

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2023.09.25.11>

How to cite: Kounalakis, M. (2023). Censorship in Teacher Training: The Case of the Lending Library of the Pedagogical Academy of Heraklion, Crete, Greece. *Futurity Education*, 3(3), 200–216. <https://doi.org/10.57125/FED.2023.09.25.11>

Censorship in Teacher Training: The Case of the Lending Library of the Pedagogical Academy of Heraklion, Crete, Greece

Manolis Kounalakis

Phd, University of Crete, Greece, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0067-4617>

***Correspondence email:** mkounalakis@edc.uoc.gr.

Received: June 2, 2023 | **Accepted:** August 18, 2023 | **Published:** September 25, 2023

Abstract: This paper examines censorship forms implemented in the pedagogical training received by the students (teacher candidates) of the Pedagogical Academy of Heraklion (Crete, Greece) during the period of the April dictatorship (1967-1974). First, a bibliographical overview of the main term of the paper, namely the censorship, is attempted, and then the historical context of the censorship actions undertaken by the dictators is analysed. The research was based on the archival material of the Academy, specifically the documents relating to its lending library. The historical interpretive methodology of 'history from below' was followed. The aim of the research was to highlight the correlation between the examined documents, which seemingly did not relate to the concept of censorship, and the conceptual and historical context set. The results of the research revealed many acts of censorship, overt or latent, concerning the formation of the institution's lending library. The above results constituted important findings, as they contributed to the scientific methodology of 'history from below', as the research object was not associated with a person or a group of people, as is common practice. Instead, the focus of the research was placed on an institution of pedagogical training that has been in the margins in terms of research, and there were no papers in the relevant scientific discourse that base their research on such a research unit. Finally, this research attempted to highlight important findings that sometimes confirm and sometimes contradict the hitherto known literature on the implementation of censorship in the period under review. More specifically, the findings were consistent with the general idea of the intense censorship activity of the dictators in the period 1967-1972, but it also highlights similar results for the period 1972-1974, for which relevant research had shown that the phenomenon of censorship was clearly less visible.

Keywords: censorship, Pedagogical Academy, teacher training, lending library

Introduction

Literature review

Conceptual definition of the term. The attempt to define the censorship conceptually runs up against its extremely diverse nature and requires a broader definition than one might expect. The foreign-language literature presents three main characteristics in comparison with the Greek literature. First, it has examined more areas based on the intention or action of censorship. Subsequently, these studies have been implemented earlier than the Greek example and also focus on this concept in more detail. In the following text an attempt to focus on some very specific elements of this Greek and foreign-language literature was made.

The conceptual definition of the term under consideration varies according to the space and time around which it is considered and thus it is not possible to define common accepted characteristics for all time periods (Curry, 1997). The basic conceptual features of an initial assessment around censorship converge on the notions of "*suppressing, repressing or restricting the circulation*" of certain intellectual property (Reichman, 2001, p. 2), because it is considered objectionable according to the censor's criteria. The censorship is, in essence, an interference in the field of information and the free movement of ideas, imposed by a public authority or a political power (Ziogas, 2008). Examples that one can relate to this definition from the Greek political scene abound, especially (but not only) in the periods of Greek dictatorial - totalitarian regimes (Leonidas, 1974). In modern Greek history these regimes operated in the following periods: 1925-1926, 1936-1940 and 1967-1974. This view, however, is considered quite simplistic and partially examines the censor's power.

The term has been distinguished into three sub-forms. There is the *preventive* type of censorship which imposes a permanent control on what is going to be published. It is a method that has been applied since the Middle Ages, with regard to the bibliographic production of the period, and over time its application has been extended to the artistic, scientific and news domains (Minnich, 2010; Charnow & Charnow, 2005). In the relevant Greek literature, the issue of preventive censorship has been prominently studied in relation to its implementation in the Greek newsroom during the period under review in this research (1967-1974) and the high degree of implementation of the method has been noted in newspapers that opposed the dictatorial regime (Stratos, 1995), and even in news publications that operated illegally (Raitsinis, 2016).

The *repressive* form of censorship, which refers to the restriction of the circulation of an already published intellectual property is also distinguished. This type of censorship procedures may involve confiscation of the intellectual work or even punishment of the author. In some cases, in fact, when this type of censorship is not exercised in a direct way, indirect ways, related to economic issues, are imposed and work in this direction. The characteristics of this form of censorship is different from the first type mentioned above, as here the circulation of the intellectual good is initially allowed, but then it is considered that the same good may cause more moral damage compared to the general act of censorship that was not initially imposed (Heins, 2007). The preventive and repressive forms are institutionalised by the political authority and seem as regulatory actions.

There is, however, a third perspective on the issue, which refers to the case of self-censorship, according to which the author implicitly censors himself, thus, this type constitutes a non-institutionalised type of censorship (Petsini & Christopoulos, 2016, pp. 12-13). This is a type of

censorship that has been studied to a small extent in the Greek-language literature, which has identified relevant implementation of this type in the newspaper Hellenic Chronicle, which was published during the period 1824-1826 (Dimitropoulos, 2018). Significant reference to self-censorship, however, is located in the field of the historical study of literary genres. Particularly, the work of the neo-Hellenist, Byzantinologist and literary scholar Nikolaos Mavrogordatos (1882-1971) seems to have been of considerable interest in the literature (Bouchard, 2018 ; Pehlivanos, 2018). More theoretical documentation of this term, however, is found in related studies concerning not the historical study of literary genres, but their reception based on literary theory (Zervou, 1992).

