The 3rd Hellenic Observatory PhD Symposium:

Contemporary Greece: Structures, Context and Challenges, June 2007

Athanasia Chalari

PhD Candidate, University of Warwick, Department of Sociology

The combination of Greek and English Language: How Greeks benefit from this 'dialect': A Social-Theoretical Approach.

Abstract

In the present study '*The combination of Greek and English Language*' is defined as the tendency which some Greek native speakers have to combine Greek and English language when they speak. This tendency is usually observed within Greeks who live in English-speaking countries and regularly occurs within conversations between Greeks.

Within current social theory, a new dimension concerning the study of structure and agency has recently been developed. According to this approach, the individual and society are connected through the individual's ability to be reflective. The individual produces internal conversations before producing external conversations and internally deliberates upon them. Therefore, through internal conversation, the individual produces internal dialogues, some of which are subsequently externalised. American Pragmatism, and especially Peirce, echoed that the individual does not only produce internal conversation through language; additional elements are also involved such as emotions, icons, symbols, feelings, memories or representations. The more elements an individual uses as she produces internal conversations, the more accurate she will be when she externalises parts of her internal conversation. It is thus supported that when people use two languages in their everyday lives, they also use these languages internally. Therefore, they use more elements (i.e. syntax, grammar, vocabulary) when they produce their internal conversations and consequently, they can be more accurate, more specific, faster and exact when they use more means to externalise their inner concerns and deliberations. The present study will argue that when Greeks use a 'dialect' which is a combination of Greek and English language, they have access to a wider variety of elements which actually help the individual to externalise her internal conversations and be more descriptive about the things she wants to share with others. Thus, Greeks who use Greek and English simultaneously when they speak with other Greeks who do the same are actually benefiting from this 'dialect'.

Structure and Agency

Internal conversation is a sociological term that derives from a current sociological debate concerning structure and agency, or else a debate concerning the ways the individual and society relate and connect. The debate concerning structure and agency in Europe or micro and macro sociology in the United States (although the above terms do not coincide) has been an ongoing discussion which has not yet provided

specific conclusions. The problem may derive from the fact that social theorists do not even agree on a common definition with regard to the agent and the structure and therefore different schools of thought approach this matter in different terms and ways. The main definitions concerning structure and agency derive from Bourdieu's and Gidden's work, although several more sociologists are involved in this debate[1]. However, the common ground of the sociologists engaged in this debate is that they refuse to study structure and agency as independently terms. Although the exact definition of each term might not be precise and variations between theorists could occur, the agent has not been studied as an autonomous, independent and separate unit from structure and therefore society until recently.

Nobody denies that these two areas of reality are interrelated, interdependent and that they can only exist within a form of relationship. Since ancient times Greek philosophy realised that the individual is a social being, and as such cannot survive without society. At the same time there is not such thing as society without individuals. Therefore, although it constitutes common sense that the individual and society are closely related, they have not been studied separately and independently through sociology. In addition, the exact nature of the relationship between the individual and society is not yet known.

Archer was the first to support that *the problem of structure and agency has rightly come to be seen as the basic issue in modern social theory* (Archer: 1988: ix) and she explains that *dealing with this linkage has become the 'acid test' of a general social theory and the 'central problem' in theory* (Archer, 1988:x). Archer is currently one of the few theorists to support that structure and agency should be studied independently; in fact, she was the first to support that structure derives from agency[2]. Although most of social theorists (especially Europeans) refuse to separate structure and agency and to deal with them dialectically, Archer, along with Wiley (1994, 2006) and to a certain extent Colapietro (2006), introduced a dialectic relationship between the different parts of the agent. More importantly, Archer initiated the dimension of reflexivity as the underlying relationship between structure and agency.

[1] For example: Dietz, T. & Burns, T., R. (1992) 'Human Agency and the Evolutionary Dynamics of Culture' *Acta Sociolgica* V. 35: 187-200.
[2] And thus external conversation derives from internal conversation

Conversation

Since the present study will use the term 'internal conversation', I should first explain how this term is differentiated from conversation *per se*. Conversation is defined as the interaction through language that occurs between two or more people. Everyone can conduct everyday conversation. The vast power of everyday talk is at our disposal, to contact and influence other people. Almost everything we do that concerns others, involves us in conversation (Nofsinger 1991). Conversation is a form of action, or symbolic interaction, that sociology has investigated, initially through the work of Goffman (1961) and Garfinkel and recently through Discourse Analysis[3], Conversation Analysis[4] and Sociolinguistics[5]. In terms of sociological investigation, conversation constitutes a useful area of study because it uncovers a basic form of everyday interaction and the use of language is of course important for the achievement of such interaction. However, besides the principles of each language (syntax, grammar) that the interlocutors use, a specific kind of action exchange and thus interaction is achieved. For many sociologists, society is based on the individuals' interactions, and thus conversation represents a typical area for the study of interaction. It is understood that the examination of the individuals' interaction through conversation can uncover a deeper understanding of the society *per se*.

In fact, Nofsinger explains that conversation constitutes a major part of everyday life and functions to organise society itself. Sociologists such as Douglas (1970), Goffman (1971, 1981) and Karp and Yoels (1986) have recognised that the 'orderliness' of everyday life forms the basis of society's structure. That orderliness is generated in social interaction and primary conversation. Furthermore, conversation is a primary method through which interpersonal relationships are formed, maintained, and dissolved. Individuals become connected through conversation (Nofsinger, 1991). Undeniably, conversation constitutes the basis of interaction between individuals and language is the basis of such interaction. The present study, however, divides

[3] For further analysis see: Malcolm, C. (1977) *An introduction to discourse analysis* London : Longman

[4] For further analysis see: Nofsinger, R., E. (1991) *Everyday conversation* Newbury Park : Sage Publications

[5] For further analysis see: Trudgill, P. (1983) *Sociolinguistics* : *an introduction to language and society* Harmondsworth : Penguin

conversation into two separated spheres or levels. These two levels are: external and internal conversation. External conversation partially coincides with what has been described as conversation *per se*. In addition this study perceives external conversation as part of what is understood as 'conversation' and not as conversation *per se*.

Internal Conversation

As was mentioned above, this study supports (following Archer's school of thought) that there are two different kinds of conversation: internal and external and that internal conversation is the source of external. Internal conversation describes the dialogical interaction the individual has with herself in relation to the social environment. This interaction can take the form of thoughts, dreams, feelings, icons, memories, processes and any other kind of experience that the individual can use in order to deliberate about herself and society. Equally importantly, internal conversation refers to those inner dialogical experiences that the individual usually prefers to keep unspoken. Thus when we refer to 'internal conversation', we refer to personal properties which are known and are experienced only by the individual who produces them – they are first person in kind. The rest of the social environment is not necessarily or usually aware of them. Often, when we use the term internal conversation we mean the dialogical properties of inner life. It is a notion as old as Plato, but also is a term which has been recently developed within social theory where its definition is precise and specific:

Internal conversation is a term that was initially introduced by the social theorist Margaret Archer (2000, 2003, 2007) and refers to the *mental activity all normal people experience* and which is described as *the talk all normal people have with themselves, within their own heads, usually silently and usually from an early age* (Archer, 2007: 2). For Archer, internal conversation *is the personal power that enables us to be the authors of our own projects in society* (Archer, 2003: 34) and she explains that internal conversation is *a personal emergent property rather than a psychological faculty of people* because of its relationship to natal social environment and changes in social circumstances (Archer, 2003: 94). Internal conversation can involve *daydreaming, fantasising and internal vituperation; through rehearsing for some forthcoming encounter, reliving past events, planning for future eventualities , clarifying where one stands or what one understands, producing a running commentary on what is taking place, talking oneself through (or into) a practical activity; to more pointed actions such as issuing internal warnings and making promises to oneself, reaching concrete decisions or coming to a conclusion about a particular problem* (Archer, 2007: 2).

Archer views 'internal conversation' as the mode through which human reflexivity is practiced and she provides a detailed definition: *'reflexivity' is the regular exercise of the mental ability, shared by all normal people, to consider themselves in relation to their (social) contexts and vice versa* (Archer, 2007: 4). For Archer, reflexivity is the means by which we make our way through the world; she clarifies that reflexivity itself is held to depend upon conscious deliberations that take place through internal conversation. Therefore, reflexivity, as the interaction the individual experiences between herself and her social environment, takes place through internal conversation. Archer (2003) suggested three properties of reflective deliberations: a) genuinely interior b) ontologically subjective and c) causally efficacious and she states that: *only if the 'internal conversation' can be upheld as an irreducible personal property, which is real and causally influential, can the exercise of its powers be considered as the missing mediatory mechanism that is needed to complete an adequate account of social conditioning* (Archer, 2003: 16). Archer identified four modes of reflexivity, they are: a) 'communicative reflexivity' refers to those whose internal conversation requires completion and confirmation by others before resulting in a particular course of action, b) 'autonomous reflexive' refers to those who sustain self-contained internal

conversations leading directly to action, c) 'meta-reflexive' which refers to those who are critically reflexive about their own internal conversations and critical about effective action in society and d) 'fractured reflexives', referring to those whose internal conversation intensify their distress and disorientation rather than leading to purposeful course of action (Archer, 2007: 93).

In 2006 Wiley, developing his own insight in the 'semiotic self', tried to examine the nature of inner speech (Wiley uses the term 'inner speech' to refer to internal conversation) and he explains that inner speech is intra-subjective and dialogical; it involves two speakers, but not two persons; these two speakers are aspects of one and the same person. Wiley underlines the fact that inner speech is obviously a language and is also *de facto* private. He also argues that '*non-linguistic imagery may also substitute for parts of a (inner) sentence'* (Wiley, 2006: 321) and he explains (following Peirce's views) that what inner participants say to each other could be expressed through emotions, sensations, non-linguistic thoughts, speech qualities or even visualised sensations. It is important to note that, according to Wiley, internal conversation can be fully understood only by the person within whom it is happening, although they are capable of giving an account of it to another, i.e. interlocutor. In turn, this person chooses which part of each internal conversation she wishes to share with others and which part to keep private. Although internal conversation can and does have linguistic characteristics which would be understood by many people, it can also consist of symbols and images (e.g. fantasising a hamburger as one is hungry). In this case, the content of internal conversation can only be understood directly by the individual who produces it. Wiley very successfully states that: '*we are little gods in the world of inner speech. We are the only ones, we run the show, we are the boss'* (Wiley, 2006: 329). Furthermore, he argues that internal conversation is partly public or publishable and partly private i.e. it is a 'semi-private' language[6]. Wiley clearly states that we can act because we can think in this way, and the most important thoughts, as the pragmatists suggested, are in the form of internal conversation.

[6] In fact Wiley argues that internal conversation (or inner speech) does represent a 'private language' contra Wittgenstein.

The description of the term 'internal conversation' derives from earlier attempts to describe such inner interaction, and terms were used like: 'inner speech[7] ', 'egocentric speech[8]', 'intrapersonal communication[9]' 'musement[10]'. However, the idea of the dialogical interaction the individual experiences with herself began in the school of thought of American Pragmatism. American Pragmatism is based on the thoughts of John Dewey, William James, Charles Sanders Peirce and George Hebert Mead. According to American Pragmatism, the individuals' knowledge is not like a mental copy of things that actually exist in reality, but is, rather, an attempt to understand the social world in order to make practical sense of it and to act effectively. In general, the pragmatistic theory of truth consists simply of those ideas that happen to work. Knowledge is true if it helps us achieve our practical actions, and it is this practical basis of truth claims that gave the philosophical position its name. In particular, Peirce provided additional arguments concerning the individual's ability to internally use more than one form of dialogical interaction. He was the one to suggest that the individual's dialogical interaction with herself is not solely and purely based on language. The best possible explanation of the contribution of American Pragmatism, was proposed by Wiley (1994) who defined how the self interacts with herself according to pragmatism.

Wiley explains that Mead had only two conversational poles (I and Me) and Peirce another two (I and You), but each missed one of the poles. Thus each had the one the other missed, so by combining the two theories Wiley concluded to the following trialogue: I – You – Me or as he calls them: I-present-sign, You-future-interpretant, Me-past-object. As Wiley suggests, this combination includes Mead's and Peirce's elements and the relations among these elements. To be human consists of present, future, and past; sign, interpretant and object; I-You-Me and all the overlap, connectedness and solidarity among these elements (Wiley, 1994). As can be seen, the basis of the definition of internal conversation, or 'inner speech' (the analogous term Wiley used) derives from the capability the individual has to dialectically interact with herself. This process was initially introduced by American Pragmatism.

[7]Vygotsky, L., S. (1962) *Thought and Language* Cambridge MA: MIT Press
[8] Piaget, J. (1926) *The language and thought of the child* . London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
[9] Vocate , D., R. (1994) *Intrapersonal Communication: Different Voices, Different Minds* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
[10] Peirce, C., S. (1934) Collected papers on Charles Sanders Peirce, V.5: *Pragmatism and Pragmaticism*. Cambridge University Press.

The Formation of Internal Conversation

A debate has now begun concerning the self which is now approached from a sociological perspective without being seen as a purely or mainly social product. It is now suggested that the self consists of private and social elements, carrying free will and personal unexpressed thoughts. Wiley made a significant contribution to the formation of the internal conversation. He presented the triadic nature of the individual's inner cosmos, and he proposed '*the I-You-Me triad as the formal apparatus of language*' (Wiley, 2006: 332). Furthermore, Wiley states that '*all I need to show is that outer events can sometimes seem like inner speech, somewhat as parole can enter the arena of language*' (Wiley, 2006: 334) and he explains that the individual actually uses much the same language format as the individual uses externally and also that the individual uses non-linguistic elements. Wiley penetrates the individual's private, personal environment and uncovers the forms of conversation the individual produces internally by suggesting that '*the inaccessibility (of inner speech) maintains the highly private nature of this language's semantics and syntax*' (Wiley, 2006: 337).

Following Wiley's (1994) suggestions on Peirce's perception on self, Archer, (2003) summarizes Peirce's main points concerning the inner world, which he perceives as first-person world and the home of each person's unique subjectivity. As Wiley explains, Peirce believed that the 'ego' has different phases: the past 'Me' (or else the object), the present 'I' (or else sign) and the future 'You' (or else interpretant). Although he did not use those exact terms, he refers to the past 'Me' as the 'critical self' which, according to Peirce, is a summation of the past, which provides us with an orientation to the future, from its deposition in the present. It has to be noted that in Peirce's work it is difficult to locate the exact points at which he refers to the concepts of I, Me and You. Wiley (1994) first and then Archer (2003) however, presented an understanding of his work concerning the inner dialogic form of thinking, which 'decodes' his perception on inner dialogue. Peirce was able to perceive the dialogic form of inner life. He conceived the interaction between the three phases of ego and he saw the interrelation between the past the present and the future. Peirce's dialogic relationship between the critical and the present self is what Archer, Wiley and, in

effect this study, perceive as internal conversation. Specifically, to Peirce, individuals are internally vocal and conversational about reflexive matters. It could also be mentioned that Wiley (1994) states that Peirce's focus was on the discussion between 'I' and 'You' (i.e. one's own self in the immediate future) or else from present to future, rather than the discussion between 'I' and 'Me' i.e. from present to past (which was Mead's view according to Wiley).

For Peirce there is a definite distinction between the inner cosmos of the individual and the outer, since he refers to internal conditions as a distinct reality from external perception and he also recognizes the individual's ability to reflect upon herself. Peirce suggests that all thinking should be conducted in signs, which could (but not necessarily) have the same general structure as words. He also proposes that *besides words individuals use non-symbolic thought-signs* which fall into two classes: *"a) icons (pictures or diagrams or other images which are used to replace words) and b) indices (signs more or less analogous to symptoms of which the collateral observations, by which we know what a man is talking about, are examples). The icons, (*according to Peirce), *mainly illustrate the significance of predicate-thoughts, and the indices the denotations of subject-thoughts. The substance of thoughts consists of these ingredients"* (Peirce, 1935, V.6:233-234). Peirce's suggestion that thinking could take place in the form of 'icons' and 'indices' (and not only through words) is an additional significant view for the investigation of internal conversation. This view provides additional elements of the components of internal conversation. Thus, Peirce introduced an angle to perceive internal conversation and which suggests that the dialogic form of inner life can also entail icons, signs, representations or memories which are not necessarily ascribed through language. This perception gives the researcher the ability to use more and different tools to approach internal conversation and consequently external conversation.

As an example, it could be said that individuals who speak more than one language have access to more 'conversational elements/symbols and signs' than an individual who speaks just one language. Each language, even if it is formed in different ways (syntax and grammar), has different vocabulary and provides different forms of expression. An individual, who speaks more than one language, has the ability to use more, better and more accurate words to express herself, she has better and faster

understanding of elements of the second language, better access to the culture the second language represents, better understanding of the interaction this individual has with people who speak different languages. This study suggests, that individuals who speak two languages equally well use internal elements (words, structures, signs, symbols) in both languages and thus, when they talk with other individuals who speak the same two languages, they might use a 'third[11]' language which is an amalgam of the two. In this way they are more accurate with what they say, faster, and it is easier for them to make an external conversation in this way. Peirce's concept of non-linguistic elements, which are used internally by individuals, opens the way to approach the combination of Greek and English language as a separate 'dialect'. Following Peirce's views, this study suggests that, the use of more symbols (which can be represented through the second or third language as individual speaks) provide the individual with more ways to interact with herself, reflect upon herself and externalize her internal conversation. A second language is an ideal example which helps to reveal the importance of symbols.

Internal Conversation and The combination of Greek and English Language

Recently, sociology made a step forward concerning the investigation of interaction through sociolinguistics, and the examination of conversation as action has been introduced. In fact, it has been extensively supported that grammatical characteristics have a central significance within Greek language in terms of action (Chalari, 2005). Current research has expanded this view by applying sociolinguistics methods in the investigation of internal conversation. It has thus been suggested that grammatical and syntactical characteristics have a central significance in terms of internal (as well as external) conversation (Chalari, 2007). Furthermore, it is apparent that different languages have different structural, linguistic, grammatical or syntactical characteristics. Therefore, although we do know the importance of such characteristics, we do not know the exact significance that each feature of conversation could have within different languages. However, it is clear that if an agent speaks more than one language, he or she has more internal means available to use during an internal conversation.

[11] This 'third' language in this study is the combination of Greek and English and is occasionally used by Greek students in Great Britain, U.S., Australia.

It is a usual internal observation, for individuals who have to use more than one language in their everyday life, to think on occasions in the second language, namely to produce internal conversation in a different language to one's mother-tongue. Students who study in a foreign country find it difficult at the beginning of their studies to write or speak in any academic language other than their first language. Often therefore, academics will advise them to think in the foreign language in order to speak it. It is also said that only when a person thinks in a second language will they know this language well. This suggestion is also supported from the answers Greek students (studying in U.K. universities) gave to an exploratory interview concerning internal conversation and the use of the second language. Most of the students who were asked agreed that when they first started their studies in the U.K., they had to translate internally what they were listening to, and especially, what they were saying. However, after some time, they felt more confident in replying directly in English without translating their external conversations internally.

