

JOURNAL OF THE HELLENIC DIASPORA

VOL. VI, No. 1

SPRING 1979

ANATOMY LESSON

by VASILIS VASILIKOS

THE UNITED STATES AND THE OPERATIONAL
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE GREEK
ARMED FORCES, 1947-1987

by YIANNIS P. ROUBATIS

THE POETRY OF DINOS CHRISTIANOPOULOS:
AN INTRODUCTION

by KIMON FRIAR

THE POETRY OF DINOS CHRISTIANOPOULOS:
A SELECTION

A SURVEY OF RECENT TRENDS IN
GREEK HIGHER EDUCATION

by HENRY WASSER

BOOK REVIEWS

LETTERS

JOURNAL OF THE HELLENIC DIASPORA

A Quarterly Review

VOL. VI, No. 1

SPRING 1979

Editorial Board:

DAN GEORGAKAS
PASCHALIS M. KITROMILIDES
PETER PAPPAS
YIANNIS P. ROUBATIS

Managing Editor:

PHYLLIS R. CRAIG

Advisory Editors:

NIKOS PETROPOULOS
DINO SIOTIS

The Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora is a quarterly review published by Pella Publishing Company, Inc., 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, NY 10001, U.S.A., in March, June, September, and December. Copyright © 1979 by Pella Publishing Company.

The editors welcome the freelance submission of articles, essays and book reviews. All submitted material should be typewritten and double-spaced. Translations should be accompanied by the original text. Book reviews should be approximately 600 to 1,200 words in length. Manuscripts will not be returned unless they are accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Subscription rates: Individual—\$12.00 for one year, \$22.00 for two years; Foreign—\$15.00 for one year by surface mail; Foreign—\$20.00 for one year by

air mail; Institutional—\$20.00 for one year, \$35.00 for two years. Single issues cost \$3.50; back issues cost \$4.50.

Advertising rates can be had on request by writing to the Managing Editor.

Articles appearing in this *Journal* are abstracted and/or indexed in *Historical Abstracts* and *America: History and Life*; or in *Sociological Abstracts*; or in *Psychological Abstracts*; or in the *Modern Language Association Abstracts* (includes *International Bibliography*) in accordance with the relevance of content to the abstracting agency.

All articles and reviews published in the *Journal* represent only the opinions of the individual authors; they do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors or the publisher

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

ATHAN ANAGNOSTOPOULOS is associate professor of classics at Boston University . . . KIMON FRIAR's translations of Yannis Ritsos, Takis Sinopoulos, and Manolis Anagnostakis will be published soon . . . S. VICTOR PAPACOSMA is associate professor of history at Kent State University . . . PETER PAPPAS is an editor of the *Journal* . . . In addition to being an editor of the *Journal*, YIANNIS P. ROUBATIS is the Washington correspondent of the Athens daily, *Ta Nea*. He is currently working on a book about the murder of George Polk . . . MINAS SAVVAS teaches creative writing at San Diego State University . . . GEORGE VALAMVANOS is a regular contributor to the *Journal* . . . PERICLES S. VALLIANOS received his doctorate in the history of ideas from Brandeis University . . . VASILIS VASILIKOS is the author of *Z*, *Photographs*, and *The Monarch*, among many other works. His most recent book is *My Whole Life (Stelios Kazantzidis)* . . . HENRY WASSER is professor of humanities at the College of Staten Island and an associate of the Center for European Studies of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He is the co-author of *Higher Education in Western Europe and North America: A Selected Annotated Bibliography*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Statement</i>	4
<i>Anatomy Lesson</i> by Vasilis Vasilikos	5
<i>The United States and the Operational Responsibilities of the Greek Armed Forces, 1947-1987</i> by Yiannis P. Roubatis	39
<i>The Poetry of Dinos Christianopoulos: An Introduction</i> by Kimon Friar	59
<i>The Poetry of Dinos Christianopoulos: A Selection</i>	68
<i>A Survey of Recent Trends in Greek Higher Education</i> by Henry Wasser	85
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Pericles S. Vallianos on <i>Homage to the Tragic Muse</i> ...	97
Peter Pappas on <i>Politics and Cinema</i>	102
S. Victor Papacosma on <i>Social Change and Military Intervention, 1880-1909</i>	107
George Valamvanos on <i>The Athenian Review</i>	109
Minas Savvas on <i>Resistance, Exile and Love</i>	114
<i>Letters</i>	117
<i>Publications Received</i>	119
<i>Index</i>	122

Statement

With the previous issue, the first five years of the *Journal* came to a close. Begun as a voice against the dictatorship of April 21, it has developed into a permanent forum for the democratic discussion of all issues concerning contemporary Greek reality. Furthermore, it has become an important medium for the presentation of what is most vital—and viable—in Greek culture.

While we believe that we have done much to ensure that the *Journal* become an authentic organ of Greeks in the diaspora, we know that there is still more to do. As we enter our second five years, we would like to invite our readers to participate in the *Journal's* development.

We welcome not only suggestions for improvement, but constructive criticism of our errors and deficiencies. We believe that the production of a magazine accounts for only half of its life—the other half begins only after it reaches the hands of the reader. In that spirit of common enterprise, we urge all our readers to take an active role in the ongoing definition of the *Journal*.

—The Editors

Anatomy Lesson

Μάθημα Ἀνατομίας

by VASILIS VASILIKOS

Last fall, after an absence of many years, Vasilis Vasilikos visited the United States for several weeks. The immediate creative result of that visit (though not the only or final one, undoubtedly) was "Μάθημα Ἀνατομίας," the story which follows these comments. Ostensibly about a conference of anatomists, its essential concern is the meaning of history and the manner in which it is confronted. The central metaphor of anatomy is an unusually perceptive crystallization of the social role historians play in defining and analyzing the development of our collective consciousness. Humanity's past is reified into a corpse which historians—history's anatomists—dissect. Having done so, they deduce from its entrails not only what has already been but what is yet to come. As such, their "profession," Vasilikos seems to imply, is sometimes inseparable from the ritual function of a magus.

Although "Μάθημα Ἀνατομίας" may bear similarities to any number of academic conferences, it would be a profound misjudgment to read it as a *conte à clef*. To do so would be to lose the general resonance of Vasilikos's metaphor for the satisfaction of illusory deductions. The point to the story is not to make connections "to persons living or dead," but to describe the process by which humanity many times distorts its own self-portrait. In this sense, the reference in the story to Rembrandt's painting is not only significant but crucial.

As more and more scholars are beginning to realize, the rigidly-defined specialization which has been imposed on the humanities and social sciences is leading to a new intellectual barbarism. Most political scientists are as ignorant of Stendhal and Mayakovsky as professors of literature are oblivious to Locke and Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*. It is time to reinterpret the idea of the rationalization of academic disciplines and to understand that history and culture are the two separate profiles of the same human face. In that respect, we can learn as much about history from a writer as we can about literature from a historian. In any case, we are indeed fortunate in that "Μάθημα Ἀνατομίας" is an excellent example of both history and literature.

—Peter Pappas

Στόν Θανάση

Ἡ αἰθουσα ἀνατομίας ἦταν ὑπερπλήρης. Ὁ λόγος πού τό μάθημα αὐτή τή φορά εἶχε ὑπό ἐξέτασιν ἕνα ἀσυνήθιστο πτώμα: ἕναν ἄντρα πού ἔμενε ἀνεπτόπιστη ἡ ἐποχή τοῦ θανάτου του, ἀπό βλῆμα στήν καρδιά. Πού ὅμως ἦταν σίγουρο, ὅπως εἶπε ἡ συντονίστρια τοῦ μαθήματος, μιά γυναίκα δυναμική, ψυχῇ αὐτῆς συναθροισις ἔξω ἀπ' τά καθιερωμένα, ἦταν δεδαιωμένο—ἐπιστημονικά ἐξακριβωμένο—ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος αὐτός, παλιός ἀντάρτης, εἶχε βρεῖ τόν θάνατο στήν κρίσιμη γιά τή χώρα του δεκαετία 1940 - 1950. Διατηρημένος στήν ψυχραποθήκη τόσα χρόνια, φέτος τόν βγάλαν ἀπό κεῖ γιά πρώτη φορά γιά νά τόν κόψουν καί νά μελετήσουν τά ἀληθινά περιεργα ὄργανά του.

Γιατί τό πτώμα αὐτό εἶχε μιά καρδιά, ὅπως δεῖξαν οἱ πλάκες πού τοῦ πήραν, ὑπερβολικά ἀναπτυγμένη («γεμάτη ἐλπίδες, ὅπως θᾶλεγε κι ὁ ποιητής», συμπλήρωσε ἡ συντονίστρια), ἐνῶ ἀντίθετα τό πεπτικό του σύστημα ἦταν (πάντα σύμφωνα μέ τίς ἀκτινογραφίες) ὑπερβολικά ἀτροφικό («ἀπό τήν πείνα τοῦ καιροῦ του, τῆς Κατοχῆς»). Ἀκόμα παρουσίαζε κι ἄλλα παράξενα γιά ἕνα «ἄφτερο δίποδο» (κατά τήν ἔκφραση τοῦ μεγάλου μας Καζαντζάκη): τό ἀριστερό ποδάρι του ἦταν πιό μεγάλο ἀπ' τό δεξι (ἀπ' τό ἀδιάκοπο τρέξιμο, σκέφτηκε ὁ «Ροῦμπενς», πού εἶχε πάει νά παρακολοθηθεῖ τό μάθημα), ἐνῶ τό δεξι χέρι του ἔμοιαζε δυσανάλογα ἀναπτυγμένο σέ σχέση μέ τό ἀριστερό του («ἀπ' τό νά τά παίρνει ἀπ' τοὺς προστάτες, τοὺς ξένους», συμπλήρωσε ὁ «Ρέμπραντ» δίπλα του, πού εἶχε πάει παρέα μαζί του, «τίς ἐγγλέζικες λίρες, τά ἀργύρια τῆς προδοσίας»). Τό κεφάλι του ἦταν δόλιχο κι ὅπως θᾶλεγε ὁ Πουλιανός, ἄν τό κρανιομετροῦσε, ἀνῆκε στόν καθαρόαιμο τύπο τοῦ Ἑλληνα ἢ τοῦ Ρωμηοῦ, ὅπως τό καθόρισε μέ τίς ἐγκεφαλομετρήσεις του στοὺς πολιτικούς πρόσφυγες τοῦ Καύκασου καί τῆς Τασκένδης.

Τά μάτια του, γιά πάντα κλειστά, ἀποτελοῦσαν ἕνα μυστήριο γιά τοὺς ἀνατόμους. Ἦταν ἄραγε πράσινα, λαδιά, καστανά ἢ μαύρα; Καί ποιά φλόγα ἄραγε νά τά ἔκαιγε; Τά γένεια του, ὅπως μεγάλωσαν στό διάστημα πού μεσολάδησε ἀνάμεσα στή στιγμή πού σκοτώθηκε ὡσου νά τόν κλείσουν στήν ψυχραποθήκη, τόν ἔκαναν νά μοιάζει μέ παπά, μέ τόν καλόγερο-ὕπασπιστή τοῦ Βελουχιώτη ἢ ἀκόμα μπορούσαν νά θεωρηθοῦν πανομοιότυπα, στό στυλ τῆς γενειάδας, μέ ἐκείνη τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ τοῦ ΕΛΑΣ, στρατηγοῦ Ναπολέοντα Ζέρβα.

Τό στόμα του ἦταν σφραγισμένο μέ τήν πίκρα, μιά πίκρα ἀνείπωτη, σά νᾶξερε, τή στιγμή πού κατάλαβε ὅτι δέν πρόκειται νά τό ξανανοῖξει, ὅτι κάποια μέρα θά γινόταν αὐτό πού σήμερα πράγματι συνέβαινε, ν' ἀποτελέσει δηλαδή σῶμα πρὸς ἀνάλυσιν, «ἀνατομία ἐνός ἐγκλήματος», ἐκτεθειμένο, ἀπροστάτευτο, ἀνῆμπορο ν' ἀπαντήσει στίς ἀπόψεις καί στίς κόψεις τῶν μεγάλων ἀνατόμων. Στόμα πικρό, λαλιά βουδαιμένη, Ἑλλάδα προδομένη, πτώμα πρὸς ἐξέτασιν.

The anatomy room was overcrowded. The reason was that the lesson this time had an unusual corpse under examination: a man whose time of death, from a bullet in the heart, remained undetermined. But it was certain, as the chairwoman of this lesson—a dynamic woman, the soul of this extraordinary gathering—said, it was scientifically verified, that this man, an old partisan, had met his death during 1940-1950, a critical decade for his country. Preserved in the morgue for so many years, this year they took him out for the first time to dissect him and study his truly curious organs.

For this corpse had a heart, as the X-rays they took of him showed, that was extremely developed ("filled with hopes, as the poet would have said," the chairwoman added), whereas, on the contrary, his peptic system was (always according to X-rays) extremely atrophied ("from the famine of his time, the Occupation"). Also, he manifested other strange things for a "wingless two-legged being" (according to the expression of our great Kazantzakis): his left leg was bigger than his right ("from the endless running," thought "Rubens," who had gone to attend the lesson), whereas his right hand seemed disproportionately developed compared to his left ("from taking the English pounds—the money of betrayal—from his protectors, the foreigners," added "Rembrandt," who had gone with him, next to him). He was dolichocephalic, and as Poulianos would have said if he had done the cephalometry, he belonged to the pure Greek or Romios blood type, as had been established from the encephalographs of the political refugees in the Caucasus and Tashkent.

His eyes, closed forever, were a mystery to the anatomists. Were they perhaps green, yellowish green, brown or black? And what flame had burned in them? His beard, as it had grown in the period that had intervened from the moment he was killed to the time they had put him in the morgue, made him resemble a priest, the monk aide-camp of Velouchiotis, or, even more, could be seen as a replica, because of the style, of the one worn by the leader of EDES, General Napoleon Zervas.

His mouth was sealed with bitterness, an unspoken bitterness, as if he knew, the moment he realized that he was not destined to open it again, that some day there would occur what indeed was occurring today, that he would become, that is, a body for analysis, "the anatomy of a crime," exposed, undefended, unable to answer the considerations and lacerations of the great anatomists. A bitter mouth, a muted voice, a Greece betrayed, a corpse for examination.

Ὁ Ρέμπραντ ἢ ὁ Ροῦμπενς (διαφωνοῦσαν αὐτὸς μὲ τὸν φίλο του γιὰ τὸ ποιὸς ἀπ' τούτους δύο εἶχε ζωγραφίσει τὸν περίφημο πίνακα κι ἀπὸ τὴν διαφωνία τους αὐτὴ εἶχαν προσεταιριστεῖ τὰ δνόματά τους) θὰ ζωγράφιζε ἀλλιῶς τὸ ἀνατομικὸ μάθημα ἂν ἦταν παρὼν στὴν αἰθουσα αὐτὴ, τὴν κατὰ μισητὴ ἀπὸ πλῆθος διψασμένο, κεντρισιμένο στὴν ἔσχατὴ του περιέργεια νὰ μάθει, νὰ πληροφορηθεῖ τί ἦταν τελοσπάντων αὐτὸ τὸ παράξενο πτώμα πού πολλοὶ τ' ἀναγνώριζαν γιὰ δικὸν τους (ὅσοι εἶχαν ἀκόμα ἀγνοοῦμενους τῆς ἐποχῆς ἐκεῖνης καὶ τοὺς ἀναζητοῦσαν ἀκόμα μέσω τοῦ Διεθνoῦς Ἐρυθροῦ Σταυροῦ), ἐνῶ οἱ περισσότεροι ἀναγνώριζαν στὴν παραμορφωμένη σωματικὴ του διάπλαση ἕναν πρόγονο τῆς δικῆς τους σωματικῆς ἀναπηρίας. (Κ' εἶχαν συρρεῦσει, ἐκτός ἀπ' τοὺς καθαυτὸ φοιτητὲς τῆς Ἰατρικῆς πού ἔτσι κι ἀλλιῶς θάρχονταν στὸ μάθημα, πλῆθος ἄλλοι, φοιτητὲς ἄλλων σχολῶν, κοινωνιολόγοι, ἐνδυματολόγοι, ποιητὲς, νομικοὶ καὶ ψυχαναλυτὲς, καθὼς κ' ἕνας κόσμος πού πόδιζε γιὰ πρώτη φορὰ σὲ πανεπιστημιακὸ χῶρο, ἐργάτες, μηχανολόγοι, ἐστιατοροὶ, συνομηλίκοι τοῦ πτώματος στὴν ἐποχὴ τοῦ θανάτου του, σημερινὰ γεροντάκια, μὲ φλόγα ὁμως ἀσβεστῆ κ' ἕνα σωρὸ ἀναμνήσεις.)

Ὁ Ροῦμπενς ἢ ὁ Ρέμπραντ λοιπὸν θὰ ζωγράφιζε ἕνα ἀμφιθέατρο σημερινοῦ πανεπιστημίου, ὅπου τὰ διψασμένα πρόσωπα θὰ γέμιζαν ἀσφυκτικὰ τὸ χῶρο· ἀπὸ τὰ μεγάλα παράθυρα θὰ περνοῦσαν πλάγιες ἀκτίνες φθοριακοῦ φωτός (ἕνας ἥλιος χημικὸς ἀπ' ἔξω)· στὸ πλάτωμα μπροστὰ ἀπὸ τὸ μισοφέγγαρο τραπέζι θάταν τὸ πτώμα, φωτισμένο μὲ σπὸτ, συνδεμένο μὲ ἀποσιμητικὰ καλώδια, μπάς καὶ μυρίσει· κι ἀπάνω, στὸ μισοφέγγαρο τραπέζι, θὰ ἔβαζε, μπροστὰ στὰ φυτεμένα μικρόφωνα, στὴ σειρά, τοὺς ἐξῆς ἀνατόμους: πρῶτα, σὲ προφίλ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸ, γιὰτὶ ἔπιανε τὴ γωνιά τοῦ τραπεζιοῦ, ἕναν τύπο οὐδέτερο· δίπλα του ἕναν ξερακιανὸ· πλάι στὸν ξερακιανὸ ἕνα συμπαθητικὸ γεροντάκι, θασσανισμένο· στὴ μέση τὴν κυρία, τὴν συντονίστρια· δίπλα ἀπ' αὐτὴν ἕναν μὲ μούσι· δίπλα ἀπ' τὸ πρῶτο μούσι, πού ἦταν ψαλιδισμένο, ἕναν ἄλλον μὲ μούσι δλόφυτο· κατόπι μιά περίεργη μορφή Ἄγγλου λόρδου· καὶ τελευταῖο ἕναν καθηγητὴ πού ἔμοιαζε κι αὐτὸς καταφυγμένος. Τὸ σύνολο μιά μᾶλλον θλιθερὴ σύναξη ἀνατόμων πού δ,τι τοὺς χαρακτηρίζε (ἂν ἐξαίρεσοῦμε τὴ θασσανισμένη μορφή τοῦ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν τρίτου) ἦταν μιά ψυχράδα ἐπαγγελματικὴ, μιά αὐτοϊκανοποίηση γιὰ τὸ πού εἶχαν ἕνα τόσο ἐνδιαφέρον πτώμα νὰ πετσοκόψουν, ἕνα αἶσθημα θριάμβου τελικὰ πάνω στὸ θάνατο ἀφοῦ αὐτοί, οἱ ζωντανοί, εἶχαν ἔτσι τὴν εὐκαιρία νὰ τὸν ἀναλύσουν.

Αὐτὸς μὲ τὸν φίλο του θρισκόταν στίς πρῶτες σειρὲς ἔτσι πούμποροῦσαν νὰ ξεχωρίζουν λεπτομέρειες στὰ πρόσωπα τῆς στρογγυλῆς τραπέζης. Ὅση ὥρα κράτησε τὸ μάθημα, σκάσαν ἀπ' τὴν ἀνημπόρια τους πού δὲνμποροῦσαν νὰ καπνίσουν. Τὸ μάθημα περνοῦσε ὄλο στὰ μαγνητόφωνα πού δούλευαν σ' ἕνα μικρὸ καμαράκι, καταγράφοντας τὴ ζωντανία τῆς συζήτησης τῶν ἐπιφανῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιστημόνων πάνω στὸ πτώμα τοῦ ἀνώνυμου φουκαρᾶ.

Rembrandt or Rubens (the two friends disagreed about who had painted the famous work and, from their disagreement, they had assumed their respective names) would have painted the anatomy lesson differently if he were present in this room packed with a thirsty crowd, spurred to its ultimate curiosity to learn, to be informed at last about the nature of this strange corpse which many recognized as their own (those who still had people missing from that period and were still searching for them through the international Red Cross), while most recognized in his deformed bodily shape an ancestor of their own physical handicap. (And there had assembled, in addition to the actual medical students who would have come to the lesson anyway, a throng of others: students from other schools, sociologists, costume designers, poets, legislators and psychoanalysts, as well as a crowd which was setting foot on a university campus for the first time—workers, machinists, restaurateurs, contemporaries of the corpse at the time of its death, old men now, but with an unquenched flame and many memories.)

Rubens or Rembrandt, then, would have painted an amphitheater at a modern university, where the thirsting faces would have jammed the place to suffocation; through the large windows the rays of a fluorescent light would have passed obliquely (a chemical sun from outside); on the platform in front of the crescent-shaped table there would be the corpse, illuminated by spotlights, connected to deodorant wires, lest it smell; and on the crescent-shaped table he would have placed, in front of the planted microphones, in order, the following anatomists: first, profile to the audience, because he occupied the corner of the table, a neutral type; beside him, a scrawny fellow; beside the scrawny one, a sympathetic old face, tormented; in the middle, the lady, the chairwoman; beside her, someone with a beard; beside the first beard, which was trimmed, another man with a fully grown beard; then, the strange face of an English lord; and finally, a professor who also looked frozen. The whole, a rather sad assembly of anatomists who were marked (if we exclude the tormented face third on the left) by a professional coldness, a self-satisfaction based on the fact that they had such an interesting corpse to dissect, a feeling of triumph over death, since these people, the living, had, thus, a chance to analyze it.

He and his friend were seated in a front row so they could discern the details on the faces of the people at the round table. As long as the lesson was going on, they were furious that they could not smoke. The lesson went on to tape recorders which were working in a small room, recording the vigor of the discussion of these illustrious scientists concerning the corpse of the anonymous man.

Ἡ συντονίστρια ἄρχισε τὸν πρόλογό της λέγοντας πὼς χρειάστηκαν πολλοὶ κόποι καὶ πολλὰ ἔξοδα γιὰ «νά φτάσουμε στήν παρούσα στιγμή». Πρῶτα γιὰ νάρθει τὸ πτώμα ἀπ' τήν Ἑλλάδα ἐδῶ πού θρίσκονταν, δηλαδή στὶς Ἑνωμένες Πολιτεῖες τῆς Ἀμερικῆς, ἔπειτα γιὰ νά κληθοῦν ὅλοι οἱ παρευρισκόμενοι ἀνατόμοι ἀπὸ τίς διαφορετικὲς ἔδρες τοὺς ὅπου διδάσκαν, νά συμπέσουν οἱ ἐλεύθεροι χρόνοι τοὺς καὶ τὰ λοιπά. Εὐχαρίστησε τὸ κοινὸ γιὰ τὴν ἀθρόα συμμετοχὴ του καὶ τὴν ἑλληνικὴ πρεσβεία στήν Οὐάσιγκτον πού πραγματικὰ βοήθησε ἀπεριόριστα, μὲ κάθε τρόπο, τὴ γραφειοκρατικὴ μηχανή, νά παρθοῦν οἱ σχετικὲς ἄδειες τῶν ὑγειονομικῶν ἀρχῶν, τῶν ἀστυνομικῶν κατόπι, ὥσπου νά φτάσουν ἐπιτέλους στή στιγμή αὐτὴ ὅπου τὰ μαχαίρια τῶν ἀνατόμων, ἀκονισμένα, θά μπορούσαν ἀνεμπόδιστα νά δουλέψουν.

Τὸ κοινὸ δυσφοροῦσε μὲ τὸ μακρονάρι τῆς εἰσαγωγῆς. Φοβόταν μήπως ἀρχίσει τὸ πτώμα καὶ βρωμάει πρὶν μάθουν ποιὸς ἦταν, γιὰτί πέθανε καὶ τὰ ρέστα.

«Κατ' ἀρχὴν (πῆρε πρῶτος τὸ λόγο μετὰ τὴ συντονίστρια τὸ ψαλιδισμένο μούσι), δὲν ἔχουμε στή διάθεσή μας ὅλα τὰ ἀπαραίτητα στοιχεῖα πού θά βοηθοῦσαν νά καθορίσουμε τὴν προέλευση τοῦ νεκροῦ. Ὑπάρχουν, ἐπιστημονικὰ μιλώντας, πολλὰ κενά. Χωρὶς τὴ ληξιαρχικὴ πράξη γεννήσεως καὶ θανάτου, καμιὰ αὐτοψία δὲν ἔχει τὰ ἐγγύγια τῆς ἀκρίβειας. Μά ἦταν τέτοια ἡ ἐποχὴ πού πέθανε ὁ ἄνθρωπος, συμπλήρωσε, ἀνώμαλη, ταραγμένη, πού ζητοῦμε φύλλους στὰ ἄχαρα. Καταστραφῆκαν ἀρχεῖα, χαθῆκαν οἰκογένειες, ξεκληριστῆκαν σπίτια. Ἡ Ἑλλάδα δὲν χαρακτηρίζονταν ποτέ ἐξάλλου γιὰ τὴ διατήρηση τῶν ἀρχείων της. Τύπος περάσματος, διασταύρωσης λαῶν, πού νά κρατᾶ γενεαλογικὰ δέντρα! Ἄν σκάψεις πίσω ἀπ' τὸν κάθε Ἕλληνα (καὶ εἶμαι Ἕλληνας, διευκρίνησε, ἂν καὶ σταδιοδρόμησα ἐδῶ, στήν Ἀμερικὴ) θά βρεῖς τὸ ἴδιο περίπου πού συμβαίνει μὲ τοὺς τίτλους ἰδιοκτησίας: βρίσκονται στήν Κωνσταντινούπολη, στὸ ἐκεῖ ἀρχαιοφυλακεῖο, πού δὲν ὑπάρχει γιὰτί τὸ κάψαν οἱ Νεότουρκοι. Ἔτσι, πίσω ἀπὸ κάθε Ἕλληνα, κρύβεται ἐν σπέρματι ἓνας Ἀλβανός, ἓνας Τοῦρκος, ἓνας Σλαῦος, ἓνας Εὐρωπαῖος, ἓνας Ἀσιάτης. Τὸ καθαρδαίμο τῆς φυλῆς τῶν Βίκιγκς, λόγου χάρη, δὲν ἀπαντιέται σέ μᾶς, στὸν ἑλληνικὸ λαό. Ἄν τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κρανίου του μᾶς ὑποβάλλει τὴν ἰδέα ὅτι εἶναι ἀπ' τὸν Πόντο, τίποτα δὲν ἀποκλείει ἢ καταγωγὴ τοῦ πτώματος νάνα ἀπὸ τὴν Μέσα Μάνη ἢ ἀπὸ ψηλά, τὴν Φλώρινα. Τὸ γεγονὸς ὅτι βρέθηκε, μπορεῖ νά βρέθηκε δηλαδή στὸ Βίτσι, πάνω σέ μιὰ βουνοκορφή, δὲν χαρακτηρίζει κι αὐτὸ τίποτα. Πὼς ἀνέβηκε στήν κορφὴ; Κρατώντας πολυδόλο; Ἦταν δηλαδή μπουραντάς ἢ κατσαπλιάς, γιὰ νά μεταχειριστοῦμε τὴν ὀρολογία τῆς ἐποχῆς ἐκεῖνης. Μοναρχοφασίστας ἢ φαντάρος τοῦ δημοκρατικοῦ στρατοῦ; Τίποτα ἀπ' ὅλα αὐτά, ἐξηγῶ, δὲν ἐνδιαφέρει τὰ ἐπιστημονικὰ δεδομένα τοῦ προβλήματος. Ἡ ἀπόσταση πού ἔχουμε ἀπὸ τὸ γεγονὸς μᾶς βοηθεῖ νά τὸ δοῦμε χωρὶς φόβο καὶ πάθος. Τὸ πτώμα εἶναι πτώμα. Ὅσο κι ἂν, συμπλήρωσε, σωστὴ εἶναι κ' ἡ ἀντίθετη ἀποψη: ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστήμονας πρέπει νά λαβαίνει θέση. Ἡ θέση μου ὁμως, ἢ δική μου, μὲ κάνει

The chairwoman started her introduction by saying that much effort and many expenses had been necessary "to arrive at the present moment." First, the corpse had to come from Greece to here where it was now, that is, the United States of America; then, all the anatomists who were present had to be invited from their various universities where they were teaching; their free times had to coincide, etc. She thanked the audience for their great participation and the Greek Embassy in Washington, which had really helped, in every way, the bureaucratic machine to get the required permits from the health authorities and the police until they had finally reached this moment when the whetted knives of the anatomists could work unobstructed.

The audience was growing impatient with the long drawn-out introduction. They were afraid that the corpse might begin to smell before they could learn who it was, why it died, and the rest.

"To begin with" (the first one to speak after the chairwoman was the trimmed beard), "we don't have at our disposal all the necessary documents which would help determine the origin of the dead man. There are, scientifically speaking, many gaps. Without the registrar's certificate of birth and death, no autopsy has the guarantee of accuracy. But," he added, "the period in which the man died was such, anomalous and turbulent, that we are looking for a needle in a haystack. Archives were destroyed, families perished, homes were annihilated. Besides, Greece has never been characterized by the preservation of her archives. A land of passage, of the crossing of peoples, how could it keep a genealogical tree? If one dug into each Greek (and I am Greek," he explained, "although I've made my career here in America), he'd discover almost the same thing that happened with property titles: they were in Constantinople, in the Archives Bureau which no longer exists because the Young Turks burned it down. Thus, behind each Greek hides, in seed, an Albanian, a Turk, a Slav, a European, an Asian. The pure race of the Vikings, for example, does not exist in us, in the Greek people. If the shape of his skull suggests to us that he's from Pontus, nothing excludes the possibility that the origin of the corpse might be from Mesa Mani or from the north, from Florina. The fact that it was found, that it might have been found, on Vitsi for instance, on a mountain ridge, means absolutely nothing. How did he get to the mountain peak? Holding a machine gun? Was he a *bouradas* (quisling) or a *katsaplias* (bandit), to use the terminology of that period? A monarchofascist or a soldier of the Democratic Army? Nothing of all this, I explain, is of interest to the scientific givens of the problem. The distance which we have from this fact helps us to examine it without fear or passion. A corpse is a corpse. Although," he added, "the opposite point of view is also correct: a scholar must take a position. My position, though, my own position, makes me confess the nonexistence of any position. Because I lack the documents. Documents which would have obliged me to take a position. . . ."