The foreign-language literature has further advanced the theoretical exploration of the term and highlights the fact that it is a productive form of censorship, as individuals are unconsciously forced to constrain their preferences according to heterodoxy, and ultimately not only accept them, but continue to produce cultural products based on these norms (Bunn, 2015, p. 26; Cook, & Heilmann, 2013). A very useful point that has also been highlighted is the role of libraries in the process of self-censorship. It is worth noting that many books are censored by library workers, and in this case it is often not a matter of censorship, but of redefining the content. In essence, libraries themselves tend to self-censor their content and the criteria by which they do so are not yet clear. However, in some cases they are related to exogenous (in relation to libraries) actors and factors or even inaccuracies and misinterpretations in administrative tasks and ultimately either overt or latent censorship processes emerge (Whelan, 2009; Moellendick, 2009, pp. 71-72; Moody, 2004, 2005).

The above distinction does not penetrate in depth and thus more theoretical tools are needed in order to explore these categories to the extent that they should be explored rather than examined superficially. Therefore, censorious actions were examined both in the form of arbitrary practices and in the capacity of a covert action that takes into account all socially determined prohibitions arising from political, economic, religious or other systems of power (Jansen, 1988, p. 221). In order to fully understand the previous statement the views of M. Foucault about the formation and management of power structures should be taken into account.

Without intending to analyse the French philosopher's work, it is considered useful to make a very brief reference to his views that influence the subject of the proposed research. This reflection arises from his research on power relations and, above all, we can condense some of his thoughts as they emerge from his works *Surveillance and Punishment* and *The History of Sexuality*.

The first book briefly discusses the characteristics of the disciplinary means applied in prisons during the Enlightenment period. It follows from his thought that the authority that applies punitive practices '*must remain aloof from the punishment it imposes*' (Foucault, 1976, p. 76). For this reason, a whole mechanism is set up by the agents of power, whereby a state of risk is established, through which the ideal way of exercising disciplinary power is formed. Thus the subjects accept these actions. Moreover, the act of enforcing detention moves from the group view of punishment to an individual action, where each prisoner is placed individually in cells which have the characteristic of visibility, the "panopticon". The prisoners are now visible and thus become participants in the process of detention and repression (Foucault, 1976, pp. 226-231). Thus they limit and censor themselves, maintaining the state of confinement.

The second mentioned book, examines the limitation of discourse around sex. Foucault (1982, p. 47) uses the term '*mass culture*' which is associate with a process of '*regulated impulse*' and refers to the whole network of relations and mechanisms activated to impose restriction as something normal. Example of such mechanisms are the sciences (such as medical ones) that were activated to establish repression practices as something normal and moral, by introducing new concepts that justify

prohibition.

After reading the two books, a relational understanding of censorship emerged, as the power relation is not only generated within the state apparatus, but also between citizens. Therefore, the formation of our self, our "subjectivity", is directly related to the networks of power relations. That which limits the expression of our subjectivity and censors it must be considered in relation to these networks of power in which we ourselves participate. This leads us to the conclusion that censorship is also influenced by the subjects themselves. They self-censor and thus contribute to the perpetuation of a restrictive and limited situation.

The above productive aspect of censorship has been supported by many modern supporters. One of these is J. Butler who points out that there are strong censorship examples that have not resulted from explicit state policies of restriction (Butler, 1998, pp. 249–251). Moreover, the author agrees with Foucault's view of the productive aspect of censorship and extends it in relation to its repressive form, considering that it fails to form a regime of complete prohibition, because it fails to form the conditions of subjectification through legitimate means and to describe the social space it wants to impose.

The French sociologist P. Bourdieu has also dealt with the issue of censorship by examining it from a different point of view, language and symbolic power. Censorship is established as a structural necessity within the field of language, which is directly linked to the social position of the individual and the social conditions under which it is created. These seem to influence what Bourdieu calls the '*expressive interest*', which is linked to the form and power of censorship and is satisfied within the restrictive frameworks set for it. Censorship, then, becomes a result of a project of '*euphemism*', which can go as far as silence. The analysis, however, goes deeper and demonstrates that the mechanisms of censorship need not take the form of an explicit prohibition by an institution, as the best kind of censorship is one in which subjects do not understand that they are being censored. This requires a process of internalisation of the dominant discourse. Anyone who does not participate in this process is excluded from the social groups themselves. Therefore, the more effective the repression is, the less the concept of censorship is revealed, as it becomes something normal in the mind of the reader (Bourdieu, 1991, pp. 137–139).

Extending the above, it has been pointed out (Athanasίου, 2008, p. 159) that the concept of habitus also plays a decisive role in the issue of censorship. This follows if taking into consideration that the subjects' prepositions are also located in the culturally acceptable objects or goods. That is, something appears as normality in relation to the cultural criteria that we have and have been shaped within society, either by the primary habitus (the family) or by the secondary habitus (school). Therefore, the notion of rivalry in one's speech - a basic criterion for applying some kind of censorship - is linked to the habitus from which the characterisation of it as rivalry arises. This converses with Foucault's view of subjectivity, mentioned above, as the formation of the acceptable subject is influenced by the dominant habitus and is ultimately embodied in a process of explicit or implicit restriction.

The censorship during the period of April dictatorship (1967-1974) in Greece. The above theoretical remarks will help in a deeper examination of the phenomenon of the censorship about the chosen period. However, before describing the archival documents that will be interpreted in light of these considerations, it seems appropriate to explain the route of censorship during the April dictatorship years.