These observations do not take place accidentally. As has been argued, internal and external conversations do not operate separately. Conversely, they have to co-operate in order for conversation[12] to be achieved, although in many occasions internal conversation will not necessarily become external. Therefore, internal and external conversations are structured in analogous ways, but the agent produces more internal conversation than external (this can be understood from the fact that we do not vocalise every small thought we produce, and we usually spend more time silent than speaking). But how is this relationship between internal and external conversation shaped in the case of an individual who speaks more than one language on an everyday basis.

When an individual has to produce an external conversation in a different language, in order to achieve conversation with a person who speaks this language, it is presumed that the latter thinks in this second language. This is for two distinct reasons. Firstly, the person does not have enough time to translate internally every word the other person produces, prepare a response and translate this sentence into the language the

[12] In this case I refer to external conversation.

other person speaks. This is a totally dysfunctional and time consuming procedure. Secondly, during the production of external conversation the individual does not produce a separate/different internal conversation. This can be said because when a person thinks something (that is, produces an internal conversation) but simultaneously says something else (produces a different external conversation), usually one of each set of thoughts (or conversations) becomes problematic and not easily understood. This observation probably derives from the limited ability of the human brain to perform similar but separate functions simultaneously. Therefore, it is possible that a person speaking a foreign language remains totally focused on this attempt, and thus does not perform any other internal function in another language.

Therefore, when a person speaks in a different language, it is possible that internal and external conversation will co-operate in a synchronised way. However, what is more important in this section is what happens when the individual produces internal conversation. Internal conversation embraces most language and conversational characteristics that external conversation forms. Therefore, an individual who produces internal conversation in a different language can use more language functions than in a situation where the individual produces internal conversation in solely one language. For example, if an individual speaks Greek as a mother tongue, and English as a second language, it is possible to use Greek verbs in English sentences, because Greek verbs include more information in a single word than English verbs[13]. For example:

I: *pes mu pos geernusate to vradee*
tell me how came back CLI night
tell me how you were going back at night

This is a characteristic example, which shows clearly the difference between the use of a Greek verb, and the analogous verb in English. The verb in red, *"geernusa-te"* is a single word, which ending –te indicates the person: you, the tense: past continues, the number: plural, the voice: passive etc. As seems obvious, there is much information that a single verb can provide (Chalari, 2005). Therefore, if an individual

[13] For further discussion concerning Greek verbs and the information they contain, see: Chalari (2005)

wants to take advantage of the two languages she speaks, she can simultaneously produce an internal conversation which is based on Greek and English grammatical characteristics and semiotics and then externalised it. It has to be noted, that sometimes Greeks seem to use repeatedly specific English words which are shorter than the analogous Greek and easier in use. Such words are the following: 'ok' (*entaxee* in Greek), 'please' (*se parakalo* in Greek) 'thanks' or 'cheers' (*se euxareesto* in Greek) or terms often used between students like: 'thesis'/'PhD' (*deedaktoreekee deeatreevee*), 'MA' (*metapteexeeako*), 'supervisor' (*epoptees katheegeetees*), 'postdoc' (*metadeedaktoreeko*), 'journal' (*erevneeteeko pereeodeeko*), 'viva' (*proforeekee eeposteereeksee / eksetasee tees deedaktoreekees deeatreevees*)[14] etc. What is suggested at this point is that Greek students in the UK, critically choose which words (Greek or English) to use and when, as they produce conversations with other Greek students. Each conversation is unique and thus the combination of Greek and English does not necessarily follow a pattern. An example of the combined languages could be the following: a Greek student in the UK speaks to another Greek student in an everyday conversation:

1.A. *oreesteeke to viva?* (Combination)
oreesteeke ee eksetash tees deedaktoreekees deeatreevees? (Greek)
Has(it) been scheduled the viva? (English-direct Translation)
(Has the viva been scheduled?) (English-actual Translation)

[14] Note that the use of 'ee' refers to the better pronunciation of the word in Greek. ('ee'=η,ι,υ,ει,οι; and 'e'=ε, αι)

2.B. *auto pereemeno* (Greek)
This (I am) waiting (English-direct Translation)
This is what I am waiting for (English-actual Translation)

3.A. *peeges* *sto campus*[15]*?* (Combination)
Peeges sto panepesteemeeo? (Greek)
did you go to the campus? (English-actual Translation)

4.B. *tora pao* (Greek)
Now (I am)going (English-direct Translation)
I am going now (English-actual Translation)

In the above fragment, two Greek students talk in the dialect which combines the Greek and English language. In the first line of the first turn the dialect can be seen whereas in the second the Greek version and in the third the English version. As it seen in the first utterance the speaker uses the Greek verb 'oreesteeke'. The ending –eeke of the Greek verb provides information about the person: it, the tense: past continues, the number: single, the voice: passive etc. Also the first speaker uses the English word 'viva' since the Greek translation of this word (eksetasee deedaktoreekees deeatreevees) is too long. In the second turn the next speaker responses in Greek and he uses a Greek verb which, as the previous one, is shorter than the analogous verb in English. In the third turn the speaker uses again the combined 'dialect' by using a Greek verb (which is shorter than the one in English) and an additional word in English ('campus', which does not have an accurate direct translation in Greek). The final turn in a short response in Greek; again, it contains a Greek verb which provides more accurate and faster information than the analogous in English.

The above example of a brief external conversation between two students, describes four characteristic turns/sentences between two Greeks who combine Greek and English in their everyday conversations. It is seen in this example, that the 'combined'

[15] The English word 'campus' is translated in Greek as: "πανεπιστημιακός χώρος, τοπικός προσδιορισμός του χώρου του πανεπιστημίου". As can be seen the translation is much longer than the word in English 'campus'.

sentences are shorter than the ones in Greek or English translation, accurate, fast in terms of production and both participants can understand each other perfectly.

Another interesting observation that supports the repeated use of the combination of Greek and English language, is that Greek students use this 'dialect' very often in e-mails Greek students send to one another on occasions when they have to use English script (Latin characters) but use the Greek language. The outcome is to produce a message which consists of Greek and English language, grammar and syntax. They also use this dialect often, e.g. in English stores (when they discuss with each other and at the same time they have to say something to the salesman) or when they are explaining an academic term in Greek language (when they have learned this term in English). This mixture of two languages helps Greek students to express themselves more effectively, without worrying if they are not well understood and usually in an informal manner.

It is possible that analogous kinds of dialects are used by people who speak other languages. It is apparent, though, that if these people use characteristics from two different languages to produce external conversation, they will definitely do something analogous when they produce internal conversation. It can be also said that the environment (i.e. country) the person is in at the moment of the production of the conversation is also important[16]. According to the answers Greek students gave to an exploratory questionnaire, when these students are in Greece, they tend to speak more Greek than English and after a while, they do not feel the need to combine these two languages. Also, the individuals themselves who interact each time to produce a conversation are also a significant factor. If both of them speak both languages equally well, then it is possible that this 'dialect' will appear. However, if they do not speak the same languages, they will avoid using any kind of 'dialect'.

Thus, when a person speaks more than one language on everyday basis, it is presumed that his or her internal conversation would use the characteristics of both languages,

[16] For further discussion see: Khoury, A., I. (2007) *The Precautionary Principle in the EU and the Role of Public Opinion in Risk Regulation.* PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, In file with the author.

and when she produces external conversation in the second language, only the second language is used. The case of Greek students constitutes a good example of individuals who can produce internal conversation in a 'dialect' that can save them time and effort. These observations were fully supported from the answers Greek students gave to questions concerning this specific 'dialect'. All the respondents occasionally use this dialect, mostly when they talk and not when they exchange e-mails. The main reasons they claim for using this dialect is for convenience, to save time/when they hurry or to be accurate. They confirmed that they use it mostly when they are in the U.K. and rarely when they return to Greece. However, when they talk about their science (the subject they study in the U.K.) they find it easier to use English terms, even if they talk to Greeks in Greece.

It could be argued, thus, that when Greek students use the combination of Greek and English language in their external conversations, they think internally in this dialect. Sometimes they use more English words, at other times, less. This decision, as well as which words will be pronounced, constitute a personal matter for each individual. As the students themselves suggested, the number of English words they use may vary, and the words they use depend on many factors (e.g. where they are, when they talk, who they are talking to, how comfortable they feel, if they have time or not, etc). Therefore, although they have a second language available internally, they choose which words, expressions, and notions they would use according to external circumstances. Thus the external conversation they produce is a combination (that varies in every conversation) of two different languages.

Discussion

In the present study, the terms of internal and external conversation were introduced. Individuals develop internal conversations in order to interact with themselves about themselves and the society. It was also explained that individuals produce external conversations which derive form internal conversations. Through classic and current social theory, it was supported that the individuals produce internal conversations not only by using one language; they also use additional elements like icons, memories but more importantly, they can use more than one language and thus a combination of two languages. Therefore, if individuals are able to produce such 'dialect' internally

they can also externalise it and use it as external conversation in order to interact with each other. Greek students in the UK occasionally use a 'dialect' (namely a combination of Greek and English language) between them in order to communicate in a faster and more accurate way. As it was explained, in order to produce external conversations, Greek students use elements from both languages internally and they critically decide which words to use, in what order and from which language. Naturally, the external environment is important factor in their decision making, the person they interact with, the topic they are talking about etc. Therefore, although, this 'dialect' does not follow a specific pattern, it occurs often between Greek students through their verbal and written interaction. The combination of Greek and English language is used as a 'third' language which enables the participants to produce easier, faster and more accurate conversations.

Bibliography:

Archer, M., S. (2007) *Making our Way through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility*. Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M., S. (2003) *Structure, agency and internal conversation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Archer, M., S. (2000) *Being human: the problem of agency* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chalari, A. (2005) 'Why Greeks talk at the same time all together: examining the phenomenon of overlaps in everyday Greek conversations' *The 2nd LSE PhD Symposium on Modern Greece*: "Current Social Science Research on Greece" London School of Economics, June 10, 2005 Available on line, at : http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/hellenicObservatory/

Chalari, A. (2007) '*The Relationship between Internal and External Conversations'* PhD Thesis: University of Warwick, in file with the author.

Colapietro, V. (2006) '*Cartesian Privacy and Peircian Interiority'* [Working Draft] The Pennsylvania State University.

Dietz, T. & Burns, T., R. (1992) 'Human Agency and the Evolutionary Dynamics of Culture' *Acta Sociolgica* V. 35: 187-200.

Douglas, J., D. (1970) *Understanding Everyday Life.* Chicago: Aldine

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis* Berkley: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1961) *Encounters. Two studies in sociology of interaction* London : Allen Lane The Penguin Press

Goffman, E. (1971) *Relations in Public* New York: Harper & Row

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of talk* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Karp, D., A, & Yoels, W., C. (1986) *Sociology and Everyday Life* Itasca, IL: Peacock

Khoury, A., I. (2007) '*The Precautionary Principle in the EU and the Role of Public Opinion in Risk Regulation'*. PhD Thesis: University of Cambridge, in file with the author.

Malcolm, C. (1977) *An introduction to discourse analysis* London : Longman

Nofsinger, R., E. (1991) *Everyday Conversation* London: Sage

Nofsinger, R., E. (1991) *Everyday conversation* Newbury Park : Sage Publications

Piaget, J. (1926) *The language and thought of the child* . London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Peirce, C., S. (1935) Collected papers on Charles Sanders Peirce, V.5: *Pragmatism and Pragmaticism*. Cambridge University Press.

Trudgill, P. (1983) *Sociolinguistics*: *an introduction to language and society* Harmondsworth : Penguin

Vocate , D., R. (1994) *Intrapersonal Communication: Different Voices, Different Minds* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Vygotsky, L., S. (1962) *Thought and Language* Cambridge MA: MIT Press

Wiley, N. (1994) *The Semiotic Self*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Wiley, N. (2006) 'Inner Speech as Language: A Saussurean Inquiry' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* V. 36(3): 319-341[0].

Reflections on Identity and Women's Writing in Modern Greece

This paper will discuss the notions of **women's writing** and **identity** in post-dictatorship modern Greece. It is part of an ongoing research on women's writing in the given cultural context--one that aims to examine women authors' contributions to Modern Greek literature and people.

Before proceeding any further, I wish to set the parameters for the examination and analysis of these rather broad terms; I start with women's writing. Instead of strictly defining this notion as a literary tendency, a form of writing, or a genre, this paper will examine the term as the virtual space/ *topos* where the Greek woman's identity and experiences are reflected upon and renegotiated. Besides the post-1974 era, the paper will also briefly refer to the period of the dictatorship—a time, during which all writers, male and female, came together to reflect on the nation's identity and anxieties. It examines how women writers-with the reinstatement of democracy- turned to a reflection of the Greek women's social/political experiences which in turn had a major impact on their identity, thus marking the transition of literary texts addressing the individual's identity/ sense of self. In the process, this provides a cultural critique and the reconstruction of womanhood.

When referring to identity, this study will focus on the different dimensions/ attributes/ aspects(in the case of Greek women - gender, social roles, femininity), that characterize and, to a certain extent, formulate the **individual** with regards to his/her sense of self, and as a part of the **collective** (being Greek/nationality).

Identity, it will be argued, is ascribed upon the individual by the given cultural and social context, but, in turn the individual redefines the assigned identity, thus keeping the notion in a state of flux, evolution and renegotiation.

Hence, as I will illustrate, the issue of **identity** is a recurring motif in women's writing. Dimitris Papanikolaou points out,

"if identity is the narrativization and at the same time the interpretation of experience, its role is to cover the gaps produced by identification, those moments where the multiple attachments of a person contradict each other. Theorists of identity would argue here that identities are produced at the meeting point (the suture) between positions offered to a subject (interpellations) by the discursive environment she or he moves within and by his/her own attempts to perform subjectivity. As Stuart Hall reminds us, `precisely because identities are constructed within, not outside discourse, we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices" (Papanikolaou 2006: 204).

I begin this analysis by providing the historical background of Greece in the late 60's and early 70's. I believe that it is during the dictatorship years that women were received as true equals to their male counterparts—that is, as equal authors/subverters of the regime.

This is when they consciously joined and became part of a collective effort simultaneously resisting the junta and addressing the cultural needs of the Greek reading public. This period marks the beginning of a new era for women writers; it is one during which, from writing on the collective identity, they move on to that of the individual man/woman.

What follows this historical review in the paper is the theoretical framework and the thematic analysis of motifs found in selected women's novels briefly discussed in the conclusion of the paper. The analysis—which constitutes the main part of the study--reveals a correlation between women's writing and identity; specifically, how Greek women writers sought to imagine and reconstruct modern female identity both in the public and private spheres. In her critically acclaimed work, Van Dyck has reflected on the literary works of women writers. One can note how the censorship and the overall political and cultural oppression- that came with the reign of the colonels-mirrored the systemic societal limitations women have been experiencing in conservative Southern European countries (i.e. Spain). This is also one of the themes that emerge in this paper. So, let me begin by providing the necessary socio-political background, that served as the catalyst for women's writing and identity.

Historical Background

As both Van Dyck and Roufos explain, during the reign of the Colonels a meticulously crafted ideological platform had been put in place, designed to crush any critical opposition; at the same time, the regime tried to keep up with appearances of civility and legality and to project having a `benevolent' paternalistic character to the outside world. In order to maintain this elaborate charade both domestically and beyond Greece's borders, censorship was crucial. Faced with the grim reality of the overwhelming curtailing of one's voice, some—like the writer Tsirkas--decided to abstain from publishing literary texts altogether, as a means of refusing compliance with the enforced censorship (Gkritsi-Milliex 1987: 63-64).

This lasted till 1970; the year when the nation's writers broke the silence and published the popular collections *Dekaochto Keimena,* followed shortly after by *Nea Keimena I* and *II*. These works brought together the talent of several Greek authors who were opposed to the dictatorship, and essentially represented a collective response to the anti-Dictatorship statement made by the first Greek Literature Nobel laureate George Seferis (on the BBC World Service) in March 1969. According to Seferis, the time had come to react to the cultural stagnation brought upon the nation due to the colonel's anachronistic and cacophonic views on the essence of Greek identity, art and culture (Clogg 1972: 148). His call was answered; the above mentioned collections compiled literary works which were addressing the nation's **collective** needs and anxieties under the junta. They did so all the while surpassing the individual participant's hesitations to go ahead with such a bold move for fear of being persecuted by the colonels, should the military Press Service deemed fit. By defiantly exploring the limits of freedom of expression under adverse political conditions, this effort provoked a response by the regime. Several writers

“were arrested on unspecified charges [… Indeed,] to write in contemporary Greece [meant…] to write on the boundary: in a political situation where the act of writing is an act fraught with uncertainty and grave personal risk” (Spanos 1973: 367).

Yet, despite these dangers, Greek writers-women and men-joined forces and produced works that circumvented the use of existing forms of expression (Keeley 1983: 111-113). They induced them with new layers of ideological meaning, by virtue of using allegories, metaphors, and metonymies. The restrictions imposed by the regime were converted into possibilities to find imaginative `solutions' for a freer written expression. For instance, Manto Aravantinou wrote in Nea Keimena II

“είναι η γλώσσα αυτή η δική μου νεόκοπη και σ'αυτήν/ θα μιλήσω./θα μιλήσω γι'αυτά που θελληματικά τα κρατούσα ζηλότυπα/ μέσα μου, πολύτιμα, νόμιζα, σε χώρους αφύλακτους./Γιατι πέρασα μέσα απο ένα σεισμό και τώρα δεν έχω/ πια φόβο κανένα” (Seferis et al. 1972: 117-8).

This turn could be described as ushering a new era for Modern Greece and its literature, carrying the promise for the rejuvenation of the Greek political, cultural and civil state of the nation. Indeed, it would be the precursor for the exaltation and optimism that came as soon as democracy had been safely reinstated in Greece.

And so it seemed to be: According to EKEBI, soon after the fall of the junta in the summer of 1974, publications picked up sharply and both male and female authors were able to freely publish their works.

For women writers, their participation in the literary resistance against the dictatorship, in addition to the restoration of democracy and the boom in publishing brought the promise of a full inclusion in the literary establishment--one in which they had not been an integral part of, prior to the junta—and of the importance of their own voice. (Athanasopoulos 1980: 53, Varika 1978: 47-9).

This was not for lack of talent or trying. These `new' women writers did have critically acclaimed Greek women authors as their predecessors. Well before the 1970s, writers like Zoi Karelli, Kallirhoe Parren, Theoni Drakopoulou-Pappa a.k.a Myrtiotissa, Maria Polydouri and Dido Sotiriou, had a luminous presence in Modern Greek letters. In addition, Greece had had its own Women's movements (i.e. Greek League for Women's Rights, National Council of Greek Women) and even several organizations and magazines catering to the female readership early on (such as *Efimerida Ton Kyrion, Ellinides, Poli Ton Gynaikon, O Agonas Tis Gynaikas*). Their existence however did not bring the active integration of women to Greek life; instead the prescribed role, a woman had in the arguably patriarchal society kept prevailing—one clearly defined, with emphasis on Greek women's domestic role and duties. The seven-year dictatorship and its cultural and social exaltation of the triptych `fatherland, religion, family' only served to make things worse for women, whose main-if not exclusive-roles were thus prescribed as ones of patriotic, pious/religious mothers.