νά ομολογήσω τήν ἀνυπαρξία τῆς θέσης. Γιατί μου λείπουν τά στοιχεῖα. Στοιχεῖα πού θά μέ ἀνάγκαιζαν νά λάβω θέσιν. . . .»

Καί λέγοντας αὐτά, κατέβηκε ἀπ' τό βῆμα καί τράβηξε τήν πρώτη μαχαιριά στό μέρος πού τό βλήμα βρήκε τήν καρδιά.

(Ἔνα χωράφι ἀνθόσπαρτο εἶδε Αὐτός νά θγαίνει, ἕνα καλύδι ταπεινό, ἡ κασιόκα δεμένη, οἱ κόττες νά βοσκοῦν, μιά οἰκογένεια ἀγροτική πού μιά νύχτα τῆς κάφιν τά σπαράτά της εἶτε γιατί βοήθησε τ' ἀγναρτικά εἶτε γιατί ἦταν καρφωτή τοῦ γείτονα πού τσακώνονταν γιά μιά ρίζα ἐλιᾶς, πρὶν ἀπ' τόν πόλεμο ἀκόμα.)

«Ἄν τό βλήμα», συνέχισε τό ψαλιδισμένο μούσι, «εἶχε μείνει μέσα στό σῶμα, θά μπορούσαμε νά καθορίσουμε τήν ταυτότητα τοῦ θύματος πού θάταν, ὑποχρεωτικά, ἀντίθετη τοῦ τόπου καταγωγῆς καί προελεύσεως τοῦ θπλου, ἔπως λέν στόν στρατό. Ἄν τό βλήμα ἦταν ἀμερικάνικο, ὁ νεκρός μας τότε θάταν ἕνας ἀντάρτης. Ἄν ἦταν ρωσικό, θάταν ἕνας στρατιώτης τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ στρατοῦ. Ὡστόσο, γιά νά ἐξετάσουμε τή δομή τῆς καρδιάς, δέν εἶναι ἀνάγκη νά προστρέξουμε στήν πολιτιολογία. Ἡ δομή λοιπόν παρουσιάζει ὅλα τά συμπτώματα μιάς χρόνιας ἀνεπάρκειας. . . .»

«Ζήτηω ὁ ἠρωϊκός ΕΛΑΣ», ἀκούστηκε μιά φωνή ἀπ' τό ἀκροατήριο, μέ ἑλληνοαμερικάνικη προφορά σέ βαθμῶ τρίτοβάθμιου ἐγκαυματος τῆς γλώσσας. (Βαθῶ τό «λάμδα», σά νά λές «κάλτσες» κ' ἡ γλώσσα νά κολλᾷ στήν πάνω ὀδοντοστοιχία, ἀπό μέσα.)

Χειροκροτήματα ἀκούστηκαν διάσπαρτα μέσ τό μεγάλο ἀμφιθέατρο.

«Νά γυρίσουν ὅλοι οἱ πολιτικοί πρόσφυγες», φώναξε ἕνας ἄλλος ἀπό τά πάνω ἔδρανα.

«Νά ἀναγνωριστεῖ ἡ ἐθνική μας ἀντίσταση», ἀκούστηκε μιά ἄλλη φωνή.

«Οἱ ἐρωτήσεις στό τέλος», παρακάλεσε ἡ συντονίστρια.

«Εἶναι αἰτήματα, δέν εἶναι ἐρωτήσεις», τή διόρθωσε τό γεροντάκι, τό τρίτο ἀπ' τά ἀριστερά καί, ξεκολλώντας τό μικρόφωνο ἀπό τό μίσχο του, τό ἔφερε στό στόμα του γιά νά πεῖ:

«Ὁ σύντροφος ἔχει δίκη. Εἴμαστε ἡ μόνη χώρα πού δέν ἔχει ἀναγνωρίσει ἀκόμα τήν ἐθνική μας ἀντίσταση ἐναντία στόν χιτλερρασιασμό. Καί ὁ ἐπανατριτισμός τῶν πολιτικῶν προσφύγων ἀποτελεῖ ἕνα αἶτημα καυτό, ἐπείγον».

«Δέν σ' ἀκοῦμε», διαμαρτυρήθηκε ἕνας ἀκροατής.

Τότε, τό συμπαθητικό γεροντάκι πλησίασε πιό πολύ τό μικρόφωνο στά χεῖλια του, σά νάταν ἔτοιμος νά τό φιλήσει, καί ἐπανέλαβε:

«Τά αἰτήματα αὐτά ἐλπίζω νά γίνουν ψηφίσματα στό τέλος».

Καί κοίταξε μέ τό γλυκό, ἀνθρωπινό βλέμμα του τή συντονίστρια.

Τό κοινό ξεπάγωσε ἀπ' τόν τρόμο τοῦ θανάτου πού ἡ θέα τοῦ πτώματος πάνω στό ἀνατομικό τραπέζι τοῦ προκαλοῦσε καί ξεσπάθωσε σ' ἕνα παρατεταμένο χειροκρότημα, πράγμα ὅμως πού ἐνόχλησε

And saying this, he stepped down from the platform and made the first stab into the place where the bullet had hit the heart.

(He saw sprouting a field sown with flowers, a humble hut, the goat tied, the chickens pecking, a family of farmers whose crops had been burned one night either because it helped the guerrillas or because it was turned in by the neighbor with whom it had quarrelled over an olive tree long before the war.)

"If the bullet," continued the trimmed beard, "had remained in the body, we might have been able to determine the victim's identity, which would have been, necessarily, contrary to the place of origin and derivation of the weapon, as they say in the army. If the bullet were American, our dead man, then, would be a partisan. If it were Russian, then he would be a soldier of the national army. However, in order for us to examine the fiber of his heart, we need not refer to politics. The fiber, then, presents all the symptoms of a chronic deficiency. . . ."

"Long live the heroic ELAS," a voice was heard in the audience, with a Greek-American accent resembling a third degree burn of the tongue. (With the "L" sounding as though saying "cloths," the tongue stuck behind the upper set of teeth.) Scattered applause was heard in the large auditorium.

"Let all political refugees return," someone else shouted from the back rows.

"Let our national resistance be recognized," another voice was heard.

"Questions at the end," the chairwoman pleaded.

"They are demands, they are not questions," corrected the sympathetic old man, third from the left, and, picking up the microphone from its base, brought it to his mouth to say: "The comrade is right. We are the only country that has not yet recognized our national resistance against Hitler's fascism. And the repatriation of the political refugees constitutes a burning, urgent demand."

"We can't hear you," a listener protested.

Then, the old man brought the microphone closer to his lips, as if he were ready to kiss it, and repeated:

"These demands, I hope, will be voted as resolutions at the end."

And he gazed at the chairwoman with his sweet, humane glance.

The audience was freed from the chill of death which the spectacle of the corpse on the anatomy table evoked in them and burst into a prolonged applause, something that irritated the anatomist with the trimmed beard, who held in his hand, pierced by a fork, the fourfold leaves of the heart.

"We don't understand," said an American girl, "what you're talking

τόν ἀνατόμο μέ τό φαλιδισμένο μούσι πού κρατοῦσε στό χέρι, καρφωμένη σ' ἓνα πηρούνι, τήν τετράφυλλη καρδιά.

«Δέν καταλαβαίνουμε», εἶπε μιᾷ Ἀμερικάνῳ, «τί λέτε ἐδῶ μέσα. Παρακαλῶ κάποιος νά μεταφράσει ὅσα εἰπώθηκαν γιατί εἴμαστε κ' ἐμεῖς, οἱ Ἀμερικανοί τῆς τέταρτης γενεᾶς, πού ἀγνοοῦμε παντελῶς τά ἑλληνικά».

Ἐνας ἀπ' τήν πρώτη σειρά μετάφρασε τότε τί εἶχε εἰπωθεῖ ἀπ' τοῦς ἀκροατές κι ἀπό τό γεροντάκι.

Τότε ὁ «καταφυγμένος» εἶπε στά ἐγγλέζικα:

«Σάν ἱστορικός τῆς ἀνατομίας, ἔχω νά πῶ τοῦτο: ὀπωσδήποτε πρέπει νά γυρίσουν οἱ πολιτικοί πρόσφυγες στήν πατρίδα τους. Μά κι ὅσοι, γιά τόν ἄλφα ἢ βῆτα λόγο, μένουν μέχρι τόν θάνατό τους ἔξω, πράγμα πού προσωπικά ὁ ἴδιος τό ἀπεύχομαι σάν ἄνθρωπος, σάν ἐπιστήμονας ὅμως δέν μπορῶ νά σᾶς ἀποκρύψω τό γεγονός ὅτι κ' ἔτσι, ἐξόριστοι νεκροί, θά ἀποτελέσουν γιά μᾶς πολῦτιμα ντοκουμέντα γιά τήν ἔρευνα. Ἐμεῖς σάν ἐπιστήμονες τῆς διασποράς πιό εὐκολα συλλογίζουμε ἄλλους διεσπαρμένους. Στήν Ἑλλάδα ἐξᾄλλου πού τοῦς θάβουν καί λιώνουν στή γῆ, μᾶλλον πού ἡ γῆ τοῦς λιώνει, λόγω κλίματος, πολλά ντοκουμέντα χάνονται, τά σώματα τῆς ἱστορίας ἀποσυντίθενται, γιά νά μῆν πῶ ὅτι οἱ τυμβωρύχοι τοῦς κλέβουν ὅτι χρυσό δόντι ἢ χρυσό σταυρό τύχει νάχουν πάνω τους. . . .»

«Χρυσό σφυροδρέπανο», παρατήρησε δίπλα του ὁ Ἄγγλος μέ τό χαρακτηριστικό, ὅπως διαπίστωσε Αὐτός, ἀγγλοσαξωνικό χιούμορ του. «Οἱ κομμουνιστάι εἶναι ἄθεοι», πρόσθεσε. «Ὡς ἐκ τούτου δέν φοροῦν σταυρουδάκια στό στήθος. . . .»

Καί ἐνῶ ὁ ἀνατόμος μέ τό φαλιδισμένο μούσι ξανατοποθετοῦσε τήν καρδιά πίσω στήν ἀρχική θέση της—μιᾷ καρδιά πού μερικοί, ἀπ' τίς πρῶτες σειρές, τήν εἶδαν, ἄν καί σαράντα χρόνια στήν ψυχαποθήκη, ἀκόμα νά ματώνει—«τό αἷμα νερό δέν γίνεται»—ὁ λόρδος ἐξακολούθησε, μιᾷ πού βρέθηκε μέ τό μικρόφωνο στό χέρι, κάπως ἔτσι:

«Τώρα κρατῶ αὐτό τό ἄκακο μικρόφωνο», εἶπε. «Μά τότε στή θέση του ἦταν μιᾷ χειροβομβίδα. Κι ἄν τώρα πιάνω τό μαχαίρι τοῦ ἀνατόμου, τότε ἔπιανα τήν ξιφολόγηχ τοῦ πολεμιστῆ».

«Μά ποιός εἶναι αὐτός», ρώτησε ὁ Ροῦμπενς τόν Ρέμπραντ.

«Εἶναι ὁ Ἄγγλος πού ἔπεσε μέ ἀλεξιπτωτο μέσα στους ἀντάρτες, σά γιατρός, χειροῦργος, μά ἦταν στήν πραγματικότητα πράκτορας τῆς Ἰντέλιτζενς Σέρβις».

«Δηλαδή», εἶπε ὁ Ροῦμπενς, «τόν ἔφεραν ἐδῶ γιατί; Τί ἐκπροσωπεῖ»;

«Ἔρεει καλά τήν ἐποχή τοῦ πτώματος. . . .»

Σέ ἐγγλέζικα πού κάναν τ' ἀμερικάνικα τοῦ ἄλλου νά φαίνονται σάν πτωχοῦ συγγενῆ, ὁ Ἄγγλος ἐξακολούθησε:

«Ὅταν ἡ μνήμη μου ἐπιστρέφει στά χρόνια αὐτά πού τοποθετεῖται τό πτώμα, πού μπορεῖ νάναί ὀποιασδήποτε παράταξης ἢ ὀμάδας, πιάνω τόν ἑαυτό μου νά ἐρμηγεύει τήν τότε κατάσταση μέ τά σημερινά δεδομένα τῆς ἐπιστήμης. Τότε ἀκόμα ἡ ἀνατομία δέν εἶχε φτάσει στό σημεῖο πού σήμερα, ἡ τεχνολογική ἐξέλιξη τῆς ἐποχῆς

about in here. Please, someone translate for us what was said because we're fourth generation Greek-Americans who don't know any Greek at all."

Someone from the first row then translated what had been said by both the audience and the kindly old man.

Then, the "frozen one" said in English:

"As a historian of anatomy, I have this to say: there's no question that the political refugees should return to their country. But those who, for one reason or another, will remain abroad until their death—something which I, personally, do not wish as a human being—as a scholar, I cannot hide the fact from you that even so, as dead men in exile, they will constitute for us valuable documents for research. We, as scholars of the diaspora, come into contact more easily with other people of the diaspora. In Greece, in any case, where they bury the dead and they dissolve in the earth—rather, the earth dissolves them because of the climate—many documents get lost, history's bodies disintegrate, not to mention that graverobbers steal from them whatever gold tooth or gold cross they happen to find . . ."

"A gold hammer and sickle," remarked the Englishman with the characteristic, as he noticed, Anglo-Saxon humor, from the other end of the crescent-shaped table. "Communists are godless," he added. "Therefore, they do not wear little crosses on their chests. . ."

And as the trimmed beard was putting the heart back into its initial place—a heart which, although forty years in the morgue, some people in the first rows saw was still bleeding ("blood can't turn to water")—the English lord continued, as he was still holding the microphone, somewhat like this:

"Now I'm holding this innocent microphone," he said. "But at that time a grenade was in its place. And although now I hold the lancet of the anatomist, at that time I held the bayonet of the warrior."

"Who is he?" Rubens asked Rembrandt.

"He's an Englishman who parachuted among the partisans, as a doctor, a surgeon, but in fact was an agent of the Intelligence Service."

"What do you mean?" Rubens asked. "Why did they bring him here? What does he represent?"

"He knows the era of the corpse well. . ."

In English that made the American English of the other speaker seem like an impoverished relative, the lord continued:

"When my memory returns to those years in which we place the corpse, which may belong to any party or faction, I catch myself interpreting the past situation with today's scientific givens. At that time anatomy had not reached the point to which the technological development

μας, τήν ἔχει φέρει. Στίς μέρες μας μπορεί ἕνα πτώμα νά νεκροτομηθεῖ ἀκόμα καί στό φεγγάρι. Ἐμεῖς σήμερα δέν εἴμαστε ἐδῶ γιά φτηνές πολιτικολογίες, οὔτε γιά νά βροῦμε τίς αἰτίες καί τά αἰτιατά πού κάναν τόν ἀνώνυμο αὐτό νεκρό νά βρεῖ τόν θάνατο στήν ἀκμή, ὅπως φαίνεται, τῆς ἡλικίας του».

Κατέθηκε ἀπ' τό τραπέζι καί κρατώντας τό μικρόφωνο πάντα στό ἕνα χέρι, μιά μεγάλη τσιμπίδα μέ τό ἄλλο, πλησίασε μέ δήματα ἀλεπούς τόν Ἀμιλῆτο.

«Λένε ὅτι ἔβρεθηκε στόν Γράμμο. Ποῦ εἶναι γραμμμένο αὐτό; Ποιά ἐγγύηση ἔχουμε; Ποιά ἀρχή μπορεί νά μᾶς τό βεβαιώσει; Τό βλῆμα στήν καρδιά μπορεί νάταν ἀπό ἀδέσποτη σφαῖρα καθώς ὁ φιλήσυχος αὐτός ἀνθρωπάκος γυροῦσε στό σπίτι του, ὅπου ἡ μάνα του θά τόν περίμενε νά τῆς φέρει καμιά κονσέρβα ἀπ' αὐτές πού μοιράζαν τά ἀπελευθερωτικά στρατεύματα τοῦ Σκόμπυ ὅταν εἰσέβαλαν στήν ἀνοχύρωτη Ἀθήνα γιά νά ἐπιβάλουν τήν τάξη καί τό νόμο. Νομίζω πώς ἡ ἀνάλυσή μας, γιά νά ἔχει ἕνα θετικό ἀποτέλεσμα, πρέπει νά περιοριστεῖ στίς ἰδιομορφίες τῆς σωματικῆς κατασκευῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ περιεργου homo anomalus». (Κ' ἔκοψε τή γάμπα στό ὕψος πού ἔφταναν τά δάχτυλα τοῦ ἄλλου ποδιοῦ.) «Ἔχω νά παρατηρήσω», πρόσθεσε, «ὅτι τό ἀριστερό ποδάρι του, πού μόλις τώρα ἐξιθώθηκε μέ τό δεξί, ἄν εἶχε μεγαλώσει ἔτσι ἐν ζωῇ θά παρουσίαζε τώρα ἄλλα χαρακτηριστικά στους τένοντες. Ἡ γάμπα θά ἦταν πιό ὀμαλή, ἐνῶ παρατηροῦμε ὅτι παρουσιάζει ὅλα τά χαρακτηριστικά τῆς μεταθανάτιας ἀνάπτυξης. Νά γενικεύσω; Νά πῶ ὅτι ὁ μῦθος ἔκανε ὥστε τό ἕνα πόδι, τό ἀριστερό, νά φαίνεται υπερβολικό σέ σχέση μέ τό ἄλλο; Κάτι τέτοιο θά ξέφευγε ἀπό τά αὐστηρά καθορισμένα πλαίσια τῆς ἐπιστημονικῆς ἀκριβολογίας. Νά φανταστοῦμε ὅτι ἔτρεχε μόνο μέ τό ἕνα πόδι, ἐνῶ εἶχε δύο, θάταν ἐξίσου παράλογο. Ἐξετάζοντας λοιπόν τήν ἀνισοροπία αὐτή τοῦ νεκροῦ θά ἔλεγα ὅτι ὀφείλεται μᾶλλον σέ μιά μεταθανάτια ἀνωμαλία, στους παρασιτικούς μύκητες ἢ στήν ἐλονοσία, λαμβανομένου ὅπ' ὄψιν ὅτι τό DDT δέν ἤρθε στήν Ἑλλάδα παρά μονάχα μετά τό 1947 ὅταν τό Δόγμα Τρούμαν καί τό Σχέδιο Μάρσαλ συμβάλλαν στήν ἐξυγίανση τοῦ τόπου ἀπ' τίς λογῆς-λογῆς ἀρρώστειες πού ἀφθονοῦν σέ χώρες χωρίς ὑποδομή, χωρίς ἔργα ἐγγειοδελτιωτικά γιά τήν ἀποξήρανση τῶν τελεμάτων καί τήν καταστροφή, στό γόνο τους, τῶν παρασιτικῶν μυκήτων. . .

»Πολλές φορές μοῦ ζητήθηκε νά καθάρσω τήν ἐποχή πού τοποθετεῖται ἕνα ἀτύχημα. Κάθε ἀτύχημα ἔχει τήν ἐποχή του, ὅπως καί κάθε ἐποχή ἔχει τά ἀτυχήματά της. Τά δύο αὐτά πᾶνε, στή Συγκριτική Παθολογία, μαζί. Τό ἕνα δέν εἶναι ποτέ ἀνεξάρτητο ἀπό τό ἄλλο. Ἔχω λοιπόν τή γνώμη ὅτι ἡ ἐποχή πού πέθανε αὐτός ὁ ἀνθρωπος, τό πρόβλημα τῆς Ἑλλάδος δέν ἦταν ἡ Δεξιά καί ἡ Ἀριστερά, ἀλλά ὁ παλιός ἐκείνος διχασμός, πού τόσες καταστροφές ἐπίσφαισε στόν ἡρωϊκό λαό σας, τοῦ Βασιλεῦ καί τῆς Δημοκρατίας. Ἰπῆρχε πρόβλημα ἰδεολογικό στό ποσοστό πού ἡ μοναρχία εἶχε πάντα ὀπαδοῦς τῆς δεξιᾶς. Ἀλλά δέν ἦταν ὅλοι οἱ ἀντιμοναρχικοί κόκκινοι. Τό σιδηροῦν παραπέτασμα εἶχε δώσει ἐντολή στους ὀπαδοῦς του νά

of our era has brought it. In our day a corpse can be dissected even on the moon. We are here today neither to deliver cheap political speeches, nor to find the cause and effects that made this anonymous dead man meet his death in the prime, as it seems, of his life."

He stepped down from the table and, constantly holding the microphone in one hand, a big tweezers in the other, approached, with fox-like steps, the Speechless One.

"They say he was found on Grammos. Is that written anywhere? What evidence do we have? What authority can guarantee this for us? The bullet in the heart may have been from a stray bullet as this peace loving man, this poor man, was returning home, where his mother would have been waiting for him to bring her some canned food, the kind Scobie's liberating forces distributed when they invaded Athens to impose law and order. I think that our analysis, in order to have a positive outcome, must be confined to the peculiarities of the bodily shape of this strange *homo anomalus*." (And he cut the calf to the same length as the toes of the other leg.) "I have to remark," he added, "that if his left leg, which has just now become equal to the right, had grown like this in life, it would now show different characteristics in the tendons. The calf would have been smoother, whereas we notice that it has all the traits of a *post mortem* development. Shall I generalize? Shall I say that myth has made it so that one leg, the left one, appears extremely large in comparison to the other one? Something of this sort would be outside the strictly determined framework of scholarly exactitude. Shall we imagine that he ran with one leg only, when he had two? It would be equally absurd. Examining, therefore, this imbalance in the dead man, I would say that it's due to a *post mortem* anomaly, to parasitic fungi or malaria, taking into consideration that DDT did not reach Greece until after 1947, when the Truman Doctrine and the Marshal Plan contributed to the curing of the country from all sorts of illnesses which abound in countries without any substructure, without works of reclamation for the drying up of marshlands and the extermination, where they spawn, of parasitic fungi. . . .

It's been asked of me many times to specify the era to which an accident is attributed. Each accident has its own era, just as each era has its accidents. These two things go together in Comparative Pathology. One is never independent of the other. It's my opinion, therefore, that in the era in which this man died, Greece's problem was not between the right or the left, but that old division—which has heaped so many catastrophes onto your heroic people—between the king and democracy. There was an ideological problem to the degree that the monarchy always had followers on the right. But all antimonarchists were not reds. The iron curtain had given orders to its followers to participate in the elections.

κατέδουν στίς έκλογές. Νά ακολουθήσουν τήν νομιμότητα. Κρατώντας πάντα τήν παράνομη δργάνωση, και τά δπλα, σέ περίπτωση έκτάκτου ανάγκης. Έτσι μπορούμε νά πούμε, χωρίς φόβο νά είμαστε έπιστημονικά άδικαιώτοι, ότι άν μέν τό πτώμα αυτό άνήκει στήν παράταξη του Ζέρδα, τότε ή άνωμαλία του σωματοποιεί τήν άνωμαλία τής ίδιας τής Δεξιᾶς πού χωρίζονταν σέ ταγματασφαλίτες συνεργάτες των Γερμανών και σέ μοναρχικούς πατριώτες. "Αν άνήκει στήν άλλη παράταξη, πού μάλλον εκεί θά τό τοποθετούσα γιατί ποσοστικά είχε και τά περισσότερα θύματα, τότε ή άνωμαλία του εκφράζει τόν διπλό ρόλο πού είχε νά παίξει ή "Αριστερά, μέ τό νόμιμο και τό παράνομο σκέλος της, όποτε και τό ένα πόδι, τό κοντό, μπορούμε νά πούμε πώς ήταν τό παράνομο, ένω τό μακρύ, τό νόμιμο, ξενέριζε άπ' τό κρησφύγετό του.

»Προσωπικά, δέν μ' άρρασει νά μιλω συμβολικά. "Η έπιστήμη δέν προχωράει μέ ύποθέσεις. Έγώ ό ίδιος πολέμησα στήν πρώτη γραμμή και κάτω άπό πρόχειρα χειρουργεία, φτιαγμένα μέ ύφάσματα άλεξιπτώτων, έργάστηκα σάν γιατρός, χειρουργός, άναισθησιολόγος και γυναικολόγος άκόμα. Και σάν μαμμή. Ξεγέννησα τήν Ιστορία. "Ανατόμος έγινα όταν πέρασα στή σύνταξη, όταν πιά ή τόση γνώση του θανάτου μέ προβίθασε σέ έρμηνευτή τής ζωής. Σας λέω λοιπόν, μέ όλη μου τήν άγάπη πού τρέφω για τόν ύπέροχο λαό σας, ότι τά πτώματα γίνονται τέτοια πού ύπήρξαν οι άνθρωποινοι φορείς τους έν ζωή. Δέν μεταμορφώνονται. "Απλώς μᾶς δείχνουν πιά καθαρά τίς βασικές άνωμαλίες του άτόμου. . . »

"Ο Ρέμπραντ πρόσχε τόν "Αγγλο ανατόμο. "Η φάτσα του του θύμιζε γλυμμένο βότσαλο. Κανένα σημάδι πού νά τόν τραυματίσει. Είχε κόψει τόσους νεκρούς κι όμως αυτός κατάφερε νά μείνει άπείραχτος. Στόν τόπο του θάταν ένας μέσ τούς πολλούς, ένα πρόσωπο στό πλήθος. "Αλλά καλεσμένος σ' αυτό τό ειδικό συμπόσιο τής ανατομίας ξεχώριζε άπ' τούς γηγενείς μέ τήν καταγωγή τής φυλής του. "Η διπλή του ιδιότητα του παριζιάνου και του χειρουργου, μ' αυτήν πού έζησε μιά δλόκληρη ζωή, θύμιζε στόν Ρέμπραντ—κι ό Ροϋμπενς συμφωνούσε—τά μανιτάρια εκείνα πού φυτρώνουν στίς ύγρασίες. Δέν μπορείς νά καταλάβεις ποτέ άν είναι δηλητηριασμένα ή όχι παρά μονάχα άφου τά δοκιμάσεις. Τώρα άνέπτυσσε τίς θεωρίες του μέ τήν άνεση του άποικιοκράτη πού άπευθύνεται σέ πρωτόγονους. Γιατί τέτοια πτώματα, είναι άλήθεια, δέν εύρισκας ούτε στίς πιά άγριες φυλές των Ζουλού κι αυτός, πούχε μιά ζωή στίς άποικίες, ήταν συνηθισμένος στό ύφος πού δίνει τό συναίσθημα τής ύπεροχής πού του έμεινε και τώρα πού ήταν δίχως πιά άποικίες. "Αλλά τό πτώμα αυτό, άπό τήν εποχή πού ή αυτοκρατορία βρισκόταν στίς δόξες της, τόν ξαναγύριζε στήν χαρισάμενη εποχή τής άποικιοκρατίας.

"Ο Ροϋμπενς τόν σιεφτόταν στό διαμέρισμά του στό Λονδίνο, νά ξεπαγιάζει τό χειμώνα άπό τήν έλλειψη επαρκών καυσίμων, νά παίρνει τό ύπόγειο τραίνο, στραγγισμένο λεμόνι μέσα σέ άλλα τό ίδιο στραγγισμένα σάν κι αυτόν, πού πεθαίνοντας αναφέρεται στό άγγελ-

To abide by the law. But keeping their illegal organization, and their guns, in case of an emergency. Thus, we can say, without fear of being scientifically unjustified, that, if this corpse belonged to Zervas's faction, its anomaly incorporates the anomaly of the right itself, which was divided into Security Battalions collaborating with the Germans and into monarchist patriots. If he belongs to the other faction, where I'd rather place him because it had the most victims, then its anomaly expresses the double role which the left had to perform, with both its legal and illegal limbs, in which case the one leg, the short one, was the illegal one, we could say, whereas the long one, the legal one, came out of its hiding place.

Personally, I don't like to speak symbolically. Scholarship does not advance with hypotheses. I myself fought in the front lines and in temporary surgery rooms made of material from parachutes—I've worked as a doctor, surgeon, anesthesiologist, and even a gynecologist. And as a midwife. I've been a midwife to history. I became an anatomist when I retired, when my great knowledge of death finally promoted me to an interpreter of life. I tell you, therefore, with all the love I nurture for your exquisite people, that corpses resemble what their human bearers had been in life. They are not transformed. They merely show us more clearly the basic anomalies of the individual. . . ."

Rembrandt observed the English anatomist. His face reminded Rembrandt of a polished pebble. No sign of any scar. He had dissected so many dead bodies, and yet he managed to remain untouched. In his country he would have been one among many, a face in the crowd. But invited to this special anatomy symposium, he distinguished himself from the natives by the origin of his race. His two-fold capacity both as a partisan and a surgeon, in which he had lived his whole life, reminded Rembrandt—and Rubens agreed—of those mushrooms which sprout in damp places. You can never tell whether they're poisonous or not until you taste them. Now he was developing his theories with the ease of the colonialist addressing himself to primitive people. Because one couldn't really find such corpses even among the wildest tribes of Zulus, but this map, who had spent a lifetime in the colonies, was accustomed to that style which gives one the feeling of superiority even when one was left without any colonies. This corpse reminded him of the blissful era of colonialism, the era in which the empire had been in its glory.

Rubens thought of him in his London flat, freezing in winter because of the lack of fuel, taking the subway, a squeezed lemon among other similarly squeezed lemons who, when they die, in their funeral announcement is mentioned, in sterling, the amount of money they leave behind

τήριο τό ποσό πού ἀφήνουν πίσω τους, σέ στεργίνες, καί σέ ποιόν τά κληροδοτοῦν, ἐνῶ ἐδῶ, σέ μᾶς (ἀλλά ποιοί ἐμεῖς, ποιοί ἐσεῖς, πού τό ἐδῶ, πού τό ἐκεῖ, τάχε μπερδέψει κι ὁ ἴδιος, σά νά μήν εἶχε συνέρθει ἀκόμα μέ τήν ἀλλαγὴ, τῆ διαφορά τῶν ἔξι ὥρων πού ὑπάρχει ἀνάμεσα στήν Εὐρώπη καί στήν Ἀμερική καί νά λογάριάζε μέ ὥρια ξεπερασμένα πράγματα πού συμβαίναν ἐδῶ) . . .