¹ These newspapers were censored because they expressed mainly left-wing political ideology. These are two specific cases and, as mentioned in the following section of the investigation, there were other newspapers and magazines that were censored precisely because they expressed left-wing political ideology.

On the basis of the theoretical framework that has preceded it, it is obvious that examples of repressive censorship were abundant during the April dictatorship. Main victims of this phenomenon were the field of letters, arts and the press. Common to all censored works was their left-wing - and not completely communist - ideological orientation. Some well-known examples were: a) the immediate closure of newspapers such as *Avgi* and *Democratic Change*¹, b) the censorship of the poems of Varnalis and Ritsos, c) the banning of the film *The Battleship Potemkin* and d) the censorship of several songs by the composers songs by M. Theodorakis. D. Savvopoulos and G. Markopoulos, who also expressed anti-dictatorial ideas.

This was a form of the repression that was imposed, but in fact the impact of the preventive form of censorship was stronger. According to this, a whole mechanism was set up for the a priori control of every intellectual good that was to be released. Through this process they managed not only to restrict but also to control the general circulation of ideas.

The truth is that dictators found a very well-established legal basis from the past to implement this plan and all it took was a "legislative" misdirection to bring it back. In fact, earlier provisions from Forced Laws and Legislative Decrees, stemming from the dictatorship of 4 August 1936 and from the subsequent occupation governments of 1941-1944, which established strict state control over all kinds of printed matter, books, newspapers, theatre, singing as an artistic creation and cinema, came into force in 1967 (Andritsos, 2016). More specifically, since the period of a previous established dictatorship in Greece (1936-1941), the regime of preventive censorship was institutionalised with the relevant provisions establishing the *Ministry of Press and Tourism*. The dictators of that time took advantage of the argument of economic and tourism progress and created directorates for the control of the press, both domestic and foreign, as well as a directorate on tourism propaganda. The aim was to completely control the circulation of ideas, but also to project an idealised image abroad, a typical feature of totalitarian regimes. In particular, the Forced law 45 /1936 states that this ministry aims at «*enlightening public opinion, namely the issues related to the Greek and foreign daily and periodical press, all kinds of conferences and exhibitions, theatre, cinema, gramophone records, advertising of all kinds, lectures, publications and, in general, all forms of printed matter, live and mechanical events, so that they are within the framework of national traditions and ideals, including the control of radio broadcasting*».

This was a complete and comprehensive preventive act of censorship on almost everything that is circulated, which is reinforced by a series of legal texts that clarify the framework of repression, such as, for example, the Forced Law 437/1937, according to which non-compliance with the instructions of the Ministry of State brings about «*imposition of disciplinary control and penalties*». There were also several other laws that explicitly formulated the implementation of preventive censorship in the field of letters, arts and the press, preventing anything that opposes the Christian religion, offends public morals, propagates anarchic and subversive ideas, according to the judgment of the *Ministry of State*. In relation to the subject of this paper, Article 20 of Royal decree 108/1942² is of particular importance, which states that «*For the publication of any book in Greece, permission is required from the Directorate of Popular Education of the General Directorate of Press and Radio Broadcasting*». The same logic seems to have prevailed in the field of the press, for which Article 8 of the Forced Law 1092/1938 states: «*All issues concerning the circulation and sale of newspapers and magazines and the persons and organizations involved in them are regulated by the Deputy Ministry of Press and Tourism*».

The characteristics of the above-mentioned legal texts are akin to a regime of restriction of freedom in circulation of ideas and cultural goods. Therefore, they constitute an excellent about the necessity of censorial intervention.

² It was a law decided by the occupation government of Greece, which continued in a way with this legal provision the censorship actions of the preceding dictatorial period (1936-1941).

The *General Directorate of Press and Information* of the *Presidency of the Government* is now in charge of coordinating the censorship. It was headed by Colonel Vryonis. As it turned out, the task of repression was strengthened, especially in the early years of the regime's rule, where the most intense incidents occurred. Axelos (1984, p. 42) mentions that «*for two years formal and effective censorship was imposed on every published publication*». This situation is related to the anxiety of the rulers to ensure the proper conditions for the implementation of power. The censorship as a form of intellectual violence was accompanied in this period by the prohibition of legitimate political activity, the exile of left-wing ideological supporters and many preventive checks on the 'legitimacy' of public officials. Therefore, in the early years of the dictators' rule, violent repression, physical or otherwise, emerged as the dominant characteristic of its ideology and mode of governance.

Considering the years 1967-1969 we should also take into account another political-economic factor that had a direct impact on the area we are examining. This was the freezing of the agreement on the association of our country with the E.U., which brought a considerable political and economic burden. Censorship in this case functioned as a key tool to control the existing criticism on this issue and, consequently, as an auxiliary tool to promote a misleading appearance to the public opinion, according to which Greece relations with E.U. had not been disturbed (Peshmazoglou, 1999, p. 100).

Over time, however, the dictatorship regime came under strong pressure to shift towards the implementation of liberal policies. The pressure came mainly from Greek business leaders, which throughout the seven years seem to have been favoured. It is in this context that the attempt for a new constitution should be considered. The result, however, was not as expected, because internal contradictions and ideological rigidities could not be overcome. This is also reflected in the legislation being promoted, which in essence was incapable of overcoming the notion of repression.