Yet, after the fall of the junta, women's issues were systematically advanced in earnest by established associations and civil society groups (Cowan 1996: 61). One year after the restoration of democracy, Margaret Papandreou founded the Greek Women's Union (ΕΓΕ) to promote gender equality and women's issues. It seemed as if Greek women were finally being set free from decades of narrow conceptions of their societal roles. Indeed, as the 1980's rolled in, in conjunction with the social changes brought and adopted on gender equality (Van Steen 2003: 247) during the years PASOK was in power, women's rights and agenda was advancing (Schopflin 2000: 17).

Still, as women's rights and politics bloomed after 1974, a troublesome issue would inhibit the progress of the women's rights' movement: social labeling. The public had long associated such groups as `feminist', and feminism had been long regarded as a foreign concept. In pre-1974 Greece, women's issues were neither highly visible, nor a high priority, thus, alluding to the conservatism of

"major institutions long associated with power, agenda-making and ruling the land […] They believed that feminism had no validity for, or applicability in Greek society, which traditionally placed collective (e.g. family, regional, national) values over the freedoms of the individual. Feminism was seen as a corrupting influence that originated in the West […] culturally imperialist, and […] a case of unnatural social engineering […] a danger to male-female coexistence [and] to traditional family and community values. The term conjured up simplistic images of frivolous and promiscuous behavior, loss of female virtue, and the man-hating fanaticism" (Van Steen 2003: 251).

Hence, despite the enthusiasm and optimism after the fall of the dictatorship, society opened up, but vestiges of the past lingered in key parts of society to decelerate progress towards gender equality. Greek women writers experienced great difficulties entering the literary scene or being accepted for their contribution as individuals; they were still, first and foremost regarded as women, and only then as writers. Author Margarita Karapanou's comment-response to author J.D Faubion on her struggle as a female author in the literary Greek scene has been illuminating. She exclaimed she was in fact

"pertubed that the local `critical establishment' had largely ignored her, at a time when she was receiving the praises of New York Times critic J. Charyn and author J. Updike."(Faubion 1995:195).

Faubion came the same conclusion-that, it was customary in Greece to favor male over female authors due to a prevailing cultural conservatism not just based on gender, but also on freedom of expression. In Karapanou's case, it didn't help that she had an `unconventional' by conservative standards style in her writings and that she -at times- had mocked authority—even if it was in the guise of the colonels. This tardiness of her admission to the `all-boys club' that was called the `critical establishment' is characteristic of the mentality of those dominating the literary scene. Melpo Axioti's literary contribution also took time to be fully attributed, as did her admission in the `upper literary echelons' (Faubion 1995:197).

This was the turbulent and slow trajectory of Greek women writers' efforts in the past decades towards recognition of their own voice as individuals and rights to self-expression beyond the conservative confounds of Greek society, at the time when the issue about `women's writing' really broke out in the open. Notably, the literary symposium on women's writing in 1990 called “So, Does Women's Poetry Exist?” inaugurates the turn to the contemplation on, and examination of the notion. Indeed, Van Dyck herself has written that

“This change in perspective is related to the increasing prominence that women writers, despite the abovementioned obstacles, have gradually assumed on the Greek literary scene. A quick survey of the most influential poets from the generation that began writing under the dictatorship will reveal that they “are women[…]and many of the best selling novels published in the late 1970's and throughout the 1980's have been written by women” (Van Dyck 1998: 5-7).

As Van Dyck has explained, these individuals had addressed issues of national identity, political, social and cultural but their works had not been received with equal attention to the gender of the author-thus women’s identity.

Theoretical Framework

With new opportunities and broadening horizons from the restoration of democracy, also came new challenges and impediments. They were caused primarily by fears of an imminent war between Greece and Turkey breaking out after the latter's invasion of Cyprus and of the country's general condition-weakened and broken by the colonels' inefficient and abusive policies. In this post-dictatorship period, according to critics of Modern Greek literature such as Dimitris Tziovas, one markedly noticed the writer's shift of focus from the collective to the individual. In particular, there was a tendency to

“…explore the inner world of individuals--the self-referential character of their novels often drawing attention to the linguistic construction of identity and selfhood. The fragmented style and the discontinuous form of some of these texts undermine the notion of a unified self and foreground a crisis of subjectivity” (Tziovas 2003: 52).

Hence, the key elements of this new trend were highlighted by the re-assessment of the individual's role in the new political setting and the redefinition of the self in terms ranging from the modernist notion of identity to the postmodern notion of subjectivities. Given that the restoration of **individual** freedom came with its expansion in the public sphere—e.g. after 1974, the Greek Communist Party (KKE) was legalized—the resulting political and cultural freedom was incomparably greater than that during the time of the junta and its authoritarian effort to subjugate individuals, thus making part of a larger group and `molding' society into an obedient uniform mass based on projected nationalist fantasies and patriotic kitsch myths.

According to Roilos, the novels in the post-dictatorship era, in marked contrast, had all shared a turn to realism and historicity. In fact, he has argued that these novels

“articulate a critical commentary both on traditional modes of historiography and literary composition, and on contemporary political debates” (Roilos 2004: 1-3).

During this period, an author reflected on the years of the dictatorship and examined the trauma experienced and the role each individual had played out throughout the dictatorship. For instance, Maro Douka's novel *Archaia Skouria*, epitomized this literary tendency -- shedding light onto the experiences a young woman could aggregate while coming of age. What was evident from this novel, representative of a broader tendency--a turn to realism and the renegotiation of several identifiers the individual carries—was that it was “constructed as a narrative space where opposite elements—male/female, Greekness/ otherness, fiction/history—[were] inscribed. […]”(Roilos 2004: 2). In doing so, the author reflected on predominant notions in the current political, cultural and social context, while negotiating his/her identity.

Characteristically, French theorists-psychoanalysts support the notion that, sense of self/identity, has been

“actually produced through social relations and language. The problem lies in the fact that the social and symbolic order does not provide language adequate for [women] […To obliterate one’s sex when writing, would] cause the feminine to disappear into the masculine/neutral discourse that dominates the patriarchal order” (Korsmeyer 2004: 141).

Hence, it can be argued that women’s writing provided the narrative space to negotiate the social, cultural roles, experiences assigned to women. But, does women’s writing exist in Greece? Do Greek women writers reflect on their experiences?

Analysis

An analysis of representative novels is required to address the preceding questions. My criteria for the following selection of works is based on the following key points: (i) the novels were written after 1974, but at the same time span throughout the three decades to follow, thus allowing for reflection on the trajectory and progression of writing after the reinstatement of democracy; (ii) the novels were written by women, who in turn, have created female protagonists negotiating their identity and reflecting on their experiences as women, in the given cultural context; (iii) these works have overall been commercially successful and well-received by the readers in Greece. Based on the above, the novels chosen for this study are: *Eleni, I O Kanenas,* by R. Galanaki*; To ebdomo Rouxo,* by E. Fakinou*; Oi Leukes AsalIeutes* by M. Douka*; Bodyland,* by A. Mantoglou. Through the analysis of motifs found in the aforementioned works, I aim to illustrate how these works demonstrate that writing can become the vehicle for the negotiation of the woman’s identity. These writers, in the selected novels have found and described- in the words of poetess Katerina Anghelaki- Rooke - “[…] their feminine identity in terms of their own consciousness and their existence in a man's world” (Anghelaki-Rooke 1983:141).

To begin with, women writers reflected on the notion of Greek **femininity;** a term used, not

“to designate[…]a mysterious quality or essence that all women have by virtue of their being biologically female [but] rather, a set of structures and conditions that delimit the typical situation of being a woman in a particular society, as well as the typical way in which this situation is lived by the women themselves.” (Young 2005: 31).

Hence, the references made to femininity indicated the attributes each culture ascribes on women. The lead heroines examined in this paper have challenged/ redefined Greek femininity**,** and through them, the authors of these works have offered a commentary on the past characterizations used to describe women-thus criticizing/commenting on their past use and existence. For example,

The lead heroines of these novels do not possess any exaggerated qualities which male writers have usually reverted to, when describing a female character; the

“extreme images of `angel' and `monster' which male authors have generated for her[…]” (Gilbert & Gubar 1979: 17).

Still, women have used these images. In *Eleni I O Kanenas*, there have been several references made to a creature/ ghost of a dynamic woman named `Megali Kyra' (Grand Dame), who was wrongly killed and whose murder was left unpunished, condemning her to an eternity of haunting the island, and preventing her from resting in peace. The ghost would appear because the people of the island were covering for the male murderer. By use of this image and this device- which has been common in the predominantly male western canon- Galanaki's character has served as a critique of this projected image of woman; at the same time, it has deconstructed the reasons for her being created in the first place.

Other qualities that in their totality composed the `angelic' side of femininity abound: Purity, gentleness, grace, fragility, beauty (Gilbert & Gubar 1979: 22, 25), passivity, the need of male protection (by males who ultimately were, themselves in need of the woman's protection, as Douka has writen: ¨την ήθελε για να την προστατέυει κερδίζοντας έτσι τη δική του προστασία—Douka 1988: 162), loyalty (Douka 1988: 141), desirability by the opposite sex (Douka 1988: 87), submissiveness to the male's will (Fakinou 1994:18), forgiveness and acceptance (the quintessentially maternal figure--Douka: 1983, 279, 286). The authors have chosen to use these attributes because they reflect on the social pressures of women to look, dress and behave in a certain way. They have also made references to new, more realistic, post-patriarchal aspects of a modern woman's **identity**; her lack of confidence in expressing/ knowing herself (Douka 1988: 163), her insecurity in terms of her physical appearance and her aging (Yannakaki 2006: 90, 23), on being happy by herself (Douka 1988: 130), on the pressure of being married and having a family (Douka 1988:174), even on how a woman was supposed to write fiction (Douka 1988: 209). Of importance here was the notion that part of femininity included passivity and the submission to the dominant male. In her novel *Oi Leukes Asaleutes*, Douka portrayed the lead heroine Aspasia (a loaded historical name symbolic of female emancipation-as Aspasia was the dynamic life partner of Pericles of Golden Age Athens) fight back and fend off a male neighbour who wanted to rape her. In turn, he cursed her

for resisting his advances and tried to kill her (Douka 1988: 191). By creating this scene, Douka has actually commented on the victimization of women and society's ultimate lack of empathy for their ordeals. With the arrival of another male neighbour, Aspasia named the perpetrator and made her decision to sue him. She asked the second man to be her witness. His reply is telling since it reflected on, and reiterated the expectations society has out of the individual female; treating the needs of the collective as a priority, while neglecting and subjugating the needs/rights of the individual woman:

"Τον ήξερα ανεπρόκοπο, άλλα όχι και βιαστή. Ενδιαφέρον! Και σκοπέυετε να καταστρέψετε μία οικογένεια;..Για σκεφτείτε το...λίγο ουίσκι θα σας έκανε καλό, θα σας βοήθουσε να σκεφτείτε ψύχραιμα, όταν συνέλθετε θα δείτε και κάπως θεωρητικά το συμβάν"(Douka 1988: 193-4).

Yet, this woman was presented by the author as defiant: even if she knew people would not believe her should she decide to go to court, even if she knew that the judges would all be males:

"θα τον καταγγείλει ακόμη κι αν ξέρει ότι θα τον δικάσουν υποψήφιοι βιαστές. Ακόμη και που θα γελάσουν ότι της άξιζε το στρίμωγμα της γεροντοκόρης. Και ο θέος να σε φυλάει, θα πουν, απο τις γυναίκες που έχουν ξεμείνει, απο τις στερημένες» (Douka 1988: 204).

Douka has pointed out, how, in a culturally conservative society, part of femininity was docility. Should the victim fight back, she would be the one to blame. She has also referred implicitly to the narrative of the hysteric single-in this case old maiden/spinster-woman.

But, in general, the female character has presented interest not because of her looks or successes in life, but because she was seen as an individual, negotiating her place in the Greek context. As the above quotes illustrate, in reflecting on the attributes imposed on woman through literature, women authors have recreated the components of women's identity from a woman writer's point of view. They have presented characters at odds with the collective, and in doing so, they have framed writing from a women's perspective. As a result, by engaging in women's writing and by creating this particular discourse, women writers have managed to promote and engage in a new discourse of femininity.

Apart from the concept of Femininity, women writers have also reflected on the notion of **Gender**. I adopt Butler's definition of Gender, as a concept

"tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through stylized repetition of acts[…] gender […] must be understood as the mundane way in which bodily gestures, movements, and styles of various kinds constitute the illusion of an abiding gendered self"(Butler: 1990, 140).

Women writers have challenged this mundane way in which gender has been constituted in Modern Greece. Galanaki's novel, was based on a true historical figure, Eleni Altamoura and her decision to not have to abide to the gender expectations of her time; the heroine decided to leave Greece and travel to Italy as a young man, in order to receive higher education/training in painting. Early on in the novel, it is established that she struggled with the social constraints imposed on her gender and its connotations ("παγιδευμένη στις ιδέες της εποχής μου"), at a time when leading a woman's life meant being confined in a specific lifestyle (Galanaki 1998: 87, 192, 200). Based on the above, the lead heroine transcended the **gender** boundaries and appropriated the gender of a young male in order to obtain the training/education which was strictly prohibited to young women. The notion of gender bending was thus being introduced. At the same time, it did not mean that

"a piece of clothing [can] change[…]gender[…]so that what you get is something like the modification of gender, and the understanding of taking on a gender as a kind of consumerism" (Kotz 1992: 83).

Instead, gender became an identifier that each individual embraced but struggled with, "that sustains us at the same time as it constrains us" (Glover & Kaplan 2005: xxvii). In *Eleni, I O Kanenas,* when gender identity was challenged, the process was shown as an intricate one, internalized as much as externalized (Galanaki 1998: 104). Eleni was constantly negotiating her gender; the reader identified her as struggling to have both, by presenting herself as a man and as a woman; she had promised herself not to forget how she looked like before she embarks on her journey to Italy for her studies. Appropriating the appearance and thinking of a young male (Galanaki 1998: 72, 86) superficially provided her safety and ensured a smooth transition from one gender to the other; a young woman would not and could not have traveled by herself. The journey entered the symbolic realm: Eleni had to undergo several consecutive transformations to realize that although she enjoyed more freedom as a young man, she would still have to face constraints:

"Κοιτάζοντας το είδωλο μου αποφάσιζα σιγά σιγά να μην ξαναγυρίσω [...]στα μακρία φορέματα του φύλλου μου. Θα χαιρόμουν την ελευθερία του άντρα, σκεφτόμουν παραβλέποντας το γεγονός οτι και ως άντρας έπρεπε να γυρνώ νωρίς το απόγευμα στο μοναστήρι[...]για να μην παραβιάσω τους κανόνες"(Galanaki 1998: 76-7).

For the time she had to stay in disguise, she recovered and assumed her gender through art, through painting which alone allowed absolute freedom (an allegory for women's writing, perhaps?). This constant negotiation was a direct result of societal limitations:

"διαδοχικές Ελένες είχαν βαδίσει στην οδό του βίου μου[...]πόσες Έλενες μου ήταν γραφτό να γίνω, θύτης και θύμα μιας εποχής πιο ευαίσθητης και απο τη βελόνα της πυξίδας" (Galanaki 1998: 122, 140).

As hinted earlier, a parallel could potentially be drawn from this story to women's writing and its negation of women's writing in Greece. This young woman's subversive action could indeed be juxtaposed to the experiences of female authors--their willingness to be part of a predominantly male literary canon without claiming a writing of their own. It could be argued that

“like most women in a patriarchal society, the woman writer does experience her gender as a painful obstacle, or even a debilitating inadequacy […] she is victimized by what Mitchell calls `the inferiorized and `alternative' [second sex] psychology of women under patriarchy” (Korsmeyer 2004:141).

This line of argumentation leads to another theme to be examined—one which women writers have reproduced in their works. This is the motif of the lead heroine who, herself, engaged in writing thus, affirming her existence. Writing became the way for women to construct a discourse that would reflect on as well as reshape the social hierarchy and reality—one that allowed women a different positionality in the existing cultural hegemony. On the subject of a woman writing, Luce Irigaray has exclaimed

“I am a woman. I write with who I am. Why wouldn't that be valid, unless out of contempt for the value of women or from a denial of a culture in which the sexual is (or even, has been) a significant subjective and objective dimension?” (Kosmeyer 2004: 142).

In the selected novels, writing provided an outlet for women who engaged in it, offering a reflection on their surroundings and their reality. For example, In *Bodyland* the author has shed some light onto, and deconstructed the process of novel writing; it has been, beyond a shadow of a doubt, an arduous one.

In the novel, the lead heroine while looking at her surroundings to find inspiration for her characters, found herself wondering: Who was she;

“Ποια είμαι; [...] Καμία φωνη δεν απάντησε[...]Ποια είμαι λοιπόν; [...]είμαι όλο και λιγότερο σίγουρη[…]Είμαι αυτή που ζει στο δικό της μικρό πλανήτη, η χαρτογράφος, η καταγραφέας αλλά και η διαγραφέας...μετά απο κάμποσα λεπτά ενδοσκόπησης, η ερώτηση υποχώρησε[...]θα έγραφε μια μεγάλου μήκους ιστορία, ένα μυθιστόρημα” (Mantoglou 2005: 264-6).

In that novel, writing has been essentially an embarkation on to a journey of self-discovery and reflection. Mantoglou has made references to the female author time and again—e.g., how she has been deprived of recognition because of her sex (Mantoglou 2005: 246)--thus, commenting on the systematic exclusion of women from the literary establishment. Gilbert and Gubar have pointed out that, women writers “strategically reveal their cultural and social anxieties” (Humm 1994: 123).

Therefore--by way of shaping and creating a narrative space to negotiate identity -- writing has been empowering; it has been a way to come to terms with, and to reconcile

the individual with the past collective experience and ultimately with the society one has lived in.

In Douka's novel *Oi Leukes Asaleutes* the lead heroine experimented and escaped her suffocating and unrewarding life through writing. She fantasized completing a novel and handing it to a love interest of hers, who upon reading it gave it a negative review. According to him, `she [did] not write as a woman should' […] `it was too aggressive, revealed a fascination with the ugliness of the world' (Douka 1988: 209) Yet, in the texts was where woman / the individual "[…] is apprehended as a social and historical being, [where] language can also show us how woman is defined, understood, and appreciated in our culture" (McConnel-Ginet at al. 1980: 48). Aspasia amassed pages upon pages, with the hope that one day she would become a writer; that was what would help her through her life (Douka 1988: 53). This attitude towards writing mirrored the heroine's strengths and weaknesses as a woman; despite her doubts on how good an author she was, she did not want to give it up for it sustained her. Thus, writing assumed its Aristotelian dimension of catharsis for the author, purging the experiences, reconstructing an alternate reality or process of conceptualizing, and constructing the present. It became a consolation that she could build a story she had full control of. Thus, in a "structuralist sense, narrative is not simply "the story", but the vehicle through which the processes of identification and the construction of […identity] occur" (Walters 1995: 68).

The preceding discussion would not be complete without some mention of the relation between the woman writer and the autobiographical element.

"Works of literature describe in the guise of fiction the dense specificity of personal experience, which is always unique, because each of us has a slightly or very different personal history, modifying every new experience we have; and the creation of literary texts recapitulates this uniqueness"(Lodge 2002: 10-1).