«Τά στοιχεῖα μας γιά τό πτώμα εἶναι μόνο ἀμερικανικά», ἔλεγε τώρα ὁ ἀνατόμος πού καθόταν ἄκρα δεξιά στό μισοφέγγαρο τραπέζι, ὁ «καταφυγμένος». «Ἔχουμε παραλαβῆ ἐδῶ» (κ' ἔθγαλε ἕνα χαρτί ἀπ' τήν πέτσινη θήκη του), «ἀλλά μᾶς λείπει ὁ ἀποστολέας. Ἔτσι ἀναγκαστικά στηριζόμαστε σέ ὑποθέσεις πού προέρχονται ἀπό τίς ξένες ἀρχές. Πράγμα πού θά μπορούσε, λογικά, νά μᾶς ὀδηγήσει στή σκέψη ὅτι τό πτώμα αὐτό προέρχεται ἀπό τήν Ἰσπανία, τήν ἐποχὴ τοῦ ἐκεῖ ἐμφύλιου παραγμοῦ, ὅπως κάτι ψάρια πού ἐνῶ σερβίρονται γιά ἑλληνικά, καί μάλιστα γιά φρέσκα, ἔρχονται κατ' εὐθείαν ἀπ' τὸ Ζαῖρ, τήν Ἀργεντινὴ ἢ τήν Γουαδελούπη. Ὅμως ἔχουμε κάθε λόγο νά πιστεύουμε ὅτι τό πτώμα αὐτό εἶναι ἀπ' τήν Ἑλλάδα γιατί αὐτὴ ἡ λεβεντιά πού ἔχει, ἀκόμα κ' ἔτσι ὀριζοντιωμένο, σαράντα χρόνια στήν ψυχραποθήκη, δέν κατάφεραν νά τοῦ τήν κλέψουν, μιὰ λεβεντιά θάλεγα κολοκοτρωνεῖκη, καραϊσκακείκη, μιὰ λεβεντιά τοῦ Ρήγγα τοῦ Βελεστινῆ. . . .»

Ἀπ' τὰ μεγάλα παράθυρα τοῦ ἀμφιθέατρου, τό φῶς, πού ἔπεφτε κάθετο τώρα, φώτιζε διαφορετικά τόν ἀνεξήγητο νεκρό. Τό κοινό εἶχε ἀρχίσει νά πῆζει.

«Ἐμπρός ΕΛΑΣ-ΕΛΑΣ-ΕΛΑΣ γιά τήν Ἑλλάδα
τῆ δόξα καί τῆ λευτεριά . . .»

ὕποτονθόριζε στήν μπροστινὴ ἀράδα μιὰ κοπέλλα. Πράγμα πού προκάλεσε τήν παρατήρηση τοῦ «καταφυγμένου»:

«Δεσποινίς, παρακαλῶ νά μὴ τραγουδάτε τήν ὦρα τοῦ μαθήματος. Ἐδῶ δέν ὀρισκόμαστε σέ φεστιβάλ νεολαίας. Δέν ἤρθατε ἐδῶ πάλι γιά νά ἐκτονωθεῖτε. Εἴσατε, μὴν τό ξεχνάτε αὐτό σᾶς παρακαλῶ, σέ μάθημα ἀνατομίας. Στήν Ἑλλάδα, ἀπ' ὅπου λείπω πολλὰ χρόνια, κι ἔς μου συγχωρεθεῖ ἡ παρέκβαση, μὰ εἶναι, νομίζω, σημαντικὴ, ἔχω μάθει ὅτι ὑπάρχει ἡ τάση, ἡ ἔφεση, δέν ξέρω πῶς νά τήν κατονομάσω, νά ὑποκατασταθεῖ ἡ ἔρευνα, ἡ συγκριτικὴ μελέτη, ἡ ἀνάλυση, ἡ στατιστικὴ, μέ τὰ εὐκόλα ἄσματα. Στήν Ἀμερική, ὅπως ἴσως δέν ξέρετε, τό τραγοῦδι εἶναι πολὺ ζωντανό, χάρι στους μαύρους κυρίως, ἀλλὰ ὑπάρχουν οἱ «ντίσκο», τὰ «κλάμπ», δέν ὑπεισέρχεται στήν ὦρα τῆς μελέτης. Βρισκόμαστε σέ λάθος αἵθουσα ἂν νομίζετε ὅτι θά πιάσουμε τ' ἀντάρτικα τραγοῦδια. Ἡ δουλειὰ μας εἶναι διαφορετικὴ. . . .»

Καί μέ τό ἀστραφτερό μαχαίρι του κατέθηκε ἀπ' τὸ τραπέζι, πλησίασε τὸ νεκρὸ καί τοῦ ἔκοψε τὸ στομάχι. Ἡ σκωταριά τοῦ πτώματος κρεμάστηκε στά χέρια του σάν ἕνα ὄριμο τσαμπὶ σταφύλι. Τὸ χέρι του,

and to whom they bequeath it, but here, with us (but who are we, who are you, where's the here, where's the there, he was confused himself, as though he had not yet recovered from the change, the six-hour time difference which exists between Europe and America, and he was still calculating with outmoded timetables things which were taking place here) . . .

"Any evidence we have of the corpse is American only," said the anatomist who was sitting at the extreme right of the crescent-shaped table, the "frozen one." We have the delivery receipt here" (and he pulled a slip of paper out of his leather case, "but we are missing the sender. Therefore we depend, out of necessity, on suppositions which originate from foreign authorities. A fact which could, logically speaking, lead us to the assumption that this corpse originated in Spain, from the time of the civil war there, just like the fish which, although served as Greek—and fresh ones on top of it—come directly from Zaire, Argentina, or Guadeloupe. But we have every reason to believe that this corpse is from Greece because of the gallantry it has, even the way it has lied horizontally for forty years in the morgue; they have not managed to steal it from him, a gallantry like that of Kolokotronis, or Karaiskakis, a gallantry like that of Rigas Velestinlis. . . ."

Through the big windows of the amphitheater the light that was now falling vertically illuminated differently the inexplicable dead man. The public began to get fed up.

"March ELAS-ELAS-ELAS for HELLAS
for glory and for freedom . . ."

a girl softly hummed in the front row. This provoked a remark from the "frozen one":

"Young lady, don't sing during class time, please. You're not at a youth festival here. You haven't come here to let off steam. You are, and you shouldn't overlook this, in an anatomy lesson. In Greece, from where I've been away for many years, and may I be forgiven for the digression, but it is, I believe, important, I've heard that there is the tendency, the disposition, I don't know what to call it, to substitute research, comparative study, analysis, statistics, with frivolous songs. In America, as you may not know perhaps, singing is very alive—thanks to the blacks mainly, but there are also "discos" and "clubs"—but it doesn't intrude on study time. You are in the wrong classroom if you think that we're about to start singing guerrilla songs. Our task is different. . . ."

And with his knife gleaming, he stepped down from the platform, drew near the dead man, and cut open his stomach. The bowels of the corpse hung in his hands like a ripe cluster of grapes. His hand, in the

τό γαντοφορεμένο μέ τό διάφανο πλαστικό, ἔγινε ἔτσι μιά μαύρη κληματαριά τοῦ Κάτω Κόσμου.

«Δέν μᾶς μένει καμιά ἀμφιβολία ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος αὐτός ἔτρωγε φαγί τῆς ΟΥΝΡΑ. Γιατί παρατηροῦμε στά ἔντερα ὄλα τά συμπτώματα μᾶς δηλητηρίασης πού ὑπῆρχε κατά τή στιγμή τοῦ θανάτου του. Ἄρα ὁ θάνατός του θά πρέπει νά συνέβηκε μετά τόν πόλεμο, ὅταν ἡ ἀμερικανική βοήθεια πρὸς τήν Ἑλλάδα ἄρχισε νά καταφτάνει σέ δόσεις ἐπαρκεῖς κάτω ἀπ' τή μορφή διαφόρων σχεδίων. . . .»

«Ἡ ΟΥΝΡΑ ἔστειλε τρόφιμα στή σκλαδωμένη πατρίδα καί κατά τόν πόλεμο», παρατήρησε ἀπό τό ἀκροατήριο ἕνας ἠλικιωμένος Ἑλληνοαμερικανός πού εἶχε ἔρθει ἐπί τούτου, γιά τό μάθημα αὐτό, ἀπ' τό Σηάτλ. «Μόνο πού τότε παρουσιάζονταν σάν προσφορά τοῦ Διεθνούς Ἐρυθροῦ Σταυροῦ. Ἄλλιῶς δέν θά τό ἐπέτρεπαν οἱ κατακτητές. . . .»

Καί κάθισε τυφλωμένος ἀπό ἕναν ξαφνικό προβολέα πού ἔπεσε πάνω του γιά νά τὸν ἐντοπίσει.

«Ὅπως καί νᾶχει τό πράγμα», συνέχισε ὁ «καταφυγμένος», «ἐκεῖνο πού θέλω νά τονίσω, ὅσο κι ἂν κινδυνεύουμε νά δυσαρρεστήσουμε τοὺς φίλους μας τοὺς Ἀμερικανούς, εἶναι ὅτι οἱ τροφές τοῦ Σχεδίου Μάρσαλ ἦταν πολλές φορές δηλητηριασμένες. Οἱ ἀλλοιώσεις μέσα στά κονσερβαρισμένα κουτιά. . . . Ὅχι, δέν ἦταν τό στομάχι του χαλασμένο», πρόσθεσε ἐξετάζοντας τό κοκορέτσι τῶν ἐντέρων. «Ἄλλά ἡ τροφή πού τό ταίζαν».

Ξανάβαλε τά ἔντερα στήν ἀποθήκη τους, ἔβγαλε τό γάντι του, τό πέταξε σ' ἕνα καλάθι τῶν ἀχρήστων καί γύρισε στή θέση του ὅπου συμβουλευόμενος τά χαρτιά του δέν βρῆκε τίποτ' ἄλλο νά πεῖ. Ξαναπῆρε τό σφιγμένο, κλειστό ὕφος του. Σφραγίστηκε ξανά ὀλόκληρος μέσα στήν ἀκαμπτῆ σιωπή του.

«Δέν εἶναι» (πῆρε τότε τό λόγο ἀπ' τή συντονίστρια, τό γλυκό γεροντάκι), «ἡ δηλητηρίαση αὐτή κατ' ἀνάγκη, τονίζω τό κατ' ἀνάγκη, ἀπό τροφή ἀμερικανική. Μπορεῖ νάναι κι ἀπό τροφή πού ἔστειλε ὁ Στάλιν. Ἀφοῦ τό πτώμα βρέθηκε στήν δραματική ὁροσειρά Γράμμου-Βίτσι, θά μπορούσαμε νά κινήσουμε τήν ὑπόθεση ὅτι ἡ δηλητηρίαση προήλθε ἀπό τίς κονσερβες Chatka, τά κιβώτια φτάναν μέσω Βουλγαρίας, τοιγούνηκα, στά ἀντάρτικα σώματα, γιά τήν ἐπιβίωσή τους. Προχωρώντας, θά μπορούσαμε νά γενικεύσουμε τή διαπίστωση καί νά παραδεχτοῦμε ὅτι κάθε ξένη βοήθεια, εἴτε ἀπό τή μιά, εἴτε ἀπό τήν ἄλλη μεριά, εἶχε ἐν δυνάμει μέσα της ὄλα τά ἐπικίνδυνα στοιχεία πού προκαλοῦν τήν ἴωση, ἐπειδή ἔπρεπε ὀπωσδήποτε ὁ ἄνθρωπος αὐτός νά πεθάνει».

Κατέβηκε μέ τή σειρά του ἀπό τό μισοφέγγαρο τραπέζι. Αὐτός δέν κρατοῦσε μαχαίρη χασάπικο, ἀλλά ἕνα μικρό κινέζικο φαλιδάκι πού τὸ ἀνέπτυξε στά συστατικά του καθώς τό ξεδίπλωνε, ἐνῶ προχωροῦσε ὅπως τ' ἀναδιπλωμένα πτερύγια μηχανοκίνητου πουλιοῦ.

«Ἐχω καιρό», ὁμολόγησε, «πού δέν ἀσχολοῦμαι πιά μέ τήν ἀνατομία σάν καθημερινή πρακτική. Ἡ θέση μου στό Ἰνστιτοῦτο τῆς Συγκριτικῆς Πτωματολογίας τοῦ Στρασβούργου μέ ἔχει ἀποξενώσει

transparent plastic glove, became, thus, a black grapevine of the World Below.

"There's no doubt that this man ate UNNRA's food. Because we observe in the entrails all the symptoms of a poisoning which existed at the moment of his death. Therefore, his death must have occurred after the war, when American aid to Greece began arriving in sufficient installments in the form of various plans. . . ."

"UNNRA was sending food to our occupied fatherland during the war also," remarked a Greek-American from the audience who had come from Seattle specifically for this lesson. "Only that, at that time, it appeared to be the donation of the International Red Cross. Otherwise the occupiers wouldn't have allowed it. . . ."

And he sat down blinded by an unexpected spotlight that fell upon him to pinpoint him.

"In any case," continued the "frozen one," "what I want to emphasize, although we run the risk of displeasing our friends the Americans, is the fact that the food of the Marshall Plan was often poisoned. The adulterations in the canned foods. . . . No, his stomach was not ruined," he added as he examined the *kokoretsi* of the intestines. "Only the food with which they fed him."

He put the intestines back in their depository, removed his glove, threw it into a wastebasket, and returned to his seat, where he consulted his papers and found nothing else to say. He again assumed his taut, expressionless appearance. He again sealed himself completely behind his obdurate silence.

"This poisoning" (said the sweet old man after getting permission from the chairwoman), "is not necessarily, and I underline the word necessarily, from American food. It may well be from food which Stalin sent, too. Since the corpse was found on the dramatic mountain ridge of Grammos-Vitsi, we could put forth the hypothesis that the poisoning resulted from the Chatka canned foods; the stingy crates sent for the survival of the partisan armies used to come through Bulgaria. Furthermore, we could make the general assumption and infer that any foreign aid from one side or the other had in it the potential for all those dangerous elements which cause pestilence because this man had to die at any cost."

His turn came to step down from the crescent-shaped table. He did not carry a butcher's knife, but a tiny Chinese scissors which he opened up to its components and, as he approached, unfolded like the folded wings of a toy bird.

"It has been a long time," he confessed, "since I dealt with anatomy as a daily practice. My position at the Institute of Comparative Study of Corpses in Strasbourg has alienated me from my old skill. And it is

ἀπ' τήν παλιά μου τέχνη. Καί δέν εἶναι χωρίς κάποια συγκίνηση πού ξαναπιάνω τό φαλίδι, ἀφοῦ ὁ ἀνθρωπος αὐτός, ποιός ξέρει, ἴσως καί νάταν ἕνας παλιός μου συναγωνιστής».

Στάθηκε, κοντός ὅπως ἦταν καί μικροκαμωμένος, στό πλάτωμα, σθησμένοι σχεδόν μπροστά στό ὑπερυψωμένο πτώμα.

«Γιατί πολέμησα κ' ἐγώ στά βουνά τῆς Πίνδου, πρῶτα τόν ἐξωτερικό ἐχθρό, τούς μακαρονάδες τοῦ Μουσολίνι, ὕστερα τά χιτλερικά στρατά, ὅσπου μέ τήν ὑποχώρηση βρέθηκα στήν Ἀθήνα. . . Δέν θά ξεχάσω ποτέ μία νύχτα τοῦ '42, ὅταν μέ συνέλαβε ἡ Γκεστάπο μέ τήν κατηγορία ὅτι κουβαλοῦσα παράνομο ὕλικό. Ἦταν ἕνα βιβλίο τῆς Ἀνατομίας, αὐτά πού ὑπάρχουν ἀκόμα καί σήμερα, γιατί τά πτώματα εἶναι πάντα ἴδια, δέν ἀλλάζει ἡ σταματημένη κίνηση ἐνός ὄργανισμοῦ, γι' αὐτό καί δέν ἀλλάζουν τά ἀνατομικά βιβλία. Ἐνας ζωντανός ὄργανισμός μεταμορφώνεται, τό πτώμα ὅμως . . . τελοσπάντων . . . τό θυμάμαι γιατί», κ' ἦταν ἀληθινά συγκινητικό τό γεροντάκι, σταματημένο κάτω ἀπ' τόν προβολέα πού τόν ἐκλεινε στόν κύκλο του καί μετατοπιζόνταν μαζί του, «ἕνας τέτοιος προβολέας ξαφνικά μέσ τή νύχτα ἐκείνη τήν παγωμένη τοῦ '42 μέ σταμάτησε στό δρόμο. Οἱ πεταλωμένοι γκεσταπίτες πηδῆξαν ἀπ' τό καμιόνι, μέ μάγγωσαν. Βρῆκαν στά χέρια μου τό ἐγχειρίδιο τῆς Ἀνατομίας κι ὅπως δέν ξέραν ἑλληνικά ὑποπτευθῆκαν ἀμέσως τά σχεδιαγράμματα τῆς καρδιάς καί τού νευρικοῦ συστήματος πώς ἦταν δρόμοι τῆς παρανομίας, μέ γιάφκες σημειωμένες μέ κόκκινο. Μέ σύραν στό Χαϊδάρι, μέ δασάνισαν νά δημολογήσω τό κρησφύγετο τοῦ παράνομου τύπου, εὐτυχῶς ἦρθε ἕνας ἀξιωματικός πού μιλοῦσε γαλλικά, θαυμαστής τοῦ Βάγκνερ. Τοῦ ἐξήγησα. Καί μ' ἀφήσαν ἐλεύθερο. Μά ὅ,τι ἔζησα δυό νύχτες στά κρατητήρια τῆς Γκεστάπο μ' ἔκαναν ν' ἀλλάξω γραμμή. Ὁργανώθηκα. Κατόπι βγήκα στό βουνό. Κι ἀπό κεῖ, δέν ξανακατέβηκα. Μέ τήν ἦττα τοῦ κινήματος, πῆρα τῶν ὀμματιῶν μου κ' ἔφυγα στό ἐξωτερικό. Πέρασα μέσω Ἀλβανίας. Ἐντί ὅμως νά πάω, ὅπως οἱ περισσότεροι, στίς λεγόμενες σοσιαλιστικές χῶρες—ἀπό τότε ὑποπτευόμενον πώς κάποιο λάκκο ἔχει ἡ φάβα τους—προτίμησα τή Δύση. Ὅπου καί σταδιοδρόμησα.

»Ἀπό τό 1960 καί μετά, ξέκοφα μέ τήν πρακτική. Στήν ἔδρα μου, τῆς Συγκριτικῆς Ἀνατομίας, ἀσχολήθηκα κυρίως μέ τόν χῶρο τόν δικό μας, τό μεσογειακό. Ἑλλάδα - Ἰσπανία - Πορτογαλία ἀποτελοῦσαν μέχρι πρό τινας τόν κύριο ἄξονα τῶν ἐρευνῶν τοῦ Ἰνστιτούτου, ὅπου οἱ διαφορετικές θρησκείες καθόριζαν ἐν πολλοῖς καί τήν διαφορετική μεταχείριση τῶν νεκρῶν. Δουλειά μου λοιπόν . . . »

Τό κινέζικο φαλιδάκι στά χέρια του ἦταν ἕνα κομφοτέχνημα. Ἀνέβηκε πάνω σ' ἕνα πόντιουμ, γιά νά βρεθεῖ πιά φηλά ἀπό τό πτώμα κ' οἱ μπροστινοί (μαζί ὁ Ροῦμπενς κι ὁ Ρέμπραντ) τόν εἶδαν πού εἶχε βουρκώσει καθός ἔσκυψε στοργικά πάνω ἀπ' τό νεκρό. Δέν ἔκανε καμιά ἀπό τίς βίαιες κινήσεις τῶν ἄλλων. Μέ μία ἀπειρή τρυφερότητα ἔκοψε λίγο πίσω ἀπ' τό αὐτί, ἐκεῖ πού μπορούσε νάταν, ἂν ὁ ἀντάρτης ἦταν γυναίκα, τό σκουλαρίκι κι ἀνέσυρε μέ τήν πένσα του, ἕνα μικρό, ἀσήμαντο ξυλαράκι.

not without some emotion that I touch the scissors again, since this man, who knows, was perhaps an old comrade of mine."

He stood, short as he was and of a small frame, on the platform, almost extinguished before the highly elevated corpse.

"Because I also fought on the Pindos mountains, first the external enemy, Mussolini's spaghetti eaters, and later Hitler's armies, when with the retreat I found myself in Athens. . . . I'll never forget a night in '42 when the Gestapo arrested me with the accusation that I was carrying subversive material. It was an anatomy book, like the ones that still exist even today because corpses are always the same, the stopped movement of an organism does not change, and that's why anatomy books do not change. A living organism is transformed, a corpse though . . . never mind . . . I remember it because," and the old man was truly moving, standing under the spotlight that enclosed him in its circle as he changed position along with it, "a spotlight such as this stopped me suddenly on that freezing night of '42. The horseshoed Gestapo men jumped from a truck and grabbed me. They found the anatomy manual in my hands, and, as they didn't know Greek, they immediately suspected that the diagrams of the heart and the nervous system were underground roads, with hideouts marked in red. They dragged me to Haidari and tortured me to betray the hiding place of the underground press; fortunately an officer came who spoke French, an admirer of Wagner. I explained myself. And they let me free. But what I lived through for two nights in the detention cells of the Gestapo made me change course. I organized myself. Later I left for the mountains. And from there I never came down again. With the defeat of the movement, I lost all hope and left for abroad. I passed through Albania. But instead of going, as most did, to the so-called socialist countries—even then I suspected there was something suspicious about them—I chose the West, where I made my career.

Since 1960, I have given up my practice. In my chair of Comparative Anatomy I have dealt mostly with our area, the Mediterranean. Greece-Spain-Portugal, until recently, comprised the main pivot of the research of the Institute, where the various religions determined to a great extent the different treatment of the dead as well. My task therefore . . ."

The little Chinese scissors were, in his hands, an *objet d'art*. He climbed onto a podium, to rise higher than the corpse, and the people in the front rows (Rubens and Rembrandt, too) saw tears in his eyes as he bent affectionately over the dead man. He didn't make any of the violent movements of the others. With infinite tenderness he cut a little bit from behind the ear, where there might have been, if the partisan were a woman, an earring, and with his tweezers pulled out a tiny, insignificant twig.

Τό κοίταξε πρώτα μέ ἀπειρη νοσταλγία, τό ἔφερε στή μύτη του, τό μύρισε, καί σηκώνοντάς το ψηλά:

«Ἄπ' αὐτό συμπεραίνουμε», εἶπε, «πώς ὁ νεκρός αὐτός εἶναι δικός μας. Εἶχε πίσω ἀπ' τό αὐτί, τήν ὥρα πού τόν πέτυχε τό μοιραίο βλήμα, ἕνα ματσάκι βασιλικό ὅπως συνηθίζαμε στήν Πυροβολαρχία τοῦ Καπτά-Φωτιά».

«Ζήτω οἱ ἥρωϊκοί νεκροί τῆς Ἀντίστασης! Κάτω οἱ μπουραντάδες!» φώναξαν μερικοί μέσα ἀπ' τό ἀμφιθέατρο.

Τό γεροντάκι, φανερά συγκινημένο, εἶχε τήν τσιμπίδα ψηλά, μέ τό κλωναράκι αὐτό πού ἦταν σάν καθουρντισμένο.

«Ἄρα εἶναι νεκρός τοῦ '47-49», πρόσθεσε. «Τῶν βουνῶν. Σίγουρα ἔπεσε ἥρωϊκά ὑπερασπιζόμενος, ἕνας, ἐνάντια ἄραγε σέ πόσους, μιά βουνοκορφή, καλύπτοντας τήν ὑποχώρηση τῶν συντρόφων του, ἀφοῦ τό πρόβλημα πιά ἦταν, ἔτσι πού μᾶς εἶχαν στριμώξει, τό πῶς νά ὑποχωροῦμε. . . .»

«Ἐξω οἱ Ἀμερικάνοι», ἀκούστηκε μιά παράξενη φωνή. «Γιάνκη γκόου χόουμ. . . .»

Σύνθημα πού προκάλεσε τήν ἀστραπιαία ἐπέμβαση τῆς συντονίστριας, πού παρατήρησε καυστικά ὅτι βρισκόταν τούτη τή στιγμή στό «χόουμ» τῶν Ἀμερικάνων, γιόρταζαν κιάλας τίς μέρες αὐτές τή γιορτή τῆς Ἀγάπης, τό «χόλουμ», κ' ἔτσι τό «γκόου» ἔξω ἦταν ἀσυνταίριαστο μέ τή γεωγραφική πραγματικότητα.

Τό γεροντάκι ξαναἔβηκε στό δῆμα. Ὅπου πῆρε τήν προηγούμενη θέση του, ὅπως στό εἰκονοστάσι, ἕνας βυζαντινός ἅγιος ἀνάμεσα στοῦς πραιτωριανούς.

Ὁ λόγος μετά πέρασε στόν οὐδέτερο πού ἦταν σέ προφίλ ὡς πρὸς τό κοινό. Ὁ Ροῦμπενς τόν κοίταξε. Εἶπε στόν Ρέμπραντ πώς τοῦ φαινόταν σάν γασάπης. Ὁ Ρέμπραντ τοῦ ἀπάντησε πώς οἱ ἀνατόμοι μοιάζουν μέ τοὺς ὀδοντογιατρούς. Μερικοί πού φαίνονται ἀληθινά ἄρθραροι ἔχουν τό πιό λαφρύ χέρι. Ἐνῶ κάτι ἄλλοι εὐαίσθητοι πούπουλα μποροῦσαν νά σέ τρελλάνουν στόν πόνο. Ἔτσι δέν ἔπρεπε νά βγάξουν συμπεράσματα ἀπ' τήν ἐξωτερική ἐμφάνιση.

Ὁ οὐδέτερος πῆρε τό μικρόφωνο κι ἄρχισε τήν εἰσαγωγή του: «Ἡ σχέση μου μέ τήν Ἑλλάδα, ἂν ὑποθέσουμε ὅτι τό πτώμα εἶναι ἀπό κεῖ, καί προσωπικά δέν θά εἶχα κανένα λόγο νά τό ἀμφισβητήσω γιατί δέν συμβαίνει, ὅπως μέ τίς ἀποστολές ἐκείνων τῶν μεταναστών πού φορτώνονται σέ λάθος κινήτους διαδρόμους τῶν ἀερολιμένων καί τό φέρετρο, ἀντί νά φτάσει στόν προορισμό του, καταλήγει, ἄς πούμε στό Χόγκ Κόγκ, αὐτό μᾶς ἦρθε συσκευασμένο, καθ' ὅλα προετοιμασμένο ἀπ' τίς Κρατικές Ψυχραποθήκες, πού κρατοῦν ρεζέρβα πτώματα γιά τό μάθημα τῆς ἀνατομίας, μετά ἀπό αἴτηση τοῦ δικοῦ μας πανεπιστήμιου, ὅπου τυχαίνει νάμαι φέτος Dean τῆς ἱατρικῆς σχολῆς, ἔτσι θά διαφωνοῦσα μέ τόν προλαλήσαντα πού εἶπε ὅτι δέν ἔχουμε ἀποστολέα, ἀλλά μόνο παραλήπτη, ἀποστολεύς ὑπάρχει κ' εἶναι τό ἑλληνικό κράτος, μέ τό ὅποιο, αὐτό ἄρχισα νά σᾶς ἐξιστοῦ, οἱ σχέσεις μου εἶναι πολύ μεταγενέστερες ἀπό τήν ὑποτιθέμενη ἐποχή τοῦ

First he gazed at it with infinite nostalgia, brought it to his nose, smelled it, and, holding it high, said:

"From this we conclude that this dead man is one of our own. The moment that the fated bullet struck him, he had behind his ear a little bunch of basil, the way we all used to in the battery of Kapta-Fotias."

"Long live the heroic dead of the Resistance! Down with the quislings!" some people in the amphitheater shouted.

The old man, obviously touched, was holding the tweezers high, with that tiny twig which seemed charred.

"Therefore, this dead man belongs to '47-'49," he added. "Of the mountains. Surely he fell defending, alone, who knows against how many, a mountain ridge, covering the retreat of his comrades, since the problem then was, the way they had cornered us, how to retreat. . . ."

"Americans get out," a strange voice was heard saying. "Yankees go home. . . ."

It was a slogan which caused the lightning like intervention of the chairwoman, who remarked caustically that they were at this moment in the "home" of the Americans, who at that time were celebrating the holiday of love, Halloween, and so the "going home" was contradictory to the geographic reality.

The dear old man went up to the platform again. There he took his previous seat, as in an iconostasis, like a Byzantine saint among the Praetorians.

Now it was the turn of the neutral type to speak, the one who was sitting with his profile to the audience. Rubens looked at him. He said to Rembrandt that he seemed like a butcher to him. Rembrandt replied that anatomists are like dentists. Some of them, who seem to be really barbarians, have the lightest hand. Whereas, some others, sensitive like feathers, could drive one mad with pain. Therefore they shouldn't jump to conclusions on account of external appearances.

The neutral type picked up the microphone and began his introduction:

"My relation to Greece, if we presume that the corpse is from there, and personally I have no reason to doubt it because this isn't the same as the dispatching of those immigrants who are loaded on the wrong escalators at the airports and the coffin, instead of reaching its destination, ends up, let's say, in Hong Kong; this one came to us packed, entirely prepared by the State Morgues in which they keep corpses on reserve for anatomy lessons, after an invitation by our university, of which I happen to be the Dean of the Medical School this year; consequently, I'd disagree with the previous speaker, who said that we have no sender, but only a recipient; there is a sender and that is the Greek State, to which, that's what I started telling you, my relations are much more recent than the

ὕπὸ ἐξέτασιν πτώματος, δηλαδή ἐγὼ πῆγα πρώτη φορά στή χώρα σας σάν τουρίστας τόν Μάη τοῦ '63, τότε πού δολοφονήθηκε ὁ Λαμπράκης καί ἐντελῶς περιστατικά ἔλαβα μέρος στήν αὐτοψία του, ὅπως καί τό καλοκαίρι τοῦ '65, πού πάλι εἶχαμε πάει οἰκογενειακῶς στά νησιά, παραδρέθηκα, ἐντελῶς πάλι κατά τύχη, στά γεγονότα τοῦ Ἰούλη τῆς ἴδιας ἐκείνης χρονιάς καί ἔλαβα μέρος στήν αὐτοψία τοῦ Σωτήρη Πέτρουλα. Ἔτσι ἦρθα σέ ἐπαφή μέ ὄλα τά προσδευτικά στοιχεῖα τοῦ μικροῦ, ἀλλά περήφανου αὐτοῦ λαοῦ, πού σέ μιά τσέπη τῶν Βαλκανίων δέν παύει νά μᾶς δίνει ἀξιοθαύμαστα παραδείγματα αὐτοθυσίας καί παλληκαριάς, προσφέροντας συνέχεια θύματα, ὄχι γιά μαθήματα ἀνατομίας, ἀλλά γιά τήν προώθηση τῶν ἰδανικῶν τῆς προόδου καί τῆς λευτεριάς. . . . »

Κατέβηκε μέ ἓνα πρωινῶτό τραπεζομάχαιρο, ὀλέθριος, ἄν κ' ἦ οὐδέτερη φάτσα του δέν ἔβαζε κανένα σ' ἀνησυχίες. Ἐξέτασε πρῶτα τό χέρι πρὶν τό κόψει. Βρῆκε τό δεύτερο δάχτυλο ἀκόμα κεκαυμένο», ὅπως εἶπε, σά νά σφιγγόταν πάνω σέ μιά νοητή σκανδάλη ὀπλοπολυβόλου, καί μέ μιά γρήγορη κίνηση τό ἀπόκοψε λίγο κάτω ἀπ' τόν ὦμο, εὐκολα, σά νάταν κακά συνδεμένο μπράτσο ἀγάλματος.