A characteristic example, which also concerns our research, is Law 346/1969, according to which the abolition of preventive censorship is prescribed. It is clearly stated in Article 11 that «*The press is free and carries out a public mission, which entails rights and duties as well as responsibility for the accuracy of its publications*». At first sight, this action enables the regime to propagandize in part a return to democratic normality. However, a closer study leads to the conclusion that censorship remains, as the number of punishable offenses, which are consistent with the non-liberal 'ideological' framework of the dictatorship's principles, increases. More specifically, there are plenty of articles in this law that define the prohibited publications, which include «*insulting the king*», «*sedition publications*»,

«*publications stirring up political passions*», «*obscene publications*», «*publications on suicides*» and, most importantly, «*publications against the national economy*». Finally, throughout the law, there is an apparently deliberate ambiguity concerning the definition of what is objectionable, in order to reinforce the feeling of self-censorship on the part of the publishers themselves.

Thus, the censorship is becoming dominant, even after the law, which prescribes its relaxation/abolition. Moreover, it is obvious that it supports dictatorship regime propaganda and operates in a productive context, in the sense that it creates those conditions whereby citizens or publishers contribute to the perpetuation of a dominant situation.

The second period of this research (1972-1974) has completely different political and cultural characteristics, which will be interpreted in relation to changes in the lending library. On a political level, the late phase of the dictatorship (1972-1974) is characterised by a fake political attempt of 'liberalisation'. In this context, various changes were promoted, such as the alleged abolition of preventive censorship, which were discussed above, the new (and more 'liberal' constitution), but also additional changes concerning education in general. In the field that concerns the paper, it is worth keeping in mind the change in the Analytical and Timetable Programme of the Pedagogical Academies,

which theoretically promote liberal characteristics, something which, of course, does not emerge from the study of these programmes³. In cultural terms, this period is characterised by the cessation of the silence of artistic creators, especially G. Seferis with the first official statement of disapproval of censorship, which contributed to the lifting of preventive censorship.

In general, the silence of the first two years (1967-1969) was succeeded by an intense intellectual movement with new publications with liberal ideology. So, dictators showed some tolerance at that time. It is also worth mentioning the emergence of several new artists in the fields of literature, visual arts, theatre and cinema. All this should be seen as a movement to produce a different cultural version against the dominant culture promoted by the dictators, who based their national narrative on the type of 'mass culture', i.e. putting forward government propaganda through radio and television, with the aim of disorienting people from the deep cultural deadlocks and projecting another model (Papanikolaou, 2017, pp. 201-209). This kind of mass production of cultural products de facto concerns the censorious actions that are examined in this article, as it constitutes self-censorship. Inviting citizens to participate in cultural products and unconsciously adopting them pushes individuals to limit their choices in the space of the culturally acceptable good, in line with the characteristics of dictators.

In this direction, sports (football) but also various celebrations (religious or not), were utilised, aiming at keeping the people hypnotic and, above all, to transmit to them a different type of culture, which would not threaten the presence of the dictators in power. In the same logic of propaganda, television broadcasts also worked, something unprecedented for Greece at that time. It is worth noting that the content of the few television programs at that time was determined by the dictatorial regime (Zacharopoulos & Paraschos, 1993, p. 42; Dampasis, 2002, p. 26; Klapsis, 2019, p. 90). Another means of propaganda for the dominant political and cultural situation were the Cinematographic Newsreels, which were short films shown in cinemas and presented events in the world, but differentiated according to the intentions of the dictators (Lambrinos, 2013, p. 230). Finally, during the period under review (1967-1974), a number of films were state-financed, which dealt with war issues, such as the resistance against the Germans, as well as the revolution against the Turks, in order to strengthen the national spirit of the citizens and consequently to reinforce the ideological background of the dictators (Koulouri, 2020, p. 411; Papadimitriou & Kulentianou, 2009, p. 225; Lemonidou, 2017, p. 190).

Research Problem

The issue of the censorship is an extremely diverse concept. However, its study in the Greek literature has been quite limited and mainly focused on specific aspects, overlooking other essential characteristics. The essential features studied in the Greek literature most often focus on the violent suppression of freedom of expression through bans on books, newspapers, magazines and artistic material. All these cases were linked to politically turbulent periods and some took place during the rule of totalitarian regimes (1936-1941 and 1967-1974). But is this enough and, more importantly, does it constitute the main mechanism of censorship? Apparently, the relevant literature has not managed to highlight in the field of modern Greek historiography of education other aspects of the application of censorial actions, which are related to non-obvious processes.

Research Focus

This paper focused on exploring forms of censorship in teacher education during the period of the April dictatorship (1967-1974) in Greece. More specifically, through the above mentioned findings of the literature dealing with the issue of censorship, an attempt was made to show at least two aspects of

³ For more details on this topic see Kounalakis, M. (2020). *The historical library of the Pedagogical Academy of Heraklion (1933 - 1985) and its role in teacher education* (pp. 256-280) [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Crete.

censorship, one overt and one latent, which seem to have directly influenced the pedagogical training of the future teachers, students of Pedagogical Academy of Heraklion (Hereafter P.A.H.) of this period. All theoretical remarks on this subject were correlated with specific archival documents from the Pedagogical Academy of Heraklion.

Research Aim and Research Questions

The main objective was to highlight those features of the pedagogical training offered by the P.A.H., which were related to the enforcement of censorious actions. This process emerged through the study of the lending library of P.A.H. The main research question was to assess whether there were features of the pedagogical training offered by the P.A.H. in the period under review that were conducive to the development of censorship. The individual research questions concerned the specific actions of this censorship strategy.

