. There is no place for them in the image of Greek unity. For instance, there is very little attention for Jews during the Second World War and other groups than the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire.

Bilateral political relations and foreign policy are often mentioned by scholars and politicians as causes for changes in the contents of history textbooks. However, developments in these fields rather prevent change than promote it. A much referred to agreement between Greek foreign minister Papandreou and his Turkish colleague Cem in 1999 to review the image of the respective neighbor did not have any influence yet. The changes that were made in the books so far were not the result of the agreement. On the other hand, it is likely that the declaration of independence of the Republic of Macedonia in the early 1990s played a role in the maintenance of a traditional presentation of the Macedonian Question in the than newly issued textbook for the gymnasium. The Macedonian Question was also used as an argument in the withdrawal of Repousi's book. It was said that Repousi prepared children for the acceptance of the northern neighbor under the name 'Macedonia', the nightmare of every upright Greek, as many Greeks reason.

In general, it can be said that internal strife between the Greek political parties influences textbooks much more than events in foreign relations.

References

Textbook sample

Primary school books:

- Textbook 1: E. Kafentzi, *Ιστορία των νεωτέρων χρόνων. Τάξη ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [History of the modern times. 6th class of primary school] (Athens 1977).
- Textbook 2: N. Diamantopoulou and A. Κυριαζοπούλου, *Ελληνική ιστορία των νεωτέρων χρόνων. ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [Greek history of modern times. 6th grade of primary school] (Athens 1985).
- Textbook 3a: D. Aktypis, A. Velalidis, *Στα νεότερα χρόνια. Ιστορία ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [In modern times. History for the 6th grade of primary school] (Athens 1993).
- Textbook 3b: D. Aktypis, A. Velalidis, *Στα νεότερα χρόνια. Ιστορία ΣΤ' δημοτικού* [In modern times. History for the 6th grade of primary school] (Athens 2007). 1997 revised edition of the previous book.
- Textbook 4: M. Repousi, C. Andreou, *Στα νεότερα και σύγχρονα χρόνια. Ιστορία για την ΣΤ' Δημοτικού* [In modern and contemporary times. History for the 6th grade of primary school] (Athens 2008).

Gymnasium books:

- Textbook 5: Georgias P. Koulikourdi, *Νεώτερη Ευρωπαϊκή ιστορία από τον 15 αι. μ. Χ. ως σήμερα* [Modern European History from the 15th century until today] (Athens 1975).

- Textbook 6: V. Kremmydas, *Ιστορία νεότερη – σύγχρονη. Ελληνική και Ευρωπαϊκή* [*Greek and European modern and contemporary history*] (Athens 1984).
- Textbook 7: V. Vl. Sfyroera, *Ιστορία νεότερη και σύγχρονη* [*Modern and contemporary history*] (Athens 1991).
- Textbook 8: E. Louvi and D. Xfaras, *Νεότερη και σύγχρονη ιστορία* [*Modern and contemporary history*] (Athens 2007).

Secondary literature

Adamou, Maria, *Το εκπαιδευτικό σύστημα στην υπηρεσία του εθνικού κράτους. Η ελληνική περίπτωση 1950-1976* [*The educational system in service of the nation state. The Greek case 1950-1976*] (Athens 2002).

Aerts, Remieg, ‘De uilen van Lyotard; over postmodernisme en politieke geschiedenis’ in *Ex tempore – Verleden Tijdschrift* 25/3 (2006) 203-225.

Antoniou, Vasilias Lilian, and Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoğlu, ‘Nation and the Other in Greek and Turkish history textbooks’ in Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal and Hanna Schissler, *The nation, Europe, and the world: textbooks in transition* (New York/Oxford 2005) 105-121.

Avdela, Efi, *Ιστορία και σχολείο* [*History and school*] (Athens 1998).

Avdela, Efi, ‘The teaching of History in Greece’ in *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18 (2000) 239-253.

Berger, S., Donovan, M., and Passmore, K., ‘Apologies for the nation-state in Western Europe since 1800’ in Berger, S., Donovan, M., and Passmore, K., (ed.), *Writing national histories. Western Europe since 1800* (London 1999) 3-14.

Berger, S., *The search for normality. National identity and historical consciousness in Germany since 1800* (New York and Oxford 2002).

Breisach, Ernst, *Historiography. Ancient, medieval & modern* (1994).

Brown, K.S., and Hamilakis, Y., (ed.), *The Usable Past; Greek Metahistories* (2003).

Clarck, Victoria, *Why angels fall. A portrait of Orthodox Europe from Byzantium to Kosovo* (London 2000).

Clark, Anna, 'What do they teach our children?' in S. Macintyre, *The history wars* (Melbourne 2004) 171-190.