Maro Douka's novels, for example, betrayed an autobiographical overtone; the author strived with words and struggled with finding/creating a style of her own. In *Archaia Skouria*, the heroine was once again a subject of study for the reader, as she was in search of discovering her own self, her private views and her personal political affiliations. Repeatedly, the reader was presented with the multiple problems a young woman had to endure if she wanted to participate in youth organizations, and attempted to enter politics. This had more significance, given that in the political arena during the years described by the author the vast majority of politicians were, of course, male. Thus, writing became a way of negotiating identity, a vehicle for attesting to the difference, while producing new gender representations. Further, it also allowed for women to establish a modicum of cultural space for themselves, for, if their reality was gendered, then so was the representation of women and their experiences in their writing.

Conclusion

This study is essentially a first reflection on key issues I plan to further explore in my research. The above represent my preliminary findings and arguments on the trajectory of

women's writing in modern Greece. The analysis provided on how notions such as individual, gender, femininity and feminine expression are conceived and constructed. It illustrated this point through looking at a selection of novels-that offers an insight into the Modern Greek cultural/political/literary milieu and the complex-and often, complicated-space that female writers had to negotiate. In part of this paper, I have referred to the historical, social and cultural context, during and after the dictatorship in Greece. In doing so, I aimed to frame my analysis with data from the specific turning-point period which, itself, is of key importance for the standing of women in the Modern Greek society-by way of the impressive talent it unleashed, the optimistic aspirations it nourished and the often disappointing realities it unfolded. The reinstatement of democracy marked a new era in Greece in which women writers overcame hurdles placed before them, aspiring to achieve full equality when compared to their male counterparts; their trajectory has not been as smooth as had been envisioned in the euphoric immediate post-junta period. By providing the overall social context and referring to women's movements, I photographed the parameters of social standing of women at the onset of democracy and full expression of individual freedoms. I traced their struggle for equality and the fragmentation of women's organizations which ensued. In the novels I chose for analysis, in essence, women have been renegotiating their legacy/history and position in Greek society in earnest. This has been done by the weaving of intricate literary texts-rich in literary styles and individual modes of expression, that have resulted in the creation of a network of texts which represent the totality of their views and experiences on the trajectory of women's identity/ womanhood in Modern Greece.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Douka, Maro. *Oi Leukes Aseleutes*. Athens: Kedros, 1988.

Fakinou, Eugenia. *To Ebdomo Rouxo*. Athens: Kastanioti, 1989.

Mantoglou, Argyro. *Bodyland: Istories Dromou kai Tromou.* Athens: Kedros, 2005.

Galanaki, Rhea. *Eleni, I O Kanenas*. Athens: Agra, 1998.

Phrantze, Anteia. *Yparchei, loipon, Gynaikeia Poiese*. Athens: Etaireia Spoudon Neoellenikou Politismou kai Genikis Paideias, 1990.

Seferis, Georgios. et. al. *Dekaochto Keimena*. Athens: Kedros, 1971.

Seferis, Georgios. et al. *Nea Keimena*. Athens: Kedros, 1972

Secondary Sources

Rye, Gill. *Reading for change: interactions between text and identity in contemporary French women's writing*. New York: P. Lang, 2001.

Van Dyck, Karen. *Kassandra and the Censors: Greek Poetry Since 1967*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Van Steen, Golda. *'Margarita Papandreou: Bearing Gifts to the Greeks?'* Journal of Modern Greek Studies, Vol. 21, No. 2, 2003, pp. 245-82.

McConnel-Ginet at al.*Women and Language in Literature and Society*. Connecticut: Praeger, 1980.

Spanos, William V. '*Greek Writers and the Military Dictatorship'*. Contemporary Literature, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1973, pp. 363-377.

Beasley, Chris. *Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers*. London: SAGE, 2005.

Keeley, Edmund. *Modern Greek Poetry: Voice and Myth.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Tziovas, Dimitris. *The Other Self: Selfhood and Society in Modern Greek fiction*. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2003.

Faubion, James D. *Rethinking the Subject: An Anthology of Contemporary European Social Thought*. Oxford: Westview, 1995.

Glover, David. Kaplan, Cora. Genders. Oxford: Routledge, 2005.

Gkritsi-Milliex, Tatiana. '*Ημερολόγιο Οχτώ Ημερών*'. Η Λέξη, Athens, April-May 1987, pp. 63-64.

Clogg, Richard. Yannopoulos, George. Greece *Under Military Rule*, London: Secker & Warburg, 1972.

Sontag, Susan. *A Barthes Reader*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1982.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Young, Iris M. *On Female Body Experience: "Throwing Like a Girl" and Other Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Schöpflin, George. *Nations, Identity, Power: The New Politics of Europe*. London: Hurst, c2000.

Cowan, Jane K. '*Being A Feminist In Contemporary Greece'*. Practicing Feminism: Identity, Difference, Power, Ed. Nickie Charles and Felicia Hughes-Freeland, New York: Routledge, 1996.

Lodge, David. *Consciousness and the Novel*, London: Secker & Warburg, 2002.

Rye, Gill. Worton, Michael. *Women's Writing in Contemporary France: New Writers, New Literatures in the 1990s*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2002

Korsmeyer, Carolyn. *Gender and Aesthetics*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Humm, Maggie. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Feminist Literary Criticism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994.

Gilbert, Sandra M. Gubar, Susan. *The Madwoman in The Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Waugh, Patricia. *Feminine Fictions: Revisiting the Postmodern.* London: Routledge, 1989.

Kaplan, Gisela T. *Contemporary Western European Feminism*, London: UCL Press, 1992

Patsalidis, Savvas. '*Greek Women Dramatists: The Road to Emancipation*'. Journal of Modern Greek Studies, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1996, pp. 85-102.

Anghelaki-Rooke, Katerina. *'Sex Roles in Modern Greek Poetry'*. Journal of Modern Greek Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1983, pp. 141-156.

Roilos, Panagiotis. *'Greek Historiographic Metafiction and Maro Douka's A Cap of Purple'*. Journal of Modern Greek Studies, Vol. 22, No. 1, 2004, pp. 1-23.

Papanikolaou, Dimitris. *'Demetrios Capetanakis: a Greek poet (coming out) in England'*. Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. Vol. 30, No.2, 2006, pp. 201-223.

Cixous, Hélène. '*Le rire de la Méduse'*. L'Arc, No. 61, 1975, pp. 39-54.

Jusdanis, Gregory. '*Is Postmodernism Possible Outside the "West"? The Case of Greece'*. Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, Vol. 11, 1987, pp. 69–92.

Athanasopoulos, Panagiotis. *'Zoi Karelli: Tin Eleutheria th brhka sthn Poiese'*. Diavazo: Epitheorisi Vivliou, No. 30, 1980, pp. 52-9.

Varika, Eleni. '*I Gynaikeia Exegersi; Ena Neo Prosopo tis Antrhopinis Apeleutherosis'*. Diavazo: Epitheorisi Vivliou, No. 45, 1981, pp. 38-42.

"The Making of the Communist Youth Identity through the discourse about "Culture": the case of the Communist Youth of Greece (KNE) in the First Years of the Metapolitefsi (1974-78)."

Paper especially prepared for the 3rd PhD Symposium, organised by the Hellenic Observatory of the LSE, London, June 2007

Presented by Nikolaos Papadogiannis, 1st year PhD student in History, University of Cambridge[1]

[1] I would like to acknowledge my gratitude towards Prof Efi Avdela , Dr Adam Tooze and Professor Richard Evans for their comments on drafts of this paper. Of course, I am to blame for the deficiencies of this work. An earlier version of it was presented in the Modern European History Workshop of the University of Cambridge in May, 2007.

1) Introduction: Political situation in post-dictatorship Greece, 1974-81

The mid-1970s witnessed major shifts in the political life of a number of Southern European countries: in particular, Portugal, Spain and Greece ceased to be governed by dictatorial regimes. As regards the case of Greece, where the militaristic regime had lasted from 1967 to 1974, the reinstitution of democracy was marked by two characteristics: First of all, the *reconfiguration of the ideological debate*. The post-Civil War discursive topoi of anticommunism, i.e. the fidelity in the "Greek Orthodox nation" and the "Slavic-Communist" danger, were erased from the public debates.[2] Actually, in 1974, the Communist Party of Greece (KKE), which had become outlawed since 1947, was re-legitimized. However, since 1968 it had split in the Communist Party of Greece (KKE), the pro-Soviet one, and the Communist Party of the Interior (KKE Es), the eurocommunist[3] one. The Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), KKE and KKE Es understood each other as part of the *progressive* and *democratic* forces, in juxtaposition to the ND, the governing conservative party, and all employed the *anti-Americanist discourse* as regards the desirable foreign policy of Greece.[4]

Moreover, the collapse of the dictatorship was the onset of a period of an intense politicization. Actually, a significant part of the youth had been active in the 1960s as well under the left-wing Democratic Youth Lambrakis (DNL)[5]. The latter was

[2] Yiannis Voulgaris, H Ellada ths metapoliteysis, 1974-1990, statheri dimokratia simademeni apo ti metapolemiki istoria, Athens 2002, pg. 60

[3] These communist parties supported freedom of press and religious belief, and advocated political pluralism. They included the Italian Communist Party (PCI), the French Communist Party (PCF), the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) and other, smaller ones.

[4] Yiannis Voulgaris, H Ellada ths metapoliteysis, 1974-1990, statheri dimokratia simademeni apo ti metapolemiki istoria, Athens 2002, pg. 60.

[5] The DNL, according to Vernardakis and Mayris, had 37,000 members and could mobilize up to 100,000 in 1965.Quote from Katsapis, K., "Hxoi kai apohxoi: koinwnikh istoria tou rok en rol fainomenou sthn Ellada, 1956-67" (Sounds and echoes: A social history of rock ´n´ roll in Greece, unpublished PhD thesis, Panteion University, 2006), pg. 309

created in 1964, after the assassination of the leftist MP Grigoris Lambrakis by extreme rightists and it was a merger of the Youth of EDA[6] (N. EDA), which acted under the guidance of the party, and of the Democratic Movement of Youth Grigoris Lambrakis (DKNGL), a more autonomous left-wing group. DNL was closely related to EDA, but was not officially guided by the latter. Its members struggled for more funding for education, demanding 15% of the budget to this direction; they also protested against the limitations to free expression of the leftists that existed, such as the certificates of social beliefs that recorded the political orientation of every citizen, stigmatizing the opponents of the regime. The imposition of the dictatorship in 1967 brought this militancy to an end, as EDA and DNL were outlawed and, subsequently, dissolved. Nevertheless, in the early 1970s, there was a new wave of politicization of students, which culminated after the collapse of the dictatorship in 1974. In the first years of the re-establishment of democracy, the activity of left-wing student organizations, was remarkable: students participated en masse not only in the elections of student bodies, but also in mass gatherings that defined the ideological orientation of the Greek universities; the crucial role of *progressive* student groups in the writing of the regulations of their schools as well as in the de-juntisation committees, charged with the responsibility to remove members of staff who had co-operated with the militaristic regime, were signs of their increasing influence.[7]

In fact, the two communist parties attracted a significant bulk of university students after the collapse of the dictatorship.[8] The two strongest communist youth groups in Greece were the *Communist Youth of Greece* (KNE), affiliated with the Communist Party of Greece, and *Rigas Feraios* (RF) affiliated with the Communist Party of the Interior, with the former having been created in 1968 and

[6] EDA (United Democratic Left) was the umbrella party of the Left in post-war Greece that included the members of the then outlawed KKE in Greece.
[7] Yiannis Voulgaris, H Ellada ths metapoliteysis, 1974-1990, statheri dimokratia simademeni apo ti metapolemiki istoria, Athens 2002.
[8] Ibid, pg. 249-55. An evidence of the strength of KNE are the results of its student branch, Panspoudastiki, in the student elections during this period: 20% (2nd) in 1974, 23,2% (2nd) in 1975, 27,4% (1st) in 1976, 27,3% (1st) in 1977, 30,6% (1st) in 1978. Data is based upon the results released by the EFEE (National Student Union of Greece).

the latter in 1967, following the dissolution of the DNL. The main difference between them was the disagreement concerning the alliance between the Greek communist parties and the political leadership of the Soviet Union and the eastern block countries, with KNE being pro-Soviet and RF being sceptical towards the USSR.[9]

As regards KKE and KNE, they claimed to be the *vanguard of the popular struggle*. Concomitantly, KKE and KNE attempted to show that they were the sole expression of the communist orthodoxy, in contrast to leftist "extremists" and to "rightist opportunists" (meaning the current of eurocommunism), although they recognized Rigas Feraios as another "progressive" and "democratic" group.

This paper wishes to go further into the discourse of KNE and focused on the period 1974-78. The following questions are examined:

1) What was the ideal communist subjectivity fostered by KNE?
2) What role was "culture" (politismos) supposed to play in its forging?[10]
3) How were the categories of gender, nation and generation articulated and defined as part of this narrative?
4) What images of "American" and "Soviet" modernity were employed in their narratives about "culture" (politismos) ?

[9] Actually, the distancing from USSR was not a Greek peculiarity; especially since the Soviet invasion in Prague, a number of Communist parties in Western Europe, such as the Spanish, the French and the Italian, became less and less influenced by the Soviet regime and embraced the doctrine of e*urocommunism*: these communist parties supported freedom of press and religious belief, and advocated political pluralism. They were influenced by movements of protest that had appeared since the late 1960s, such as the feminist.

[10] At this point, it should be clarified that my use of the term "culture" does not coincide with that of KNE. As regards my approach, culture is not limited to arts, but is understood with the broader sense to include everyday life practices .For such a definition, see Hugh Mackay, "Introduction" in Mackay, H. (ed.), Consumption and everyday life (London 1997), pg. 7. The definition offered by KNE is analysed below. To avoid confusions, when referring to the discourse of KNE, the term will be put in brackets.

2) Theoretical background

As regards the theoretical underpinnings of this paper, it should be first of all clarified that emphasis is attached to the self-perceived identity of the examined political group; [11] the forging of identities in general cannot be understood outside the discourses that convey certain classifications and values, which determine the subjective understanding of interests.[12] In the historiography of communism, in fact, the examination of representations and narratives is acquiring an increasing importance.[13]

In particular, my PhD in general has to do with the reception of American culture in Greece, for the examination of which the concept of "cultural imperialism" seems to be of little heuristic value, as it underestimates the agency of its recipients.[14] My work resonates with approaches that highlight the fact that American cultural patterns are re-contextualized and appropriated in various ways, as concepts, such as "Networks of Americanisation" [15], used by the Swedish social anthropologist Ulf Hannerz, and "Americanisation from below" [16],

[11] For an example of such an approach, see Jon Lawrence, "Class and gender in the making of Urban Toryism, 1880-1914", The English Historical Review, vol. 108 (Jul 1993), pg. 630

[12] For the cultural turn in history and in social sciences in general, see: Dirks, N., Eley, G., Ortner, S., (ed.), Culture/Power/History: A reader in Contemporary Social Theory (New Jersey 1994) and Hunt, L. (ed.), The New Cultural History (London 1989)

[13] For the case of USSR, see, for instance, the use of the concept of "stories" in: Sheila Fitzpatrick, Everyday Stalinism. Ordinary Life in extraordinary times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s (Oxford 1999) and the discourse analysis of Interwar diaries in Jochen Hellbeck, Klaus Heller, Autobiographical practices in Russia (Goettingen 2004). For the use of "stories" case of the Italian Communist Party, see: Kertzer, D., Politics and Symbols: The Italian Communist Party and the fall of communism (New Haven 1996)

[14] For such a use, see Herbert Schiller, *Mass Communications and American Empire* (New York 1969) and Herbert Schiller, *Communication and Mass Domination* (New York 1976).

[15] Ulf Hannerz, Networks of Americanisation. Aspects of the American Influence in Sweden (Uppsala 1992).

[16] See Kaspar Maase, Bravo Amerika: Erkundungen zur Jugendkultur der Bundesrepublik in der fünfziger Jahren (Hamburg 1992). For an approach of American culture as appropriated by

used by Maase, show. However, what emerges from the written sources of the Greek communist youth groups in the 1970s is the fact that what is labeled as "American" may not necessarily emanate from the USA. Thus, in this paper, while the discourse on "Americanization" shall be approached as a reflexive engagement with issues concerning the present and future of Greek society, the term "American" shall be approached as to an extent de-territorialised *concept-metaphor*, referring sometimes to the geographical setting of the USA, but often to a number of countries coined as "capitalist".[17] Furthermore, the connotations of "America" will be approached as *multi-dimensional*, stressing that there were representations of an "other" America, different from the negatively signified "American Way of Life". As mentioned by Passerini and Laliotou, the issue of "which America" is mentioned in the representations shall be taken seriously into account.[18]

Moreover, it shall be argued that the "American Way of Life" is a wide semantic field. Thus, the perception of the Self, of what was juxtaposed to the "American Way of Life", has to be examined carefully. In fact, KNE stressed that, in order to help combat this "way of life", it had to contribute to the "preservation" and "diffusion" of "progressive art" and, most prominently, the "militant popular traditions of the Greek people". The latter, alike concepts, such as "authentic" and "folk" are approached in this paper as *socially constructed and historically malleable*, subject to the dynamics of categories, such as class, gender and race.[19] Thus, the symbolic and value system of the grand narrative of left-wing

---

Europeans, see also Richard Pells, Not like US: how Europeans have loved, hated, and transformed American culture since World War II (New York, 1997) and Uta Poiger, Jazz, Rock and Rebels, Cold War and American Culture in a divided Germany (London 2000).

[17] Ioanna Laliotou, Louisa Passerini, "Preface: An experiment in teaching and learning", in: Passerini, L. (ed.), Across the Atlantic: Cultural exchanges between Europe and the United States (Brussels 2000), pg. 14.

[18] Ibid

[19] For an example of such an approach, see Robin Kelley, « Notes on deconstructing « The Folk » », The American Historical Review, vol. 97, no 5 (Dec 1992), pg. 1400-08.

patriotism shall be examined with special interest in the positioning of gender and generation relationships within it.

Finally, special interest shall be attached to both *cultural flows and representations of modernity of the socialist countries*, particularly, USSR, which featured prominently in the discourse of KNE. Actually, through the examination of this group it shall be argued that the analysis of the impact of the USSR as a role-model, should cease to be confined to Eastern Europe, as has happened until now,[20] and should be taken into account for the western part of the continent as well.

3) Social and cultural changes in Greece since the 1960s

As a matter of fact, since the late 1950s a new regime of consumption began to diffuse, which continued after the imposition of the dictatorship as well: the consumer expectations of all social strata tended to converge; the lower social strata oriented themselves to goods considered until then as treats, such as fridges and cars.[21] Moreover, the dissemination of television on a national level, especially during the years of the dictatorship, is telling: in fact, in the first post-war years, 26% of the households in the rural areas claimed to own a TV set,

[20] For the concept of "Sowjetisierung" (Sovietization) in the case of the Democratic Republic, see: Jarausch, K., Siegrist, H., Amerikanisierung und Sowjetisierung in Deutschland, 1945-1970 (Frankfurt 1997) and Michael Lemke," Foreign Influences on the Dictatorial Development of the GDR, 1949-1955", in: Jarausch, K. (ed.), Dictatorship as experience. Towards a socio-cultural history of the GDR (New York and Oxford 1999). For an argumentation in favour of finding ways to overcome the acute division of East and West Europe, see: 'How to bring Eastern Europe in? ', unpublished lecture by Arfon Rees in the Summer School of Comparative History of the European University Institute in Florence, August 2005.