Research Methodology

General Background

The theoretical remarks that precede this paper, as well as the brief historical review of censorship implementation during the period of the April dictatorship (1967- 1974) in Greece, served as basic tools of interpretation for the presence of censorship in teacher education within the specific example presented in this paper. More specifically, selected archival documents of the P.A.H. deposited at the KE.M.E.I.E.D.E.⁴ were utilised regarding the training of future teachers in Crete during the period of the seven-year April dictatorship. We will attempt to describe the books that were banned by a document sent to the Pedagogical Academies, as well as the route of this act. Subsequently, we are going to focus on a catalogue containing the books in the lending library of the P.A.H. in order to highlight interesting facts about the circulation of selected categories. In addition, a series of non-obvious actions related to book enrichment in the lending library in the hope that sufficient information will emerge to link these actions to an inverse notion of censorship, which is linked to its productive notion, as discussed in the theoretical part of the article was examined. The methodology was the historical interpretive method of 'history from below' whereby the focus was on individuals and situations that were marginalised by historians and the aim of this methodology is to bring out the real voice of the objects of research, which official history often silences by focusing on 'big' events (Hourdakis, 2006).

Sample of the research: Description of the archival documents relating to censorship in the field of education of teacher candidates in Crete

Library folder with recommendations for book purchase. In a folder entitled *Library folder with recommendations for books to be purchased*, which belongs to P.A.H. archives, a series of mails were found, according to which a number of books should be completely banned. Apart from the content of this list, it is considered appropriate to study the route of the documents leading to the ban. The key document states that

«We temporarily prohibit the circulation, marketing, retail or wholesale sale, clandestine or through agents (placemen) of all the books, writings and reprints listed in the attached list'. It goes on to specify that 'Publishers, booksellers, travelling salesmen and any private individual who associates with them for the purpose of buying or selling the items in the above list' will be punished 'in accordance with the provisions of Article 9 of Law No 9 of 1912, in combination with the provisions of the Criminal Code».

⁴ Centre for the Study and Research of the History of Education and the Teaching Profession of the University of Crete, Greece.

The 'legal' penalty is mentioned in the law entitled '*On the state of siege*' as amended by Laws in 1962, 1941 and 1922.

The previous legislation proves the declaration of Greece in a state of siege, which also marks the abolition of freedom of circulation of intellectual property in the country. The order is notified to the gendarmerie and the *Athens City Police Directorate*, so that they can take the necessary measures and carry out the required checks.

The next action of this prohibition is a very important piece of information according to which *«in addition to the list of banned books transmitted, a second list has been drawn up, which will be sent and a third list will probably be drawn up»*. The same document also mentions that

«it would be advisable for to consider the possibility of an investigation by the competent persons locally into the possibility of the existence in school libraries of books of communist or corrupting content in addition to those contained in the daily catalogues».

The last document in the archives referring to the ban is addressed mainly to the Inspectors of Primary Education in the district and asks for a preventive check of school books. The inspectors are obliged to inform the principals of the schools under their jurisdiction in case

«where books are sent to the Schools by the publishers for purchase, they have to make a preventive inspection of them and, if in their objective and impartial judgment the books sent are objectionable either in content or form, they are obliged to be returned immediately to the senders».

Library archive. From the file entitled *Library Archive*, found in the archive, details about the origin of books of P.A.H. lending library were detected. More specifically, there were numerous documents referring to the decisions to purchase or donate books to the lending library during the late period of the April dictatorship, which covered the period of 1972-1974.

Donations consisted the main reason for the enrichment and also the formation of this lending library, according to this document. The books were divided into 24 taxonomic - cognitive categories, based also on the taxonomic distribution prevailing in the aggregated book catalogues of the library of the P.A.H.

Research Results

List of banned books

In the above mentioned list there were a total of 759 titles of banned books, magazines and newspapers, divided into 14 categories. As regards the content of this list, it should be commented that the five most numerous categories were, in order, the following: Literary, Historical, Books published in the Iron Curtain and imported into Greece, Newspapers and Marxist. The table below shows in detail the most numerous categories of banned books, as well as the number of book titles corresponding to each of them:

Table 1

Number of Books, Newspapers or Magazines Banned by the April 21 Regime, Sorted in Descending Order

Category name	Number on books
Literary	184
Historical	114

Books published in the Iron Curtain and imported into Greece	72
Newspapers	63
Marxist	62

Based on the above mentioned list, it follows a very brief presentation of the content of some categories, not only the five most numerous. In the category of Marxist books we detect book titles which refer to the functioning of the Soviet Union and its ideological principles. The list with the most recorded authors, included some of the greatest ideological leaders of the left-wing ideological and political conviction, such as Lenin (20 books), Marx (5 books), Trotsky (4 books) and Mao Tse-tung (3 books).

In the category of Historical books there are book titles about Byzantium, ancient Greece, Chinese history, Russian history, modern Greek history, prehistoric Greece, World War II, history of modern and ancient Greek literature and history of the Greek language. The books are written mainly by Greek authors, but there are also books in foreign languages in translation. Dimitrios Fotiadis with 14 titles is the most recorded author in this category, followed by Yannis Kordatos with 9 books and Tasos Vournas with 5 titles. All of these authors also embrace left-wing ideological and political convictions.

In the most numerous category, i.e. Literary, there are books titles on prose and poetry, but also scientific treatises on literary issues. Mainly identified books by some of the most well - known authors with left-wing ideological and political convictions were found in this category. More specifically, the most recorded authors are: Yannis Ritsos (26 books), Menelaos Loudemis (18 books), Kostas Varnalis (16 books), Tasos Livaditis (3 books) and Kostas Birkas (3 books).