«Δέν μπορούμε καθόλου», εἶπε, γυρνώντας πρὸς τό κοινό τῆς αἰθουσας πού τόν παρακολοῦθοῦσε τρομοκρατημένο, «νά ἰσχυριστοῦμε ὅτι τό χέρι αὐτό, τό δεξί, δέν ἤξερε τί ποιοῦσε τό ἀριστερό του. Ἦταν δύο χέρια, δεξί κι ἀριστερό, μέλη τοῦ ἴδιου σώματος, πού ἄν τσακώθηκαν ἦταν γιατί τά ἐξανάγκασε ἡ μαχαιριά πού εἶχε δεχτεῖ στήν πλάτη ὁ ἄνθρωπος αὐτός, τό ἀγνώσιμο θῦμα. Τά χέρια», ἐξακολούθησε ἤρεμος, «ὅπως καί ὄλα τά μέλη τοῦ σώματος, ὑπακούουν στά ἐγκεφαλικά κέντρα. Θά ἀπορεῖτε μέ τήν ὑπερτροφία τοῦ δεξιῶ βραχίονα σέ σχέση μέ τόν ἀριστερό πού ἔμεινε στίς νορμάλ διαστάσεις. Θά σᾶς τό ἐξηγήσω. Σύμφωνα μέ τά τελευταῖα δεδομένα τῆς ἐπιστήμης μας, ἔχουν ἀνακαλυφτεῖ δύο ομάδες νευρικών κέντρων στόν ἀνθρώπινο ἐγκέφαλο. Ἡ πρώτη πού βρίσκεται ἀριστερά, στό πίσω μέρος, προκαλεῖ τίς ἀνεπτυγμένες λειτουργίες τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τίς ἔγνοιες, τίς λέξεις, τά νοήματα, καί κατευθύνει τά δεξιά ἄκρα. Ἡ δεύτερη ομάδα πού βρίσκεται δεξιά, καί σ' αὐτήν ὑπακούουν τά ἀριστερά τμήματα τοῦ ὀργανισμοῦ, ἔχει σχέση μεγαλύτερη μέ τίς ἐνστικτώδεις λειτουργίες: μέ τό τραγούδι, τό αἶσθημα, τήν ἀναρθηρὴ κραυγή. Σέ καθυστερημένα παιδιὰ, πού ἄνωγ παρυσιάζουν μεγάλο ταλέντο στίς τέχνες, διαπιστώνουμε μιά σχετικά μεγαλύτερη ἀνάπτυξη αὐτῆς τῆς δεύτερης ομάδας τοῦ κρανίου. Ἄν λοιπόν παραδεχτοῦμε ὅτι σ' ἓνα ἀνισόρροπο ὀργανισμό ὑπάρχει ἀναγωνισμός αὐτῶν τῶν δύο ἐγκεφαλικῶν ἐστιῶν, δέν θά ἀπορήσουμε γιατί καί τά χέρια ὑπάκουσαν σέ μιά διαφορετικὴ διαδρομὴ στήν ἐξέλιξή τους. Σέ ἰσόρροπους ὀργανισμούς δέν παρατηρεῖται καμιά τέτοια ἀνωμαλία. Μόνο ἐκεῖ ὅπου . . . »

Καί μέ εὐλάβεια ἀκούμπησε πίσω τόν κομμένο βραχίονα στό πτώμα, σά νάταν ἓνα μάρμαρο.

«Ἀπὸ τό τατουάζ στό μπράτσο του», πρόσθεσε, «μποροῦμε νά εἰκάσουμε ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑπῆρξε ναυτικός, ἓνας Ὀδυσσεύς, θάλασσα, πού

supposed era of the corpse under examination, I mean that I went to your country for the first time as a tourist in May '63, the time when Lambrakis was assassinated, and I took part in his autopsy entirely by chance, just as in the summer of '65, when I went with my family to the islands and was present, again entirely by chance, at the July events in the same year and I took part in the autopsy of Sotiris Petroulas. In this way I came into contact with all the progressive elements of that small, yet proud, people who, in a pocket of the Balkans, have never ceased to give us marvelous examples of self-sacrifice and bravery, offering victims continually, not for anatomy lessons, but for the advancement of the ideals of progress and freedom. . . ."

He stepped down with a jagged tableknife, deadly, although his neutral face didn't make anyone uneasy. He examined the hand first before cutting it. He found the second finger "still charred," as he said, as if it were tightly squeezed on an imaginary machine gun trigger, and with a swift movement he cut off the arm a little below the shoulder, effortlessly, as if it were the badly connected arm of a statue.

"We can't at all," he said turning toward the audience which was watching in terror, "maintain that this hand, the right one, didn't know what the left one was doing. They were two hands, the right and the left, limbs of the same body, and if they quarrelled, it was because they were forced to do so by the stab this man, this anonymous victim, received in the back. The hands," he went on calmly, "like all the limbs of the body, obey the brain centers. You must wonder about the hypertrophy of the right arm in relation to the left one which remains within normal dimensions. I'll explain this. According to the latest findings in our field, two groups of nervous centers in the human brain have been discovered. The first one, located to the left, in the back section, causes the developed functions of man—concepts, words, notions—and it directs the limbs on the right side. The second group located on the right side, and which the parts of the organism on the left side obey, has a greater relation to the instinctive functions: to singing, to feeling, to the inarticulate cry. In retarded children who, nevertheless, show a great talent in the arts, we observe a relatively greater development of this second center in the skull. If we accept, therefore, that in an imbalanced organism there exists a competition between these two encephalic sources, we won't be surprised as to why each of these hands obeyed a different course in its development. In balanced organisms no such anomaly is noticed. Only there where . . ."

And, piously, he again put down the severed arm onto the corpse, as if it were a piece of marble.

"From the tattoo on his arm," he added, "we may surmise that this man was a seaman, an Odysseus I'd say, who found at last, here at Cornell University, his Ithaki. . . ."

δρῆκε ἐπιτέλους, ἐδῶ στό πανεπιστήμιο τοῦ Κορνέλ, τὴν Ἰθάκη του. . . . »

« Ἄν καὶ ὁ μῦθος τοῦ Ὀδυσσεύα, πῆρε τὴ σκυτάλη τοῦ λόγου ὁ παρακειμένος ξερακιανός, « πού ἔθιξε ὁ ἀγαπητός συναδέλφος, θά μποροῦσε νά μᾶς μπᾶσει στήν περιοχή τῆς λογοτεχνίας, πρέπει νά ποῦμε ὅτι τό Ἰθάκα τῆς Νέας Ὑόρκης, καμιᾶ σχέση δέν ἔχει μέ τὴν Ἰθάκη τοῦ Ὀμήρου. Προσωπικά ἐγώ ἀσχολοῦμαι καί μέ τὴ συγγραφή, εἶμαι δηλαδή ἰατροφιλόσοφος, καί θά εἶχα πολλά νά παρατηρήσω ἐπὶ τοῦ προκειμένου, ἀφοῦ ἡ ἀνατομία τοῦ σώματος δέν διαφέρει ἀπό κείνη τῆς ψυχῆς. Ἀλλά θά κινδύνευα ἔτσι νά βγῶ ἀπό τὰ αὐστηρά καθορισμένα πλαίσια τοῦ μαθήματος. Σᾶς θυμίζω μόνο τούς στίχους τοῦ Ἐγγονόπουλου πού ταιριαίζουν γιά τὴν περίστασή μας: "Σ" αὐτὴ τὴν ἐποχὴ τοῦ ἐμφύλιου παραγαίμου. . . . »

Κατέβαινε στό μεταξύ, μιλώντας, ὁ ξερακιανός, καί ὅταν ἔφτασε στό νεκρὸ ἔδωσε μιά μέ τό μαχαίρι του στό κρανίο, ὅπως ὁ ταβερνιάρης ἀνοίγει τὰ κεφαλάκια τοῦ ἀρνιοῦ πρὶν τὰ σερβίρει στό πιάτο.

Τότε κάτι παράξενο ἔγινε μέσ τό ἀμφιθέατρο: ἀπ' τό ἀνοιγμένο κεφάλι τοῦ πτώματος βγήκε ἓνα ὀλοζώντανο περιστέρι πού ἄρχισε νά φτερουγίζει μὴ ξερόντας πού νά κρυφτεῖ. Πῆγε πρὸς τὰ πάνω, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κάψαν τὰ φτερά τὰ δυνατὰ σπότ. Πῆγε πρὸς τὰ κεί ἀπ' ὅπου ἔμπαινε τό φῶς τοῦ φθοριακοῦ ἥλιου, ἀλλὰ τό ράμφος του χτύπησε πάνω στό ἀλεξίσφαιρο ἀπορροφητικὸ τζάμι. Κάθισε λίγο πάνω σ' ἓνα ἀποσμητικὸ καλώδιο, μὰ ξαναπέταξε πλαταγίζοντας φοβισμένο τὰ φτερά του, σάν τὰ σαράντα χρόνια πού ἔμεινε ἐγκλειστο στό κρανίο τοῦ νεκροῦ νά τοῦ εἶχαν ξεμάθει τὴ χαρὰ νά πετάει. Κουραζόταν εὐκολα. Σαράντα χρόνια ζοῦσε ἐγκλωβισμένο, ἀνασαινόοντας ἀπ' τίς τρύπες καί τ' αὐτιά τοῦ νεκροῦ, σαράντα χρόνια ἀπὸ τό «ἄφτερο δίποδο» πού ἦταν ὁ ἄνθρωπος βγήκε τώρα τό «ἔνφτερο δίποδο» πού ἦταν τό πουλί, ἐνῶ οἱ γυναῖκες σφίγγαν τὰ γόνατά τους ἀπὸ τρόμο, σάν τὰ δικοτηλῦδονα, καί μερικοὶ παλιοὶ καμπούριαζαν ἐπιτήδες γιά νά τοῦ προσφέρουν ἀποκούμπι νά καθίσει. Σέ λίγο, ἀναίτια, τό πλῆθος ξέσπασε σέ ζητωκραυγές.

« Ἀνοῖξετε του νά φύγει », φώναξε ἓνας.

Κ' ἓνας ἄλλος: « Κρατᾶ ἓνα χαρτί στά νύχια του ».

« Εἶναι περιστέρι-μαντατοφόρο ».

« Φέρνει μιά παραγγελιά ».

« Ἐνα μήνυμα . . . »

Οἱ φωνές τρόμαξαν τό πουλί πού τώρα πετοῦσε πανικόβλητο. Μόγος, μέσα στοὺς ἀνατόμους, τό γεροντάκι δάκρυζε ἀπ' τὴ χαρὰ του. Τό περιστέρι σά νᾶδε τό δάκρυ του καί πῆγε, σάν ἐπιφοίτηση, κοντὰ του. Ὁ γέρος τῶπιασε μέ τρυφερότητα, τὸ γαργάλισε τό λαϊμό.

Ἡ συντονίστρια ἐπέμενε πῶς δέν μποροῦσε ἓνα «ἀπρόοπτο γεγονός» νά τοὺς χαλάσει τό μάθημα. Πῶς ἔπρεπε νά συνεχίσουν, νά δλοκληρώσουν οἱ κ.κ. καθηγητές τίς ἀπόψεις τους γιά τό πτώμα. Ἀκόμα

"Although Odysseus' myth," continued the nearby scrawny fellow in the relay race of speeches, "to which my dear colleague hinted at could lead us into the field of literature, we must say that the Ithaca of New York bears no relation to Homer's Ithaki. Personally I also occupy myself with writing, I am, that is, a philosopher doctor, and I'd have a lot to say on the matter since the anatomy of the body is not different from that of the soul. But then I'd risk going beyond the strictly defined limits of the lesson. I remind you only of Engonopoulos's lines, which apply to our case: "In this era of civil rending. . . ."

In the meantime the scrawny fellow kept walking forward, talking, and when he reached the dead man, he plunged his knife into his skull, just as a taverna owner splits open the heads of spring lambs before serving them on a dish.

Then something strange happened in the amphitheater: from the split head of the corpse a live dove came out and started fluttering its wings without knowing where to hide. It went upward, but the powerful spotlights burned its feathers. It went toward the side through which the light of the fluorescent sun came in, but its beak hit the bulletproof, absorbent windowpane. For a short while it sat on a deoderant wire, but it flew away again, flapping its wings fearfully, as if the forty years it remained shut in the skull of the dead man had made it unlearn the joy of flying. It grew tired easily. For forty years it had lived caged, breathing through the dead man's holes and ears, after forty years, from the "wingless two-legged being" which this man was, now came this winged bird that made the women keep their knees tightly together, like the dicotyledons, and some old fellows hunched over purposely to offer it a prop to sit on. After awhile, the crowd burst into spontaneous loud cheers.

"Open so it can get out," someone shouted.

And someone else: "It holds a slip of paper in its claws."

"It's a messenger-dove."

"It brings a dispatch."

"A message . . ."

The shouts frightened the bird, which now flew about terror-stricken. Amid the anatomists, only the dear old man shed tears of joy. The dove seemed to have noticed the old man's tears and went near him, like divine illumination. The old man caught it tenderly, and tickled its neck.

The chairwoman asserted that "an unexpected event" should not spoil the lesson. That they had to go on so that the Messers. Professors could conclude their views about the corpse. They had not yet examined the chest, they had not analyzed his genital organs, his thighs . . .

She spoke to a void. No one listened to her. Then she proceeded to the written questions which had been submitted to her. She read some of

δέν είχαν εξετάσει τόν θώρακα, δέν είχαν αναλύσει τά γεννητικά του ὄργανα, τούς μηρούς . . .

Μιλοῦσε στό κενό. Κανείς δέν τήν ἀκουγε. Τότε πέρασε στίς γραπτές ἐρωτήσεις πού τῆς είχαν ὑποβληθεῖ. Διάβασε μερικές μέ φωνή στεντόρεια: «Ποιός ὁ ρόλος τῆς ἐκκλησίας στήν περίπτωση τοῦ συγκεκριμένου νεκροῦ πού ἐξετάζουμε»; «Τόν εὐλόγησε παπᾶς ἢ διάκος»; «Ἄν ἦταν νεκρός τοῦ ἀντάρτικου, ἀποκλείονταν νά ὑπῆρξε θῦμα τοῦ Ζαχαριᾶδη»; κ.τ.λ.

Κανείς δέν τήν πρόσεχε. Ἡ προσοχή δλονῶν ἦταν στραμμένη πρὸς τό περιστέρι πού τό γεροντάκι, πάντα στό μισοφέγγαρο τραπέζι, τό κρατοῦσε προστατευτικά μέσα στίς δυό παλάμες του. Τό ζέσταινε ἢ ζεσταινόταν ὁ ἴδιος ἀπ' αὐτό. Πάντως προσπάθησε ν' ἀποσπάσει μέσα ἀπ' τά γαμπά του νύχια ὅπου ἦταν περασμένο τό τυλιχτάρι μέ τό μήνυμα. Τό περιστέρι κουνούσε φιλάρεσκα τό κεφάλι του ὅπου τά πλούσια πούπουλα ἀναρριπίζονταν χωρὶς νά δείχνουν τά νεύρα τοῦ λαιμοῦ του, χαρούμενο πού βρῆκε μιά φωλιά στά τρεμάμενα χέρια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κι ὅταν πείστηκε τό ἴδιο πῶς θρискόταν στόν κατάλληλο ἀνθρώπο, ἀπό μιά μυστική ἐπικοινωνία πού είχαν οἱ δυό τους, ξέκαμψε τά γαμπά νύχια του κι ἄφησε τό τυλιγμένο χαρτί πού κρατοῦσε νά πέσει σάν αὐγό.

Τό γεροντάκι τό πήρε, τό πέρασε σά δαχτυλίδι ἀρραβώνα στό μικρό του δάχτυλο γιά νά τό ξεσφίξει κ' ὕστερα, προσεχτικά, μέ τήν ἴδια πένσα πού εἶχε πιάσει πρὶν τό κλαδί μέ τό βασιλικό στ' αὐτὸ τοῦ ἀντάρτη, ἄρχισε νά τό ξεδιπλώνει.

Στό διάστημα αὐτό τό περιστέρι, λευτερωμένο ἀπ' τά χέρια του, κυκλοφοροῦσε σεινάμενο-κουνάμενο πάνω στό τραπέζι μέ τά φυτεμένα μικρόφωνα, πηδώντας χαριτωμένα τά καλώδια-παγίδες, ὅμοιο μέ τά περιστερία τοῦ Ἁγίου Μάρκου, στή Βενετία, πού περπατοῦν, ὅταν ἢ ὁμώνυμη πλατεία πλημμυρίζει, πάνω σέ ξύλινους διαδρόμους πού στήνονται γιά τούς περαστικούς, γουργουρίζοντας, φάχνοντας γιά φαγητό, πηδώντας τρομαγμένα κάθε πού τό γκόγκ τῆς ἐκκλησιᾶς σημαίνει τά τέταρτα, τά μισάωρα καί τίς ὥρες. Αὐτό πηδοῦσε κάθε φορά πού ἕνας ἀνατόμος ἤθελε νά τό πάρει στά χέρια του, πατοῦσε πάνω στίς γραπτές ἐρωτήσεις πού είχαν σκορπίσει μπροστά ἀπ' τήν ἐνοχλημένη συντονίστρια καί μόνο ὅταν ὁ Ἄγγλος λόρδος τοῦ ἔβριξε κάτω σπόρια γιά νά φάει, αὐτό, καχύποπτο, ἔκανε πῶς σκύβει νά ταμπήσει, μιά γρήγορα σά νά τό μετάνιωσε κ' ἔκανε πίσω. Μόνο ἀπό ἕνα ἄθιχτο ποτήρι μέ νερό ἤπιε καί γλούγλισε μετά εὐχαριστημένο.

Οἱ ἀκροατές, τεντωμένες χορδές στά καθίσματα, εἶδαν τότε τόν βυζαντινὸ ἄγιο νά δακρύζει. Τό τυλιχτάρι κρέμονταν στά χέρια του σά γάζα ἀπὸ νωπή πληγή. Μιά γάζα ὅμως πού μεταμορφώθηκε σέ λίγο κ' ἔγινε ἄσπρο ἐκτυφλωτικό φῶς, ὅπως ἀκριδῶς βλέποντας τίς τρέπες τοῦ παλτοῦ ἐνὸς πλαγιασμένου ζητιάνου πάνω στή σκάρα τοῦ μετροῦ, ξαφνικά, τό παλτό γίνεται ἢ νύχτα κ' οἱ τρόπες τ' ἀστέρια τῆς.

Ἔκλαιγε τώρα τό γεροντάκι λές κι ὅλη ἡ συγκριτικὴ ἀνατομία πού τόσα χρόνια διδάσκει στό Στρασοβουργο, μέ τόση ἐπιτυχία, νά

them in a stentorian voice: "What was the role of the church in the case of the dead man we're examining?" "Was he blessed by a priest or by the devil?" "If the dead man belonged to the partisans, is it possible that he was a victim of Zachariadis?" etc.

No one paid attention to her. Everybody's attention was turned toward the dove which the dear old man, always at the crescent-shaped table, was holding protectively between his two palms. He was warming it or was himself warmed by it. Anyway, he was trying to remove from its hookclaws, the folded slip of paper with the message which was caught there. The dove was coquettishly shaking its head, where the rich feathers rippled without uncovering the nerves of the neck, happy that it had found a nest in this man's trembling hands, and when it was convinced that it was with the right person, because of some secret communication the two of them shared, unhooked its hookclaws and let the folded slip of paper it was holding drop like an egg.

The dear old man took it, put it on his little finger like an engagement ring, in order to unloosen it, and then, carefully, with the same tweezers with which he had earlier picked up the twig of basil from the partisan's ear, he began unfolding it.

Meanwhile, freed from his hands, swaying and swinging, the dove circulated on the table with the planted microphones, hopping gracefully over the wire-traps, like the doves at St. Mark's in Venice, which walk on wooden crosswalks set up for pedestrians when the square floods, cooing, searching for food, hopping fearfully each time the gong of the church sounds the quarter hours, half-hours, and hours. This dove hopped each time some anatomist wanted to hold it in his hands, stepped over the written questions which were scattered in front of the annoyed chairwoman, and, only when the English lord threw it some seeds to eat, did the dove, suspicious, pretend that it was bending down to peck, but quickly, as though changing its mind, stepped back. It only drank, afterwards, from an untouched glass of water and giggled happily.

The audience, like taut strings in their seats, saw the Byzantine saint shedding tears. The folded slip of paper was hanging from his hands like gauze from an open wound. A gauze, though, that in a short while was transformed into a white dazzling light just as when we look at the holes of a beggar's overcoat lying on the grid of the subway, and, suddenly, the overcoat turns into the night and its holes into stars.

The dear old man was weeping now as though all the comparative anatomy he had taught for so many years at Strasbourg so successfully had melted like crystal icicles when the sun appears, destroying all morgues, all scientific research, and everything becomes fluid again, the

Ξίλωσε σάν τά κρυσταλλώματα τῶν πάγων ὅταν θγαίνει ἔξαφνα ἕνας ἥλιος καταργητικός κάθε ψυχαποθήκης, κάθε ἐπιστημονικῆς ἔρευνας καί ὅλα γίνονται ξανά ρευστά, γιομίζουν τά ρουμάνια νερά πού τρέχουνε, πουλιά πού κελαηδοῦνε, «κι ὁ κόσμος ξαναγίνεται ἁμορφος στά μέτρα τῆς καρδιάς».

Οἱ ἀνατόμοι εἶχαν πετρώσει στίς θέσεις τους. Μοιάζαν οἱ ἴδιοι τώρα μέ πτώματα πού χρειάζόταν ἄλλους ἀνατόμους νά τούς νεκροτομήσουν. Μήπως τό μήνυμα κατοργοῦσε τίς θέσεις τους, τούς ἄξιους μισθούς τους; Τί θά γινόταν χωρίς τά πτώματα, πολύτιμες ὑποτροφίες τῆς ζωῆς τους, ὅπως οἱ ἐθνολόγοι πού τόσο φοβοῦνται τήν ἐξαφάνιση τῶν πρωτόγονων φυλῶν;

Τά ἑφτά μικρόφωνα κουνηθῆκαν τότε ἀπ' τίς θέσεις τους, μαζευτήκαν ὅλα σάν ἠλιотρόπια μπροστά στό σφιχτό στόμα τοῦ κλαμένου ἁγίου. Τά καλώδια τεγνωθήκαν σά νεῦρα μπετατζήδων πού σηκώνουν θαριοῦς τενεκέδες ὕγρου μπετόν. Κι ὁ κόσμος, μέσ τό ἀμφιθέατρο, ὄρθιος καθῶς γιρῶνε ν' ἀκούσει τόν ὕμνο τῆς Τρίτης Διεθνούς, ἤ ὅπως κρατοῦν ἕνός λεπτοῦ αἰγή γιά τά θύματα. Τά στήθια τῆς συντονίστριας ἀνεθοκατέβαιναν, μπαλκόνια ἀπ' ὅπου φύγαν οἱ προεκλογικοί ὁμιλητές. Ὁ ξερακιανός ἐπαιζε ἀμήχανα μέ τά χέρια του, λές κ' ἔφταιγαν αὐτά πού λευτέρωσαν τό περιστέρι, ὁ οὐδέτερος μ' ἕνα τζσκόνητο χαμόγελο περίμενε τήν συνέχεια, τό φαλιδιαμένο μούσι κάτι ψιθούριζε στό δόλοφυτο δίπλα του, ὅπως ἕνα κυπαρίσσι γέρνει ἀπ' τόν ἄερα κι ἀκουμπᾷ πάνω σέ μιὰ φουντωμένη καρυδιά, ὁ Ἄγγλος εἶχε βγάλει ἀπ' τήν τσέπη τό ρολόι του κ' ἔλεγε στόν «καταφυγμένο» κάτι σάν ἄν τό γεροντάκι ἀργοῦσε ἀκόμα νά διαβάσει τό μήνυμα θά χάναν τό προγραμματισμένο «lunch», ἐνῶ ὁ «καταφυγμένος» εἶχε γίνει τό ἁμολίωμα τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ του σ' ἕνα μουσεῖο ἀπό κερλίλιωνοντας ἔξαφνα ὅπως τά ψάρια Εὐρυδικῆς πού ἀφοῦ μείνουν λίγο ἔξω ἀπ' τήν κατάψυξη ἀποκοτοῦν μιὰ γλοιώδη περιφερειακή οὐσία, κάτι σά σάλιο πού βρωμάει «συντήρηση». Κι ὁ νεκρός νά χαμογελοῦσε, πέρα ἀπ' τόν θάνατο, λές κ' ἡ ταραχή τοῦ κόσμου τόν εἶχε ἀναθερμάνει, τοῦ ἔφερε στό δέρμα τά ρίγη τῆς ἄλλης ταραχῆς, λίγο πρὶν τό βλῆμα τόν βρεῖ στήν καρδιά καί τόν ἀφήσει ἐπιτόπου.

Τό γεροντάκι ἔβηξε, καθάρισε τήν φωνή του καί πλησιάζοντας τά ἑφτά μικρόφωνα, διάβασε τό τυλιχτάρι:

— Ο ΒΕΛΟΥΧΙΩΤΗΣ ΖΕΙ.

Τό ἀκρατήριο, ὄχι ὄλοι, ξέσπασαν σ' ἀλαλαγμούς χαρᾶς. Χωρῖσαν ἀμέσως τά πρόβατα ἀπ' τά ἐρίφια. Οἱ παλιοί ἐπονίτες, ἐαμίτες, τοῦ ΕΛΑΣ, πού βρεθῆκαν στήν Ἀμερικῆ, μικρομαγαζάτορες, ἐσιτάτορες, μηχανολόγοι, ἐργάτες, μπῆκαν ἐπικεφαλῆς τῆς πορείας πού σχηματίστηκε ἀμέσως, μέ τό νεκρό ἀντάρτη ἐπικεφαλῆς πού τόν σηκῶσαν παιδιά φτωμωμένα, μέ μπράτσα γερά, φοιτητές κάθε σχολῆς καί δυό-τρεῖς καθαρίστριες τοῦ πανεπιστήμιου, ἀπό ἐλληνική σπορά, καί τραγουδώντας τραγούδια τοῦ ἀγῶνα, «λευτεριάς λίπασμα, οἱ πῶτοι νεκροί», ξεκίνησαν—γιά πού; Δέν ξέραν ἀκόμα. Ἄν ὀπῆρχε πρε-

ravines fill with running waters, birds chirp, "and the world becomes beautiful again to the heart's standards."

The anatomists had turned to stone in their seats. Now they themselves looked like corpses that needed other anatomists to perform autopsies on their bodies. Did the message, perhaps, abolish their positions, their worthy salaries? What would become of them without corpses, the valuable grants of their lives, like the ethnologists who fear the extinction of primitive races?

The seven microphones moved from their places then, they all gathered like sunflowers before the tightly closed mouth of the weeping saint. The wires stretched like the muscles of construction workers lifting heavy buckets of mixed concrete. And the people in the amphitheater, standing, as though waiting to hear the Third International, or keeping a moment's silence for victims. The bosom of the chairwoman kept going up and down, like balconies from where preelection speakers have left. The scrawny fellow was drumming his fingers, bewildered, as though they were to blame for freeing the dove; the neutral type, with a Gioconda smile, was waiting for the continuation; the trimmed beard whispered something to the fully grown beard beside him, just as a cypress tree bends from the wind and leans against a fully grown walnut tree; the Englishman had taken his watch out of his pocket and said to the "frozen one" that if the old man hesitated a little longer in reading the message, they'd miss their prescheduled "lunch," whereas the "frozen one" had turned into the spitting image of his own self in a wax museum, melting suddenly like Eurydiki's fish which, if left outside the freezer for a short while, acquire a sticky substance around them, something like saliva smelling of "preservation." And the dead man kept smiling beyond death as though the turbulence in the people had warmed him up, brought shivers from the other turbulence to his skin, a little before the bullet hit him in the heart and killed him on the spot.

The dear old man coughed, cleared his throat and, approaching the seven microphones, read the folded slip of paper:

"VELOUCHIOTIS LIVES."

The audience, not all of them, burst into loud cries of joy. The sheep were instantly separated from the lambs. The old EPON, EAM, and ELAS followers who happened to be in America—small storeowners, restaurateurs, mechanics, workers, went to the head of the march that was formed immediately, with the dead partisan at the head carried by well-built lads with strong arms—students of every school, including two or three cleaning women from the university, of Greek descent, all singing the songs of the struggle, "compost of freedom, the first dead," they started

σβεία, θά πηγαίναν ἐκεῖ. Μά τό πανεπιστημιακό βουλο δέν τούς ἔδινε καμιά προστασία. Γρήγορα σειρήνες αστυνομικῶν, ἀσθενοφόρα, τρέξαν πρὸς τό κέντρο τῆς ἀναταραχῆς, τό μεγάλο ἀμφιθέατρο τῆς Ἰατρικῆς Σχολῆς. Τό γεροντάκι εἶχε τό γενικό πρόσταγμα τῆς εἰρηνικῆς διαδήλωσης. Τό μάθημα τῆς ἀνατομίας καταργήθηκε ἀπ' τήν ἔξαφνη ἐμφάνιση τοῦ περιστεριοῦ πού ἦρθε γιά νά φέρει τό καλό μαντάτο: «Ὁ ἀγώνας συνεχίζεται. Εἴμαστε ἀκόμα στήν ἀρχή. Ἐμπρός γιά νά σηκώσουμε τόν ἥλιο πάνω ἀπ' τήν Ἑλλάδα».

Στό γεῦμα τους, οἱ ἀνατόμοι σχολίαζαν κάπως πικρόχολα, ἀνάμεσα στό ἄσπρο καί τό κόκκινο κρασί πού ἐναλλάσσονταν, μετά τό ψάρι πού τό ἀκολούθησε μπιφτέκι, τήν τάση τῆς νέας γενιᾶς νά ἀνασταίνει ἀκόμα καί τούς νεκρούς, ἐνώ, στό ἐπίδωρπιο, μεταξύ τυριοῦ καί ἀγλαδιοῦ, συμφωνοῦσαν πῶς ἔτσι τούς ἀπάλλαξαν ἀπό τήν ἀπογευματινὴ τουλάχιστο διδασκαλία.