[21] See Karapostolis, Vassilis, H katanalwtiki symperifora sthn ellhnikh koinwnia, 1960-75 (Consumerist behavior in Greek society 1960-1975, Athens 1984). It is noteworthy that similar changes occurred in other European countries since the late 1950s. For the case of West Germany, see Wildt, M., "Consumer Mentality in West Germany" in R. Bessel, D. Schumann (ed.), Life after death : approaches to a cultural and social history during the 1940s and 1950 (Cambridge 2003).

whereas 88% of the rural population claimed to be watching television at home or at public spaces, such as the kafeneia, on a daily basis.[22]

The shifting horizons of consumerist expectations went hand in hand with the challenging of traditional[23] patterns of gender and generation relationships. In particular, in the 1960s, daughters began to acquire more freedom in selecting their partners, who, however, were expected to be their future husbands; the father and their brothers were supposed not to impose their will through violence, but through discussion.[24] In other words, a new family model *started* emerging, based more on mutual understanding and less on violence.[25]

The re-configuration of the family model was facilitated by the growing number of students, including those of rural origin, since the early 1960s: from less than 30,000 in 1960, they rose to approximately 80,000 in 1972.[26] A lot of young people left the Greek periphery to study and live in the urban centers (and, especially, in Athens and Salonica), often being away from their parents,[27] what made difficult the implementation of the norms of the traditional patriarchal family. In fact, in 1968-69 the two-thirds of the student population did not come from either Athens or Salonica.[28] Moreover, it has to be stressed that since the early

[22] See Karapostolis, Vassilis, H katanalwtiki symperifora sthn ellhnikh koinwnia, 1960-75 (Consumerist behavior in Greek society 1960-1975, Athens 1984). For the impact of American television programs on Greek identity, see Franklin Hess, "Singular Visions, Multiple Futures: Culture, Politics and American Mass Media in Modern Greece" (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Iowa, 1999).

[23] At this point, it should be clarified that, when referring to patterns of gender and generation relationships, the term "traditional" is used in a schematic way, trying to capture the patriarchal set of relationships existing in most parts of the country. On no account, however, is the possibility of exceptions to this pattern precluded. Moreover, to avoid misunderstandings, I put the term "tradition" in brackets, when its conceptualization by the Left is depicted.

[24] Avdela E., Dia logous timhs (For reasons of honor, Athens 2002), pg. 236

[25] Ibid, pg. 239-40

[26] Kostis Kornetis., "Student resistance to the Greek military dictatorship :subjectivity, memory, and cultural politics, 1967-1974" (unpublished PhD thesis, European University Institute 2006), pg. 48

[27] Despite the ongoing process of urbanization, the rural population was still high and often parents did not move to the cities together with their children.

[28] See Kostis Kornetis., "Student resistance to the Greek military dictatorship :subjectivity, memory, and cultural politics, 1967-1974" (unpublished PhD thesis, European University Institute 2006), pg. 49

1960s, as a result of more flexible family strategies, a rising number of young women started entering the university.[29]

In the context of the emergence of a new family model, new forms of sociality began to appear since the late 1950s, what could be termed as youth cultures. In particular, young men and women began to gather in absence of their parents, having specific dressing styles, music preferences and linguistic idioms. Obviously, these identities were based on consumerist patterns and not on relations of production.[30] At this point, it should be clarified that "youth culture"[31] was a plural phenomenon, however, with different forms of youth identity and sociality appearing, such as the young leftists as well as the fans of rock ´n´ roll, labeled as ye-yedes. Rock music started disseminating in the mid-1950s and had become immensely popular by the mid-1960s, especially the bands "Beatles" and the "Rolling Stones", with the former enjoying a relative lead.[32] Many of their fans started forming their own amateur bands, while they endorsed a more casual dress code, wearing jeans (the men) and mini skirts (the women).

Initially, the Greek Left (mainly expressed by EDA) was hostile towards rock ´n´ roll, coining it part of the "American Way of Life", together with Hollywood cinema, porn movies and billiard halls, which they blamed for de-politicisation and juvenile delinquency. The main leftist youth groups, initially N. EDA (Youth of EDA) and, since 1964, DNL, developed a highly normative discourse, professing to instill to their members the "militant popular traditions"; this discourse was part of the claim by the Greek Left in general to represent the "authentic Greek Nation" in contrast with the conservative forces, labeled as "stooges of imperialism", a claim that intensified in the mid-1950s due to the rebellion of

[29] Ibid
[30] For such a definition, see Liakos, A., H emfanisi twn neanikwn orgnwsewn. H periptwsh ths Thessalonikis (The appearance of youth organizations. The case of Salonica, Athens 1988)
[31] So, as at the beginning of this paragraph, it is preferable to refer to youth cultures instead of a youth culture.
[32] Katsapis, K., "Hxoi kai apohxoi: koinwnikh istoria tou rok en rol fainomenou sthn Ellada, 1956-67" (Sounds and echoes: A social history of rock ´n´ roll in Greece, unpublished PhD thesis, Panteion University, 2006), pg. 181

Greek Cypriot forces against the British administration.[33] The preservation of the "militant popular traditions" was correlated with the initiative of a number of Greek intellectuals, including Mikis Theodorakis, leader of the DNL, to set poetry into music, in order to "purify" the "popular tradition" from foreign influences, what was coined "artistic popular"(entexno laiko) trend.[34] Coterminous with the "popular traditions", according to the DNL, was a specific pattern of sexual relationships among young men and women, which favoured stable relationships leading to marriage. Nevertheless, the activities in the DNL had also an empowering element in the relationships of their male and female members, who co-existed and worked together in mass events, such as the demonstrations in July, 1965. Moreover, they began to socialize without their parents in boites[35] and in parties in the Clubs of DNL.[36]

The young leftists started interacting with the rock n´ roll fans in 1967, when such a group participated in a peace concert organized by the DNL.[37] This interaction intensified in the early 1970s: many young Greek leftists, especially those living in urban centers, such as left-wing students, became familiar, apart from Dylan and Baez, with musicians of experimental rock, such as the Pink Floyd, Led

[33] For the representations of the Greek nation in the discourse of the Left in post-Civil War Greece, see Venetia Apostolidou, Logotexnia kai Istoria sth metapolemikh Aristera: h parembash tou Dimitri Xatzi, 1947-81 (Literature and History in the post-war Left: the intervention by Dimitris Chatzis, 1947-81) (Athens, 2003).

[34] For a relevant analysis, see Dimitris Papanikolaou, "Sxhmatizontas th neolaia: O Theodorakis, o Savvopoulos kai "tou `60 oi ekdromeis" " (Shaping the youth: Theodorakis, Savvopoulos and the "travelers of the `60"), unpublished article, and Dimitris Papanikolaou, Singing Poets: Popular Music and Literature in France and Greece (Oxford 2007). See also the intervention by Akis Gavriilidis in Seventh Conference of the Greek Society of Political Science in the following website:http://www.politikinet.gr/conference2005/SYNEDROI/gavriilidis.html , as well as his book Gavriilidis, A., H atherapeyti nekrofilia tou rizospastikou patriwtismou (The unremedied necrophilia of the radical patriotism, Athens 2006)

[35] The boites were small spaces, where young people gathered to listen to live music. They firstly appeared in France, to be found in Greece since the early 1960s until the late 1970s. Many boites existed in the area of Plaka in Athens.

[36] The Clubs of the DNL were the spaces where the theatrical or musical groups related to the DNL gathered. They usually included a library. Apart from the bigger urban centers, they existed in smaller towns of the Greek periphery as well.

[37] Katsapis, K., "Hxoi kai apohxoi: koinwnikh istoria tou rok en rol fainomenou sthn Ellada, 1956-67" (Sounds and echoes: A social history of rock ´n´ roll in Greece, unpublished PhD thesis, Panteion University, 2006), pg. 383

Zeppelin, even with music bands that in the 1960s were largely criticized by the DNL, such as the Beatles.[38]An important result of this interaction was changes in the dress code of the young leftists. In particular, young male leftist students ceased to wear suits and ties and embraced military jackets and jeans, whereas feminine students started wearing trousers.[39] The outer appearance of the left-wing students was also influenced by the hippies, who gathered in specific areas of Greece, such as Matala. Although none of the leftist youth organizations had developed relationships with the hippies, young leftists employed elements of the latter, such as the hand-woven bags.[40]

Finally, since the early 1970s, pre-marital sexual intercourse started becoming more acceptable among young leftists. Homosexuality, however, was still a taboo.[41]

Nevertheless, it has to be clarified that, with the exception of the dress code, the aforementioned changes did not spread to the entire spectrum of the leftist youth. The issues of music taste and sexual intercourse in fact were a terrain of contest between various leftist youth organizations in the years that followed the collapse of the dictatorship.

4) The framework of the discourse of KNE, 1974-78

After the restitution of democracy, the Greek Left tried again to “preserve the militant popular traditions” by fostering a “progressive cultural movement” (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma). The Other was again the “American Way of Life”.

[38] Kostis Kornetis, “Student resistance to the Greek military dictatorship :subjectivity, memory, and cultural politics, 1967-1974” (unpublished PhD thesis, European University Institute 2006), pg. 239
[39] Ibid, pg. 261
[40] Ibid, pg. 227, 253
[41] Ibid, pg. 256-57

In general, in the texts of KNE in the period 1974-1978, the dominant bipolar model was "imperialism" against the "peoples".[42] In particular, the imperialist centres with the USA being the most prominent one were represented as exploiting a number of countries, which were portrayed as "dependent" upon them. The representation of the "imperialist" forces bears the first key ambiguity of the discourse of KNE: these forces were on the one hand described as "very powerful", "with sharp teeth".[43] On the other hand, they were described as "rotting" and "dying".[44]

In the case of Greece, the "bourgeois class" in the 1970s was represented as helping the "imperialist" centres exploit the Greek economic resources and allowing "imperialist" troops to station in Greece and pose a threat for socialist countries.[45] Actually, the Greek "bourgeois class" was portrayed as trying to oppress the "progressive art" and, most prominently, the "popular traditions of the Greek people",[46] what had happened since the establishment of the Greek state. Nevertheless, since the 1950s it also actively promoted the "American Way of Life", which was the cultural dimension of the "dependence" of the "bourgeois class" upon the "imperialist USA" since the late 1940s.

[42] See some core theoretical texts of KNE: the speech of the secretary generals of KNE and KKE in the 1st and the 2nd Festival of KNE; the Decision of the 1st Convention of KNE, 1976; and the Declaration of KNE about the "militant class patriot education of youth", 1977.
[43] "Moral conformism and moral anarchism: "humanism" and class wrath", Odigitis, 7 October 1977, pg. 17
[44] "Socialism, Capitalism", Odigitis, 17 September 1976, pg. 8
[45] "9 years of KNE: Extracts from the speech of comrade G. Farakos in Larisa", Odigitis, 14 September 1977, pg. 9
[46] "One year after the 1st Convention of KNE: The speech of comrade D. Gonticas, secretary general of KNE", Odigitis, 5 March 1977,

5) "The militant popular traditions and the progressive cultural movement"

In fact, what the group, as well as KKE, underwent during the examined years is what Voulgaris coins *"remarx-leninisation":*[47] following extensive reflection about the reasons that led to the staging of the coup d´etat, the group argued that what played a major role was the absence of a disciplined communist organization, including its youth, since KKE in Greece had been incorporated in the apparatus of EDA since 1958. EDA, according to KNE and KKE, did not follow the communist organizational practices and, despite the important role that DNL played in "supporting a progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma)[48], the party was plagued by factionalism, what prevented them from organizing an effective struggle against the establishment of the dictatorship, according to KNE.[49] Thus, in a number of decisions and key texts by the secretaries of KNE and KKE in 1975-77, it was pointed out that the members of the Communist Youth of Greece had to undergo a constant process of "education" (diapaidagwgisi), so as to function as role-models for the entire Greek youth.[50] At this point, the second key ambiguity emerges: although Greek people are described as the "bearers of morality" in contrast with the "bourgeoisie"[51], they are also in need of education.[52]

[47] Yiannis Voulgaris, H Ellada ths metapoliteysis, 1974-1990, statheri dimokratia simademeni apo ti metapolemiki istoria, Athens 2002, pg. 112

[48] In fact, DNL referred to either the "militant popular traditions" or the "national democratic culture". It fostered the creation of Clubs, as mentioned above and practices, such as planting trees. It also planned to organize a youth festival, but did not eventually manage to do so. For more, see Saint-Marten, K., Lambrakides. Istoria mias genias (Lambrakides. History of a generation, Athens 1984), pg. 96

[49] It is telling that Charilaos Florakis, the secretary general of KKE, claimed in his speech in the first Festivals of KNE that: "(KNE) keeps the **best elements** left behind by the activity of the DNL (…)" . The bold is mine. For more, see: "Youth and experience in one body for the most beautiful ideal" (speech of C. Florakis in the First Festival of KNE), Odigitis, 25 September 1975, pg.7

[50] The speech of the secretary generals of KNE and KKE in the 1st and the 2nd Festival of KNE; the Decision of the 1st Convention of KNE, 1976; and the Declaration of KNE about the "militant class patriot education of youth", 1977.

[51] Recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg 17.

The major task of "education" (diapaidagwgisi) was, first of all, to help forge the ideal communist subjectivity. In the discourse of KNE, the ideal young communist had to be educated as an "uncompromising militant", as the pathway to the socialist future would require hard struggles.[53] What emerged was a communist subject, which was defined as "civilised" and was centered on his/her political activity. Actually, in the biographies of "exemplary comrades" or "heroes" of the communist movement in Greece and worldwide circulating in the texts of KNE, the individual mentioned had to exhibit very specific elements: participation in the common struggle, organised by the "vanguard" Communist Party and its youth, either to repel "fascist" or "imperialist" forces, hard work to establish progressive institutions and self-denial, culminating in the sacrifice of his/her life.[54] No member was regarded as a special individual, but as part of a collectivity. In fact, the concept of "free time", fully detached from the requirements of the development of the aforementioned identity, was not acceptable in KNE. Every facet of the life of its members had to revolve around the digestion of the elements of the ideal communist subjectivity as well as to function as a role-model for the rest of the youth.[55] Thus, the limits between "personal" and "political" were very vague for those organized in KNE.

The "exemplary" member of KNE had to follow specific patterns of behaviour in gender and generation relationships, too. In the case of the former, gender representations were under-sexualised and based on the idea of "restraint": non-stable relationships were deemed as "immoral", as shall be discussed below, and

---

[52] For this ambiguity, see the intervention by Akis Gavriilidis in Seventh Conference of the Greek Society of Political Science in the following website:http://www.politikinet.gr/conference2005/SYNEDROI/gavriilidis.html .

[53] "Declaration of KNE", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg. 10-11.See, also, Farakos, G., Youth and the labour movement (Athens, 1977)-it was written in 1972, but circulated five years later, as well as the speech of Grigoris Farakos to the Central Council of KNE in 1977, in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977).

[54] "The moral aspects of a communist", part 3, Odigitis, 3 July 1977, pg. 15.

[55] "For the education of the youth masses", Odigitis, 19 December 1975, pg. 10

preventing young people from concentrating on struggle. Acceptable relationships, considered only between heterosexual persons, had to be stable and long-lasting, eventually leading to marriage;[56] sexuality was not discussed even as part of the frame of the stable couple: the latter had to be based on "spiritual values" and its relationship was described as "sentimental" and never as "sexual". As it was mentioned in the Declaration of KNE about the "militant class patriot education of youth":

> "(Young people should have) stable sentimental relationships, away from the economic and social restrictions that prejudices impose, but, simultaneously, (young people) should combat every sign of degeneration of moral corruption".[57]

As regards the relations between young people and their parents, the organisation claimed that often the moral code and the political preferences of the two sides differed, what brought tensions. However, young people had again to show "restraint", even if their parents detested their communist militancy: parents, according to KNE, "worked hard" for the welfare of their children, what the latter had to respect and follow their example as part of the struggle against "imperialism and the monopolies".[58] As the Recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977 mentioned,

> "It is unacceptable for the members of KNE and especially its cadres to break ties with their families (…) our point of departure should be that the parents suffer and may have sacrificed much for their children"[59]

[56] "Dowry: a parochial institution", first part, Odigitis, 13 August 1976, pg. 9.
[57] "Declaration of KNE", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg. 13
[58] "A manipulated problem: the relationships of the young people with their families", Odigitis, 1 April 1977.
[59] "Recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg. 18

Moreover, young people had to regulate their behaviour in two domains: entertainment and school. The former should not be extended late at night. Pupils and students had to excel, to be "first at school and first in the struggle", in order to satisfy their parents.[60] The eventual target of KNE was that its members through their political behaviour persuade their parents to shift political allegiance and join KKE.[61]

In general, the regulation of gender and generation relationships had to be implemented in such a way, so as to ensure the unity of what KNE described as the agent of struggle: the "Greek people". Therefore, every kind of behaviour that differed from the aforementioned, including left-wing political organisations with different priorities, such as the feminist movements or organisations inspired by Marcuse[62] were deemed as "de-orienting" and deviating from the basic conflict, according to the group, namely "peoples" against "imperialism". According to the group, youth was a special category, but its struggle was represented as "inseparable" from that of the "people" in general, including persons older in age. It is telling that KNE represented itself as supplementary to KKE, supposed to provide the latter with "real revolutionaries", when its members were so old that they could no longer be part of a youth group. Moreover, a senior figure of KKE, like Farakos, who was in his fifties during the 1970s, actively interfered with the ideological background of KNE as regards the "life with meaning" and the "American Way of Life". The ideal relationship between the party and its youth organisation was perhaps better illustrated by the anthropomorphic metaphor

[60] Speech of Grigoris Farakos to the Central Council of KNE, in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977).
[61] "The speech of comrade C. Florakis in the Second Festival of Kne-Odigitis", Odigitis, 17 September 1976, pg. 14-15.
[62] Marcuse was particularly detested for challenging the vanguard role of the proletariat and for showing preference to groups, like the hippies. For more about the stance of KNE towards Marcuse**,** see "Ideological campaign for the de-orientation of the youth", Odigitis, 15 April 1977, pg. 13

used by the secretary general of KKE, Florakis: “youth and experience in one body for the most beautiful ideal”.[63]

Actually, the activity of the group was extrovert and aimed at disseminating what KNE called a “life with meaning” to the entire Greek youth. As the Declaration about the “militant class patriot education of youth” stated,

> “(The members of KNE) should ideal men/women and militants for the masses of the Greek society, for their parents, for our entire people (…)”[64]

The “life with meaning” consisted of the desirable political subjectivity, as well as of the aforementioned gender and generation relationships, had to spread to young people who were still not members of the organisation, what would happen through the “preservation of the militant popular traditions”. Both the “life with meaning” and the artistic creation that would enable its establishment were for KNE the connotations of “culture”(politismos). Nevertheless, the group employed the term in a highly normative manner, distinguishing the “popular traditions”, which were “true art” and “culture” (politismos) of “high quality”,[65] from the “American Way of Life” would be named as “pseudo-culture”, consisting of “sub-products”.[66] To make this distinction more palpable, KNE employed various metaphors to describe the latter: “dirty”[67], “decadent”, “rotten” and “dark” were some key ones, in contrast to the “progressive art”, which was represented as the reflection of a “vigorous” and “sturdy” world.[68]In fact, sometimes KNE used the term “civilisation” (koultoura) instead of “culture” (politismos) to describe the

[63] “Youth and experience in one body for the most beautiful ideal” (speech of C. Florakis in the First Festival of KNE), Odigitis, 25 September 1975, pg.7.
[64] “Declaration of KNE”, in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg.11
[65] “The song: course and perspective”, Odigitis, 4 June 1975, pg. 7.
[66] For example, see “Thirty years Truman Doctrine, thirty years of national dependence”, Odigitis, 11 March 1977, pg. 19, and “Declaration of KNE”, in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg.8.
[67] For the metaphorical use of “dirt”, see: Douglas, M., Purity and Danger (London 1966).
[68] “The incomprehensible art as a consequence of capitalism”, Odigitis, 25 October 1974, pg. 7 and “The song: course and perspective”, Odigitis, 4 June 1975, pg. 7.