In the category of Partisan books there are mainly titles dealing with internal issues of the left-wing political party in Greece. In the category of Political books were detected scholarly analyses of the international political situation from the perspective of the left-wing ideology. Among the most recorded authors, were found some who played an important role in the Greek the left-wing ideology, such as: Elias Iliou, Miltos Kyrkos and Yannis Voultesis.

In the category of Philosophical books were detected very important books about the communist ideology. For example, we found 5 books by Mao Tse-Tung, but also books by Hegel, Plekhanov, Lenin and Stalin. Finally, in the categories of Newspapers and Magazines all the titles come from left-wing ideological organisations in Greece and abroad. Interestingly, there are newspapers from Germany, Australia, London and the USA.

Library archive

According to the second series of documents the research resulted in 1.189 donations of books within a period of 2 years. This number should be considered extremely high compared to the total number of copies/books in the library during this period.

The categories of books that are donated the most concern ancient and modern Greek literature. These are followed by books on psychology, sociological-political books on issues of left-wing political ideology, history and pedagogical books. Table 2 shows in descending order the number of donations by taxonomic category:

Table 2

Number of Donations by Taxonomic Category of Books in the Lending Library of the P.A.H. During the Period 1972–1974

Category names	Number of books
Psychology	367
Ancient greek literature	232
Modern greek literature	177
Sociology-politics	77
History	70
Pedagogy	64
Philosophics	60
Science-agronomy	30
Declamations	21
Physical education-scouting-sanitation	21
Didactics	20
Without information	15
Theological	11
Foreign literature-foreign languages	6
Magazines	8
Art and aesthetics	4
Dictionaries-encyclopedias	1
Literature	1
Home economics	2
Legislation	2

A very important feature of these donations is that they come from a very small number of donors, despite their large number. It should be said that two are the main donors to the library in the period 1972-1974, the *Student Welfare Service* (865 donations) and the *General Secretariat for Press and Information* (259 donations). The *General Secretariat of Press and Information* offers a large number of books on modern Greek literature and a relatively high number of sociological-political books on issues of left-wing political ideology. On the other hand, the *Student Welfare Office* donates mainly books on psychology, but also many books on ancient Greek literature. The dominant taxonomic categories

mentioned above are broken down by donor according to what is shown in Tables 3 and 4:

Table 3

Number of Donations from the General Secretariat of Press and Information by Taxonomic Category of Books in the Lending library of the P.A.H. During the Period 1972–1974

Donor name	Number of books
Psychology	0
Ancient Greek literature	0
Modern Greek literature	144
Sociological-political	50
Pedagogy	0
History	26

Table 4

Number of Donations from the Student Welfare Service by Book Category of the Lending Library of the P.A.H. During the Period 1972–1974

Donor name	Number of books
Psychology	362
Ancient Greek literature	230
Modern Greek literature	44
Sociological-political	21
Pedagogy	57
History	14

Discussion

The results of the research should be related to the theoretical remarks on the definition of the concept of censorship, as well as to the brief references that preceded it concerning the legislative actions of the dictatorship regime in this field. At this point, there is a need to clarify that this effort involved a high degree of novelty, as there were no relevant studies in the international and Greek-language literature on the subject of this paper in the field of the historiography of Modern Greek education and for this reason it is difficult to make any correlations or comparisons of the findings of this research with others. Therefore, the main aim of this article was to add to the relevant scholarly discourse a still unappreciated aspect of the application of censorial actions in periods of dictatorial regimes and, particularly, regarding the issue of the education of future teachers.

The purpose of this research was to assess whether there were features of the pedagogical training offered by the P.A.H. in the period under review that were conducive to the development of censorship. According to the findings of the research, there were a number of intense censorial actions concerning the content of the permissible knowledge that the institution's lending library could contain, which attempted to delimit culturally acceptable debate. The administration of the P.A.H. could not fail to comply with this order, as it was interested in its survival in the newly formed political and ideological context. The process of removing books from the lending library corpus constitutes a *de jure* act of degradation of the pedagogical training offered by the P.A.H., but also a *de facto* confession of its complicity with the ideological principles of the dictatorship regime. What can be effortlessly deduced from the research of the archive is the policing and repressive character of the educational institutions at that time. It is no coincidence that all mails that were studied, originating from the Ministry of the Presidency of the Government and the General Secretariat for Press and Information, was transferred to the structures of the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, which then pass these orders on to the directors and inspectors of primary education, who are required to cooperate with the police. The ban therefore originates from non-educational institutions and permeates all educational institutions. Therefore, the lending library itself functions as a 'micro-unit' of research and is clearly part of the pedagogical training provided. In this sense, the main objective of the research has been achieved.

The individual research questions concerned the specific actions of this censorship strategy. From the findings of the research it became clear that censorship in the period under consideration with regard to the pedagogical training of P.A.H. was not limited to the violent prohibition of knowledge, but also extended to a non-obvious process of determining permissible knowledge. This took place through specific donations, mainly from state institutions, which influenced the ideological stance of the library and in an implicit way ideologically and pedagogically directed the Academy's students. The origin of the books is a very useful element in interpreting this research and was shown in Tables 3 and 4. What can be concluded is that the main organisation for implementing and coordinating the censorship (the General Secretariat for Press and Information) intervened in the enrichment of the lending library with a donation of many books from the second group, aiming at its ideological reorientation. On the other hand, State Service for Student Welfare was taking the same action, except that it is also donating a large number of books from the first group. If one considers that the largest number of donations came from a department of the ministry which was concerned with the concept of welfare, then the donations took on a different meaning. More specifically, the dictatorial regime intervenes in the library and influences its ideological orientation in an invisible way through the concept of welfare, which has been associated in the past with situations of dealing with morbid situations, but at the same time has also functioned as a means for social reforms and shaping the concept of socially acceptable (Karakatsani & Theodorou, 2010). Therefore, this intention of healing the body is now transferred in the intellectual level and it seems to be more effective in this way. This is an experiment of 'inoculating' the spirit of the students' minds with the aim of their ideological 'purification', according to dictators' standards.