14.11.78

—towards where? They didn't know yet. If there were an embassy, they'd go there. But university asylum didn't give them any protection. Soon police sirens, ambulances, ran toward the center of the turmoil, the big amphitheater of the medical school. The sympathetic old man was in charge of the peaceful demonstration. The anatomy lesson was terminated by the sudden appearance of the dove, which came like another Holy Ghost to bring the message: "The struggle continues. We are still at the beginning. Let's go ahead to raise the sun over Greece."

At lunch, the anatomists commented somewhat bitterly—between white and red wine, interchangeable, after fish followed by steak—about the tendency of the young generation to resurrect even the dead, whereas, during dessert, between the cheese and the pears, they agreed that, in this way, they were relieved, at least, of their afternoon teaching.

November 14, 1978

Translated by Athan Anagnostopoulos

The United States and the Operational Responsibilities of the Greek Armed Forces, 1947-1987

by YIANNIS P. ROUBATIS

"The Greek Government could not cooperate within the framework of the Alliance's military organization with a country which, in utter disregard of international agreements, inflicted grievous injury upon an important segment of the Greek nation. As a consequence of this decision, *Greece shall recover forthwith, over her entire territory, airspace and territorial waters, full exercise of sovereignty which was heretofore limited on account of her participation in NATO and as a result of the permanent presence on Greek soil of foreign military installations and facilities for the regular use of Greek airspace and territorial waters by foreign military aircraft and naval vessels.*" (emphasis added)

With these words, contained in an August 28, 1974 message to the heads of state of the NATO countries, Prime Minister of Greece Konstantinos Karamanlis announced the decision of the Greek government to withdraw its military forces from the integrated military command of the Alliance. The letter, apart from its immediate implications for the allies, was important in one other respect: for the first time since the end of the Second World War a leader of the Greek right had admitted in writing that there had been limitations placed on the sovereignty of Greece by its participation in the NATO alliance and the acceptance of bilateral agreements with other Western nations. Karamanlis had not, of course, stated anything new. There were not many people who had thought that Greece had been a sovereign nation since the end of the Civil War in 1949. Karamanlis had, however, articulated a truth that had been floating both in Greece and abroad for a good number of years. Namely, that Greece was a country under the tutelage of its major allies, and that the tutelage was exercised through the use of the military aspects of the relationship.

The editors of this journal wrote not too long ago that "from the liberation of Greece in 1944 until today, the decisive—and 'dynamic'—factor in Greek political life has been the army. The resolution of the 'problem' of the army will play a fundamental role in resolving the more general

This article is based on a presentation made in November 1978 to the Union of Democratic Scholars of North America (ΕΔΕΒΑ).

political 'problem' in Greece today".¹ By its very nature, the subject of the Greek army has not been open to academic scrutiny. The reasons for that are many. Most of the pertinent documents in the various national archives are still classified. Furthermore, most of the researchers in this area have tended to concentrate on the diplomatic side of the relationship. Academics in the western world, and especially in the United States, have a preference for the style of diplomacy rather than the substance of interstate relations, and, as a consequence, are more comfortable in dealing with diplomats and their papers than with soldiers, who are traditionally closemouthed and overclassify their written output. The military aspects of the relationship are, however, as important as the political ones. Furthermore, most of the time they are also more interesting. My intent in this brief essay is to set out a number of observations and to offer some information on the relations between the Greek and the American military establishments. My conclusion can be stated from the very start of this presentation: I am in full agreement with the current prime minister of Greece when he states that the military role and the military alliances Greece has chosen—or was made to choose—put limitations on the full exercise of sovereignty by that country within the area over which a nation is traditionally supposed to exercise such sovereignty.

In the annual process that precedes the submission of the American administrations' foreign military sales and security assistance proposals, one can find some rather interesting statements. The Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, George S. Vest, testified recently that "[the security assistance program for Greece for Fiscal Year 1980] . . . will assist Greece in fulfilling its NATO obligations and help provide for Greece's self-defense. The program also is a continuing indication of U.S. support for a democratic Greece. It has also been formulated with a view to strengthening the south-eastern flank of NATO at a time of particular concern in that region."² Moments before, Vest had said that "[the U.S.] continue[s] to have an on-going and positive defense relationship with Greece. Our facilities in Greece continue to operate with the full cooperation of the Greek authorities. Sixth Fleet ships are making regular calls at Greek ports and we have had an exchange of high-level military visits."³

A first reading of these statements would lead one to conclude that either Vest or Karamanlis have described the prevailing situation between the two nations in a less than candid manner. According to the Karamanlis letter to the Alliance, Greece would "not participate" in NATO and would put restrictions on the use of foreign "military installations and facilities" on Greek soil. Why, then, is Greece receiving credits from the U.S. for "fulfilling its NATO operations" and "cooperating fully"

¹ Statement by the Editors, *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, special issue, *Greece: 1940-1950*, vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978, p. 4.

² Statement of George S. Vest, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 1, 1979, p. 10.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

with the American military authorities in their use of "facilities" in Greece? To answer such questions, one has to look at the development of the U.S.-Greek military relationship as it has unfolded over the years. The question one must answer first is what operational responsibilities were assigned to the Greek military establishment after the Second World War. Once that is examined, a lot of seemingly contradictory statements become more consistent with each other.

The Early Years

On August 1, 1946, Thomas Karamessines, a former OSS operative who later held a series of high offices in the CIA, "had been designated as Attache" at the American Embassy in Athens.⁴ He wrote a memorandum to the American ambassador at the time, Lincoln MacVeagh, on the Communist Party of Greece. MacVeagh forwarded the memorandum to the Department of State in a dispatch entitled "Rightist Campaign to Eradicate Communists in Greece."⁵ Karamessines informed MacVeagh that, "from a ranking officer of the Intelligence Directorate of the Greek General Staff," he had learned that Greek officers were drawing up plans "whereby strict security measures will be taken to protect the armed services from subversion and sabotage." He also told the ambassador that "the plan calls for purging all the armed and associated services of all persons suspected of membership in, or sympathy with, the KKE." Karamessines went on to write that:

The source of our information also made it clear that the Staff is presently considering methods whereby, following the conclusion of the Paris Conference or shortly thereafter, the Greek Government can proceed to neutralize the KKE completely and effectively, even if it is necessary to declare the Party illegal. . . .

Although the officers of the General Staff have always been known as pronounced anticommunists, it is believed that several recent occurrences have hastened their thought along the lines described above. . . .

It is perhaps regrettable that moderation and discretion have not been considered as consistent with effectiveness by the present Government, and one may wonder whether precipitate and ill-considered moves will not do more damage than good in the long run. *Nevertheless, in the light of all our information, we cannot disagree with the Staff's definition of the problem.* (emphasis added).

MacVeagh, commenting on the memorandum, wrote that "altogether,

⁴ Department of State Records, 811.20200/1-2246.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 868.00/8-1046.

Mr. Karamessines' conclusion that 'in the light of all our information, we cannot disagree with the Staff's definition of the problem', would seem unexceptional. . . . Practically every one of the above complaints against the KKE was made a year ago, though the lot was not lumped together, to excuse a campaign of eradication." MacVeagh, no Communist sympathizer himself, nonetheless observed that, "under the guise of royalism this program [of the Greek government] actually approximates Fascism at a time when, if anything has been proven by events, it is that Fascism has no place in the modern world." He goes on to observe:

By their policy of continually enlarging their definition of Communism to include all who do not support the return of the King, the extremists of the Mavromichalis type now conducting the Government's crusade against Communism are risking the creation here, by confirming the alliance of large numbers of democrats with the extreme left, of the same sort of ideological civil war which has occurred in Spain. . . .

Some diplomatic historians insist that it was not until later that the United States made it a matter of policy to support any element within the country that would guarantee anticommunist policies. What is important in the two differing views expressed by Karamessines and MacVeagh is that it becomes apparent that, from the very first years of the U.S.-Greek military relationship, there was general agreement as to the role of the Greek army among the "professionals" in the two countries.

MacVeagh might have disagreed with the Greek Staff and the Karamessines conclusions, but less than six months later the decisions and actions of his government did not support his views. The Karamessines' view of the role of the Greek army and his ready acceptance of their plans, after the necessary expressions of regret as to the lack of "moderation and discretion" had been made, was to be the attitude that prevailed. The American civilian and military strategic planners did not assign to the Greek army the role of protector of the country from possible outside attacks, but, rather, envisioned an army the main objective of which was the protection of the ruling class from the citizens of the country. The United States never intended the Greek army to become a fighting force for the defense of the country. Instead, they wanted an army that would restore and maintain internal order.

In the last three months of 1947 and the first five months of 1948, the Staff of the National Security Council undertook to prepare a series of reports on the situation in Greece with a view to formulating the official policy of the United States. The draft of the first report was submitted for consideration by the National Security Council on January 6, 1948. The problem that the Staff of the NSC examined was stated on the first page:

To assess and appraise the position of the United States with respect to Greece, taking into consideration the security interests

of the United States in the Mediterranean and Near East areas.⁶

In paragraph four of the report it was stated that:

The Greek Government rests on a weak foundation and Greece is in a deplorable economic state. There are [sic] general fear and a feeling of insecurity among the people, friction among short-sighted political factions, selfishness and corruption in Government, and a dearth of effective leaders. The armed forces of Greece, both military and police units, are hampered in their effort to eliminate Communist guerrilla forces by lack of offensive spirit, by political interference, by disposition of units as static guard forces and by poor leadership, particularly in the lower echelons. The Greek army, if strengthened, adequately equipped, operationally and technically well advised, and assured of continued US support, *can eliminate guerrilla forces composed of Greek nationals alone.* (emphasis added)

In order to "assure the continuation of US support," the Staff of the NSC recommended that the United States:

Demand as a condition for the continuance of the assistance program, the complete cooperation and aggressive action of the Greek government, including such measures as . . . divorcing politics from the conduct of operations. . . .

and also:

Increase the assistance to the Greek armed forces to the extent necessary to cope with the guerrilla situation by reallocation of funds within the present aid program and placing emphasis upon the military assistance in future programs.

This report to the National Security Council, among other things, gave the first official indication of how the United States saw the Greek army one year after they had taken over from the British in assisting it. The report also gave the first indications that the U.S. interest in the Greek army was going to be limited. More importantly, the Staff of the NSC mentioned, even though only in passing, what was going to become a cornerstone of American policy toward the Greek army. The Greek army was going to have to become "depoliticized." "Political interference" had contributed to the army's woes, according to the American planners. By demanding, and getting, a hands off policy in regard to the army from Greek politicians, the Americans managed to create a force which was

⁶ RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, P & O, 091 Greece, (TS), file 13, National Archives (hereafter cited as NA). (Also known as NSC 5, January 6, 1948.)

loyal to them, rather than to the country. This was essential for the success of what was to follow. On February 12, 1948, the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, Sidney W. Suers, in an official note, wrote that the NSC had considered "a draft report on the above subject—the position of the U.S. with respect to Greece—and adopted it in its revised form. . . ." The NSC recommended that the President approve the conclusions of the report on Greece, which he did. The main points of the draft report were included in the approved NSC5/1. There was, however, one addition. Paragraph 8, subsection b, of the report stated that one of the alternatives for the United States in Greece was "*to continue and strengthen the present US assistance program to Greece, using all feasible means short of the application of US military power.*" (emphasis in the original).⁷ Paragraph 10 stated that:

The United States should . . . make full use of its political, economic and, if necessary, military power in such manner as may be found most effective to prevent Greece from falling under the domination of the USSR either through external armed attack or through Soviet-dominated Communist movements within Greece, *so long as the legally elected government of Greece evidences a determination to oppose Communist aggression.* (emphasis added)

Paragraph 11 contained a very peculiar conclusion:

As an interim step based upon the analysis in paragraph 8 *b*, this determination should be immediately evidenced and implemented by: *a.* Strengthening the present U.S. assistance program to Greece, using all feasible means short of the application of U.S. military power. *b.* Conducting, with the consent of the legal Greek government, training flights into Greece by U.S. armed forces. *c.* Actively combatting Communist propaganda in Greece by an effective U.S. information program and by all other practicable means, [deleted—not declassified].

The National Security Council of the United States decided then that the Greek government would "evidence a determination to oppose Communist aggression" by implementing a series of measures that required *American actions* in Greece! The Greek army was to be assigned a role that would augment these American decisions on Greece's future later on in the same year.

On November 24, 1948, in a memorandum of the Department of the Army's Office of Plans and Operations we find that:

⁷ The other two alternatives were "to end all aid or all military aid to Greece" and "to continue and strengthen the present type of aid to Greece, combined with one or more of the following uses of US military power." NSC 5/2, RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, P & O, 091 Greece, (TS), 12 February 1948.

The Department of the Army has recently approved the following concept for future Greek Aid:

a. That US Military Aid be made available to Greece *only* to the extent required to eliminate large scale guerrilla activity and thereafter to maintain a reasonable state of internal security, and *that no attempt would be made* to provide US support to the establishment of a Greek Army large enough to control the northern borders of Greece. (emphasis added)

b. That any Military Aid to Greece in the future be evaluated in relation to that given to other countries united with the U.S. in resisting Communist expansion; and be proportionate to the accrual of strategic advantages gained by the U.S. as a result of such aid, except as outlined in paragraph d below.

c. That future aid to Greece be on an austerity basis; the degree and amount to be dependent on the military success achieved by the Greek Government with the means presently available.

d. In the event that the relative priority accorded Greece in the overall U.S. Military Aid Program or a stringent reduction in the availability of U.S. Military Funds results in reducing the Greek Armed Forces below the level required to eliminate large scale guerrilla activities, the minimum amount of U.S. aid to Greece should then be that amount of U.S. aid required to prevent the Communist elements in Greece from achieving a position of dominance politically or militarily, or both.⁸

The decisions of the Department of the Army were based on an earlier National Security Council recommendation, which was adopted by the NSC and approved by the President on May 25, 1948.

NSC 5/3, which was a study of the use of American military power in Greece, concluded that, if the United States had to act in Greece, "decisions as to (a) the strengthening of US military forces in the Mediterranean area, and (b) the adoption of measures equivalent to the initiation of mobilization, should be made in the light of the over-all world situation and not primarily as a contribution to the solution of the problem in Greece."⁹ On November 24, 1948, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in J.C.S. 1826/12, a paper on Greece and Turkey, concluded that, although it would be to the military advantage of the United States to give aid to the Greek army to the point that it could resist "all forms of Communist aggression," the strategic realities and "other more important commitments made by the United States," made it "impracticable . . . to extend military

⁸ RG 218, Records of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, CCS 092, 22 August 1946, Sec. 15, pp. 2-3.

⁹ RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, P & O, 091 Greece, (TS), 25 May 1948, file 13, pp. 5-6.

aid to Greece beyond that required to eliminate guerrilla activity." The same paper contained another important decision for the future of the operational roles of the Greek army. The American generals decided that, after the end of the Civil War, "military aid will be reduced to that sufficient only to maintain Greece's internal security."¹⁰

On March 23, 1949, President Truman approved the conclusions of a National Security Council report entitled "U.S. Objectives with Respect to Greece and Turkey to Counter Soviet Threats to U.S. Security." The report, known as NSC 42/1, concluded that it was in the interest of U.S. national security that neither Greece nor Turkey "fall under communist domination." Paragraph 30 in the conclusions contained what has become, in the last twenty-five years, the cornerstone of United States policy towards the Greek military establishment:

Because Turkey is strategically more important than Greece and because the present situation in Greece is precarious, whereas in Turkey it is relatively sound, the United States has greater long-range strategic interests in the military establishments of Turkey than those of Greece.¹¹

NSC 42/1 adopted the conclusions of another study on U.S. long-range strategic interest "in the military establishments of Greece and Turkey." According to NSC 42/1, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in agreement with the State-Army-Navy-Air Force Coordinating Committee, had decided that Greece should have "A Greek military establishment capable of maintaining internal security in order to avoid the communist domination of Greece." On the other hand, Turkey should have:

A Turkish military establishment of sufficient size and effectiveness to insure Turkey's continued resistance to Soviet pressure; the development of combat effectiveness to the extent that any overt Soviet aggression can be delayed long enough to permit the commitment of U.S. and allied forces in Turkey in order to deny certain portions of Turkey to the USSR.¹²

The National Security Council report repeated earlier limitations on the commitment of American military power for the defense of the two small allies. Paragraph 32 of the conclusions stated that all military decisions with respect to Greece and Turkey "should be made in the light of the over-all world situation and the defense needs and potentialities of the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean areas as determined on the basis of U.S. strategic interests, and not primarily as a contri-

¹⁰ Quoted in *Report of the Joint Munitions Allocation Committee to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Programs for Foreign Military Assistance*, 7 March 1949. RG 218, CCS 092, 8 August 1946, Sec. 20, p. 440.

¹¹ NSC 42/1, NA, p. 17.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

tribution to the solution of the problems in those countries.”¹³ Two years later, on February 6, 1951, the Staff of the National Security Council prepared another draft report for the NSC. There was an important change. For the first time there was mention of an operational assignment for the Greek army that included defense against outside enemies. However, the primary objective of the military establishment, as the Americans saw it, was the maintainance of “internal security.”¹⁴ There was also another important aspect in the new report. The national security planners made it clear both that they were not ready to supply Greece with the necessary materiel to ward off an attack—because of “the limits of existing priorities and availabilities”—and that the U.S. would not necessarily come to the assistance of Greece in the event of an attack from socialist bloc countries. They stated that the United States “in common prudence should assist in opposition to the attack in a manner and scope to be determined in the light of circumstances then existing.”¹⁵ Even if and when it responded, the United States would “provide such military materiel and deploy such forces to the general area as can be made available without jeopardizing the security of the United States or areas of greater strategic importance to the United States.”¹⁶ The same report, in rather explicit language, explained that, after September 1949, the objective of military assistance to Greece was “to provide support to a Greek military establishment which would be capable of maintaining internal security and affording Greece, *through certain limited accessories*, a modicum of prestige and confidence, and which, in the event of global war, would be capable of causing some delay to Soviet and/or satellite forces and of assisting in the over-all war effort.”¹⁷

Those who drafted the report took no chances, however. The Greek army was supposed to “maintain internal control,” but there were politicians who might get in the way of the “mission” of the army. In the section on the “Alternative Courses of Action” paragraph on the political situation, which, twenty-nine years after it was written, remains heavily censored, it is stated that:

In the political field the principal alternatives lie in the determination of the degree to which the United States should intervene in the internal affairs of Greece in order to insure the employment of policies which will strengthen democratic procedures, increase the acceptance of social responsibilities by the Greek Government, and utilize effectively United States assistance.

DELETIONS

The United States must remain prepared to insist by appropriate means upon the

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁴ NSC 103, February 6, 1951, NA.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

implementation of policies and measures indispensable to the achievement of United States objectives."¹⁸

There should be no misunderstanding here as to the type of intervention the writers of the report had in mind for "strengthening democratic procedures." A little more than a year later, under the pressures of the United States representatives in Greece, the government in power fell. One of the most important policies of that government was the reorientation of the political life of the country towards a national reconciliation and an integration of all political tendencies in the political life of Greece. At approximately the same time that this report was drafted, the Joint Chiefs of Staff put the finishing touches on the "Greek War Plan PHOENIX." Appendix III of this plan dealt with the "Internal Security Plan" drawn up by United States military experts for the use of the Greek army.¹⁹

In the beginning of the 1950s there was an initial decision to reduce the Greek armed forces from the authorized level of 120,000 men for the Army, 12,000 men for the Navy, and 5,000 men for the Greek Air Force. The events in Korea reversed that decision. Instead, the United States decided that the Greek military establishment should remain at the authorized levels, and be provided with assistance which at least would give the impression that the armed forces were able to defend the country from outside attack. The Military Assistance Program (MAP), and the operational responsibilities of the Greek army for the rest of the decade, were to be based on the determinations made in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

The Decade of the Sixties

Beginning with the first part of the decade of the sixties, the views of the American strategic and military planners concerning the Greek Army were predicated on two considerations: 1) the kind of Western alliance that was desired, and 2) the kind of strategy that the United States intended to follow in the area of southeastern Europe. In the mid-sixties, American planners had decided that the NATO alliance was evolving into a different organization from the one they had envisioned at its inception. This evolution was the result of at least three developments:

- a) The threat to Europe from the Soviet Union was perceived by the allies as a diminished one. b) Since the threat was not as great as before, the European allies were not willing to spend

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁹ RG 218, Records of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, CCS 091 Greece, (TS), 30 April 1951.

as much for arms. c) There was a renewed impetus within the Alliance towards more nationalistic sentiments and concerns.

These developments were seen as leading toward an alliance which was going to pay lip service to integration, while at the same time being much looser than before. The U.S. specialists did not consider these as negative developments. They decided at that point that the United States should collaborate with NATO only when it was convinced that it was in the U.S.' best interest to do so. This decision was reflected in the January 19, 1967 U.S. Senate Resolution 49. The American legislators demanded that the commitments to the activities of the Alliance be related in a more direct way to the national interests of the United States than was the case until that time. More bluntly, the American national security managers had decided that the NATO alliance was not serving the goals of their country as faithfully as in previous years and, as a consequence, decided to limit their commitment to it until such time as it would be deemed necessary to increase it again.

Given these perceptions regarding the overall situation of the Alliance, there was also a change in the strategy to be followed in the southeastern Mediterranean. In the view of the U.S. strategists, the events of 1963 and 1964 in Cyprus had dictated a realignment of priorities. American policy-makers and military planners rated the possibility of a war between countries belonging to the two blocs as far less likely than a war between Greece and Turkey. As a result, United States objectives in assisting the Greek armed forces accorded the highest priority to the prevention of such an eventuality rather than to preparing these forces to defend their country against the "real enemy." The reduction of Greece's capacity to fight a defensive or offensive war against Turkey over the issue of Cyprus became the major goal guiding military relations between Greece and the United States throughout the sixties.

The first indication of this policy decision came in a series of draft papers and studies by the United States Department of Defense. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense prepared, on February 11, 1964, a *Draft Talking Paper for Assistant Secretary of Defense John T. McNaughton in Talks with the Minister of Defense of Greece*. Soon after that, McNaughton told Greek officials of the Greek Department of Defense that reductions would have to be made in the Greek air force and navy, with the objective of restricting the offensive capabilities of those branches of the Greek military. The American assumption was that the reductions would lessen the possibilities of a Greco-Turkish war over Cyprus. The American concern over a Greco-Turkish conflict was substantial because it would injure a series of American interests in the area. Although U.S. strategists of the 1960's had not changed their evaluation of the contributions of the two countries to the global strategy of the United States, Greece did represent an asset which would have been seriously damaged by a war between the two countries.

With the loss of its bases in North Africa, Greece's value to the

United States had dwindled. Greece's role in a generalized war would be almost exclusively to protect—to the extent possible, given its limited military resources—its own territory. American policymakers had decided that the Greek "undertakings would not seriously affect the outcome of the strategic campaign." However, Greece did have certain strategic functions in the plans of the American specialists. It was seen as a counterweight to possible excessive Turkish pressures on the United States. Thus, its role was as: 1) an alternate base area to Turkey, 2) a hedge to possible Turkish estrangement from the United States, 3) a land mass to be used as a stepping stone from the core area of the Alliance to the southern flank, 4) a check on Turkish demands for a *quid pro quo* and against the possibility that they could get out of hand, and 5) an impediment to the Soviets' access to the Middle East. On March 25, 1965, a group which was put together to study the defense posture of Greece in the five years from 1966 to 1971 issued its report. Headed by U.S. General Charles H. Bonesteel, the Hellenic Defense Study Team of the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued a *Reappraisal of the Defense Posture of Greece for the Period FY 1966-FY 1971*.²⁰

The team which drafted the report concluded that an attack on Greece from the north was "highly unlikely." A sustained Bulgarian attack, if it were to be successful, would "require extensive Soviet air and logistics support."²¹ According to this report, "it is not the intent of NATO or MAP to equip and maintain military forces in any one country, which would enable it to defeat alone a Communist bloc limited aggression against it."²² Bonesteel proposed that Greece design its forces in such a way as to assume that the allies would come to its assistance. This meant that Greece would not need to have adequate forces to fight a war by itself against any country. The key to Greek defense would have to be the reliance—and dependence—on outside reinforcements from its allies. The principal aims of the implementation of the Bonesteel proposals were in agreement with the policy decision that Greece not possess a military establishment capable of undertaking independent operations. This conflicted sharply with the strategic objectives of Greece, which were similar to those of the United States except in one important area: it was in Greece's interest to create a fighting force which would be capable of defending the country against possible Turkish attack, and, if necessary, to carry the fight to the enemy. This meant that Greece needed strong naval and air components in its armed forces.

The Bonesteel Report proposed that the Greek air force be composed of eight tactical squadrons or 144 aircraft. McNaughton wanted a further reduction to seven squadrons. Initially, Greek air force officers refused to discuss such cuts with the Americans. The Bonesteel report recommendations would have reduced by twenty percent the number of operational aircraft in the inventory of the Greek air force. The Americans argued that the

²⁰ The report will be referred to hereafter as the Bonesteel Report.

²¹ Bonesteel Report, p. V-10.

²² *Ibid.*, p. XIII-4.

aircraft that were going to be put out of commission were obsolete F-86s and F-84s. Greece, however, had adopted a defensive strategy, that is, it would remain in the defensive until attacked. In such a strategy, quality and quantity of aircraft are equally important. In addition, at the time of the mid and late 1960s, most of the air forces of the nations in the Balkans and eastern Mediterranean were contemporaneous with the F-86s and F-84s. When that argument of obsolescence did not work, the Americans told Greece that the MAP programs would have to be cut in the near future, and that, in any case, the U.S. would not be able to support the modernization efforts of the Greek air force. It is interesting to note that, in 1968, only 25 out of more than 150 F-84s in the Greek air force inventory had been purchased with Military Assistance Program monies.

The Bonesteel Report also proposed that no new improvements be made in the Greek navy. It argued that Greece's contribution to the defense effort of the allies in the naval field would be made through the availability of port facilities and shipyards for common use. In terms of land forces, the Americans proposed that Greece deactivate two 1st echelon divisions which would have added up to fifteen percent of the total strength of the Greek field armies. It is estimated that such cuts would have reduced the operational effectiveness of the Greek army by several times this percentage if they had been in the areas which are considered crucial for a cohesive defense. During this same period, the United States rejected all Greek suggestions for the improvement of fortifications on the northern borders. The Greeks had requested to be provided with Atomic Demolition Munitions or ADMs, which were used in the border areas of other countries of the Alliance.

The proposals and the requests for reductions were never presented for what they were in reality: attempts to limit Greek capabilities to fight a war with Turkey. Nor were the Greeks ever informed about the change in the minds of the U.S. strategic planners concerning the nature of the threat from the north. Even if nothing had changed in terms of strategic perceptions, however, dependence on outside reinforcements contains an important risk factor: what if an emergency occurs, and the allies that are supposed to come to the rescue decide that they cannot or do not want to help? The Bonesteel Report drafters touched on the problem. According to them, the Greeks were concerned that the allies would "look the other way" in the event of an emergency.²³ In addition, the Bonesteel proposals envisioned Turkish air force units among the forces which would come to Greece's assistance!

The first official responses to the proposed cutbacks were made in the "Greek Response to the 1966 Annual Review Questionnaire (ARQ) of the North Atlantic Council" that is known as the *Greek Statistical Summary*.²⁴ The Greek civilian and military leaders rejected the need for such drastic reductions. On April 21, 1967, a group of military officers carried out a coup d'état. On July 21, 1967, Dr. Maurice J. Mountain,

²³ *Ibid.*, p. II-2.

²⁴ AR (66), Greek D/2, November 1966.

Director of Policy Review for MAP and ISA, concluded in a report that the junta "does not have any other place to go" except to the United States.²⁵ By the middle of 1968 the putschists had agreed to most of the American suggestions.

The Post-Junta Period

The events that followed the invasion of Cyprus by Turkish military forces in the summer of 1974 demonstrated that, on the whole, the United States succeeded in the realization of its major goal concerning the Greek army. Greek military units which could have been of some assistance to the people of the Republic of Cyprus were completely incapacitated. Seven years earlier, the coup d'etat had demonstrated that the other goal of the United States assistance to the Greek military establishment had also been accomplished: when forces considered inimical to American interests in the area seemed as if they would take over the governing of Greece, the Greek army—or more correctly, elements of the Greek army—undertook an operation allegedly to "maintain internal security in order to avoid the Communist domination of Greece." The decisions of NSC 42/1 of 1949 were implemented in their entirety.

The decision of the immediate post-junta government to withdraw from the military part of the NATO alliance represented a new and, to a certain extent, radical departure for the Greek military establishment.²⁶ One of the first decisions of the civilian government in Athens was to undertake a complete modernization of the Greek armed forces. Particular emphasis was placed on the refurbishing of the Hellenic Air Force and the Hellenic Naval Forces that had suffered more as a result of the United States decisions of the mid and late 1960s. It is the impression of most experts on the field that, on the whole, the modernization efforts have been successful. The Greek armed forces are considered today to be efficient and capable of inflicting heavy injuries on any aggressor in the area.

The most dramatic changes have occurred in the creation of a modern air force. The emphasis in the U.S. plans was on a Greek air force that would be a fair-weather attack force. Beginning in the first few months after the fall of the junta, the Greek air force was converted to a diversified force, able to conduct an all-weather air defense and undertake ground attacks and antishipping missions against potential threats from all possible enemies. The specific programs that led to this change in the operational capabilities of the Hellenic Air Force centered around the acquisi-

²⁵ *Funding of Military Assistance to Greece*. OSD/ISA, July 21, 1967, p. 19.

²⁶ There is considerable debate as to what Greece did or did not do with respect to that decision. In the letter quoted at the beginning of this essay, Karamanlis seemed to indicate that Greece was indeed withdrawing from the integrated command structure. On November 28, 1978, the Greek Minister of National Defense said that the Karamanlis government "never said they are getting out."

tion by Greece of: 1) the Mirage F-1C fighter interceptor aircraft from France, 2) the T-2E Buckeye light-attack jet trainers, 3) the C-130H Hercules medium transport aircraft, 4) the A-7H Corsair ground-attack fighters, and 5) the F-4E Phantom multipurpose fighters. While the A-7H had been ordered in the period immediately preceding the fall of the junta, the democratic government was successful in speeding up the delivery of those aircraft.

*The United States and the Greek Armed Forces
in the Decade of the Eighties*

Five days after the receipt of the Karamanlis letter on the Greek withdrawal from the military wing of NATO, Henry Tasca, the American ambassador to Greece sent a long telegram to the Department of State which contained a number of observations on the Karamanlis letter and some suggestions on the course to be followed by the United States. This September 3, 1974 message also included a section on the Greek army. Indirectly, Tasca proposed a way to reestablish the old relationship between the United States and the Greek military establishment. He wrote that "Legal and practical status of Grant equipment [MAP equipment] provided to Greece during past two decades will be matter of some concern to Greek military." It was the opinion of the American government that the proper amount of pressure could limit the desires of the Greek government to continue making decisions on its military procurement program irrespective of American determinations on that program. American military planners continue not to assign to Greece any operational responsibilities in their strategic planning in regards to a wider war. The U.S. does not want Greece to obtain advanced aircraft because both the NATO Commands and the Joint Chief of Staff strategists do not consider such acquisitions as essential to the defense of the Alliance as a whole or the United States' interests in the area.