"progressive art" or to refer to a "civilised way of life"[69], another term for "life with meaning"; even when using the term "culture"(politismos), its meaning should be understood as a conflation of both.[70]

The "militant popular traditions" included various cultural patterns. Most references under this rubric were to music and, particularly, the following genres: "*folk (dimotiko) , rempetiko[71] and the songs of resistance"* (*antartiko*, namely of EAM[72], the National Liberation Front).[73] A number of artists, whose aim was to "preserve and disseminate" folk (dimotiki) music, such as Domna Samiou and Dora Stratou were often presented in "Odigitis", the weekly newspaper of the organisation, and appeared in the festivals of the organisation, as shall be analysed below.[74] As regards rempetiko, it was detested in the 1960s by the Left; nevertheless, it was becoming increasingly part of the leftist youth culture since the early 1970s, as left-wing students gathered in taverns, and sang such songs.[75] In the mid-1970s, artists singing rembetiko songs, like Sotiria Bellou, appeared in the Festivals of KNE.[76]

Although the "popular militant traditions" revolved around music, the latter was not their only constituent. In "Odigitis", there were some articles about *craft*, as well, while craft artefacts, like pottery from the island of Sifnos, were sold in the festivals of KNE.[77] Moreover, a genre that attracted some attention by KNE was

[69] For example, see "Recommendation by the Central Council", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg. 25
[70] The term "culture" (politismos) was bisemic in another sense as well: sometimes it was equated merely with arts and sometimes with every kind of everyday practice, equated with the "way of life", but only with its desirable forms, namely the "life with meaning".
[71] Rempetiko is a kind of music that developed among Greek refugees from Turkey, mainly in the Interwar period.
[72] EAM was formed in 1941 from a number of leftist or centre-leftist organisations, aiming to fight against the Tripartite Occupation of Greece (1941-44).
[73] "The song: course and perspective", Odigitis, 4 June 1975, pg. 7.
[74] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 17 September 1975, pg. 18 and "The culture of the people is the power of the people", Odigitis, 30 July 1976, pg. 12
[75] Kostis Kornetis, "Student resistance to the Greek military dictatorship :subjectivity, memory, and cultural politics, 1967-1974" (unpublished PhD thesis, European University Institute 2006), pg. 251
[76] "Ahead of the Festival of KNE-Odigitis", Odigitis, 10 September 1975, pg. 5
[77] Ibid

"Karagiozis": a form of popular theatre with satirical content emanating from the Ottoman Empire, which was becoming extinct in post-war Greece.[78] Finally, "Odigitis" organised a brief campaign in favour of collecting information about "traditions", during which a number of descriptions of folk festivals (panhgyria) appeared.[79]

In general, the "popular militant traditions of Greece" were regarded as compatible with other genres: First of all, classical music, such as the works of Beethoven, described in "Odigitis", as bearing the feelings of "victory" and "revolution".[80] Folk music bands from other countries, such as Bulgaria and Chile, were also endorsed and appeared in the Festivals of KNE every year.[81]

Moreover, the "traditions" were deemed compatible with what was named "contemporary progressive artistic creation". The latter was quite diverse: first of all, it included the work of a number of composers that was described as "political song". Some of them, like Theodorakis, had appeared since the 1960s, whereas others, such as Thanos Mikroutsikos and Andriopoulos in the 1970s. These composers bore in common that they set poems into music-what had started, as shown above, in the 1960s as "artistic popular" (entexno laiko).[82] Some examples are: Poems of Seferis set to music by Andriopoulos as "Seferis´ Circle", the "Music Act on poetry by Brecht" by Mikroutsikos, "Epitaphios", "Romiossini" (poetry of both by Ritsos), "Mikres Kyklades" (poetry by Elytis) by Theodorakis.[83] The "contemporary progressive artistic creation" expanded to other arts as well: the poetry of Ritsos and Varnalis, literature about the Civil War (such as the "Kataxtimeni Xwra", ie Occupied Land, by Efi Panselinou), as well as plays by

[78] "A small report of the great Karagiozis", Odigitis, 19 February 1977, pg. 11
[79] "The culture of the people is the power of the people", Odigitis, 9 July 1976, pg. 16
[80] "Ludwig van Beethoven", Odigitis, 15 April 1977, pg. 12
[81] "Ahead of the Festival of KNE-Odigitis", Odigitis, 10 September 1975, pg. 5
[82] For a relevant analysis, see Dimitris Papanikolaou, "Sxhmatizontas th neolaia: O Theodorakis, o Savvopoulos kai "tou `60 oi ekdromeis" " (Shaping the youth: Theodorakis, Savvopoulos and the "travelers of the `60"), unpublished article, and Dimitris Papanikolaou, Singing Poets: Popular Music and Literature in France and Greece (Oxford 2007)
[83] For example, see "The song: course and perspective", Odigitis, 4 June 1975, pg. 7.

Brecht (such as “The Petty Bourgeois Wedding”) and Tschechov (such as the “Wedding”) were presented in “Odigitis”.[84] In fact, Ritsos, a member of KKE, often appeared in the Festivals of KNE to read his poems; he had also dedicated part of his work to the group, like the poem “The children of KNE” (written in 1977).[85]

Another element of the “contemporary progressive artistic creation” had to do with cinema. In particular, “Odigitis” promoted the works by film directors of the “New Hellenic Cinema” trend[86], like the movies “The Travelling Players” and the “Hunters” by Angelopoulos.[87] Concerning the former, it was commented in “Odigitis” that “the historical and socio-political space is portrayed in such a heart-breaking realist attitude for the first time in the Greek cinema”.[88] The group was also in favour of the French Nouvelle Vague cinema: the Club of Panspoudastiki, namely the space where the student group of KNE held events, showed movies by Godard, such as “Alphaville” and “Pierrot le fou”.[89] They also urged the state television channels not to show Italian neorealist movies late at night, so that the “working people” will be able to watch them.[90] It should be stressed that some genres of American cinema were also included: primarily, the movies of Charlie Chaplin. When the latter died in 1977, “Odigitis” devoted to some pages to him. Although Chaplin´s character, “The Tramp”[91], was an anti-hero, deviating from the model of “organised struggle” that KNE put forth, Chaplin

[84] For example, “Brecht and the Berliner Ensemble”, Odigitis, 9 October 1974, pg. 15, “Art, Letters, Life”, Odigitis, 3 February 1977, pg. 11 and “Your honour, our honour, poet”, Odigitis, 29 April 1977, pg. 5
[85] “Children of KNE”, Odigitis, 23 September 1977, pg. 7
[86] This trend cannot easily be defined, as it was not a rather homogeneous category. In general, it was politically oriented and influenced by non-Greek realist trends, such as the French Nouvelle Vague.
[87] “Art, Letters, Life”, Odigitis, 24 October 1975, pg. 15 and “Art, Letters, Life”, Odigitis, 27 October 1977, pg. 12
[88] “Art, Letters, Life”, Odigitis, 24 October 1975, pg. 15
[89] “Art, Letters, Life”, Odigitis, 27 August 1975, pg. 12
[90] “Greek television”, Odigitis, 9 January 1976, pg. 25
[91] Known as “Charlot” in a number of countries, including Greece

was described as a “fighter for peace” and as “highly critical of the inequalities existing in the American society”.[92]

Generally speaking, the axis of all the works included under the rubrics of “popular militant traditions” and “contemporary progressive artistic creation”, often mentioned together as “progressive art”, were the feelings that, according to the group, these works helped disseminate: the “resentment for exploitation” was a necessary prerequisite, coupled, usually, with the “optimism for the victory of the oppressed against the oppressors”. [93] Concomitantly, the approved style was the realistic, in order to make sure that the audience “understands as far as possible" what is reading/listening/watching and avoids the “confusion” that modernist trends cause, according to the group.[94]These feelings, as KNE claimed, cultivated an energetic audience, opting for “struggle”. In other words, the “progressive art”, according to the group, helped the forging of the militant identity that it desired to foster among young Greek people.[95] Especially the “popular militant traditions of the Greek people” were represented in a reified manner as an “immortal” set of cultural patterns that reflected the “heroic” past of Greeks; in the brand of patriotism endorsed by KNE, the Greek nation was represented as the victim of heavy exploitation, but simultaneously as being militant by its nature, with the War for Independence in 1821 and the Resistance against the Tripartite Occupation[96] in 1941-44 as the peaks of its militancy. It is telling that KNE used an old slogan of EPON (United Panhellenic Youth Organisation, the youth organisation of EAM), “we struggle and we sing”, as slogan for its second festival in 1976. Therefore, the “Greek traditions” were *“progressive”* by their very nature, according to KNE in the sense that they

[92] “Charlie Chaplin: “I am simply an active partisan for peace” “, Odigitis, 5 January 1978.
[93] See, for example, “The educational role of KNE”, Odigitis, 05 December 1975, pg. 11
[94] “The incomprehensible art as a consequence of capitalism”, Odigitis, 25 October 1974, pg. 7 and “The song: course and perspective”, Odigitis, 4 June 1975, pg. 7.
[95] Of course, it should not be taken for granted that this is the only interpretation of the aforementioned works. For example, Rigas Feraios, the eurocommunist youth group, praised Mikroutsikos not so much for disseminating the “feeling of struggle”, but for being quite experimental as regards the form of his work and for not limiting himself merely to the transition of a political message.
[96] German, Italian (until 1943), Bulgarian

helped encourage the struggle of the "peoples" against "imperialism".[97] Customs, such as the dowry, which were detested by the group, were never described as part of the "Greek traditions", but simply as something "anachronistic".[98]

Nevertheless, "progressive art" may have emanated from national settings different from the Greek one, provided that it helped disseminate the "resentment for exploitation" and, optimally, "optimism for the victory of the oppressed against the oppressors". However, a cultural product, in order to be deemed acceptable by KNE, it had to be attributed to a *specific nation*: whatever was considered as a mixture, as in-between different national cultures, such as the folk art that was supposedly distorted to suit the taste of tourists or Greek music with English lyrics, was strongly rejected. The only exception in this rule was the combination of works of classical music with folk music, as the promotion of the hybridic genre of "folk opera" shows.[99] In fact, classical music was the only brand of "progressive art" which, although identified as non-Greek, was not attributed to a specific nation.

Moreover, it should be stressed that the discourse of KNE about the "popular traditions" was not unambiguous: whereas some genres of the "progressive art", like folk songs (dimotika), were regarded as "progressive" per se, others were "progressive" under conditions. A clear example for this case is rembetiko: Although it was becoming increasingly acceptable by young leftists since the early 1970s, some members of KNE still viewed it as expressing "decadence" and as being related to subcultures prone to drug consumption; one member of KNE, actually, coined it as the Greek "American Way of Life".[100] Nevertheless, the official line argued that the "rempetiko" had become another expression of

[97] "The song: course and perspective", Odigitis, 4 June 1975, pg. 7.
[98] "Dowry: a parochial institution", first part, Odigitis, 13 August 1976, pg. 9.
[99] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 6 May 1977, pg. 15
[100] "Art-letters-life", Odigitis, 24 October 1975, pg. 14.

"popular culture"(laikos politismos), by being promoted by "progressive" artists, preferably in politicised events, such as the Festival of KNE.[101]

The "preservation and dissemination" of "progressive art", in every case, had two parts: the artists, who would collect and compose pieces of art, and the leftist groups, primarily KNE, which portrayed itself as the "vanguard of the youth movement", which would hold events that would make sure that the "progressive art" helps the establishment of the feeling of "youth militancy". The aim was the construction of what was coined by the left-wing organisations "progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma).[102] The latter was not simply a construction of KNE: in fact, similar moves dated back in the 1960s, as shown above, and restarted with the reinstitution of democracy with the initiative of various leftist groups, especially KNE, Rigas Feraios and the Youth of PASOK, whose classifications and priorities, however, did not always coincide.[103] In the case of KNE, the "progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma) would be a *joint project* with "every progressive cultural agent in Greece", namely even with non-members of KNE, provided that they did not criticise the organisation publicly and that they shared the core concept that the "progressive art" was a means for the politicisation of the Greek youth.[104] Thus, the group did not decline to co-operate with artists belonging to other leftist organisations, provided the above preconditions. For example, in its festivals, the singer N. Xylouris, member of the Communist Party of Greece-Interior, appeared.[105] On the contrary, KNE was at odds with Theodorakis until 1978, due to accusations of the latter, according to KNE, that the group was an "enemy of

[101] Ibid
[102] For example, see "Arts-letters-life", Odigitis, 08 October 1975, pg. 12
[103] See, for example, the exchange of views on the "cultural movement" in ANTI in 1978. There was a particularly heated debated between KNE and Rigas Feraios. The latter, representing itself as a "renovative" force, described the cultural policies of KNE as "parochial" and "conservative", sometimes likening the morality put forth by KNE as similar to that of the Church. KNE, portraying itself as the vanguard of the youth movement, considered Rigas Feraios to lack the spirit of struggle due to its reluctance to "educate" its members through the "militant popular traditions of the Greek people". For more from the perspective of KNE, see "Echoes of a Festival", Odigitis, 21 October 1977
[104] For example, see "Arts-letters-life", Odigitis, 08 October 1975, pg. 12
[105] "The song and the dance", Odigitis, 17 September 1976, pg. 6-7.

culture (politismos)"[106], what annoyed the organisation very much, given the weight it assigned to the "progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma). Members of KNE claimed to have respect for his work, but accused him for being "selfish", as his initiatives were outside the cultural project of KNE, and for "playing the game of the bourgeoisie" by attacking the cultural policies of the group.[107]

The "progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma), as viewed by KNE, would take various forms. The most important for KNE were its Festivals organised once annually since 1975. In fact, the idea of organising a youth festival was firstly expressed by DNL, who, however, did not manage to materialise it.[108] The Festivals of KNE combined concerts and screenings by "progressive artists" with speeches of cadres of KNE and KKE. The speech of the secretary general of KNE and of KKE in every festival was supposed to clarify the ideological background of the group. The Festivals took place in Athens, however, since 1976 events related to it were organised in smaller cities and towns, such as Thessaloniki, Patra, Lamia and Iraklio, to make sure that the "progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma) reaches the widest possible audience. [109]

Another form were a nexus of societies that had to reproduce the "progressive art" and in which the members of KNE were urged to participate. These included the Youth Committees at the factories; the pupil communities; cultural societies that usually appeared in the suburbs of Athens (called Democratic Youth Movements in the first post-dictatorship years); and university student cultural societies. A student society, often praised by KNE for its work, was the "Theatre

[106] "Who benefits from the claims by Mikis Theodorakis?", Odigitis, 24 September 1976, pg. 9
[107] The composer was rehabilitated in 1978 and he was the candidate of KKE for the mayoralty of Athens.
[108] Saint-Marten, K., Lambrakides. Istoria mias genias (Lambrakides. History of a generation, Athens 1984), pg. 96
[109] "4 days of song, happiness and struggle", Odigitis, 20 August 1976, pg 16.

Society of the University of Athens".[110] Again, these societies were not necessarily controlled by KNE; in fact, there was a struggle among the leftist youth groups regarding their orientation. A major disagreement had to do with whether they would be co-ordinated through a body that would set the basic guidelines of their orientation in a national level, as supported by KNE, or not, as endorsed by Rigas Feraios.[111]

Finally, "Odigitis" promoted a number of professional music bands, performing in boites.[112] The most famous of these bands were "Tampouri" and "Limeri". In their performance, these artists usually played folk (dimotika) and rempetika songs but, especially, songs of EAM and EPON, sometimes showing slides simultaneously or interchanging their music with readings from "progressive" poets.[113] The audience was not supposed to dance, but it participated with embodied activities, such as raising their fist, what is a communist gesture. Boites were at their peak in the very first post-dictatorship years, especially 1974-77; immediately afterwards more and more young people oriented themselves towards other genres, especially various kinds of rock music.[114]

[110] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 21 May 1975, pg. 12 and "By the Theatre Society of the University of Athens: The folk opera "The bridge of Arta" ", Odigitis, 6 May 1977, pg 15.
[111] For the argumentation by Rigas Feraios, see, for example: "For a new form of organisation of the cultural movement", Thourios, 20 January 1976, pg. 14.
[112] It is interesting that the performance of the "popular traditional" music took place in boites, a space that was an import from France, but was never coined as "foreign", what brings us to the argument by D.Miller that transnationally flowing patterns may serve to strengthen local ties and to construct the sense of "authenticity". For more, see Daniel Miller, "Coca-Cola: a black sweet drink from Trinidad", in: Miller, D., Material Cultures (London 1997). It should also be clarified that the aforementioned music was played in some and not all the boites of Athens in the post-dictatorship years.
[113] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 12 November 1976, pg. 13.
[114] Manolis Ntaloukas, Elliniko Rock: Istoria ths neanikis koultouras apo th genia tou Xaous mexri to thanato tou Paylou Sidiropoulou, 1945-1990 (Greek rock: history of the youth culture since the generation of chaos until the death of Paylos Sidiropoulos, 1945-90, Athens 2005), pg. 353.