The above description can be explained in terms of productive censorship. Dictators created the substitute of the cultural tradition that violently overthrew by them and incorporated people into it, as part of it and a structural component of its continuation. The same seems to have been attempted in the lending library under consideration. A large set of books were offered that served the hyper-nationalist approach as a characteristic element of dictators' ideology. Therefore, the individual research questions are answered and highlighted a strong presence of hidden censorship in the provided pedagogical training.

Conclusions and Implications

In conclusion, it could be argued that the main objective of the present research, namely the

emergence of characteristics in the pedagogical training offered by the P.A.H. in the period 1967-1974, has been achieved. Through the presentation of the preceding research findings, the violent intervention of the dictators during their first period of rule (1967-1972) and the continuation of this effort in a clandestine manner in their second period of rule (1972-1974) became apparent. Through all this preceding research it became clear that the P.A.H. lending library, as a micro-unit of research, is capable of revealing to a certain extent a 'bottom-up' censorship. As it was mentioned in the conceptual definition of the censorship, its repressive form does not produce strong effects. Dictators could not shape the conditions of subjectification of citizens according to its own criteria through legal means. It tried in the early phase of its government, but the result of this effort had the opposite effect in the field of culture.

In conclusion, it could be argued that the 'other academy' - the lending library - reveals overt and latent aspects of censorship in the pedagogical training of students of P.A.H. during 1967-1974. The dictators initially intervened in an overt way by removing 'corrupt' books and completed the procedure of repression by contributing (through the donations mentioned above) to the formation of a dominant knowledge group which could more effectively and unobtrusively control the formation of the scientific and not only scientific personality of future teachers.

It is worth noting at this point that the current research, as it is part of an archival material study, pertains exclusively to the institution from which the archival material originates, namely, the P.A.H. Therefore, in accordance with the ethics of the historical interpretative methodology "from below", it is difficult to generalise the conclusions of this research to other institutions providing pedagogical training in Greece in the period 1964-1974. In any case, the aim of the followed methodology was to correlate and compare the findings from the micro-units of research (in this case the library of the P.A.H.) with the literature and more generally with research that examined "from above" the historical reality. By definition, such an effort aspires to highlight a specific case of historical reality, with the aim not to influence the general picture the researcher has of a historical period, but to reflect on the particular characteristics of the specific case under study.

Suggestions for Future Research

This research could be further developed at a future level. In continuation of the proposed study, it would be of great historical interest to attempt a correlation and subsequent comparison of the institution of censorship in education (as there are no relevant studies on this issue in teacher education) in the period 1967-1974 with the findings of the present research. In this way, the researcher would have the opportunity to reflect on the presence of other unseen forms of censorship, which they may have overlooked in his/her research. Therefore, this research can be an occasion for broader work on the institution of censorship and offer an additional methodological - interpretative tool. However, the topic of this article can be explored more comprehensively and especially in greater depth if other documents are included, which will accompany the documents studied in this paper. More specifically, it would be of great research interest to study the book loans of the lending library under consideration. In this way, it would be possible to understand whether the censorship intention studied in this article was implemented in practice by the students themselves - future teachers. In this way, the productive form of censorship, which was discussed in the theoretical part of this paper, could be more fully highlighted. It would also be useful to study the documents concerning the student projects created by the borrowed books. It would also be important to study documents concerning the teaching of the courses at the P.A.H. during that period, so that any convergences or divergences with the censorship intention described above can be seen.

References

- Andritsos, G. (2016). Censorship in Greek cinema: Protectors of the nation and youth. *Journal of the Editors*.
- Athanasidou, A. (2008). Censorship and performativity: Regulating the limits of legal discourse. In G. Ziogas (Ed.), *Aspects of censorship in Greece* (pp. 158–166). Nefeli.
- Axelos, L. (1984). *Editorial activity and the movement of ideas in Greece*. Stochastis.
- Bouchard, J. (2018). Nikolaos Mavrokordatos and self-censorship. In I. Hadjipanagioti-Sangmeister (Ed.), *Control of ideas and censorship from the beginnings of Greek printing until the Constitution of 1844* (pp. 163–172). Athens.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press.
- Bunn, M. (2015). Reimagining repression: New censorship theory and after. *History and Theory*, 54(1), 25–44. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24543076>
- Butler, J. (1998). Ruled out: Vocabularies of the censor. In R. Post (eds.), *Censorship and silencing*. (pp. 247–260). Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.
- Charnow, S. D. (2005). The Politics of preventive censorship. In *Theatre, politics, and markets in Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (pp. 53–84). Palgrave Macmillan New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-05458-6_3
- Cook, P., & Heilmann, C. (2013). Two types of self-censorship: Public and private. *Political Studies*, 61(1), 178–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00957.x>
- Curry, A. (1997). *The limits of tolerance: Censorship and intellectual freedom in public libraries*. Scarecrow Press.
- Dimitropoulos, D. (2018). Between censorship and self-censorship. The attitude of the Hellenic Chronicles. In I. Hadjipanagioti-Sangmeister (Ed.), *Control of ideas and censorship from the beginnings of Greek printing until the Constitution of 1844* (pp. 351–372). Athens.
- Forced law 1092/1938, About the press. (1938). *Official Government Gazette*, 68, Vol. A, 02/22/1938.
- Forced law 437/1937. About Supplementing Law No. 45 of the Forced Law "About the establishment of the State Ministry of Press and Tourism. (1937). *Official Government Gazette*, 22, Vol. A, 25-1-1937
- Forced law 45/1936, About the establishment of the Ministry of Press and Tourism. (1936). *Official Government Gazette*, 379, Vol. A, 31-8-1936.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *Supervision and punishment*. Rappas.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *History of sexuality. 1 The thirst for knowledge*. Rappas.
- Heins, M. (2007). *Not in front of the children: 'Indecency', censorship, and the innocence of youth*. Rutgers University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hj1m3>
- Hourdakis, A. (2006). "Little secrets": The small scale and the concept of "microtext" in the history of education on the basis of a children's scrapbook. In H. Tzikas (Ed.), *Issues of history and historiography of education* (pp. 71–104). Epikentro.