The United States has been attempting to slow the process which would lead to the purchase by Greece of additional high-performance aircraft. For example, all the requests of the Greek government for the acquisition, sometime in the mid 1980s, of fighter bombers such as the F-16s have been turned down. More recently, in October of 1978, the American government went to extraordinary pains to discourage the representatives of the McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft Company from showing the F-18 aircraft to the Greeks. When a representative of the company went to Athens, the State Department informed him of the policy of the U.S. government that Greece was not to buy those aircraft. He was also told that the American diplomats in Greece were instructed not to facilitate any contacts by the representative of MDC [McDonnell-Douglas Company] with the Greek government. In another similar incident, the American government refused to sell the Stinger missile to the Greek army. The

Stinger is a man portable air defense system or MANPAD, and is considered one of the best such systems in existence.

The problems the Greek government is encountering with the procurement of advanced systems is not damaging to Greek military capabilities at this time. The recent acquisition of a number of superior defense systems and advanced aircraft contribute to a very effective Greek military machine at the present time. However, the same cannot be said of the future. If the American policy continues, the result will be that, by 1987 as compared to 1975, there will be a reduction in the aircraft assigned to air defense roles of 47.38 percent, in the aircraft assigned to ground attack roles of 83.51 percent, and in aircraft which are assigned to military transport and airlift support roles of 85 percent.

The refusal of the United States government to sell these weapons systems is based on justifications similar to the ones used in the fifties, sixties, and early seventies. The American projections which are used in the process which results in the determination of the necessary levels of military equipment for the fulfillment of American strategic goals make a number of assumptions which refer to the overall politico-strategic situation as it is perceived by the United States. There are both assumptions on the situation in general and ones on the situation in particular areas of the world. Accordingly, the United States strategists made the following assumptions:

- a. There will be no general war during the period from November 1978 to the end of 1988.
- b. There will be no limited war or East-West crisis that would cause major changes in the posture of the armed forces of the non-U.S. NATO members.
- c. None of the NATO members will leave the Alliance during this period.

More specific assumptions on the eastern Mediterranean were also made. These included the following:

- a. The national missions of the armed forces of the member states in the area would remain essentially unchanged.
- b. There is little possibility of an attack from a Communist nation on Greece or Turkey.

Given these assumptions, the American planners see no reason that Greece should possess armed forces capable of fighting a full-scale war. In the military planning of the Alliance, Greece is to depend on outside reinforcements for its defense if it is attacked. The overriding concern of the Americans is that if Greece is not stopped from acquiring the kinds of weapons it has procured since late 1974, it will indeed be able to fight

against any enemy which might threaten its security. It is an American assumption that an attack from the north is unlikely. It is a fact that, at this point, Greece faces a threat from its neighbor to the east.

When all is said, the unwillingness of the United States to sell weapons systems to Greece impedes Greece's ability to have armed forces which would be able to defend the country from the only threat it faces, namely, the one from the east. However, the Americans are faced with a dilemma. Greece's economic position makes it possible for it to procure additional military equipment from European nations. For example, in the next ten years, fighter aircraft could be procured on a short-time basis if they were needed to ensure parity with a Turkish Air Force which was modernized by the United States. If the U.S. continues to refuse to consider Greek requests for F-16 fighter bombers, Greece could obtain similar aircraft from European companies. The Tornado MRCA and the Mirage 2000/4000 are comparable aircraft which would be made available to the Greek air force if they were requested. This would present a problem for Greece in only one respect. As a rule, the packages that are offered by American companies are preferable to those of European companies because the logistics/maintenance support packages of the Americans are both more economical and more complete. This problem would be overcome almost completely, however, if the Tanagra maintenance facility is completed and can function efficiently.

As far as can be ascertained, American efforts to reimpose their views of the operational role of the Greek armed forces on the Greek government have been unsuccessful. American efforts to bring Greece back into the integrated military command of NATO in some official way seems to be related to this failure. The American strategists hope that with the formal reintegration of the Greek military establishment into NATO, Greece would be more willing to follow the dictates of the United States than has been the case lately. The hope is that, once Greece is reintegrated, it would abandon its recent philosophy concerning the operational responsibilities of the Greek armed forces and once again adopt a philosophy of more dependence on "mutual alliance support" and "interdependence" in the defense field.

Conclusion

From the very beginning of the military relationship between Greece and the United States, the Americans have tried to create a Greek military which would be an independent political force within the country. The American goal was to have a force in Greece which could influence the country's civilian leadership along the lines that would serve the strategic interests of the United States in the area. The leadership of the Greek armed forces was made to believe that it was the guardian of the "wholesome way of life," the force that would uphold the "principles of democracy" as these were understood by the United States. Three decades of

military assistance programs and contacts with the American military establishment were designed in such a way as to make the leadership of the Greek army think that the United States was the sole guarantor of its interests. The United States imposed on Greece an unbalanced development of its armed forces, with substantial dependence on U.S. and NATO ground, air, and naval power. The illusion that in times of emergencies the allies would come to Greece's help became the basis of the military doctrine of interdependence for defense. There are few today who believe that, if there were an emergency, there would be sufficient warning time for the United States or any of Greece's NATO allies to augment the Greek defenses in any substantive way. If anything, the doctrine of interdependence in the defense field has added to the dangers with which Greece is faced. Nuclear weapons located in Greece ostensibly for the common defense are outside of Greece's control and could result in it becoming a target of Soviet nuclear weapons in a conflict in which it would have no stakes. By way of various military related matters, the United States compromised Greek sovereignty in the most dramatic way.

To this day, the United States obtains almost complete information on what goes on within the Greek armed forces. For example, the Greek army gives specific information to the United States Military Representatives on war reserve supplies in the Greek inventories. On November 1, 1978, American officers in Athens informed the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff that the Greek Army needs "x amount of 90 mm tank ammo by type . . . to bring their war reserve level of supply up to x days" (deletions not in the original). Another example would be the cannibalization²⁷ of equipment. Under the prevailing agreements between Greece and the United States, when Greece wants to cannibalize equipment obtained under the Military Assistance Program, special permission has to be obtained from the U.S. The first week of June, permission was asked to cannibalize a U.S. Department of Defense disposal manual.

Following the fall of the dictatorship and the events on Cyprus, the United States was faced with a new development. For the first time in the postwar period the majority of the Greek officer corps realized that, in the end, the policies which were put forward by the United States hurt them the most. Those policies led to a Greek army which was not in touch with the people it was supposed to protect. In addition, those policies deprived the Greek armed forces from the state of the art weapon systems which are responsible for an efficient and effective fighting force. In the last four years this tendency has been reversed. Under the policies pursued by the Greek government, the Greek armed forces have been provided with the most modern weapon systems, although, in the opinion of the United States, they are not "needed" by the Greek army.

Recently, things seem to be changing again. In the January 16, 1979 discussion in the Greek Parliament on the course of Greek foreign policy,

²⁷ The term is used to describe the process by which a certain piece of equipment is taken apart so that its components can be used to repair similar equipment.

Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis said that in the event the military balance in the area is changed in favor of Turkey, Greece "has other means" to maintain that balance. That statement was thought to mean that Greece would take steps to acquire arms from any source which would be willing to provide them. The representatives of the United States in Athens gave a different interpretation to that remark. In an interview with a Congressional aide, he read from a cable from the American Embassy in Greece to the Department of State which contained the following:

We do not believe that the Prime Minister's statement that "other means" are available to Greece should America upset the military balance in the Eastern Mediterranean implies any turning away from Greece's pro-Western policies. Rather it should be seen as another example of Greece's continuing and deepseated concern over its security.

One week later, on January 23, 1979, the Deputy Chief of Mission at the Greek Embassy in Washington received another indication of the renewed confidence of the United States that the relations between it and Greece could once again return to the mores of an earlier period. The Greek diplomat complained to the U.S. Department of State that there were delays in processing \$70 million from the Fiscal Year 1979 Foreign Military Sales credit. An officer of the State Department, the Greek DCM's interlocutor, took advantage of the meeting to voice American concern over apparent difficulties in negotiations of another bilateral arrangement. He expressed the wish that the problems would be overcome quickly and the agreement concluded as soon as possible. Once again, American officials are becoming confident that they can use crude pressure to pursue their policies in Greece.

The Poetry of Dinos Christianopoulos: An Introduction

by KIMON FRIAR

Although few poets in Greece have so frankly exposed their lives in their poetry, Dinos Christianopoulos has purposely been meager in presenting us with biographical information. He was born in Thessaloniki on March 3, 1931 in the Public Maternity Clinic, the son of Yannis and Persephone Dhimitriou, and two months later was baptized Constandinos. When he was one and a half years old, however, he was adopted by Anastasios and Fani Dhimitriadhis, who chose this particular infant because of the similarity of surnames. In 1945 the poet adopted the pseudonym Christianopoulos ("Son of Christ"). He has never been able to trace his parents or their whereabouts. After completing his early education in the city of his birth, he enrolled in the School of Philosophy at the university there and took his degree in literature in 1954. He then spent two years completing his military service, worked as a librarian in the Public Library of Thessaloniki from 1958 to 1964, and then opened up a proofreading office of his own for whatever publishing house or printer might ask for his services. In 1958 he founded the literary periodical *Diagonal*, which he has been publishing for periods of five years with respites of two years, and in 1962 branched into book publication with the founding of Diagonal Publications. In 1974 he also founded the Diagonal Art Gallery for the exhibition of painting and sculpture, primarily of Thessalonian artists, and began to publish *Sieve*, a small periodical reproducing works of art from the gallery exhibitions. Dinos Christianopoulos has spent his entire life in Thessaloniki, visiting few places in mainland Greece or the islands, making only the most necessary trips to Athens, primarily to give readings of his poetry. He has enclosed himself in his own self-contained universe.

His first book, *Season of the Lean Cows* (1950), which Christianopoulos had written between the ages of nineteen and twenty, is often religious in subject matter only, and prefigures the sense of remorse and guilt that is to color most of his subsequent poetry. His poems arise from a generally religious environment with which the young man found himself in continuous and exacerbating contention. Inexperienced as yet in any sort of eroticism he found himself in constant excitation. The reading of the poetry of Constantine Cavafis came as a sudden revelation and release, and gave the young poet the courage and the mode for writing on themes hitherto forbidden. Even today, Dinos Christianopoulos considers the Alexandrian poet the only true genius modern Greek poetry has produced. From Cavafis he took the daring of expression, clarity of formula-

tion, confessional mode, prosaic elements, and technique of using historical events to personify personal and contemporary problems. The other great influence during these early formative years was T. S. Eliot, who introduced him to the expression of Christian agony in contemporary times, to the modern structure of verse, and to the juxtaposition of historically anachronistic situations. He tried to blend these two influences into a technique and attitude which might result in a style all his own.

Like Cavafis before him, Christianopoulos used, for historical settings and metaphors, some scenes from classical settings in ancient Greece and Rome, as in "Antigone: In Defense of Oedipus" or "Ithaca," but the majority of his first poems are set in the Hellenistic and Greco-Roman periods, in those transitional times when pagan sensuality was being corroded by Christian asceticism, when pangs of guilt and remorse intruded on those who, as in Cavafis's poem, "The Dangers," were "part pagan and but partly Christianized," or who led a double life, as the protagonist of "Myres: Alexandria, A.D. 340," from whose Christian relations his pagan lover fled before he "could be usurped and altered by their Christianizing." The martyr St. Agnes remembers "the most innocent, the most accidental touch" of her body with that of St. Sebastian's at the very moment when their lips "were singing the praises of the Lord." As in Saint John of the Cross and in Saint Theresa, the erotic element is inextricably blended with the religious; if the centurion Cornelius prays to the Lord to save his beloved slave Andonios, it is, as he confesses, because "love dictates my faith," and in final desperation he declares that "if need be, I can even turn Christian." If Magdalene is to leave prostitution behind her and follow Christ, it is not so much out of religious conviction as out of love: "if I embrace Christianity one day, it shall be for love of him; / and if I should suffer martyrdom for his sake, his love shall have inspired me," because "love inflames my faith and love inflames my repentance."

The young man who wrote these poems at so early an age does not seem to have had any erotic experience as such. In symbolic and metaphorical terms he embodies the agony of erotic privation intensified by what is hinted at as some sort of sexual anomaly. Cavafis showed him how to clothe personal problems in historical vestments and place them in a dramatic as opposed to a lyrical setting. It is indeed astonishing to see how much he has taken from Cavafis, and yet, considering his youth, how much he has succeeded in writing, in that mode, poems genuinely his own. The manner in which they juxtaposed the erotic and the religious, the vulgar and the ideal, the physical and the spiritual, the mythical and the real, yet were leavened with humorous, satirical and sarcastic elements, gave a universally acclaimed enchantment to these poems. Modern problems of character and morality were so illuminated by ancient environments and personages that they did not truly need the young poet's anachronisms to emphasize contemporaneity. Yet even these had their mocking and ironic place in a youthful imagination that loved to startle: Oedipus is a symbolist poet and plays a broken down barrel-organ;

Cornelius's slave plays the accordion; Maria the Egyptian sings in bars and takes a brief course in Byzantine music; Roman soldiers love to be photographed. These superficially startling devices are soon to be discarded for deeper, more fundamental elements of shock. Thus far, the protagonist of these poems, unlike the perverse populace in "Sodomites," has at least "kept up appearances." In "Ithaca," a commentary and answer to Cavafis's poems, "Ithaca" and "Waiting for the Barbarians," Odysseus leaves Ithaca not for any moral or patriotic purposes but because he cannot bear the narrow-mindedness of his people, their stifling morality, their Christian organizations, and, on his eventual return, brings back with him all the turbulence of Poseidon's seas. There is no solution of any kind, barbaric, aesthetic, or moral.

Throughout these historical and "religious" poems, the reader becomes aware, through hints, innuendoes and sudden outcries, that they are but masks to disguise a more private obsession, until suddenly in the last poem, "Incident in Athens," the masks are ripped off and the scene set in contemporary times. The participants in the dramatic dialogue are two homosexual youths, a young man and the soldier he had picked up and brought to his home. The masks have not been completely detached as yet, however, for this is the only poem Christianopoulos has written in which the victim, the person debased, is not the protagonist, although for both participants their situation leads to denial. But this poem was the opening wedge which, in four years, permitted Christianopoulos to discard what he now considered to be false accouterments, unnecessary decor and disguise, and, by casting aside the crutches of myth and history, seek to come to terms with both himself and his poetry. From now on the struggle toward self-knowledge and self-acceptance, and the ruthless stripping away of anything in his poetry which might obscure or falsify, are to be inextricably woven in the character and art of Dinos Christianopoulos.

His style and his content partake of the same stark nudity. When he published *Knees of Strangers* in 1954, after four years of silence, Christianopoulos had cast the die and, once and for all, declared himself. Although his poems are openly confessional, it would nevertheless be misleading to accept them at face value only and not take into consideration the transformations which any art form imposes. It would be best to consider the "I" of these poems not as the poet himself but as the protagonist of the poems at aesthetic remove. These poems, together with those in *Defenseless Craving* (1960), where they reach their peak, and in *Suburbs* (1969), constitute a persistent attempt of the protagonist to come to terms with himself. Every poem is a small confession, and all together they compose the diary of a private passion which, the more personal it becomes, the more it becomes poetically justified.

Most of the themes developed in his subsequent poetry are announced in *Knees of Strangers*. Soldiers and sailors now take their true remorseless position and the protagonist becomes their willing victim. He dreams of a soldier lover dragging him into the city's streets and squares to be

trampled under by heavy army boots, and in his utter degradation cries out to the Lord. Such masochistic debasement tinged with religious repentance, a note that pervades much of liturgical literature, runs like a bloodstained thread through much of Christianopoulos's poetry. Slowly, as "the age / of modesty slips away" and the protagonist watches his "youthful innocence vanishing," he is seized by pangs of remorse when he recalls the vulgar words and gestures he has permitted himself to suffer. How can he confront, as all such young men must, the waiting mother to whom he is by temperament bound and crucified? He is now in the position of Cavafis's young man in "He Swears," who vows "now and again to begin a better life":

But when night comes with its own strength
Of the body that now craves and seeks, he goes
Once more, foredoomed, to the same fatal joy.

Night throughout these poems is the inciter and the panderer that destroys the moral uprightness of day, that slowly corrodes the will, gradually benumbs hesitation and whatever remnants of morality remain, then increases the body's excitation until the victim is "fully mature now for corruption." Driven into the corner of despair from which there is no exit, the blind alley of his destiny, he turns in despair like a caged animal against the moral world, and since now he has nothing to hide, longs for "Total Nakedness." Night has offered him detestable embraces, the sweet baits of hell, the mechanical actions of making love, havoc and lacerations. What remains is, in effect, a remorseless striptease, for he knows well that the "integral nakedness" for which he longs "is the gift only of an integral love." Nevertheless, the vulgarity of such "stripping of the flesh" is the necessary cauterization for the more integral nakedness of the soul. I know few poems in which nudity of style and content are so matched as in the poems of Dinos Christianopoulos. Shorn of embellishments, his simplest words take on a special weight and a special responsibility.

In *Defenseless Craving* (1960), Christianopoulos brings to full fruition the themes he had announced and somewhat explored in *Knees of Strangers*, and in it "Ruined Quarry" is the key poem. The time has come when the protagonist can no longer hide his secret life, when the face and body betray corruption as though they were the ruined quarry from which an ideal marble statue may once have been quarried. Nakedness has been forced upon him. It no longer helps to pretend. "Of what use," he cries, "is the double-bolted dignity of silence / now that all know whom we implored, in whose embrace we coiled?" Though forced by necessity, he must now strip himself to the soul and in his poetry proclaim his secrets, for he has now become "like a personal diary in the hands of strangers." He has been drifting from body to body, from concession to concession until brought to the final impasse and there knows at long last that "no silence can save you, / not even honesty." This is the ultimate despair.

Brought to rock bottom, believing that naked confession can perhaps lead to salvation, he now realizes that even such honest confrontation with himself and others cannot change the course of destiny. Two possibilities are left: suicide or adjustment. The protagonist faces this problem in "Adjustments to Catastrophe," where he declares:

I want neither to die nor to be healed
I want simply to adjust to my catastrophe.

He knows now that he is doomed to seek debasement, to be tormented, to indulge in his obsessions until he becomes satiated. All he can hope for is a respite short of destruction, that "on the height of the spasm's deification" he might find the strength to say "Lord, nothing more!" and thus not run into an "overtime of my catastrophe." He knows well his masochistic tendency to surrender himself completely, his rage to destroy himself utterly.

As he roams the streets at night seeking tenderness and to invest his life, he knows that he shall only find a bought body, misunderstanding and crudeness, that he shall find nothing in which to invest; there are no returns, there is only expenditure, bankruptcy, waste. Such lovemaking is only "a consolation of spasms." Driven by unbearable loneliness, he knows, nevertheless, that such lovemaking is "above all a confirmation of our loneliness / when we attempt to roost in a body difficult to inhabit." It is as if he is being psychologically driven to find what will deny him the very thing he seeks, as though he is seeking his own destruction, as though he can no longer live without pain, suffering and denial. He has by now only too well adapted to his catastrophe, so much so indeed that it is torment that imparts to the despairing body a painful pleasure, and that at least keeps the senses alive.

The poems in *Suburbs*, on the whole, carry on the motives of the previous books, although to some degree the scene has shifted from the cruising grounds of the city streets to the more idyllic setting of the countryside. And yet, as Milton and Christopher Marlowe before him have pointed out, and Cavafis in "The City," we carry our own private hell within us wherever we go. Even in the purlieus of love, "the caterpillars come." The countryside itself is being despoiled. Taking a "Love Stroll in the Countryside," the lovers find it invaded by new housing, couples on motorcycles, and blaring rock tunes. Nature herself pricks with thorns, burrs and mosquitoes. "This is no place for us," the protagonist concludes—"Even the countryside has its own way of wounding us." The almond trees have been cut down one by one, and day by day one more trysting place in the country is being demolished to make way for shops and apartment buildings. "They are Tracking Down Everything Picturesque" is Christianopoulos's classic statement on this subject.

Some of the poems in *Suburbs* are preludes of another theme which is to play a significant role in Christianopoulos's poems from now on, extending the range of his sensitivity and his awareness. It was first an-

nounced in the poem from his previous collection, "Interval of Joy," in which, recalling the interval of ecstatic joy when making love in the countryside, the protagonist suddenly feels a sense of guilt in snatching at happiness while so many about him are suffering. "May the unhappy forgive me for it," he concludes, "I have not suffered enough / for the pain of my neighbor to touch me." Ever since the aftermath of the Second World War, the German-Italian occupation of Greece, the civil wars and dictatorships that followed, many modern Greek poets have been preoccupied with a poetry of social concern which rose, as it must, from deep personal and subjective involvement, as well as from actual participation in the political arena. One of the best in this tradition is another poet from Thessaloniki, Manolis Anagnostakis, whose poems are almost exclusively a diary or journal recording his own active participation in the left wing movement. But the protagonist of Christianopoulos's poems has enough self-knowledge to know that his imprisonment in his own narcissistic and erotic life has made it impossible for him to speak of social concerns which would partake of the same honesty and sincerity which he has demanded of himself in his erotic confrontations. "The Splinter" is the only poem which refers to any actual political event: the assassination of the left wing Parliamentary Deputy, Dr. Gregory Lambrakis, who, on May 22, 1963 in Thessaloniki, was run down and clubbed to death by hired thugs on a three-wheeled truck, documented by another author from Thessaloniki, Vasilis Vasilikos, in his book *Z*. Although three years had passed since that incident, the protagonist honestly confesses that he had once more fallen into "the same indifference about political matters," running off to his rendezvous while others fell or were beaten because of their ideals. The incident nevertheless remains in his body like a festering splinter. Later he was to write,

like the leftists do i love you my brothers
 both they and we are constantly persecuted
 they for bread—we for body
 they for freedom—we for love
 for a life without fear and derision

Only by suffering to the utmost in his own personal hell can such a protagonist begin to understand and feel compassion for the pain of others, and thus identify himself with universal and even political suffering in the only honest way he can. Whereas Cavafis, undergoing pangs of remorse for his preoccupation with his own erotic satisfactions, justified them later in life because, as he says,

... in the dissipation of my youth
 were shaped the volitions of my poetry,
 was laid the groundwork of my art,

the protagonist in Christianopoulos's poems, ashamed before the suffer-

ing of his country while he plays away on his own fiddle, acknowledges that at least by consorting with the young men of the lower classes, "I got to know you better and feel your pain." In "Making Love in the Fields," the protagonist hesitates to trample down the wheat stalks in a farmer's fields because "just for the sake of a small love nest / a whole kilo of wheat will go to waste / . . . just think of that poor farmer! / Hasn't he had enough / with middlemen, loans and taxes." In *The Cross-Eyed* (written between 1949-1970), where such sentiments come to a climax, he even finds sufficient compassion, in "The Dragons," to understand the deprivation which impels the sex murderer to stalk young couples making love beyond the suburbs. In "Afternoon," as he watches children playing thoughtlessly and joyously amid ancient ruins, he suddenly feels a deep love for all mankind, because the children "played amid the ruins and knew nothing of death, / they played amid the ruins, and knew nothing of remorse." "Let them not accuse me of easy solutions," he cries out in "I Forsake Poetry," whether the easy solutions are to be found in art or in politics. Even later, in "Whatever I Mocked," when he has had his fill "of bread and love," when the "deprived" are no longer his brothers, he is still shaken "when by chance I confront their glances." But it is in "Demobilized," when the protagonist returns to civilian life after completing his military service, that he faces up to the grimness of social responsibility:

All we have gone through is nothing in comparison
to what we shall face before us:
unemployment, drought, crop failure,
the daily struggle for a loaf of bread,
the children crying and father's pension small,
and our uncle in America merely promises.

"There is no end," he concludes, "to this servitude," whether military or political.

In 1960, beginning with *The Body and Remorse*, then continuing with *The Body and Longing* (1970), and *The Buffet* (1975), Christianopoulos entered into a second cycle in his poetry by writing very brief, laconic, epigrammatic poems under the general title *Small Poems* (1975). These terse poems, stripped bare even of capitalization or titles, bring to a final extremity his growing tendency toward compression, complete nudity of expression and confession, and, in their honesty, do not permit expression to outlive inspiration. They are notations, distillations of experience even more personal and acute than before, more laic in diction. A surprising lyricism at times is sharply alternated with both personal and social satire, even with sarcasm and a tinge of cynicism, a certain hardening of the affections. In 1970 he took these small poems a step further and condensed them into quatrains, triplets and couplets. Although the erotic themes are still predominant, more incisive, more cutting, the satirical element is prevalent, whether in religious, social or political themes.

The protagonist delights in word play, in linguistic acrobatics (often impossible to translate) of colloquial and even slang idioms. In these poems, whose cycle has still not been completed, Christianopoulos has created a species of brief notations that have a personality uniquely their own, unlike either the Japanese *haiku* and *tanka*, or the ancient Greek epigram.

In the beginning Christianopoulos had primarily recorded "the itineraries of passion," the excitations, obsessions, drives, lusts, guilts and adventures that accompany the pursuit of what Cavafis often calls "an illicit love," in the pursuit also of fulfillment, of finding an integral whole. But such integrity, extremely difficult among normal couples, he found to be almost impossible in the search, as he says in "Antigone: In Defense of Oedipus," of "the pleasures which the current morality forbids." In "Making Love," the protagonist has learned that such pleasures are more often than not simply a "consolation of spasms," that when the despairing man is driven to what will deny him the very thing he seeks, such affairs are, above all, "a confirmation of our loneliness / when we attempt to roost in a body difficult to inhabit."

The theme of loneliness, an obsessive one throughout all of modern Greek poetry, increases in intensity in Christianopoulos's poetry, especially in the *Small Poems*, for "the impasses of loneliness increase." The protagonist discovers that such loneliness is universal, that love is simply an "exchange of loneliness," that one wrings out his own loneliness into the blood of the other, that it doesn't matter who sows in the field of love, for it always sprouts with loneliness. When nothing is to be expected any more from the handsome, one may then look knowingly to the homely, "whose own loneliness becomes fertile ground." Concomitantly, in the beginning the protagonist believes he simply wants to glut his excitement, to kill his despair, but gradually becomes aware that what he truly longs for is love and, above all, tenderness, but that what he receives, instead, is exploitation and misuse. Loneliness thus in itself turns savage and becomes too hardened to recognize love if ever it happens to come. If love does come, there is the savage compulsion to kill it. "Call it masochism," says the protagonist, "call it whatever you wish / I feel inadequate for so much tenderness." "Those who torment us," he acknowledges, "carry greater weight." Such lovers are doomed to destroy what they most seek and to conclude in isolation and loneliness. They are self-punished in "the crime of loneliness."

After the initial stages of his first book of poems, where, following Cavafis, Christianopoulos utilizes the embellishments of history and myth, what most characterizes his poetry is a continuous stripping of the body and the soul in an agonized existentialist struggle for more and more honesty and sincerity in the confessional mode. There is no doubt that he has proffered us, in his books, the successive pages of a diary fatalistically delivered into the hands of strangers, and although we accept these revelations with respect for the integrity they display, we must never forget that we have in fact been given art and not raw confession. Sincerity and honesty are not of themselves an art form and are indeed often inimical

to art. The artistry in the entire structure and tonality of the poems lies in their presentation of dramatic situations that make the personal universal, that suggest as much as they define, that brush the borderlines of prose with the wings of the imagination, that reveal a tension between sin and remorse, good and evil. The poet almost persuades us that a sincere expression in pursuit of self-knowledge may, if the pursuer is a man of talent, itself become poetry. This, perhaps, is what is meant when life tries to become art: "if you cannot build / you can dig / if you cannot become / you can be." Perhaps such realism and such sincerity can be turned into poetry only by the pressures upon it by forces of society massed against it, and equally by the forces of the protagonist's guilt at first to suppress it and, later, in exposing it, to condemn it at the same time that he belligerently flaunts it. Ever since Christianopoulos has come into some sort of awareness of himself, he has been living in a state of ethical tension on the road to self-knowledge. At times it has been difficult for him, as for many others, to know where self-knowledge leaves off and self-exploitation begins. One may invent for him a spiritual law equal to physical law: that the forces of expression are equal to the forces of repression.

Except for an occasional interlarding of words from *katharevousa* in his first book—and these as often used ironically as not—his diction has remained the pure demotic of the people, tending in later years to extreme colloquialism and argot. Adjectives are few, nouns and verbs delineate with a sparseness of dramatic situation, often in dialogue but more often in monologue, the tone of a man speaking to the confession box of his inner soul. Anti-sentimental, anti-lyrical, his stylistic and confessional techniques admit of no compromise. Rather than lose his identity amid colorless masses, he prefers to turn to narcissistic confrontation, even though this might mean to drown. He has a distrust of abstraction, a love of the concrete, and through concentration on realistic detail, both physical and spiritual, reaches a universality rarely attained by those who try to take the gates of Paradise by storm.

As the poems of Dinos Christianopoulos and Constantine Cavafis make clear, the physical acts in themselves may differ, but there is little difference between homosexual and heterosexual love when spiritual, emotional, or mental consequences and tensions are depicted. The frustrations, longings, desires, ecstasies, tenderness, loneliness, disappointments, and fulfillments which both experience are the same, and when both become the victims of their passions, "the expense of spirit in a waste of shame" is, for both, as Shakespeare reminds us, "lust in action."

The Poetry of Dinos Christianopoulos: A Selection

ΙΘΑΚΗ

Δέν ξέρω ἂν ἔφυγα ἀπὸ συνέπεια
ἢ ἀπὸ ἀνάγκη νὰ ξεφύγω τὸν ἑαυτὸ μου,
τὴ στενὴ καὶ μικρόχαρη Ἰθάκη
μέ τὰ χριστιανικά της σωματεῖα
καὶ τὴν ἀσφυχτικὴ της ἠθικὴ.

Πάντως, δέν ἦταν λύση· ἦταν ἡμίμετρο.

Κι ἀπὸ τότε κυλιέμαι ἀπὸ δρόμο σέ δρόμο
ἀποχτώντας πληγές κι ἐμπειρίες.
Οἱ φίλοι πού ἀγάπησα ἔχουνε πιά χαθεῖ
κι ἔμεινα μόνος, τρέμοντας μήπως μέ δεῖ κανένας
πού κάποτε τοῦ μίλησα γιά ἰδανικά...