Clogg, Richard, 'The Greeks and their past' in D. Deletant and H. Hannak (ed.), *Historians as nation-builders* (London 1988) 15-31.

Clogg, Richard, *A concise history of Greece. Second edition* (Cambridge 2007).

Danforth, Loring M., *The Macedonian Conflict: ethnic nationalism in a transnational world* (Princeton 1995).

Danos, Antonis, 'Nicolaos Gyzis's The Secret School and an ongoing national discourse' in *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 1/2 (2002) [http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/autumn_02/articles/dano.shtml, accessed 26-07-08].

Deletant, Dennis, and Hanak, Harry, *Historians as Nation-Builders; Central and South-East Europe* (London 1988).

Frangoudaki, Anna, '«Απόγονοι» Ελλήνων «από τη μυκηναϊκή εποχή»: η ανάλυση των εγχειριδίων ιστορίας' ['Descents' of the Greeks 'from the Mycenaean period': analysis of history teaching

materials] in Anna Frangoudaki and Thaleia Dragona (ed.), «*Τι είναι η πατρίδα μας;*» *Εθνοκεντρισμός στην εκπαίδευση* [‘What is our fatherland?’ *Ethnocentrism in education*] (Athens 1997) 344-400.

Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism* (1983).

Glypsis, Leda, ‘Love, truth and national identity prescriptions: recounting the 1919-1922 war in Greek school textbooks’ in *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 29 (2007) 103-119.

Grever, Maria, and Stuurman, Siep (ed.), *Beyond the canon. History for the twenty-first century* (Basingstoke 2007).

Gstrein, Heinz, ‘Politische Kultur in Südosteuropa: Griechenland’ in A. Mosser (ed.), *Politische Kultur in Südosteuropa. Identitäten, Loyalitäten, Solidaritäten* (Frankfurt am Main 2006) 183-193.

Hamilakis, Yannis, ‘“Learn history!” Antiquity, national narrative, and history in Greek educational textbooks’ in K.S. Brown and Y. Hamilakis (ed.), *The Usable Past. Greek Metahistories* (Oxford 2003) 39-68.

Hobsbawm, Eric, ‘Introduction: Inventing Traditions’ in E. J. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, *The invention of tradition* (Cambridge 1983) 1.

Kaelble, Hartmut., ‘Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?’ in *H-Soz-u-Kult* 08.02.2005
[\[http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/id=574&type=diskussionen\]](http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/forum/id=574&type=diskussionen), accessed 31-08-2008].

Kazamias, Andreas M., ‘The politics of educational reform in Greece: law 309/1976’ in *Comparative education review* 22/ 1 (1978) 21-45.

Kitroeff, Alexander, 'Continuity and change in contemporary Greek historiography' in *European history quarterly* 19/1 (1989) 269-298.

Kocka, Jürgen, 'Comparison and beyond' in *History and Theory* 42 (2003) 39-44.

Körner-Wellershaus, Ilas, and Fougeron, Françoise, (eds), *Histoire/Geschichte – Europa und die Welt vom Wiener Kongress bis 1945*(Stuttgart/Leipzig 2007).

Koulouri, Christina, *Dimensions idéologiques de l'historicité en Grèce (1834-1914)* (Frankfurt am Main 1991).

Koulouri, Christina, 'Research on Greek textbooks: a survey of current trends' in *Paradigm* 14 (1994).
[<http://faculty.ed.uiuc.edu/westbury/Paradigm/KOULOURI.pdf>, accessed 31-08-08]

Koulouri, Christina, *Teaching the history of Southeastern Europe* (Thessaloniki 2001).

Koulouri, Christina (ed.), *Clio in the Balkans. The politics of history education* (Thessaloniki 2002).

Koulouri, Christina, 'Introduction' in C. Koulouri (ed.) *Clio in the Balkans. The politics of history education* (Thessaloniki 2002) 15-51.

Liakos Antonis, 'Modern Greek Historiography (1974-2000). The era of transition from dictatorship to democracy' in Ulf Brunnbaer (ed.), *(Re)Writing History. Historiography in Southeast Europe after Socialism* (Münster 2004) 351-378.

Liakos, Antonis, 'History Wars: notes from the field'. Paper at the Annual Conference of the International Society for History Didactics 'Public Uses of History', 19-21 September 2007, Thessaloniki.

Macintyre, Stuart, *The history wars* (Melbourne 2004).

Makrides, Vasilios N., 'Orthodoxie, griechische Ethnie und Nation, griechischer Nationalstaat und Nationalismus: Mythen und Realitäten' in I. Keul, *Religion, Ethnie, Nation und die Aushandlung von Identität(en). Regionale Religionsgeschichte in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa* (Berlin 2005) 67-92.