- Jansen, S. C. (1991). *Censorship: The knot that binds power and knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
- Karakatsani, D., & Theodorou, V. (2010). 'Hygiene orders': Medical supervision and social welfare for the child in the first decades of the 20th century. *Dionikos*.
- Klapisis, H. (2019). The propaganda of dictatorship. In D. Kairidis, A. Klapisis, & S. Vlachopoulos (Eds.), *Dictatorship of the Colonels: A seven year period anatomy* (pp. 90–108). Pataakis.
- Koulouri, X. (2020). *Fustanelles and Chlamydes, historical memory and national identity 1821-1930*. Alexandria. Lambrinos, F. (2013). *It is Junta. Will it pass?*. Kastaniotis.
- Law 346/1969, About the press. (1969). *Official Government Gazette*, 232, Vol. A, 11/15/1969.
- Lemonidou, E. (2017). *History on the Big Screen. History, cinema and national identities*. Taxideftis.
- Leonidas, N. (1974). The rodent of truth: Censorship and the rodents that served it during the seven years. *Anti*, (1).
- Meynand, J. (2002). *The political forces in Greece. Volume 2: Royal abortion and military dictatorship*. Savvalas.
- Minnich, N. H. (2010). The fifth Lateran council and preventive censorship of printed books. *Annali Della Scuola Normale Superiore Di Pisa. Classe Di Lettere e Filosofia*, 2(1), 67–104. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24308618>
- Moellendick, C. M. (2009). Libraries, censors, and self-censorship. *PNLA Quarterly*, 73(4), 68–76. <https://pnla.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/volume-73-4-summer-2009.pdf>
- Moody, K. (2004). Opinions and experiences of Queensland-based public librarians with regard to censorship of materials in public library collections: An exploratory analysis. In *Proceedings of the ALIA 2004 Biennial Conference: Challenging Ideas*. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/479/1/ALIA_Paper_eprints.pdf
- Moody, K. (2005). Covert censorship in libraries: A discussion paper. *The Australian Library Journal*, 54(2), 138–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049670.2005.10721741>
- Papadimitriou, L., & Kulentianou, M. (2009). *The Greek musical. Critical-cultural view*. Papazisis.
- Papanikolaou, D. (2017). Making some paradoxical moves: Culture in the years of dictatorship. In Karamanolakis (Ed.), *The military dictatorship*. Ta Nea.
- Pehlivanos, M. (2018). On the self-censorship of a ruler: Nicholas Mavrokordatos and the Philotheos Parerga. In I. Hadjipanagioti-Sangmeister (Ed.), *Control of ideas and censorship from the beginnings of Greek printing until the Constitution of 1844* (pp. 173–192). Athens.
- Peshmazoglou, V. (1999). Greek dictatorship (1967–1974) and the EU: Economy, politics, ideology. In G. Athanasatou (Ed.), *The dictatorship 1967–1974* (pp. 92–114). Kastaniotis.
- Petsini, P., & Christopoulos, D. (2016). Why censorship. In P. Petsini & D. Christopoulos (Eds.), *Censorship in Greece 1967-1974*. (pp. 10–16). Rosa Luxemburg Foundation.
- Raitsinis, C. (2016). *Illegal press, censorship and propaganda during the dictatorship of the colonels 1967-1974* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, School of Economics and Political Sciences.
- Reichman, H. (2001). *Censorship and selection: Issues and answers for schools* (3rd. ed.). American Library

Association.

Royal decree 108/1942, About the amendment, supplementation and codification of the provisions on the control of theatrical works, cinematographic films, gramophone records and books. (1942). *Official Government Gazette*, 48, Vol. A, 03/06/1942.

Stratos, K. (1995). *Opposition and dissent the position of the newspapers in the 1967-1974 dictatorship*. Kastaniotis.

Whelan, D. (2009, February 02). *A dirty little secret: Self-censorship*. School Library Journal. <https://www.slj.com/story/a-dirty-little-secret-self-censorship>

Zacharopoulos, T., & Paraschos, M. (1993). *Mass media in Greece: Power, politics and privatization*. Praeger.

Zervou, A. (1992). *Censorship and resistance in the texts of our childhood: 'Robinson', 'Alice' and 'The fairy tale with no name': an adult's reading*. Odysseus.

Ziogas, G. (2008). *Aspects of censorship in Greece*. In G. Ziogas (Ed.), *Aspects of censorship in Greece* (pp. 2–10). Nefeli.