Τώρα ἐπιστρέφω μέ μίαν ὑστατη προσπάθεια
νὰ φανῶ ἄψογος, ἀκέραιος, ἐπιστρέφω
κι εἶμαι, Θεέ μου, σάν τὸν ἄσωτο πού ἀφήνει
τὴν ἀλητεία, πικραμένος, καὶ γυρνάει
στὸν πατέρα τὸν καλόκαρδο, νὰ ζήσει
στοὺς κόλπους του μίαν ἄσωτῖα ἰδιωτικὴ.

Τὸν Ποσειδῶνα μέσα μου τὸν φέρνω,
πού μέ κρατᾷ πάντα μακριά·
μά κι ἂν ἀκόμα δυνηθῶ νὰ προσεγγίσω,
τάχα ἢ Ἰθάκη θά μοῦ βρεῖ τὴ λύση;

ITHACA

I do not know if consequences forced me to leave
or because I needed to escape from myself—
from that narrow-minded Ithaca of little grace
with its Christian organizations
and its stifling morality.

At any rate, this was not the solution, but only a half-measure.

From then on I wallowed from street to street
acquiring wounds and experience.
The friends I once loved have now vanished
and I have remained alone, fearful that someone may see me perhaps
to whom I had once spoken of ideals . . .

Now I have returned with a final attempt
to seem irreproachable, integral; I have returned
and I am, dear God, like the prodigal who has forsaken
his vagabond wanderings, embittered, and returns
to his good-hearted father, to live
in his bosom a private prodigality.

I bring Poseidon within me,
who always keeps me far off;
but even if I could put into harbor,
could Ithaca possibly find me the solution?

ΤΥΨΕΙΣ

“Όσο περνούν οι μέρες και μακραίνει
 ή ηλικία τής σεμνότητας, αισθάνομαι
 τίς ανεπαίσθητες ραγισματιές έντός μου
 από νύχτα σέ νύχτα νά πληθαίνουν:
 δρόμοι πού πήρα μέ χαμηλωμένα μάτια,
 φώτα πού πέσαν πάνω μου ανέλεητα,
 λόγια πού πρόστυχα κι άπ’ τίς χειρονομίες—
 μά πού πολύ, ή δ΄ψη τής μητέρας μου
 όταν γυρνώ άργά τό βράδυ και τή βρίσκω
 μ’ ένα βιβλίο στό χέρι νά προσμένει
 βουδή, ξαγρυπνισμένη και χλωμή. . .

«ΜΥΓΔΑΛΙΕΣ»

Αυτό τό μέρος τό λέγαν «Μυγδαλιές».
 Τίς πρόλαβα. Μοσκοβολούσε ό τόπος.
 Φίσκα ή άγράμπελη, κι ένα ποταμάκι
 κατέδαζε ξερόφλουδα άπ’ τά άλώνια.

Έδώ έρχόμασταν τά βράδια για κορμί.

Σιγά σιγά τίς κόψαν όλες. Ένα ένα
 ξεφύτρωναν στή θέση τους σπιτάκια.
 Πρώτοι έμεις τά εγκαινιάζαμε. Η άγάπη μας
 ζυμώθηκε στίς σκαλωσιές και τά τσιμέντα τους.

Τώρα δέν έμεινε ούτε μία μυγδαλιά.
 Γέμισε ό τόπος μαγαζιά και κατοικίες.
 Μας έφαγαν ακόμα ένα τσαίρι.

REMORSE

As days go by and the age
of modesty slips away, I feel
imperceptible crevices within me
increasing from night to night:
streets I took with lowered eyes,
lights that fell upon me mercilessly,
words more vulgar than the gestures—
but much more, my mother's face
when I return late at night and find her
waiting for me with a book in her hand,
silent, sleepless, pale . . .

"ALMOND TREES"

This place was once called "Almond Trees."
I was in time to see them. The place was filled with fragrance.
Periwinkles teemed, and a small river
carried down dry chaff from the threshing floors.

We used to come here at night for a body.

One by one the almond trees were all cut down. One by one
small houses sprouted in their place.
We were the first to inaugurate them. Our love
was given shape amid the scaffolding and the cement.

Not even one almond tree has remained.
The place has filled up with shops and apartment buildings.
They gobbled down one more place for love in the country.

ΕΡΩΤΑΣ ΣΤΑ ΧΩΡΑΦΙΑ

Καλύτερα ἄς μὴ μποῦμε στὸ χωράφι,
 δέ θέλω νά τσαλαπατήσουμε τὰ στάχια.
 Γιά μιὰ μικρὴ ἐρωτικὴ φωλιά
 θά πάει χαράμι ἓνα κιλό σιτάρι.
 Βέβαια, εἶναι ὠραῖο νά πλαγιάζεις
 μέσα στά στάχια καὶ τίς παπαροῦνες
 σκέψου ὅμως καὶ τὸ φουκαρά τὸ γεωργό,
 πού δέν τοῦ φτάνουν τὰ ζιζάνια, τὸ χαλάζι,
 οἱ ἔμποροι, τὰ δάνεια, οἱ φόροι —
 νά χεῖ κι ἐμᾶς νά τοῦ κάνουμε χαλάστρα.

Καλύτερα νά πᾶμε παρακάτω.

Ἡ ΑΓΚΙΔΑ

Τὸ βράδυ πού σκοτώσαν τὸν Λαμπράκη
 γυρνοῦσα ἀπὸ ἓνα ραντεβού.
 «Τί ἔγινε;» ρώτησε κάποιος στὸ λεωφορεῖο.
 Κανείς δέν ἤξερε. Εἶδαμε χωροφύλακες
 μὰ δέ διακρίναμε τίποτε ἄλλο.

Πέρασαν τρία χρόνια. Ξανακύλησα
 στήν ἴδια ἀδιαφορία γιά τὰ πολιτικά.
 Ὅμως τὸ βράδυ ἐκεῖνο μέ ἐνοχλεῖ
 σά μιὰ ἀνεπαίσθητη ἀγκίδα πού δέ θγαίνει:
 ἄλλοι νά πέφτουν χτυπημένοι γιά ἰδανικά,
 ἄλλοι νά ὀργιάζουν μέ τὰ τρίκυκλα,
 κι ἐγὼ ἀνέμελος νά τρέχω σέ τσαίρια.

MAKING LOVE IN THE FIELDS

We'd better not go into the fields,
I don't want to trample down the wheat stalks.
Just for the sake of a small love nest
a whole kilo of wheat will go to waste.
Of course it's lovely to lie down
amid the wheat stalks and the poppies;
but just think of that poor farmer!
Hasn't he had enough with insects and hailstorms,
with middlemen, loans and taxes—
without our putting a spoke in his wheel too.

We'd better go a bit further on.

THE SPLINTER

The night they killed Lambrákis
I was returning from a date.
"What's happened?" someone on the bus asked.
No one knew. We saw policemen
but could make out nothing more.

Three years went by. Once more I fell
into the same indifference about political matters.
But that particular night disturbed me
like an imperceptible splinter that won't come out:
some clubbed down for their ideals,
others roaring about on their tricycles,
and I mindlessly running off to make love in the meadows.

ΕΓΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΩ ΤΗΝ ΠΟΙΗΣΗ

Ἐγκαταλείπω τήν ποίηση δέ θά πεί προδοσία,
 δέ θά πεί ἀνοίγω ἕνα παράθυρο γιά τή συναλλαγή.
 Τέλειωσαν πιά τά πρελούδια, ἤρθε ἡ ὥρα τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ·
 ὅσοι δέν εἶναι ἀρκετά κολασμένοι πρέπει ἐπιτέλους νά σωπάσουν,
 νά δοῦν μέ τί καινούριους τρόπους μποροῦν νά ἀπαυδήσουν στή ζωή.

Ἐγκαταλείπω τήν ποίηση δέ θά πεί προδοσία.
 Νά μή μέ κατηγορήσουν γιά εὐκολία, πώς δέν ἔσκαψα βαθιά,
 πώς δέ βύθισα τό μαχαίρι στά πιό γυμνά μου κόκαλα·
 ὅμως εἶμαι ἄνθρωπος καί γώ, ἐπιτέλους κούράστηκα, πώς τό λένε,
 κούραση πιό τρομαχτική ἀπό τήν ποίηση ὑπάρχει;

Ἐγκαταλείπω τήν ποίηση δέν θά πεί προδοσία·
 βρίσκει κανεῖς τόσους τρόπους νά ἐπιμεληθεῖ τήν καταστροφή του.

I FORSAKE POETRY*

I forsake poetry does not mean I betray,
does not mean I open a window to transactions.
The preludes now have ended, the hour of the deluge has come;
all those who are not sufficiently damned must at last fall silent,
must seek to find new ways of growing weary in life.

I forsake poetry does not mean I betray.
Let them not accuse me of easy solutions, of not having dug deeply,
of not having plunged the knife to my barest bones;
but I too am a mere man, I have finally grown weary, how shall
I put it—
is there anything more frightfully fatiguing than poetry?

I forsake poetry does not mean I betray;
one can find so many ways to nurse one's catastrophe.

*This poem was first published in *The Charioteer* No. 10 (1968). Since then, both poet and translator have changed many parts of it. This new rendition incorporates all changes made within the last decade.

(ἀπό τὰ ΜΙΚΡΑ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΑ)

τό φίλι
 ἐγώνει πιδό πολύ
 ἀπ' τό κορμί

γι' αὐτό τό ἀποφεύγουν
 οἱ πιδό πολλοί

*

ὁ διψασμένος δέ ρωτάει
 ἄν τό νερό εἶναι γλυφό

ὁ πεινασμένος δέ θυμώνει
 ἄν τοῦ πετάξουν ξεροκόμματο

κι δταν ἡ καύλα χτυπάει στό μυαλό
 καλύτερα ἡ προστυχιά παρά ἡ τρέλλα

*

πατρίδα μου σέ ντρέπομαι
 ἐσύ διαρκῶς στραγγίζεις
 καί γώ τό βιολί μου

κι δμως παρέα μέ τ' ἀγόρια σου
 σέ μαθαίνω καλύτερα
 καί σέ πονάω

(from SMALL POEMS)

the kiss
unites much more
than the body

this is why most
avoid it

*

a thirsty man does not ask
if the water is brackish

a hungry man does not become angry
if you toss him a dry crumb

and when an erection throbs in the brain
prostitution is better than insanity.

*

my country, i stand ashamed before you
you drain away bit by bit
while i play my own fiddle

but by keeping company with your lads
i got to know you better
and feel your pain

σάν τούς ἀριστερούς σᾶς ἀγαπῶ ἀδέρφια μου
 κι αὐτοί κι ἐμεῖς διαρκῶς κατατρεγμένοι
 αὐτοί γιά τό ψωμί—ἐμεῖς γιά τό κορμί
 αὐτοί γιά λευτεριά—ἐμεῖς γιά ἔρωτα
 γιά μιὰ ζωὴ δίχως φόβο καί χλεύη

σάν τούς ἀριστερούς σᾶς ἀγαπῶ ἀδέρφια μου
 παρόλο πού κι αὐτοί μᾶς κατατρέχουν

*

μέ τσάκισε κι ἀπόψε ἡ Ἐγνατία
 μέ τὰ κεσάτια της
 δέ μυρμηγκιάζει πιά ἡ ὀμορφιά
 στά παραθαλάσσια—
 κάτι ἔχει ἀλλάξει
 ἀρχίσαμε καί δῶ τὰ καμύματα τῆς Ἀθήνας
 ὅσοι δέ φεύγουν γιά τή Γερμανία ἀκριδοπληρώνονται
 ἀνέβηκαν πολύ οἱ ταρίφες
 πού ὁ καιρός πού τριγυρούσαμε χωρίς λεφτά
 κάνοντας κιόλας καί τόν δύσκολο

πρέπει νά θρῶ μίαν ἄλλη Ἐγνατία

*

ἄν ποτέ μέ τρακάρετε
 νά τριγυρνᾶω ὑποπτα
 σέ πάρκο ἢ ἐρημιά

μή μέ παραξηγήσετε
 μήν πείτε μέσα σας
 «τό ταγκαλάκι!»

δέν μπορείτε νά ξέρετε
 πόσο ἀγωνίστηκα
 πρὶν λυγίσω

like the leftists do i love you my brothers
both they and we are constantly persecuted
they for bread—we for body
they for freedom—we for love
for a life without fear and derision

like the leftists do i love you my brothers
even though they persecute us too

*

tonight Main Street has once more worn me to a frazzle
with its lack of trade,
beauty no longer swarms
in the town square—
something has changed
the hustling in Athens has reached here too
all who have not left for Germany come high
the tariff has soared
gone are the times when we cruised without a penny
even playing hard to catch

i must find another Main Street

*

if ever you bump into me
as i wander with a suspicious air
in parks or isolated places

do not think ill of me
do not say to yourselves
"the hustler!"

you can't possibly know
how much i struggled
before i gave in

κάνω γά σέ φιλήσω
 μ' αποστρέφεται
 δέν εμπιστεύεται τά χείλια σου
 σέ ένα βόθρο

μονάχα κάτω απ' τόν άφαλό
 πουλιέσαι

*

πόρνοι και καταδότηι
 θασιλειαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι

θεέ μου
 εἶναι τρομερό
 γά μέ θάζεις μαζί μέ τούς χαφιέδες

*

ἐπάνω οὐρανόσ, κάτω ἡ νύχτα
 στή μέση οὐ φαλόσ—διαρκῶσ νυχτώνω

*

σέ πῆρα γά μ' ἐπισκευάσεις
 κι ἐσύ μέ ξεχαρδάλωσεσ

i go to kiss you
but you turn away
you won't entrust your lips
to a cesspool

only beneath your navel
are you for sale

*

*neither fornicators nor informers
shall inherit the kingdom of God*

my God
it's dreadful of You
to place me among the stoolpigeons

*

the sky above, the night below
the navel between

i am continually falling into night

*

i took you to repair me
and you took me apart

κάθε φορά που νομίζω πώς σ' έχω στο χέρι
 βλέπω πόσο ό ξρωτας είναι άχειροποίητος

*

μήν ξεκουμπώνεις τό πορτέλο σου
 θά διαλυθει τό ποιήμα

*

ουαί τῷ άνθρωπῳ εκείνῳ
 δι' οὗ τό σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται
 λέει τό εὐαγγέλιο
 λέτε κι ἐσεῖς

ἐάν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε
 ἔκθαλε αὐτόν
 λέει τό εὐαγγέλιο
 λέω κι ἐγώ

*

τά πρόδατα ἀπήργησας
 ζητοῦν καλύτερες συνθήκες σφαγῆς

*

ἀκόμη καί ὁ σύλλογος εὐνούχων
 ἀντιτίθεται στά ἀντισυλληπτικά

every time i think i have you in hand
i see that love is not handwork

*

do not unbutton your flap
the poem will fall to pieces

*

*woe to that man
by whom the offense cometh
so says the gospel
and so say you*

*and if thine eye offend thee
pluck it out
so says the gospel
and so say i*

*

the lambs have gone on strike
they seek better slaughtering conditions

*

even the society of eunuchs
is opposed to birth control

Translated by Kimon Friar

A Survey of Recent Trends in Greek Higher Education

by HENRY WASSER

Due to political turmoil and a long-deprived system of higher education, Greece has only recently come to terms with the issues and problems associated with structure, admissions, and curricula of post-secondary institutions which, in western Europe, have been confronted and decided upon since 1968.

In the 1965 O.E.C.D. report for Greece based on 1961 statistics, a series of needs for education was listed: eliminating student fees for secondary and higher education, extending compulsory education from six to nine years, raising the school-leaving age from twelve to fifteen, lengthening the period of training in primary colleges from two to three years of post-secondary education, creating a higher pedagogical institute at the university level to conduct research in all fields of education, offering pedagogical training to university graduates wishing to teach in secondary schools, and providing refresher courses for teachers at all levels of education. An urgent requirement was independent university research into the subject of textbooks, teaching equipment, and teaching methods in secondary general education from the educational, psychological, sociological, as well as economic point of view. Recognizing that the teacher-student ratio at all levels of education was the worst in Europe, the report noted the strong cultural demand for education and the necessity for further democratization of secondary education.

Bringing curricula into harmony with social and economic development aims was imperative. Programs would have to be designed to create a cultural outlook which, though linked to traditional values, would ensure an understanding of modern life and shape the intellectual flexibility mandatory in an era of rapid social change. It was essential for Greece to improve technical and vocational education, for the tradition of classical education was overwhelming: classroom and teaching conditions in most technical schools were unsatisfactory, and entry into higher education was not possible by way of technical and vocational schools.

In 1964 the government began to introduce reforms which deemphasized humanities and classical literary studies, and added instruction in pure and applied science. By 1967 over one-half of 10,000 Greek students in foreign universities were taking courses in engineering or other scientific and technical subjects. Also, in 1964 the government made public education free throughout, including the universities; the period of compulsory attendance changed from six to nine years; demotic Greek

became the operational language in all public schools below the level of universities; and a standardized graduation exam at the end of six years of general secondary education was adopted to replace former university entrance exams, with a passing mark alone permitting entrance. The colonels in 1967 reduced compulsory attendance to six years and reinstated *katharevousa* as the principal teaching medium not only in secondary education but in the last three grades of primary school, abolished secondary school graduation exams, and again required a university entrance exam—thus tightening admission to the universities.

In earlier years, priority in formal education had been given to studies preserving Hellenic-Christian civilization as reflected in classical and Byzantine traditions of modern Greece in the belief that they would strengthen social solidarity and nationalism. Consequently, programs in secondary school and higher education had been based on classical studies, law, the humanities, and social sciences to the detriment of technical and scientific education.

Greece, no matter which ideology or party dominated the government, it was thought, could count on respect for learning in the abstract and the belief that education is the key to wealth and high social status. Impoverished villagers went to great lengths to save the money necessary to see their sons through secondary school in the hope that upon graduation they would qualify for admission to a university. This process was both cause and effect of the social mobility characteristic of Greek society. In the 1960's, in contrast to European universities, over forty percent of the students at the Universities of Athens and Thessaloniki were from families of farmers and laborers.

The O.E.C.D. analysis had pointed to the economic requirement for these changes: to improve the proportion of national income devoted to education in Greece from 2.1 percent, Europe's lowest despite overall enrollment ratios among Europe's highest, to 3.2 percent. One concludes that the long term requirement for Greece was a decisive move toward comprehensivization of the school and postsecondary institutions.

University students had been foremost in creating difficulties for the authoritarian regime of the colonels, and they initiated the movement that was eventually to topple the government. Consequently, student organizations and faculty who resisted the regime have considerable influence over present higher education policy. The colonels had instituted a commissar system under which they appointed retired or former military officers with wide veto powers to supervise education and to see that every action of the university was in accord with the dictates of the government. The colonels had attempted, without signal success, to gain support from students with free textbooks and free medical care, interest-free loans, new halls of residence, and highly subsidized means. They had also catered to younger faculty impatiently awaiting promotion to professor by forcing the retirement of many older professors who had shown political or curricular independence, thereby opening chairs to lecturers. This policy gained moderate support, more in the sciences than in the social sciences

or humanities faculties. In 1969 Repressive Laws 93 and 180 had provided harsh penalties for disciplinary offenses, and gave the government commissioners the right to sit in on all student meetings to guard over "national security interests." However, students had courageously protested this legislation, and put forward general demands for greater student participation in university life and for democratically elected student representatives. The government, unable to achieve any support from higher education, in 1973 invoked the New Law 1347, giving the government power to revoke the deferment of students from national service because of willful abstention from attendance at lectures and classes. This led to broadening protest movements and, eventually, to a bloody confrontation.

After the downfall of the junta, seven years of determined effort to transform Greek education had first to be rolled back. A constitutional act, entitled "On the Restoration of Legality to the Higher Education Institutions," was published on September 3, 1974 as a result of the insistence of students and faculty for *apobouniopiisis* (dejuntafication) of Greek life. The act contained several basic provisions. All those who were dismissed from their university posts between April 21, 1967 and July 23, 1974 were automatically reinstated. All those directly appointed to posts by the regime without being elected to their posts by the faculties were dismissed; those who, although properly elected to their posts, held higher office under the regime as ministers, deputy ministers, general secretaries of ministries, governors of banks, or special advisers, were suspended for two years. Disquiet, however, grew over the fact that the position of those elected to chairs during the dictatorship was left untouched, although it was known that in a number of cases direct pressure was applied by the junta-appointed "commissars" to secure the election of candidates viewed favorably by the regime. There was, nevertheless, provision in the act for examination of complaints of collaboration made against any members of university staffs.

Although just before the coup the status of education had been improved by substantial salary increases for teachers and professors and by allowing a considerable degree of autonomy in educational institutions, the major problems had only begun to be articulated. After the colonels, long term basic structural changes remain essential. Gross overcrowding, inadequate facilities, and an extremely unfavorable student-staff ratio can only be overcome by massive money allocation—unlikely to be forthcoming in the present economic climate.

More significant than the deficiencies is the nature of the system: democratized higher education appeared in 1974 to be a major aim. The governance structure of Greek universities, while interfered with, has not changed very much: it remained rather similar to the structure of western European universities of the pre-1965 period. A university senate consisting of a rector, deans, and one representative from each faculty or college, decides all academic matters pertaining to the faculty or college concerned. A general assembly composed of all regular full professors at the university has jurisdiction over the election of the senate, proposals

for new legislation, and the handling of all internal academic matters.

The licentiate is done in three years, with one year for the Master's, and one year and submission of an acceptable thesis for the doctorate. This doctorate is closer to the first German, first French, or English than to the American doctorate. The diploma in engineering requires four years, with one year for the doctorate. In the School of Economics and Commercial Science, a diploma in economics or commercial science is given after three years of study, and, after a fourth year and thesis, a doctorate in economics is granted. The post-graduate degrees are not equal to the post-graduate research degrees of American universities. The university teaching staff at the senior level is composed of a titular professor, an extraordinary professor, and a professor holding an "aggregation" (*ifigitis*), who may or may not have teaching duties. At the middle level there is a lecturer, a director of studies, a supervisor of the laboratory, of clinical work (*epimelitis*), an assistant and, at the lower level, an assistant lecturer, assistant director of studies, of clinical work (*voitbos*), and laboratory assistants (*paraskevastes*).

In all universities the posts of professor, lecturers, and supervisors of practical classes are open only to holders of a doctorate who, in addition, have published articles in their fields. Candidates wishing to take up a post as an assistant must meet the minimum requirement of a first university degree (*ptychion*) in the special field in question.

In each faculty professors are elected by an assembly of titular professors. If a candidate obtains a two-thirds majority, he must be accepted and appointed by the Ministry, but should he obtain only an overall majority, the ratification of his appointment can be refused by the Ministry. Middle-level candidates are appointed by the Ministry of National Education and Religion on the recommendation of their heads of department. All university teaching staff (with the exception of titular professors) are appointed for a period of three years, renewable according to the regulations in force.

To change the essentially conservative character of the Greek university, a reputable committee of junta-persecuted academics, most with direct experience of foreign educational institutions, was created to advise the ministry. Many members saw the breaking of the Greek professoriat and the replacement of professorial dictatorship on the old German model by a departmental structure on British or American lines as a basic precondition of reform. They also wanted to see far greater student participation in running universities. In general, Greece has not yet achieved comprehensivation of its higher education. Comprehensivation supplies a wide range of educational possibilities so that a student can find the course best suited to his needs, narrow the gap between vocational and non-vocational education, give staff at non-university colleges a chance to combine teaching with research or, at research institutes, add teaching emphasis. A debate occurred as to whether there should be an integrated model in which there is one administration and one department for each branch of learning or a cooperative model in which the institutions remain

fairly independent but allow opportunities for moving from one to another. The development of new regional universities was seen as increasing educational opportunities and establishing access for greater numbers of the population.

Open access and comprehensivation will be longstanding requirements in Greek education. Comparison to the educational system of a country comparable in population, such as Sweden, even discounting the factor of a different level of wealth and standard of living, is not favorable. But the need is rapidly being articulated.

Greeks, however, have a social advantage derived from their cultural history. Unlike Germans, for example, they do not have a low level of parental aspiration. In Germany, children of industrial and agricultural workers are grossly under-represented in the intermediary and secondary schools. Studies show that German parents fear that the *Gymnasium's* reliance on parental assistance in homework assignments would show up their own failings, that children would grow up to think they were their parents' betters, that the far-off material rewards of white collar jobs would not be higher than what manual work could offer. Greek parents, not particularly subject to these fears despite illiteracy and lack of education, are prepared to encourage and sacrifice to put the child onto the road to higher education.

Many university students come from complete immersion in a peasant way of life. Adjustment to sophisticated urban life is a problem. But the obverse side is that the parents, no matter how low on the social or economic scale, are educationally motivated for their children. This is in contrast to a relatively egalitarian country such as Norway, where recent studies reveal that parental education can be considered as the single most important factor affecting *Gymnasium* attainment since it is expected that government policies to reduce income inequalities and expand educational facilities can eliminate educational disparities. In Norway, the relatively equal distribution of income and an abundance of educational facilities are unlikely to achieve equality of opportunity in the foreseeable future because of the demonstrated inability of government policy to affect the educational background of parents in any significant way. In most countries, sparse parental education is the single most important factor adversely conditioning the aspiration of children. The acquired pride and the ingrained cultural attitude toward education of even the illiterate and the poor enable Greeks to avoid this particular obstacle to democratizing education.

This social factor might enable Greek universities, while aware of the manpower needs of a developing country, to emphasize the particular mode—the kind of comprehensivation and nature of equal access—essential to respond effectively to social necessity.

External pressures on Greek higher education are evident. In 1971 the World Bank granted Greece fourteen million dollars to allow the financing of five centers of higher education. In 1972 it granted 23.5 million dollars "to improve the quality of education at a variety of levels

and types of institutions, help modernize the university system and increase the number of trained engineers, scientists, and other specialists." The specific details were the construction of five primary teacher training academies, schools of engineering and natural sciences at the University of Patras, three vocational agricultural schools, three mobile industrial training units, and four new merchant marine schools—all of this to be done with a twenty year loan, which allowed five years of grace with interest at $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum (financed by Japanese, Swiss, and American banks). Completion date was to be mid-1977.

In 1975 the World Bank approved a loan of forty-five million dollars. The condition was to improve relevance and quality of general secondary education and teacher training, reforming and reorienting post-secondary education, developing five accelerated industrial vocational training centers, three higher technical education centers, and ten multilateral secondary schools, and financing a post-secondary education system development study and a pre-investment study of a University Center for Pedagogical Studies to improve secondary school teacher training. The project would increase output by 2,400 graduates at the craft level and 1,500 at the technician level. It would also introduce pilot multilateral secondary schools with experimental curricula (comprehensive schools)—a considerable departure from established secondary education patterns in Greece—and would finance planning and programming of post-secondary education. The terms of the loan would be fifteen years, and five years of grace with interest at $8\frac{1}{2}$ percent per annum (the colonels got a better deal!).

Meanwhile, Greece was reporting in 1973 to the International Conference on Education in Geneva that it was developing the universities of Ioannina and Patras and developing conditions for establishing the universities of Crete and Thrace in order to lessen congestion at the universities of Athens and Salonika (in 1973, 75,000 students in higher education in Greece).

In 1976 the government decided to establish the seventh university. This one, in Crete, has schools of medicine, physics, and mathematics at Herakleon, a faculty of Philosophy at Rethymnon, and a polytechnic institute at Chania. The provisional board consisted of professors in other Greek universities, almost all of whom are from Crete. The new university comes temporarily under the charter of the University of Athens (as did Ioannina with the University of Salonika).

This procedure might be contrasted with Denmark's. When the University of Odense was established, the governing appointments board consisted of professors from the ancient university of Copenhagen. The result, according to the ministry of education, was a second, smaller, lesser Copenhagen. Government officials interested in a comprehensive, problem-oriented university decided that the next new university (Roskilde) would have a governing appointments board consisting of representatives from the community, government, unions, and industry, however, as well as more unorthodox professors. The result was the still controversial univer-

sity of Roskilde. Greek plans, however, seem to encompass replication, not change.

In 1976 also, in order to ease overloading, the Greek government decided to reduce the number of first year university places by one-quarter during the 1976-77 academic year. That is to say, 10,820 places, compared with 14,385 in 1975-76. Steps were also taken to divert candidates toward technical education by increasing the number of places in the higher technical colleges from 4,350 to 7,060. The undersecretary for education explained that overcrowding was a threat to standards of education and that the number of new admissions had not only been reduced to the level recommended by universities but also to the requirements of the current labor market, with its high number of university graduates out of work.

This decision was taken by the governing party consulting with the hierarchy of the universities. The process might again be contrasted to that in Sweden, where all basic decisions concerning higher education policy are now taken by the governing board for universities and higher education consisting of a government appointed chairperson and deputy, two members of trade unions representing the board's employees, five planning committee chairpersons (professors), the director of the employers' association, the education chief of the salaried workers' union, the folk high school rector, the ombudsman of the trade unions, the deputy director of the National Board of Education, an official of the Swedish graduates union, and a representative of the National Union of Students. By passing through this representative board, the various proposed radical changes in Swedish higher education attain an approximation of consensus.

Naturally, political leaders have also concerned themselves with educational planning. In 1975 Andreas Papandreou sought the abolition of the private sector in education, a sector which has grown at an astonishing rate, probably because of the manifest inadequacies of state provision at primary, secondary, and university levels. Papandreou, along with Karamanlis and Mavros, continued to call for increased expenditures on education. In a *New York Times* interview (April, 1978), Papandreou was quoted as saying that the state of the Greek university system was the worst in Europe except for Italy. Although considered a champion of the students, he criticized some of the demands of the Greek university students and teaching assistants who had been on strike for most of the spring semester in 1978. He observed that some of the demands, such as tenure for the assistants, were extreme, thus aligning himself with professorial traditionalists. He said that "Instead of wanting to reform a bad system, the assistants want to become a permanent part of it. The American university system on the other hand is impressive. It performs . . ."—a statement that will surprise some American analysts of higher education as well as those accustomed to view Papandreou as consistently anti-American. Papandreou would apparently change the Greek university system toward the American, but not align himself with his European ideological mates fighting for

comprehensive higher education and emphasizing equity rather than instructional efficiency.

Student opinion regarding radical change within the university is difficult to ascertain. In the 1978 student elections, the Marxist left captured more than four-fifths of the seats on sixty-three student union boards throughout Greece. The poll in the twelve universities and graduate schools was nearly fifty percent. PASP, the student branch of Papandreou's PASOK, made the biggest gain, going from third to second; first place was won by PSK, the Moscow-oriented communist group. Some analysts suggest that, despite the Marxist triumph, rank-and-file students do not necessarily share the political views of their elected leaders, and that the primary cause of the present extreme politicization of university students is to be found in inadequate educational provision and, more particularly, in a lack of dialogue between teachers and taught. Once substantial reforms are introduced, it is held, then student politics will lose much of its present intense quality.