Mauroskoufis, Dimitris K., *Η σχολική ιστορία στη δευτεροβάθμια εκπαίδευση (1975-1995) [School history in secondary education 1975-95]* (Thessaloniki 2003).

Millas, Hercules, 'History textbooks in Greece and Turkey' in *History Workshop Journal* 31/1 (1991) 21-33.

Molokotos-Liederman, Lina, 'Identity Crisis: Greece, Orthodoxy, and European Union' in *Journal of contemporary religion* 18/3 (2003) 291-315.

Nash, Gary B., Crabtree, Charlotte, and Dunn, Ross E., *History on trial: culture wars and the teaching of the past* (New York 2000).

Olick, Jeffrey K., and Robbins, Joyce, 'Social Memory Studies: from "collective memory" to the historical sociology of mnemonic practices' in *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998) 105-140.

Petridis, Triantafyllos, and Zografaki, Maria, 'Greece' in C. Koulouri, *Clio in the Balkans. The politics of history education* (Thessaloniki 2002) 487-94.

Repousi, Maria, 'New history textbooks in Greece. The chronicle of an ideological war on the national past'
[\[http://users.auth.gr/~marrep/html/intro/articles/New%20History%20Books%20in%20Greece.pdf\]](http://users.auth.gr/~marrep/html/intro/articles/New%20History%20Books%20in%20Greece.pdf), accessed 21-07-2008].

Repousi, Maria, 'Politics question history education. Debates on Greek History textbooks', Paper presented to the International Conference of ISHD in Tallinn, 27-30 September 2006.

Ribbens, Kees, "'Another brick in the wall.'" historical culture and history teaching' in M. Grever and S. Stuurman (ed.), *Beyond the canon. History for the twenty-first century* (Basingstoke 2007) 64-75.

Schöpflin, George, 'The functions of myth and a taxonomy of myths' in G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin (ed.), *Myths and Nationhood* (London 1997) 19-35.

Smith, Anthony, 'The "Golden Age" and national renewal' in G. Hosking and G. Schöpflin (ed.), *Myths and nationhood* (London 1997) 36-59.

Stuurman, Siep, and Grever, Maria, 'Introduction: old canons and new histories' in M. Grever and S. Stuurman (ed.), *Beyond the canon. History for the twenty-first century* (Basingstoke 2007) 1-16.

Theodossopoulos, Dimitrios, 'Introduction; the "Turks" in the Imagination of the "Greeks"' in *South European Society & Politics* 11/1 (2006) 1-32.

Triandafyllidou, Anna, 'National identity and the "Other"' in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21/4 (1998) 593-612.

Velde, Henk te, 'Political Transfer. An introduction' in *European review of history* 12/2 (2005) 205-221.

Werner, Michael, and Zimmerman, Bénédicte, 'Beyond comparison. Histoire croisée and the challenge of reflexivity' in *History and Theory* 45 (2006) 30-50.

Wertsch, James V., *Voices of Collective Remembering* (2002).

Newspaper articles, websites, and magazines

Academy of Athens Website

Homepage of the Academy of Athens

[<http://www.academyofathens.gr/echome.asp?lang=2>, accessed 20-6-07].

Antibaro.gr

Antivaro website

[http://www.antibaro.gr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=72:antidraseis&catid=63:text&Itemid=109, accessed 21-07-08].

Athens News

‘Greece, Turkey build a bridge over the sea with schoolbooks’,

Athens News (27-10-1999)

[http://www.athensnews.gr/athweb/nathens.print_unique?e=C&f=12485&m=A01&aa=3&eid=Α, accessed 23-08-08].

George Gilson, ‘Battle royal over history book’, *Athens News* (23-03-07)

[http://www.athensnews.gr/athweb/nathens.print_unique?e=C&f=13227&m=A12&aa=1&eid=Α, accessed 23-08-08]

BBC News Website

‘Huge Japan protest over textbook’, *BBC News website* (29-09-07)

[<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/7020335.stm>, accessed 31-08-08].

Ekathimerini Online

‘History book divides opinion’, *Kathimerini Newspaper English edition* (06-03-07)

[http://www.ekathimerini.com/4dcgi/_w_articles_politics_100012_06/03/2007_80873, accessed 21-07-2008].

ERT Online

Interview with Evripidis Stylianidis, *ERT Online* (12-09-07)
 [<http://tvradio.ert.gr/radio/interviews.asp?nid=340616&id=6>,
 accessed 23-08-08].

Greek Orthodox Church Website

Christodoulos during a ceremony at the University of Athens.
 [Website of the Holy Synod,
http://www.ecclesia.gr/greek/holysynod/holysynod.asp?id=721&what_sub=d_typou, accessed 23-0808].