6) Socialist countries: the role model

The bipolar model "American Way of life" against the "life with meaning" was mediated by the representations of socialist modernity. In this framework, the pro-Soviet socialist countries of Eastern Europe and, especially, the USSR served as a *signifier of the desirable form* of modernity for KNE.[115] This form was characterized as the closest to the ideal of the "full development of the human personality", what would guarantee a "life with meaning". In other words, the *present* of the socialist societies was represented as the *future* of the Greek society: According to KNE, the "flourishing" "anti-imperialist" movements worldwide were a clear proof that socialism, which had already been established in the "one third of the globe", would further expand, including Greece.[116]

In particular, the socialist modernity was portrayed as exhibiting technological advancement as well as equal distribution of the produced goods to the population, in contrast with the capitalist world, where the latter were reserved for a tiny minority and the majority suffered from poverty and unemployment. Various articles in "Odigitis" illustrated that people in the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries profited from a system that made sure that every citizen was entitled to free education, free medical treatment and the right to enjoy vacations in comfortable settings at a low cost.[117] The state was portrayed as very well organised and taking especially care of the cultivation of "progressive art", both in the form of the "popular traditions" of its country and of the "contemporary progressive artistic creation", as defined by KNE, sustaining numerous museums, libraries, concert halls and other spaces where people could familiarise themselves with various genres of art.[118] All these were elements of the "full development of the human

[115] See, for example, the series of seven articles appearing in Odigitis in November and December, 1976, under the banner "The Soviet Youth Today".
[116] "Socialism, Capitalism", Odigitis, 17/09/1976, pg. 3
[117] "What is the meaning of "to everybody depending on his/her needs" ", Odigitis, 16 April 1975, pg. 9
[118] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 27 August 1975, pg. 12

personality", according to KNE; the consequent satisfaction of the citizens led to zero levels of criminality, in contrast with what happened, according to the group, in the "capitalist world".[119] In fact, comparisons with the latter were often directly employed in "Odigitis", what is very clearly illustrated in the article "Socialism, Capitalism":

> "(Apart from capitalism), there is also happiness, creativity, faith and the power of the new-born, peaceful and free world of the future (namely socialism)"[120]

The comparison with the "American Way of Life was evident especially in the pictorial representations: photographs with people living in the capitalist world showed them as suffering. Particularly strong were the images of people having died or about to die of drug consumption, where they were led, according to KNE, due to the "American Way of Life".[121] On the contrary, photographs from the pro-USSR socialist countries represented people always as smiling and usually either working at a high technology laboratory or in huge libraries.[122]

A prominent part in the representations of the socialist modernity was occupied by the youth of these countries. The latter was represented as having been released from the conditions of exploitation that exist in the capitalist world and as having been "educated" as true communists. What emerged was "collective creativity": young people working hard in various posts, from menial to scientific labour, in order to achieve further development of their societies for the "common good" and not for the profit of the "bourgeoisie".[123] Concomitantly, the youth of the pro-Soviet socialist countries was represented as taking part actively in the

[119] "Zero percentage of delinquency in the socialist countries", Odigitis, 14 May 1976 and "Socialism, Capitalism", Odigitis, 17/09/1976, pg. 3
[120] Ibid
[121] "Save the youth from the "white death" ", Odigitis, 1 April 1977, pg. 6-7.
[122] "1917: 60 years of socialist reconstruction", part 6, Odigitis, 10 June 1977, pg. 15.
[123] "Socialism, Capitalism", Odigitis, 17/09/1976, pg. 3

decision-making, as its hard struggle was recognised by the state.[124] Nevertheless, its interest, according to KNE, was not confined to its country: it was represented as "committed internationalist", expressing its solidarity to other peoples, especially those portrayed as fighting against "imperialism".[125]

In order to follow their model, KNE maintained close links with the regimes of the pro-Soviet socialist countries and, especially, the youth organisations of their communist parties. The flows among them were manifold and entailed movement of people, theoretical works and cultural patterns.[126]

In the case of flows of people, members and cadres of KNE often visited the USSR and other socialist countries, writing their views in "Odigitis". In fact, in a series of articles, the "achievements" of the Soviet Union in the construction of cities in Siberia were extensively reported, as it was argued that in the countries that had attained their "national liberation", even the extremely difficult projects could materialise.[127] The role of the youth was particularly pointed out as being the pioneer in these efforts.[128] Nevertheless, the flows of people were not one-sided: delegations from the communist youth groups of Eastern Europe often visited Greece as well. In 1977, the visit of members of the Socialist Union of Youth of Czechoslovakia is mentioned in "Odigitis".[129]

As regards the theoretical works, KNE translated in Greek and disseminated books by the official Soviet Novosti publications, such as the one titled "What is communism?", which appeared in Greece in 1975.[130] Quite common was also

[124] "Soviet Youth Today", part 5, Odigitis, 23 December 1976, pg. 18
[125] "People´s Republic of Bulgaria: The youth loyal to the revolutionary traditions", Odigitis, 14 January 1977, pg. 16
[126] The special importance attached to the socialist modernity make us present the cultural patterns emanating from the pro-Soviet socialist countries not in the chapter about the "progressive art", although the group classified them as part of it.
[127] "Soviet Youth Today", parts 1-5: 26 November, 3 December, 10 December, 17 December and 23 December 1976, Odigitis.
[128] Ibid
[129] "Delegation of the Socialist Youth of Czechoslovakia in Greece", Odigitis, 4 March 1977, pg. 6
[130] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 28 May 1975, pg. 12

the publication of interviews of cadres of the Leninist Komsomol, the youth group of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. An example was a lengthy interview of Boris Pastuchov, the secretary general of the Leninist Komsomol, published in "Odigitis" in 1977, in the anniversary of the 60 years since the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia.[131] "Odigitis" also published the view of Soviet scientists on various topics, such as the ideal (i.e. "stable") relationships between young men and women.[132] Similarly, the members of KNE were encouraged to read the contributions by members of the communist parties of Eastern Europe in the journal "Problems of Peace and Socialism", which was international and translated simultaneously in various languages, including the Greek. It should also be pointed out that in the Declaration of KNE about the "militant class patriot education of youth", it was suggested that its members should read three articles by members of the Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU) about the "education" of youth in their country, including one by Konstantin Chernenko, who was secretary general of the CPSU in the brief period 1984-85.[133]

The flows of cultural patterns played an important role as well. "Odigitis" often dedicated extensive comments to Soviet movies. Two prominent examples are "The Fall of St. Petersburg" by Pudovkin and the "Prim" by Mikhaelian. The first was portrayed as an example of a very good presentation of the heroism that the revolutionaries showed, which engaged the audience and encouraged it to act in a similar way, in contrast with the cinema of the "American Way of Life" that rendered its watchers passive.[134] The second was portrayed as an example of the existence of critique in the USSR and of the meritocratic stance of its bureaucracy.[135] "Odigitis" also urged its readers to visit the "Week of Soviet

[131] "1917: 60 years of socialist reconstruction", part 26, Odigitis, 27 October 1977, pg. 18
[132] Prof A. Petrovsky, "Love, sex, morality", Odigitis, 9 April 1976 (firstly published in the newspaper "Youth" of EDON, the youth organisation of the Communist Party of Cyprus).
[133] K. Chernenko, "Elements of the Leninist style of work in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union", Problems of Peace and Socialism, August 1976 and P. Maserov, "The targets of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the education of people", Problems of Peace and Socialism, October 1976.
[134] "About the movie by Pudovkin "The fall of St. Petersburg" ", Odigitis, 8 October 1974, pg. 13-14
[135] " "Prim" ", Odigitis, 28 January 1977, pg. 13

Cinema", which was organised in the cinema "Alkyonis"[136]in Athens and included works of various well-known Soviet film directors, such as Eisenstein.[137] The work of Soviet authors was often mentioned in the newspaper of KNE, as well, especially of Maxim Gorky.[138] Finally, KNE either organised or encouraged their members to visit exhibitions with material from the socialist countries: the Club of Panspoudastiki organised shows of slides from the life in the USSR, whereas the Cultural Centre (Pneymatiko Kentro) of the Municipality of Athens held exhibitions of photographs from the USSR and of books from the German Democratic Republic, which were wholeheartedly recommended in "Odigitis".[139]

7) The "American Way of Life": main elements

Juxtaposed to the "life with meaning" that would be ensured in Greece through the "progressive cultural movement" (proodeytiko politistiko kinhma) was the "American Way of Life". The term, as mentioned above, had been used by the Greek Left since the 1950s. Its content, as used by KNE, conflated various elements; the most prominent were "depoliticisation", "evasion of struggle", "individualism" or "individual pleasure" and "careerism".[140] In fact, the "American Way of Life" was used alternatively in KNE with the signifier of "individual way of life".[141] It was also associated with drug consumption, which was represented as the "trap" for young people detesting the status quo, such as the "hippies", without the guidance, however, of a communist party. The "imperialist powers" were depicted as rendering their resistance as "passive" and "harmless", by channelling it to "escapism" through the delusions that the drugs brought, which

[136] "Alkyonis" together with "Studio" were called "art cinemas", showing movies of the New Hellenic Cinema or European realist schools, such as Nouvelle Vague.
[137] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 30 July 1977, pg. 13
[138] "Guide for self-education", Odigitis, 24 October 1975, pg. 19
[139] "Art-Letters-Life", Odigitis, 8 October 1976, pg. 17
[140] Recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg 16-17. "American Way of Life: the contemporary model", Odigitis, 22 July 1977, pg. 10-11
[141]Recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg 16-17.

turned them into "criminality", and, finally, led to their death.[142] Finally, the elements of the "American Way of Life", according to KNE, were more evident in the summer. The government was accused as promoting a "summer way of life", correlated with the increase in the number of foreign and Greek tourists since the 1960s. Again, its basic element was the "individual pleasure", which was disseminated through the advertisements of luxurious hotels and tourist resorts.[143] The "American Way of Life" was represented as threatening for Greek folk craft as well: various shops in the tourist resorts, as well as in the area of Monastiraki in Athens, were accused of producing fake imitations of it, what was described in a pejorative manner as "folklorism".[144]

The element of "individual pleasure" was to an extent equated with various forms of lack of restraint in sexual relationships, what was also called "moral corruption". Unless young people had "long-lasting" and "stable" relationships, they were depicted as "immoral".[145] "Immorality" usually had to do with forms of femininity. They were described as circulating in women´s magazines, especially those dealing with fashion. These, according to KNE, promoted the image of the "woman-object", by making women obsessed with their outer appearance and manipulating them to believe that this is the sole source of self-esteem for them.[146] The "moral corruption" was to be found, according to KNE, in the "non-stable relationships" and the "orgies" taking place in other "progressive" groups, such as Rigas Feraios, which were accused for reproducing the "American Way of Life". In the recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977, it was argued that:

[142] "Save the youth from the "white death" ", Odigitis, 1 April 1977, pg. 6-7. "Zero percentage of delinquency in the socialist countries", Odigitis, 14 May 1976. See also the book "Youth and the labour movement" by Farakos, which was written in 1972, but published in 1977.
[143] "Vacation here..and there", Odigitis, 08 July 1977, pg. 10-11
[144] "Tourism and its consequences on the youth today", Odigitis, 30 July 1976, pg. 9
[145] Recommendation by the Central Council of the organisation in 9 June 1977", in: For the militant class patriot education of youth (Athens 1977), pg 18. 3. Prof A. Petrovsky, "Love, sex, morality", Odigitis, 9 April 1976 (firstly published in the newspaper "Youth" of EDON, the youth organisation of the Communist Party of Cyprus).
[146] "Feminine magazines: entertainment or stupefication?", Odigitis, 12 December 1975, pg, 5. "Magazines for young women: poor and cheap food for thought", Odigitis, 14 January 1977, pg. 16.

> "we witness the systematic effort for the corruption of the young woman, which often takes place under the pretext of "emancipation" ".[147]

The group regarded young women who went from the periphery of Greece, namely from places where ultra-conservative gender relationships exist, to the urban centres, places where "moral corruption" was diffusing, as especially susceptible to the latter.[148]

The gender connotations of the "American Way of Life" had mainly to do with femininity, but not only: a form of masculinity attributed to this "way of life" was the "play-boy", and, especially, the "kamaki", namely males who tried to lure foreign female tourists in the resorts, so as to have sexual intercourse. [149] These men were accused by the group as showing lack of restraint. Moreover, the group detested both masculine and feminine nudism as a "fake revolution" and a sign of "moral corruption" imported through tourism.[150]

Another element of the "American Way of Life", the "evasion of struggle", was employed to describe undesirable for the group relations between different generations. The issue of the pupils´ behaviour was stressed: despite the "anachronistic" character education had in Greece, it allowed to an extent pupils to come to terms with the achievements of science; thus, the communist pupils to be "best at school and first in the struggle" and refuse to play truant and show lack of effort in their studies, as the agents promoting the "American Way of Life" would desire and what would bring them at odds with their parents.[151] They were

[147] Ibid
[148] "Young women in the village: first in the work, but in life?", part 1, Odigitis, 17 December 1975, pg. 16.
[149] "The mass movement of youth in the periphery", Odigitis, 9 July 1976, pg. 10.
[150] "The government urges you: liberate yourselves!", Odigitis, 8 July 1977, pg. 10
[151] "Our youth and school", Odigitis, 20 May 1977, pg. 17

especially advised not to gather in “dark” places, such as billiard halls and cafeterias, instead of attending their classes. [152]

The association of the “American Way of Life” with “lack of (sexual) restraint”, as regards gender relationships, and “evasion of struggle”, concerning generation relationships, was a recurring theme in the discourse of EDA and DNL as well. Nevertheless, in the 1950s and in the 1960s there was much more emphasis to undesirable forms of masculinity, such as the “teddy-boys”.[153]

The purported loci of the “American Way of Life” were numerous: “night clubs”, “bars” and “billiard halls”. In the “night clubs” KNE argued that drugs circulated.[154] Other loci of the “American Way of Life” were the cinemas where “porn”, “gangster”, “karate” and “horror” films were shown.[155] An often quoted example of the latter were the “JAWS” (1975, screened by Spielberg).[156] Such films were depicted as reflecting the “decadence” of “imperialism” and simultaneously as rendering popular the idea that a super-hero, which for KNE was a metaphor of the “imperialist militaristic interventions”, was necessary.[157] Another locus was the television programmes. In Greece after the collapse of the dictatorship, there

[152] Ibid
[153] “Teddy-boyism” was not always, but usually associated with masculinity by the Greek Left. It referred to both a specific subculture, whose members used to provoke through various practices, such as by throwing yoghurt and harassing women, as well as to reconfigurations of sexual norms in new forms of youth sociality, such as parties. In the 1950s, for the vast majority of the Greek society, new forms of entertainment and their impact on generation and gender relations were understood as overwhelmingly dangerous, linking them to juvenile delinquency: it was a case of *moral panic* (the concept of “moral panic” was introduced by Stanley Cohen, who referred to a double process, during which something that is defined by the mass media and a wide spectrum of social and political agents as a “threat for the social values and interests” simultaneously serves as a role-model for those who cannot identify with the dominant social role-models). A palpable result of the latter was the voting of the law no 4000 by all the parliamentary parties, including EDA. The moral panic gradually declined in the 1960s. For more, see Stanley Cohen, Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The creation of mods and rockers (Oxford 1987) and Efi Avdela, “Fthoropoioi kai anexelegktoi apasxoliseis: O ithikos panikos gia th neolaia sth metapolemikh Ellada” (Corruptive and uncontrollable practices: the moral panic in post-war Greece), Synchrona Themata 90, July-September 2005, pg. 31.
[154] “Save the youth from the “white death”: Pupils, one of the major targets”, Odigitis, 29 April 1977, pg. 16
[155] Ibid
[156] “Art-Letters-Life”, Odigitis, 16 January 1976, pg. 12
[157] “The cinema of “destruction” “, Odigitis, 16 January 1976, pg. 12

were two channels, both state-controlled. KNE blamed them especially for circulating American "gangster" series.[158] All the aforementioned loci were associated with the "American Way of Life" in the discourse of EDA and DNL apart from television, which appeared relatively late in Greece, comparing to the USA and Western European countries: the first channel started to work in 1966 and in general the medium was popularised during the years of the dictatorship.[159] A shift in the "American Way of Life", as connoted by DNL, had to do with wearing jeans, what was no longer detested.[160]

What should be pointed out is the fact that the term "American Way of Life" did not necessarily refer to customs and patterns existing in the USA: it was a rather broad, to an extent a *floating signifier*; its connotations sometimes referred directly to the USA, as happened with a series of articles about drug consumption in this country.[161] Concomitantly, drug consumption in Greece was associated with the "night clubs" where U.S. troops gathered.[162] A number of areas in or near Athens, namely Eleysina[163], Glyfada[164] and Plaka[165], were described as having been "plagued" by the American Way of Life due to the presence of the 6th American Fleet. Plaka was actually called "the Soho of Athens".[166] However, although some very famous porn films, such as "Emanuelle", were French, they were described in general as part of the "American Way of Life"; the music of Greek groups written in English was coined

[158] "Government Television: what it gives and what it doesn´t… to the youth", Odigitis, 28 January 1977, pg. 17
[159] The provision of electricity in many areas of the Greek periphery during the period 1967-74 was surely one factor that contributed to this result. For more, see Yiannis Voulgaris, H Ellada ths metapoliteysis, 1974-1990, statheri dimokratia simademeni apo ti metapolemiki istoria, Athens 2002, pg. 126.
[160] Katsapis, K., "Hxoi kai apohxoi: koinwnikh istoria tou rok en rol fainomenou sthn Ellada, 1956-67" (Sounds and echoes: A social history of rock ´n´ roll in Greece, unpublished PhD thesis, Panteion University, 2006), pg. 323
[161] "An "other" Edem in the West", Odigitis, 22 April 1977, pg. 16-17
[162] "Save the youth from the "white death": what the police has told us", Odigitis, 15 April 1977, pg. 11
[163] "Eleysina: Again the Americans", Odigitis, 11 June 1976, pg. 7
[164] "Save the youth from the "white death": the Greek legislation", Odigitis, 6 July 1977, pg. 7
[165] "Plaka: the neighborhood of corruption", Odigitis, 30 July 1975, pg. 5
[166] Ibid

"Greek" in a pejorative manner and was considered to be part of the same "way of life".

Furthermore, the "American Way of Life" functioned as a *prism* for the representations of the youth of the countries of the European Economic Community. Greece had signed an agreement, under which it would join the EEC in 1981, as finally happened. Thus, as the day of the entry came closer, the reflection towards its impact to the life of the Greek youth increased. Actually, the societies of the EEC countries were portrayed as generating phenomena linked to the "American Way of Life", which affected seriously their young people, as they had been "Americanised" since the end of World War II.[167] It is remarkable that the radical youth cultures of the late 1960s, alike the hippies in the U.S.A., were described as unconscious reproducers of the "American Way of Life", whose struggle, by following a mode of "spontaneous" resistance and by not being under the guidance of the Communist Parties, ended up in hedonism and drug consumption.[168] Porn movies were also flourishing in these countries, according to KNE.[169] Therefore, the group argued that the Western European societies were hardly a model. Moreover, KNE claimed that the government, in pursuing the goal of the Greek membership in the EEC, intensified its effort to disseminate the "American Way of Life", coining it "European ideal".[170]

8) Conclusions

Coming to a conclusion, it could be argued that after the re-institution of democracy in 1974, the relation of domains, such as cultural (especially music) tastes, sexuality and free time with political commitment was put under consideration by left-wing youth groups, as had happened since the 1950s. KNE

[167] "The crisis of the bourgeois "consumer culture", Odigitis, 28 May 1975, pg. 13
[168] " Don´t you believe in class, struggle and patriotism?", Odigitis, 27 October 1977, pg. 16.
[169] "Euro-porn as well", Odigitis, 10 June 1977, pg. 15
[170] "American Way of Life: the contemporary model", Odigitis, 22 July 1977, pg. 10-11. "The "European ideal", Odigitis, 1 July 1977, pg. 17.

promoted a set of values, what was called “life with meaning”, which had to do with the ideal political subjectivity, the relationships of parents and children and of young men and women, through specific cultural patterns, which were coined “progressive art” and revolved around the “popular militant traditions of the Greek people”. Its Other was the “American Way of Life”, represented as flourishing in forms of entertainment that had appeared from the 1950s until the 1970s in Greece and as leading to depoliticisation, over-sexualisation of women, lack of respect for parents and, at its worst, criminality. The “American Way of Life” was not always associated with the geographical settings of the USA, but it was a concept-metaphor for the representations of life in the “capitalist” world in general, according to KNE. Concomitantly, the USA were not assigned only dystopic representations: there was an “other” America, like Charlie Chaplin, which was critical of “imperialism” and with which the group claimed to share key ideals. Similarly, the “progressive art” was not confined to what was perceived to be “Greek traditions”. The latter clearly featured prominently; however, they were compatible with non-Greek cultural patterns, such as non-Greek folk music, Italian neo-realist and French Nouvelle Vague cinema as well as classical music. What mediated the bipolar model “life with meaning” against the “American Way of Life” were the representations of the modernity of the pro-Soviet socialist countries and, particularly, the “way of life” of the youth living there. The “socialist modernity”, as viewed by KNE, was the future to be achieved by the Greek youth and society in general.

Before closing, it should be stressed again that the “American Way of Life” served as a prism for the representation of the EEC and, as the date of entry of Greece in the latter approached, there was an increasing number of references to the “European ideal”, promoted by the government as a means of intensifying the dissemination of the “American Way of Life”. Indeed, shortly before and after the entry of Greece in the EEC, there was an extensive collective self-reflection in various domains, such as consumption and mass culture, and by various

agents, including the whole range of the political spectrum, as regards the positioning of Greece towards the other members-countries.[171]

[171] For example, the movie “Kotsos in the EEC” (1980).

Language and the Construction of Identity in Cyprus

Abstract

This presentation provides a review as to what extend language is a factor in the construction of identity in Cyprus. Identity is and has been a very complex problem in Cyprus and it is also one of the reasons that led to the war in 1974 and one of the reasons the problem has remained unresolved ever since. This paper argues that there are three major reasons that affect the notion of identity in Cyprus. These areas are: a) the consequences of the Ottoman and British Empires on Cyprus. b) The current policy on language education in Cyprus c) the political situation in Cyprus. It also speculates whether English will be used as the language of communication for the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. ***It should be noted that this paper is offered as work in progress, at an early stage of a PhD, and no strong conclusions are made.***

The impact of the Ottoman and the British Empires on Cyprus

When the Turks ceded Cyprus to Britain in 1878, the bicommunal character of Cyprus had already been formed (Kızılyürek, 2001) A census in 1832 recorded 198 Christian villages, 92 Muslim and 172 mixed villages (kızılyürek, 2001). The Greek-Cypriot community was 80% and the Turkish-Cypriot 20%, and both communities were divided linguistically, religiously, ethnically and culturally. The Turkish-Cypriots identified with Turkey, the Ottoman Empire and the Muslim religion and the Greek-Cypriots identified with the Byzantine Empire, the Greek language, culture and the Orthodox religion. Certain factors helped preserve the above mentioned values:

- The ottoman *millet* administrative system, which distinguished the two communities on the basis of religion and ethnicity. (Joseph, 2005) The Orthodox Church on the other hand held a strong position among the Greek-Cypriots and helped them preserve their political ethnic and religious identity under all the years of Ottoman rule.
- The educational system emphasized the Turkish ethnic identity to the Turkish-Cypriots and the Greek ethnic identity to the Greek-Cypriots, an educational system controlled by their respective religious institutions.

The Cypriots' national identity however, was formed during the British Colony and grew so strong, and created such a deep schism that it proved impossible to

bridge, instead; it led to the war in 1974.The Greek-Cypriots' aspiration for *Enosis* (union) with Greece and the sudden uprising of Greek nationalism was a fact that made the Turkish-Cypriots fear for their existence. This sudden nationalism led the Turkish-Cypriots to idealize motherland Turkey which would protect 'the lonely children' (Kızılyürek,2001 p.233). This was the beginning of Turkish nationalism – non existent previously- and which would grow along with Greek nationalism. It is interesting to note the different goals of each community; on the one hand was the national interest of the Greek-Cypriots which was *Enosis* (union with Greece) and on the other hand the national interest of the Turkish-Cypriots which was *Taksim* (partition of the island). The years 1960-1974 were years of internal ethnic and national conflict which culminated in the war of 1974. The notion 'identity' was further perplexed for both communities after the involvement of both Greece and Turkey and Britain became *de facto* due to the Zurich agreement as guarantor powers.

The segregated educational system that started during the Ottoman Empire continued even during British colonial years. This was a fact that suited the British colonial administration as they could further strengthen their position in Cyprus by taking advantage of this communal schism and exercise the well known 'divide and rule' policy on the island. As mentioned by Kızılyürek, 2005, the fact that the British took advantage of the ethnic and religious differences between the Greek and Turkish-Cypriots 'was the very foundation of the British administration in Cyprus' (p.229).

Even after the independence of Cyprus in 1960 this segregation continued and the two communal chambers had even gone so far as to pass a legislation –in accordance with the Constitution- that established an educational unity with Greece and Turkey (Joseph, 2001) The consequences of such a method and its impact on Cyprus today is accurately presented by Neil Fergusson, (2001 p 218): 'This ethno-nationalist indoctrination of the communities via media propaganda and biased curriculum material in segregated schools still fuels the fires, keeping the conflict alive in the minds of generations who live in isolation from their enemy'

The war in 1974 triggered further alienation for both communities as they could now freely exercise their own policies; interesting to note is the fact that despite the war and according to the Consitution, the official languages in Cyprus are both Greek

and Turkish. Due to the stagnated political situation though, very few people speak Turkish on the Greek-Cypriot side and few speak Greek on the Turkish-Cypriot side.

The linguistic situation in Cyprus is described by many as diglossic (or bidialectal) in demotic Greek 'standard modern Greek' SMG and the Vernacular Greek 'Greek-Cypriot dialect' GCD (Papapavlou-Pavlou, 1998). The situation is exactly the same for the Turkish-Cypriots where they speak 'standard Turkish' ST and the 'Turkish-Cypriot dialect' TCD.

Greek-Cypriots

Language policy and planning are closely related to factors such as social political and national and this explains the reason why the SMG (Standard Modern Greek) variety had been chosen as the 'proper' variety. It was a way to avoid being cut off from motherland Greece and to maintain an identity very similar to that in Greece. (Papapavlou, 2004) thereby intentionally enhancing the gap between the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots.

A language policy from the Ministry of Education in 2004 (see **appendix)** states clearly that the official language to be used in state schools during lessons by both teachers and students is the SMG variety. The teachers are encouraged to correct the children who use the GCD .The GCD is not denied and can be used in situations such as a celebration where a play is to be set up on Cypriots' daily lives or problems, or when reciting a poem. It also mentions that children who have specific difficulties in any kind of oral work can use the GCD in class, especially for children in lower classes.

All children are mainly exposed to the GCD until the age of six. From then onwards they are taught in schools that the SMG variety is to be used in schools and when wanting to be refined. The GCD is mainly to be used in more informal situations or when talking to family and friends. Also on TV and the Radio the SMG variety is used.

In this way children are indirectly taught that the GCD is not refined and words exclusively from the GCD are not encouraged to be used as by doing so one is related

to peasants ‘horkates’. This creates a problem to children who might feel embarrassed being caught using such words often feeling inferior or non-refined merely because they use their ‘native’ language.

On the other hand the Greek-Cypriots do not want to use the SMG variety because by doing so in more informal events one can be perceived as a snob and can even be ridiculed among friends. A nickname used for people trying to exclusively use the SMG variety is ‘kalamaras’ which is a negative interpretation for a Greek. According to a research conducted by Andreas Papapavlou where Cypriots had to compare SMG to the GCD it was discovered that the GCD guises were more sincere, friendlier, kinder and more humorous. The SMG variety remains academic and distant for most Greek-Cypriots (Papapavlou, 2004). This is another issue that confuses the notion identity for Cypriots since they cannot ‘officially’ use the language variety of their country: Cyprus, an independent state.

Turkish-Cypriots

The same linguistic situation applies for the Turkish-Cypriots too. The official language taught in schools is ST (Standard Turkish) and the TCD (Turkish-Cypriot Dialect) is used for more informal events and with the family. Also, When the Turkish-Cypriots use the ST variety they are seen as ‘phony’ and ‘pretentious’ (Kızıyürk, N-Kızıyürek, S 2001) . The only difference with the Turkish-Cypriots compared to Greek-Cypriots is that during the years 1963-1974 their only aim was to be identified with Turks and did not recognize themselves as Turkish-Cypriots. Their political aspiration in contrast to the Greek- Cypriots’ was *Taksim* i.e. division of the island and the denial of the existence of Turkish-Cypriots as such was a way to legitimize the division of Cyprus. It was seen as treason towards the Turkish nation to look at the Turkish-Cypriot community as different from the Turks. However, after the war in 1974 and the *de facto* division of Cyprus and the settlement of Turks from Anatolia in Turkey on the Northern part of the island showed that their cultural differences were more than obvious. (Kızıyürek, N-Kızıyürek, S 2001) The Turks were seen upon as ‘oriental’ and ‘uncivilized’ whereas the Turkish-Cypriots were seen as ‘not pure’ Turks and as having been influenced by the Greek-Cypriots. The process of differentiation from each other had a linguistic connotation too and therefore the use of the TCD and of Anatolian dialects is a way to mark their

differences. Another important turning point for the Turkish-Cypriots is that they have started looking upon themselves as Cypriots and want to show this in their contemporary literature and poetry. (Kızıyürek - Kızıyürek,2001)

The extremely strong national and ethnic identity in Cyprus has had tremendous effects on both communities. The mere fact that they have been segregated for 28 years has had an alienating effect bringing the two hostile communities even further apart from each other. A major problem contributing to this is the fact that today -excluding only a few- they don't speak each other's language.

Another consequence of this segregation is that both SMG/GCD and ST/TCD are diglossic in their own region. There is no interaction of either SMG/GCD and ST/TCD. They are exclusively used in their own geographic location and they do not in any way interact with each other. The fact that they have been segregated for so long using their language in their geographical region gives us a good reason to wonder whether English will be used in future as a 'linking' language between both communities. It has been noticed that after the borders had opened and both communities could cross the buffer zone, there was no other way to communicate other than by using English. The very few people who speak Greek or Turkish could communicate by using each others language but the numbers are small.

Whether English will gradually take over as the 'linking' language is a very interesting issue since it did not manage to do so during the colonial years in Cyprus for the following reasons:

a) The Greek-Cypriots felt that the local language was threatened by the substantial use of English and in protest they asked for more use of Greek than English in legislative notices.
b) There did not seem to have been any willingness to adopt English as a second language and neither Greeks nor Turks ever became competent in English. This is verified by the fact that the British created posts for Greek and Turkish translators, but these posts were not easy to fill 'due to the lack of competence in English' (Karoulla-Vrikki, 2004 p. 23)

c) The strong ethnic identities on the island Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot did not allow for English to become a lingua franca.

The fact that not any of the local languages developed into a pidgin or any other form of English as has been developed in South Asia for example is due to the fact that the Greek-Cypriots' and the Turkish-Cypriots' ethnic identity was too strong to allow to English to replace it as for both communities 'language was a prime indicator of ethnicity' (Karoulla-Vrikki p30) The Greeks felt threatened by the English language but not by the Turkish and the Turks by the Greek and not by the Greek. There was a continual battle between languages where both communities were mainly concerned in preventing any language shift.

Political situation in Cyprus

The continuous hostility between both communities and different political aspirations has created a situation where both are suspicious of each other's intentions.

Maybe the biggest problem of all in all aspects –language, political- is the fact that not all Cypriots embrace the island as theirs. The reason for this paradox is the fact that the Constitution of Cyprus was based on communal dualism. Both communities look up to their 'motherlands' Greece and Turkey respectively. Cyprus has no national song of its own, the Turkish-Cypriots use the Turkish one and the Greek-Cypriots the Greek one. They have four flags, The Greek one the Turkish one the Cypriot one and the Turkish-Cypriot one. They have different national days, which are directed against each other, The Turkish-Cypriots celebrate the Turkish national days as their own and the Greek-Cypriots the Greek ones. This has contributed to the extended loyalty of both communities to their motherlands. Also, how can these two communities come together when one side celebrates the 20th of July (day of the Turkish invasion in Cyprus) as their liberation and precisely on the same day the other side mourns?

All the above mentioned facts brings us down to the same 'core' i.e. that the political situation for the last four decades have only contributed in creating hostility for each other's ethnic community and it has created unjustified suspicions and fears

for each other. The only way of communication for both communities was through bicommunal activities and although their efforts were not on wide scale projects their achievements were notable especially in overcoming fears and biases for each other and respecting each other's ethnic identity. Nevertheless all this deep rooted hate towards each other's ethnic group has passed on from generation to generation and the loss of notion of islandness i.e that both groups embrace their two main components (Greece-Turkey) rather than the island is a very important issue in the construction of identity and this will consequently affect Cypriots on a sociolinguistic level too.

Conclusion

Cyprus, due to its geographical position has always been attractive to various invaders. The ones that have determined its modern history though are the Ottoman (1571-1878) and British (1878-1959) Empires. During the British colony the Cypriots' national identity was formed and both communities had different national aspirations and interference by Greece and Turkey in Cyprus only managed to strengthen the national identities of the Greek-Cypriots towards Greece and the Turkish-Cypriots towards Turkey. This interference along with the Constitution of Cyprus which was based on communal dualism, only managed to widen the gap between both communities. The political situation in Cyprus was such that it led to the war in 1974.

Both communities have -due to the war and partition of the island in 1974- grown apart from one another. They do not longer speak the same language despite the fact that both Greek and Turkish are the official languages in Cyprus. On the Greek part few speak Turkish and on the Turkish part few speak Greek. Also, the fact that they have been divided for so long has only led to biases and suspicions for each other. Bicommunal activities, which were the only way of communication prior to 2003, have managed to bridge part of the gap between the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots. Nevertheless the language issue is a problem since the only language of communication today between both communities –excluding the few who speak Greek and Turkish- is English.

The question that remains to be solved is whether English will continue to be used as the language of communication on the island and whether the status it enjoys as a global language of communication will affect the Greek and Turkish Cypriots in using it more or whether they will both strive to learn each others language instead; given the fact that both Greek and Turkish are the official languages of Cyprus.

References

Attalides, M (2003) *Cyprus Nationalism and International Politics.* Bibliopolis: Manheim und Möhesee.

Bourdieu, P (1997) *Language and Symbolic Power.* Oxford: Polity Press.

Bradac, J (1990) Language Attitudes and Impression Formation .In H. Giles and W. P. Robinson (eds) *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* (pp.386-412). New York: John Wiley.

Bradac, J. Cargile, A. and Hallett, J (in press) Language Attitudes: Retrospect, Concept and Prospect. In W.P. Robinson and H. Giles (eds) *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology* (2nd ed). Chichester: John Wiley.

Broome, J. (2001) Bridging the Divide in Cyprus: The Role of Bicommunal Activities in Michael, M and Tamis, A. (eds) *Cyprus in the Modern World* Melbourne:Australia

Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davy, J. and Pavlou, P. 2001. Is Cyprus an ESL country? *Proceedings o f the 12th International conference of the Greek Applied Linguistics Association,* 209-215.

Edwards, J. (1999) Refining our understanding of language attitudes. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18 (1), 101-10

Edward, J. (2001) 'British Strategic Interests and *Enosis* in Colonial Cyprus in Michael, M &Tamis, A. (eds) *Cyprus in the Modern World* Melbourne: Australia 13-24.

Edwards, J. (1994) *Multilingualism.* London: Routledge

Fasold, R. (1987) *The Sociolinguistics of Society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Fergusson, N. (2001) 'The Conflict in Cyprus: A Psychological Analysis' Michael, M & Tamis, A. (eds) *Cyprus in the Modern World* Melbourne: Australia 215-227.

Ioannou, Y (1991) the Language Problem in Cyprus today. *Cyprus Review* 3(1), 15-41.

Joseph , J. (2001) 'Post-Colonial Period, 1960-1974: Expectations and Failures' in Michael, M & Tamis, A. (eds) *Cyprus in the Modern World* Melbourne: Australia 25-60.

Karoulla-Vrikki, D. (1991) The language of the Greek-Cypriots today: A revelation of an identity crisis? *The Cyprus Review* 3(1), 42-58.

Karoulla-Vrikki, D. (2004) Language and Ethnicity in Cyprus under the British: a linkage of heightened salience. *International Journal of the Sociologyof Language.* 19-37.

Kızılyürek, N. & Kızılyürek, G (2004) The Politics of Identity in the Turkish-Cypriot Community and the Lanugae Question. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 37-55.

Kızılyürek, N. (2009) The Turkish-Cypriot Community and Rethinking of Cyprus in Michael, M and Tamis, A. (eds) *Cyprus in the Modern World* Melbourne: Australia 228-248.

Atalianis, L and Pouloukas, S(2001) Issues of Identity and Power in the Greek-Cypriot Community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural and Development* 22(1), 19-38.

Atalianis, L (2004) The Impact of English in Post-Colonial, Post-Modern Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 77-90.

Ministry of Education (2002), Statistics in Education. Nicosia: Republic of Cyprus Press.

Papapavlou, A. (1998) Motivational, Attitudinal and Sociocultural Factors in Lexical Borrowing. *Journal of Business and Society* 1(2), 151-63.

Papapavlou, A. (1998) Attitudes towards the Greek-Cypriot Dialect: Sociocultural Implications: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*134, 15-28.

Papapavlou, A. (2001) Mind your Speech: Language Attitudes in Cyprus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural and Development* 22 (6), 491-501.

Papapavlou, A. (1997) The Influence of English and its Dominance in Cyprus: Reality of Unfounded Fears. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 7 (2), 218-249.

Papapavlou, A. and Pavlou, P. (1998) A Review of the Sociolinguistic Aspects of the Greek-Cypriot Dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural and Development* 19 (3), 212-220.

Pavlos, P. and Christodoulou, N. (2001) Bidialectalism in Cyprus and its Impact on the Teaching of Greek as a Foreign Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 11 (1), 92-114.

Roussou, N (2000) The Language of Television and National Identity in Cyprus. *The Cyprus Review*, 12-(2), 45-65.

Sciriha, L (1996) *A Question of Identity.* Nicosia: Intercollege Press.

Stamatakis, N, (1991) History and Nationalism: The cultural Reconstruction of the Modern Greek-Cypriot Identity. . *The Cyprus Review, 3 (1), 59-86.*

Thomas, R. (2000) Historical and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy and Planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*,4 (2), 196-213.

Williams. R (1994) The Sociology of Ethnic Conflicts: Comparative International Perspectives. *Annual Review of Sociology* 20, 49-79.

Wardhaugh , R (2002) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* 4th ed. Oxford: Blackwell.