In.gr

‘Ενστάσεις για τα νέα σχολικά βιβλία έχει η Εκκλησία’ [The church has objections against the new schoolbooks], *In.gr News* (12-09-06)
 [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=737870>, accessed 21-07-2008].

Ενστάσεις μπορεί να υπάρχουν, τα βιβλία δεν αλλάζουν, δήλωσε η υπουργός Παιδείας’ [There may be objections, the books do not change, said the Minister of Education], *In.gr News* (14-9-06)
 [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=738628>, accessed 21-07-2008].

‘Θυσίες στο βωμό της ελληνοτουρκικής φιλίας’ [Sacrifices on the altar of Greek-Turkish friendship], *In.gr News* (23-01-07)
 [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=772560>, accessed 21-07-2008].

‘Απάντηση Γιαννάκου στις ενστάσεις της Εκκλησίας για την Ιστορία της Στ’ Δημοτικού’ [Answer Giannakou on objections of the Church on the history book], *In.gr News* (26-01-07)
 [<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=773484>, accessed 21-07-08].

‘Εκπαιδευτικοί ζητούν να μην αποσυρθεί το βιβλίο Ιστορίας της Στ Δημοτικού’ [Teachers ask not to withdraw the history book], *In.gr*

News (23-02-07)

[<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=781780>, accesses 21-07-08].

‘«Σοβαρές παραλείψεις» βλέπει η Ακαδημία Αθηνών στο βιβλίο Ιστορίας της Στ' Δημοτικού' [The Academy of Athens sees 'serious omissions' in the history book], *In.gr News* (22-03-07)

[<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=789265>, accessed 21-07-08].

Dionysis Nasopoulos, 'Βήμα βήμα υποχωρούν στη Δεξιά του Κυρίου' [Step by step receding to the right], *TA NEA Online* (05-04-07) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=16698>, accessed 31-08-08].

'Βολές από την αντιπολίτευση, ικανοποίηση από την Εκκλησία για το τέλος του βιβλίου' [Shots from the opposition, satisfaction by the Church for the end of the book], *In.gr News* (25-09-07)

[<http://www.in.gr/news/article.asp?lngEntityID=834707>, accessed 31-08-08].

Sky TV Website

'Αποσύρεται το βιβλίο Ιστορίας' [The history textbook withdrawn], *Website Sky TV* (25-09-2007)

[http://www.skai.gr/master_story.php?id=60742, accessed 28-08-08].

TA NEA Online

Manos Charalambakis, 'Γιαννάκου: «Δεν αποσύρεται το βιβλίο Ιστορίας της ΣΤ' Δημοτικού»' [Giannakou: The book for the sixth grade will not be withdrawn], *TA NEA Online* (29-01-2007)

[<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=7600>, accessed 21-07-08].

Giannis Protonotariou, 'Η Αριστερά και το βιβλίο της Ιστορίας' [The left and the history textbook], *TA NEA Online* (10-04-07)

[<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=10&ct=13&artid=16960>, accessed 21-07-2008].

Vassilis Kremmydas, ‘Όλες οι παρεμβάσεις έχουν τις ίδιες υπογραφές’ [All the interferences have the same signature] in *TA NEA Online* (19-05-2007) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=30&ct=19&artid=22432>, accessed 25-07-08].

‘Σε οριακό σημείο για να είναι έτοιμο το βιβλίο της Ιστορίας’ [Minor point before the history book is ready], *TA NEA Online* (26-07-07) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=31876>, accessed 21-07-08].

Dionysis Nasopoulos, ‘Μέχρι τον Καραμανλή έφτασαν οι διορθώσεις στο βιβλίο της Ιστορίας’ [The improvements in the history book arrived up to Karamanlis], *TA NEA Online* (02-08-07) [<http://www.tanea.gr/default.asp?pid=2&ct=1&artid=32880>, accessed 31-08-08].

The Economist

‘Textbook wars; Slovakia’s history’ in *The Economist* (29-03-2008) 37.

To Vima

Marny Papamataiou, ‘Το θρίλερ της Ιστορίας’ [The history thriller], *To Vima Online* (30/09/2007) [http://tovima.dolnet.gr/print_article.php?e=B&f=15178&m=A40&a=4, accessed 21-07-08].

Turkish Daily News

Ariana Ferentinou, “‘Commotion” on the doorsteps of Greek history’, *Turkish Daily News* (06-08-2007) [<http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=80200>, accessed 23-08-08].

Interviews and e-mail contacts

Interview with Maria Repousi, 14-03-08.

E-mail contact with Mr. Kremmydas, 14-05-2008.

Interview by telephone with the secretary of Mr. Papagregoriou, 27-06-2008.