Radical student opinion seems, at one and the same time, to demand a part in decisionmaking with respect to appointments, more security for junior faculty and assistants within the system, and an occasional outcry (this rebellion occurred in the 1960's and early '70's in Western Europe) against technocratic emphasis (and incorporation into and cooptation by capitalist society), as government shifts its emphasis away from humanities/law to science/technology. There is also the segment of radical student opinion that asks why one should bother with education since the educational system simply perpetuates class difference, that believes that society must be completely changed, with higher education following along. On the whole, radical students are not so interested in the details of particular curricular changes of the disciplines and in overhauling the teaching-learning process. Some in Greece among the social democrats, center/liberals, and conservatives seem to feel that the time is ripe for Americanizing Greek universities, that is to say, moving from the European ordinarius-chair holder system and institutes to departments—the large number of junior faculty appears to make this imperative—which has already happened to a degree; and to cut the power of the faculty by increasing the power of the department. This could mean erosion of collegiality and the rector system toward an American-style extensive use of non-faculty and professional administrators and higher education systems.

A bill drafted by the Greek ministry of education and approved by Parliament in September 1978 dealt with university structure, teaching staff, and students. Basically, departments were created in the older universities by the coalescence of five chairs of cognate subject matter in place of the all-powerful single subject professor's chair. In the new universities, there are to be "posts," and not "chairs." Tenure for those presently in the position of junior lecturers was legislated, but these permanent positions will disappear over time by attrition. The schedule for student learning is to be tightened by further restricting the number of times a student may fail and by limiting the number of years allowed to pursue a degree.

Protests by student unions and opposition parties have been to no avail as even liberal/left professors apparently favor the change. Thus, while the Greek government has proceeded to overhaul and rationalize university education in part, substantive policy issues in higher education have not yet been acted upon.

The larger discussion, however, remains on the total national aggregation; Greece is presently committed to the creation and development of new universities, little different from the old ones, with a somewhat stronger concentration on science and technology. To satisfy both local pride and search for status, each new university is likely to seek to have all the faculties which make for a traditional university. Greece could have gone another way. The higher education system might have involved the development of regional colleges and short cycle education (two years) as in Norway, the graduates of which go on to existing universities. These regional colleges would emphasize career-vocation-technical training more suited to a developing country rather than more professional opportunities (engineering, business, science), and be located in numerous towns in the country. Or it might have developed a comprehensive regional unit, the vertically complete university—that is to say, all aspects of higher education linked together in a region with the core university in the central city (Stockholm and Gothenburg in Sweden).

Or perhaps the following argument is most relevant to Greece's case. In higher education in developed countries the shift in planning has been from efficiency to income distribution (greater equitability). Should not countries in the early or middle (Greece) stages of development give priority to efficiency and growth questions, reserving their concern about income distribution for the time when they reach a more advanced stage?

The social profitability of education is higher at the lower levels of education, especially in less developed countries. In terms of world wide averages, the social returns to primary education often exceed fifty percent. Secondary education exhibits a profitability of about ten percent in developed countries and fifteen percent in less developed ones. The corresponding figure for the two kinds of countries regarding higher education is nine percent and twelve percent. The reasons are the lower opportunity costs of lower levels of schooling and human capital, which is a more scarce form of capital in less developed countries. Thus, perhaps, Greece should not concentrate on developing new universities but in widening and bettering lower school training, that is to say, expansion of primary school attendance in a less developed country is a better investment than setting up a new university (mainly replications of old ones)—until primary school attendance is universal, as in developed countries.

Or should Greece have developed comprehensive universities (in the new units), along with the three traditional universities, which would have encompassed problem-project oriented curricula—technical and professional as well as liberal arts and law—different tracks within the same institution as in Bremen (Germany). In Bulgaria, all students interested in engineering or applied science start out with the same first two years.

The better, more talented students continue beyond the two years to a degree, the others stop at a two-year diploma, becoming supervisory technologists. Quebec started the experiment of having all students go to a two year college (short cycle education) and then have the better ones go on. Comprehensive universities include this procedure, which, in essence, involves open access or open admissions.

Recent news items from Greece indicate the pressures built up by the current restrictive policies. Three medical students of Athens University were discovered to have falsified marks on Italian university certificates which they had used to get admitted to Athens. Additional students in medical faculties, the physics-mathematics department, and the school of dentistry are suspected. The situation is thought to be a by-product of the inability of Greek universities to absorb more than 12,000 students a year, roughly one out of every six competing for a place. Many of those excluded try to enroll in foreign universities. However, the problems of language, quotas, and money often force them to give up. Some are then tempted to try to "gatecrash" Greek universities.

Currently, strikes, boycotts, sit-in's, demonstrations, and even violence have developed at the universities. Grievances appear to be as follows: demand for a third examination period added to the existing two each year so that less material will be covered in each session of tests (National Union of Students); opposition to "intensification of studies" by fixing a minimum number of hours of attendance (Athens Polytechnic students); the demand that students be reexamined for the courses in which they failed in any year, cumulatively during the examinations for graduation (Patras students). The need to ease exams is, the students say, a direct consequence of inadequate facilities. They argue against intensification of studies as being a government pretext to keep students busy and out of political mischief. University authorities contend that these requests would further discredit the diplomas of Greek universities at a time when their prestige is in question by the Council of Europe. In addition, the auxiliary university teaching staff/assistants struck in 1978 for permanent civil servant status—the present draft law imposes such exacting qualifications, they say, that only a few of the 4,800 assistants would eventually be appointed to permanent status. The results were inconclusive.

Restricted admissions and shift of spaces from humanities to science-technology-business have prompted the Hellenic Educational Institute to establish a private university of humanistic sciences in Athens. The plan is to open four faculties—sociology, psychology, history of art, and the science of communication—50 students for each faculty from runners-up of the general university entrance examinations. The chairman of the institute is the present rector of Athens University and the vice-chairman is Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs. The concept for this private college was derived from the patriarchal college of the Greeks of Constantinople which was the *alma mater* of many leading figures and intellectuals of modern Greece.

The large questions may be restated. Should Greece move toward

vocational/career-oriented, middle-level technician, post-secondary education to aid its national economic growth (there are engineering departments in the new universities of Patras and Thrace, but are these training the kind of engineers-technicians necessary for Greece's developing nation condition)? Should emphasis be on the lower levels of education—secondary, twelve to eighteen years—where technicians of moderate level of training would be produced in vast numbers for the *present* economy of Greece? Are these in greater need-demand than university graduates? Does the country really need more university graduates of the public policy, econometrics, managerial systems types now widely prevalent in large, developed industrial country bureaucracies rather than the lower-level civil servant types more appropriate to less developed nations. Will Greece produce a "brain drain" (if it follows present planning) to even less developed nations as Egypt has. Will vast numbers of Greeks continue to go abroad for higher education in view of sharp restrictions in the number of places available? (It is estimated that as many Greeks go abroad to universities as attend the nation's universities.)

These are matters of policy and planning although the decisions regarding them are, of course, political. Greek universities are just beginning to confront issues which European and American universities have been facing for some time. Consequently, if stability is more or less maintained and the economy is not radically disrupted, it would appear that higher education in Greece will continue to move closer to the center of national political debate.

Sources

Information and impressions for this article were obtained from the following sources:

1. O. E. C. D. *Mediterranean Region Project: Country Reports 1965-66*, Volume 2, *Greece*, Sec. 1, "Education," Paris, 1965.
2. "Modern Educational Reform in Greece: A Symposium" in *Comparative Education Review*, February 1978.
3. Releases from the World Bank (1971, 1972, 1975) and the Greek Press and Information Office (October 19, 1978).
4. Articles in the *London Times Higher Education Supplement* (October 1977 and April 1978) and the *New York Times* (October 1978).
5. Interviews with: Professor Emeritus A. G. Tsopanakis, former dean of the University of Salonika; late Professor Stylianos Kapsomenos, former dean and rector of the University of Salonika; Professor George Vachtsevanos of the University of Northern Thrace; Professor Panagiotis Razelos of the University of Patras and the City University of New York (College of Staten Island); Professor Robert King of the Research Councils in Greece and the City University of New York (College of Staten Island); and a number of other professors and ministry officials in Greece.

Book Reviews

Homage to the Tragic Muse by ANGELOS TERZAKIS. Translated by Athan Anagnostopoulos, with a Foreword by C. H. Whitman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978. ix and 207 pp. \$8.95.

The appearance of Angelos Terzakis's book, *Homage to the Tragic Muse*, in an able English translation by Professor Athan Anagnostopoulos of Boston University, is a significant event. It promotes the dissemination of the achievements of the modern Greek mind to a circle infinitely wider than the rather provincial confines of the Greek-speaking world, within which they remain imprisoned and are ultimately stifled. It thus contributes to fruitful interaction and mutual criticism between the narrowly Greek and the universal consciousness of our era, out of which, it should be admitted, the former stands to benefit to an infinitely greater degree, since this confrontation will hopefully impose upon it standards of scholarly breadth, research, and objectivity that have been painfully alien to it up to now. In this light, the book under review is particularly valuable because it typifies both the most far-reaching peaks and the peculiar problems and limitations afflicting modern Greek intellectual endeavor.

Angelos Terzakis is one of the most distinguished living men of letters in Greece today, a well-known novelist, playwright, and

essayist. It is in this capacity that, in *Homage*, he evokes for us in a brilliant, albeit intuitive and poetic, manner the metaphysical problems that confront a sensitive human being for years immersed in the theory and stage practice of the tragic genre.

Since, beneath the veils of his elevated eloquence, a coherent theory of tragedy is here suggested, we begin with an exposition of its principal elements. Terzakis begins with his concept of a "tragic spirit" or "ethos," which he characterizes as the condensation of a cosmic law attaining its most poignant and gripping expression on the poetic-theatrical level. For its aim is to represent symbolically, and to offer to immediate intuition, the mysterious conflict that grounds the universe and determines man's fate in it, rather than to explain it through logical concepts. The conflict symbolized by tragedy is, for Terzakis, decidedly beyond the range of rational discourse.

What is the substance of the cosmic conflict that tragedy represents? It is the confrontation between an "indeterminable," "unutterable," "ineffable" world order and a human individual of developed self-will who defies it only in order to be crushed and destroyed by it in the end. The peculiarity of the sublime ethos of the tragic hero is this inward certainty that his fulfillment as an individual is possible only through this defeat that he

suffers at the hands of the absolute. The hero is a flame that must consume its own self. He is a being born for this action, a being whose mere existence provokes the wrath of an Unknown Beyond and is hence inconceivable apart from the tragic conflict that takes shape through him. On the other hand, Terzakis emphasizes that, whereas this destruction is "preordained," tragedy does not cease to be the poetic representation of the problem of "metaphysical freedom" (although by no means its solution). For the tragic hero, although "marked," at the same time *wills* his own destruction passionately; his rebellion against the cosmic order is the deepest and most definitive affirmation of his existential worth. The traditional understanding of tragedy as the depiction of all-powerful Fate is thus amended decisively.

This is the basic conceptual framework within which the inspired argument of *Homage* unfolds. To illustrate these theses, Terzakis proceeds to a highly selective treatment of some significant works in the history of tragedy. His discussion of *Oedipus Tyrannus* is valuable because it underlines the religious atmosphere of the play. Sophocles is a pantheistic "hierophant" who wishes to stir, in the deepest recesses of our feelings, the image and intuition of a divine force permeating every fiber of the physical universe. In his search for self-identity and self-knowledge, Oedipus collides with the "deadly light" of the divine element (Apollo). His ultimate conquest of truth is *eo ipso* his own destruction, in fulfillment of Teiresias' utterance that "This day will give you birth and

destroy you." But Oedipus cannot truly exist without this self-inflicted catastrophe, and that is why his entire being pushes forward in the lethal pursuit. Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* is for Terzakis the first genuine tragedy of the Christian world. It reinterprets the basic ontological conflict as man's irrepressible thirst for absolute knowledge coupled with a profound awareness that this is also the deadliest of sins, bringing about necessary damnation, "everlasting death." Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* is a tragedy that gives full play to the theme of existential anxiety through its presentation of pure, absolute Love and Death.

Summing up, Terzakis recapitulates his insight that tragedy is an aesthetic rendition of the riddle of freedom, of a conflict whose necessity and purpose must always remain a sealed mystery to our intellect. And he concludes that there is a proper tragic "age," an "ideal youth" (not to be confused with physiological youth), the chief characteristic of which is a rash boldness and a pioneering, adventuresome spirit that dares to challenge the absolute, knowing full well that it must "go under" (to use Nietzsche's phrase), for without perishing it cannot fulfill its most essential mission. What we most admire in tragedy, therefore, is the grandeur and the sublimity of this action, the tremendous *dignity*, a dignity without hope, with which the genuine tragic hero rushes forward to meet his own doom.

Terzakis claims that tragedy as he defined it is a poetic distillation of the riddle of life itself, presenting, for intuition, the problem of

"bloodstained freedom." Hence, it has a universal significance. Now, this is a sweeping claim both as far as tragedy and life are concerned, and it is based only on the most selective treatment of a few seminal works. In each case, only a few elements, events, and circumstances are abstracted from the full-blooded and living organism that is the work of art in its integrity, and they are used as springboards from which the imagination of the critic may take off to perform its ethereal acrobatics. In other words, Terzakis's method is subjectivistic to the extreme, and he himself has no difficulty acknowledging and capitalizing on the freedom that this non-objective approach entails. It is true, of course, that in Terzakis's case this subjective treatment has produced remarkable insights that illuminate very fruitfully the texts he dissects. Moreover, in his case it is easy to infer that his intuitive and emotional reaction to the tragic phenomenon springs from solid and deep knowledge of the genre in general and its particular works. Indeed, I should think that, as a rule, the most productive flights of a critic's imagination come about only if based on prior firm understanding and rational evaluation of the objective economy of the works he is treating.

After reading *Homage*, however, the intellectual demand of the mind still lingers for a more objective and scholarly treatment, in which the present theory would be grounded upon a more extensive array of at-testing facts.

But beyond the individual case of Terzakis, his glorification of subjectivism reveals, I think, a pro-

found and pervasive orientation of modern Greek cultural production, especially in the humanities. The total absence of informed inquiry and debate; the lack of translated foreign sources; the lack of libraries, archives, and other research facilities; the repressive political climate that has turned official culture into a gilded apologist of the policies of the dominant caste; in one word, the absolute intolerance of diverging or simply independent lines of interest and opinion and the shaping of powerful authoritarian and uncritical impulses in those who dominate as well as those who are dominated—these are the factors which have combined over the years to create a stifling and desperate situation. Given the impossibility, but also the unwillingness, of the intellectual worker to gather a rainbow of differing opinions on a subject in order to compare them and synthesize their positive elements into a new and higher theory, the only thing one usually resorts to is the strength of imagination. One thus uses selected facts as occasions for indulging one's own "feelings," and not for the purposes of intellectual enlightenment.

Subjectivism, more often than not devoid of true objective knowledge, has a definite impact upon style. On this score as well, Terzakis's work exemplifies a more general characteristic of Greek letters today despite the fact that its subjectivism is cultured and incisive. The riddle of tragedy or "metaphysical freedom," he tells us, is beyond the grasp of formal logic. It is ultimately a mystical experience that cannot be illustrated conceptually. But if this is the case,

then this is the end of the matter and nothing more specific can be said about it. Terzakis, however, feels compelled to elaborate on this thought from various angles. But since its mystery is, by his own definition, impenetrable, and he is not of a mind to illustrate the relation of bloodstained freedom by means of a wider selection of tragic circumstances from literature or life itself, I am afraid that in this attempt he is condemned to an endless rearrangement of words that detracts from the ingenuity and forcefulness of the point he is trying to make. Nor is the situation helped in the least by such phrasal constructs as tragedy "penetrates the impenetrable," "knows the unknowable," "explains the inexplicable," "explores the unexplorable," which function as rhetorical devices without adding meaning. The subjectivistic disposition and its fully self-conscious detachment from objective moorings, therefore, necessitate a style full of poetic uplift that is often carried to the extremes of haziness. The essay is imbued with a grandiloquence and a dramatic, theatrical tone that try to impose an artificial and external brilliance upon a subject matter that ought to radiate its own inner power.

If in Terzakis, because of the daring and remarkable substance of his thesis, this is a defect that can be disregarded, it is all the same, once again, an index of a more general condition of modern Greek intellectual production. In its most extreme manifestations it becomes the attempt to gloss over the lack of content by means of an elaborate phrasal facade.

To end this review I would like to allude to an internal tension in Terzakis's thesis. The poetic and emotional uplift, the effort for an "immediate contact with the warm body of tragedy," as the author himself expresses it, sometimes creates an atmosphere of ethereal fluidity which, removed from the concerns of "formal logic," may hide self-contradiction. There is in *Homage* a vacillation between two opposed standpoints which is not satisfactorily resolved.

On the one hand, Terzakis claims that the tragic conflict as he sees it represents a mystery unfolding on a plane beyond the triviality, brutality, and superficial harmony of our everyday experience. On the other hand, the tragic hero is not simply exceptional, he is also a "paradigm," he encapsulates the tragedy and the anxiety inherent in the life of every human being by virtue of the mere fact of belonging to the human race. We are all "marked," Terzakis insists, despite the fact that we are not always aware of this. Tragedy, therefore, does not represent merely a confrontation "in the depths" to which we must accede by abandoning the standpoint of phenomenal experience. It is equally present as a tangible historical force shaping the life course of every human *qua* human. This viewpoint I would call one of "identity" or "immanence." Now, these very different approaches to the essence of the tragic do not square harmoniously with each other in *Homage*. Either ordinary existence is insignificant, trivial, brutish, materialistic, and hence without metaphysical value—for allegedly the latter consists of the absolute nega-

tion of phenomenality—or the tragedy of freedom is instanced in the empirical movements of human consciousness as well, and hence they, too, partake of metaphysical significance. You cannot have both at once. Terzakis's argument, however, wants the hero paradigmatic of the human being *per se*, but also extraordinary and beyond experience.

Ultimately this dualistic perspective comes to dominate Terzakis's thought. And so, at the end of his essay, he tries to defend himself against the possible charge of "idealism." Personally, I see nothing objectionable in an "idealistic" theory simply on account of being idealistic, provided it has internal consistency and manages to reconstruct the reasons for a given sequence of objective phenomena plausibly. Terzakis's argument, however, is open to some objection on both these counts. In the final analysis, he says, this "world law," this Beyond that must become real by crushing the hero's will may not even exist. But how can that be, when throughout *Homage* it has served as the functional axis of the argument, as an active agent, the innermost purpose of which is to externalize itself by destroying the hero that challenges it? Does not this *define* the metaphysical order *rationaly* as a real and independent system, thus robbing it of at least some of its mystery and incomprehensibility? Furthermore, Terzakis continues, even if the transcendent order does not exist, the "bloodstained freedom" of the self still does not cease to be an ineradicable given. Yes, without doubt! But then, if this is the case,

should it not become the primary focus of our metaphysical exploration in an effort to discover how each and every minute and seemingly "trivial" act and passion of ordinary reality may serve as the objective field for the unfolding of the great tragedy of existential freedom? But this necessitates a return to objective reality and its intricate structure, a total immersion into the flow of existence in all its concrete manifestations (social, political, aesthetic) in order to record faithfully the mystery of willing, and the possibility of self-destruction that it inextricably contains, in its entire breadth. We must, thus, go through the "motions" (to use a Kierkegaardian phrase) ourselves, without shunning the complexity and depth of the exercise. Terzakis's method is, on the contrary, a simplifying one, for it is subjectively selective both on the aesthetic plane and on the plane of concrete life. For he leaves the latter totally out of his purview after condemning it as incurably trivial. His argument, therefore, merely hints at an immanentist or concrete metaphysics (that was, after all, the great contribution of both Hegel and Kierkegaard, albeit in different ways), only in order to abandon it in favor of fervent adoration of "something" ineffable that may not even exist. But concrete phenomenal life is the only possible field for the exercise of our spirit, and, hence, instead of futilely expending energy trying to depict something that is inherently indescribable, if we wish to say something intelligible, it is about the metaphysical significance of worldly striving and *its* agony that we must be concerned. And

this Terzakis himself recognizes at his best moments.

It is another indication of the state of Greek letters today that, as far as I know, this brilliant and provocative book did not spark a serious scholarly debate around the important philosophical and methodological problems that it poses for its audience. Even works of value are usually wrapped in a shroud of indifference. In this manner, their creators are either discouraged or (even worse) led to believe that they have uttered definitive and unchallengeable truths. All this perpetuates the climate of

empty subjectivism, which thus becomes a self-perpetuating affliction.

The English-speaking reader concerned with modern Greek letters ought to be grateful to Athan Anagnostopoulos for presenting him with this important sample of Greek thought. Professor Anagnostopoulos has already established a personal tradition of conscientious, painstaking, and dedicated labor in translation, which we hope will be continued for the ultimate benefit of modern Greek culture itself, which is thus brought before a world-wide court of judgment.

—Pericles S. Vallianos

*
**

Politics and Cinema by ANDREW SARRIS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978. 215 pp. \$12.95.

Andrew Sarris is, arguably, the only significant film critic in the United States. To quote his own words about André Bazin, Sarris is "something more than a film critic without being something else than a film critic." Long after the systematic philistinism of Pauline Kael and the systemic *bauteur* of John Simon (both tendencies, by the way, proceeding from the same art house chic, anti-movie ideology) have been buried in the footnotes of the history of American film criticism, Sarris's work will be chronicled as a major chapter. Now that we are on the threshold of the eighties, it is instructive to turn our gaze two decades back to the days before the academic legitimation of movies, before the overflowing film sections in

bookstores, before the New York Film Festival and the American Film Institute, to the days, in short, before it became not only acceptable but a matter of intellectual propriety for an institution as august as Columbia University to award an honorary doctorate to Alfred Hitchcock. If we turn to those days a mere twenty years ago, we will see quite clearly—and almost to our amazement—the enormous contribution which Andrew Sarris has made both to our perception of the cinema and to the cultural ambience in which it continually develops and recreates itself.

Andrew Sarris's name will always be associated with the importation into the United States of *la politique des auteurs*, that much-maligned, much-misunderstood method of film criticism and film history formulated by the first writers of *Cahiers du Cinema* (Truffaut, Godard, Rohmer, Rivette, Chabrol), who,

themselves, later became the *auteurs* constituting the *nouvelle vague*. Put very succinctly, the *politique* states that: (a) every film has an "author," or *auteur*, and that it is always the director; (b) some directors are better than others; (c) consequently, even a minor film by a major director is more interesting than a major film by a minor director; and (d) thus, one must look at and appraise films historically, which is to say, with a knowledge of what has come before and what unites all the films of a director's complete work with each other and with the rest of film history. This more or less reasonable and scholarly approach to cinematic comprehension and appreciation caused a veritable storm of denunciation when it was first articulated. Although certain lucid objections were made against the *politique* (most notably, as Sarris is the first to admit, by André Bazin), in most cases the reaction to the *auteur* theory was unusually polemical, imprecise, and, in fact, vicious. In the middle of the storm which broke out against the theory in the United States in the early sixties stood the lonely and somewhat resilient figure of Andrew Sarris, the man who introduced the *politique* to this country.

Sarris can look around him now and feel some pride. The word "filmmaker" has become synonymous with the word "director," and the director has become the superstar of the cinema. No one any longer seriously questions the fact that a film is signed and that the signature is affixed by the director. Secondly, we have come to accept the existence of "film history" and,

to use one of Sarris's favorite terms, the presence of a "pantheon" in that history. Furthermore, there is more or less general agreement on who constitutes the pantheon, and no one laughs anymore when Ford and Hawks and Hitchcock are placed side by side with Chaplin and Renoir and Welles. This phenomenon, by the way, has led to what is perhaps the most profound achievement of the *auteur* theory—the complete vindication of the American, or to be precise, the Hollywood movie as the finest and most consistently successful expression of the art of the cinema. Anyone who still denigrates "Hollywood" is, almost by definition, a film illiterate. Finally, after years of pleading with his fellow film critics to be as serious about their profession as literary and art and music critics are about theirs, it has been generally accepted that there is such a thing as film scholarship, and that one can no longer comment on film as if every movie were a self-created and self-existent entity separated from every other movie. Many of his colleagues become upset by Sarris's tendency to write about movies by referring to other movies, but, in this case, reference is a direct outgrowth of reverence, of a historical sensibility which knows that every esthetic form produces a tradition and that, as a matter of critical integrity, that tradition must be respected.

Although the times have changed, however, Sarris's notoriety remains almost intact. Indeed, his new book, *Politics and Cinema*, will probably increase that notoriety and expand Sarris's circle of enemies. If nothing else, it should alienate him even more from the left, against which he

has been waging an increasingly ferocious ideological and esthetic war for some years now. In the introduction to the volume (which comprises a collection of previously published essays, most of them from his column in *The Village Voice*), Sarris forthrightly declares his differences with the left.

Whether I regard myself as a Christian, a liberal, a skeptic, a centrist, or a dedicated democrat, I tend to prefer tinkering with society to smashing it to smithereens. I choose to live with the injustices and inequalities of bourgeois capitalism for fear of losing the music of individual voices. Marxism, as the professed inheritor of historical forces, threatens the integrity of historical scholarship. . . .

I am driven therefore by the imperatives of my politics toward a relatively pluralistic aesthetic in which the very diversity of artistic styles is counted a blessing. As I gaze upon the cinematic configurations of Max Ophuls, Kenji Mizoguchi, Jean Renoir, Charles Chaplin, John Ford, Alfred Hitchcock, Orson Welles, Luis Bunuel, Robert Bresson, Carl Dreyer, Roberto Rossellini, Michelangelo Antonioni, Ingmar Bergman, Howard Hawks, Fritz Lang, Buster Keaton, Jean Vigo, D. W. Griffith, F. W. Murnau, Ernst Lubitsch, and hundreds of other immortals in my chosen medium, I find that no one of these artists sums up or towers above the others, and that each achieves full articulation only in company with all the others. The cinema as I

understand it depends for its survival upon a civilization that possesses the largeness of spirit to preserve its past, warts and all. It is therefore not surprising that I have achieved a certain notoriety over the years for deflating the apocalyptic fantasies of the left. . . . For me as a believer in individual destiny there has been relatively little conflict between my politics and aesthetics. I am only now beginning to understand the implications of this apparent harmony. My aesthetics have been my politics all along.

He goes on to conclude his first essay in the collection by stating that "I see the left as a mirror image of the right in the realm of libertarianism. . . . When I look at *Watch on the Rhine* and *The North Star*, in which good leftists solemnly teach themselves the historical necessity of killing fascists and even obstacle-creating opportunists in cold blood, I conclude that the left has little to teach us about liberty or justice." In short, Sarris's opposition to the left stems from his conception of it as an ideology which is both esthetically and politically intolerant.

I do not accept Sarris's description of himself as either a Christian or a liberal. On the contrary, as opposed to the indeterminate individualism of bourgeois liberalism, Sarris's democratic vision has always been articulated within a distinctly social framework. More than any other American critic, Sarris is particularly aware of class reality in latter-day America and is uniquely sympathetic to what used to be referred to as "the masses." I quote

from his review of *The Godfather*.

I am convinced that *The Godfather* could have been a more profound film if [Francis Ford] Coppola had shown more interest (and perhaps more courage) in those sections of the book which treated crime as an extension of capitalism and as the *sine qua non* of showbiz. . . .

The irony is not that the Corleone family is a microcosm of America, but rather that it is merely a typical American family beset by the destructively acquisitive individualism that is tearing American society apart. It is an idea that Chaplin developed so much more profoundly in *Monsieur Verdoux*: that if war, in Clausewitz's phrase, is the logical extension of diplomacy, then murder is the logical extension of business.

In another essay, entitled "Porn versus Puritanism," Sarris defends the right of all human beings to be allowed their sexual fantasies, and he attacks the liberal bluestockings who, in pornographic movies, have found a convenient outlet for their snobbery.

. . . I'm willing to bet that few stags of yesteryear attended as many tribal sessions in basements or garages as legends of the "good old days" would suggest. Of course, there were the beautiful stags who were making it with real girls or real boys, but Narcissus was never much of a moviegoer. Then there were the rich stags like the Kennedys with real starlets to play with in the

family's swimming pool in Palm Beach. They don't need compassionate spectacles to relieve them of their dire wants and needs. I speak still for all the poor stags in the world who didn't want to undergo any elaborate tribal rituals before venturing one on one with their forbidden fantasies.

Finally, in a review of a movie made up of kinescopes from the old *Your Show of Shows*, Sarris compares the comedy style of Sid Caesar to the style of Nichols and May (both of whom, by the way, went on to become film directors).

The difference between a Sid Caesar skit and a Nichols and May skit was not only a difference in period, but also in class consciousness. With Caesar, a fundamentally popular common sense was appealed to with every bellow of outrage. With Nichols and May, an elitist *frisson* of intellectual and cultural superiority was cultivated at the expense of our most sacred cows. This was the beginning . . . of an era of cultural affluence and alienation, and of increasing fragmentation of audience sensibilities.

These examples have been selected more or less at random. In each case, what is most evident is Sarris's profoundly popular—and populist—perspective. His populism, however, is not of the American rural communitarian kind but of the European urban working class kind (which, in my opinion, can be explained to a significant extent by his Greek immigrant background).

As such, his anti-leftism is not based so much on any type of conceptual anticommunism as it is on a deep sense of betrayal.

In both politics and cinema Sarris is a convinced social democrat. His greatest affinity lies with George Orwell in politics and André Bazin in the cinema (the latter's opposition to *la politique des auteurs* notwithstanding). What unites all three men is the same sense of critical honesty, a belief in the most fundamental and various democracy, and, what is perhaps most important, a lucid compassion, a compassion which is not prepared to murder all those who have been "objectively" labeled the oppressors for the sake of all those who have been "objectively" determined to be oppressed. In short, Sarris is a vocal and uncompromising anti-Stalinist. He opposes the left—or at least the communist left—because he considers it to be mendacious, blood-thirsty, and self-righteous.

No Marxist of any integrity would argue any longer that the left has not at times, since the founding of the First International, done a great deal not so much to betray others as to betray itself. Where I disagree with Sarris, however, is that he is convinced the left is immutably corrupted whereas I believe that it is still not only capable of noble actions but, indeed, of changing the world. To quote his own quote (in his book, *The Primal Screen*) from Orwell: "Socialists don't claim to be able to make the world perfect; they claim to be able to make it better. And any thinking Socialist will concede to the Catholic that when economic justice has been righted, the

fundamental problem of man's place in the universe will still remain. . . . It is all summed up in Marx's saying that after Socialism has arrived, human history can begin." It is up to the left, of course, to vindicate itself. I believe that it can and will. Before it can do so, however, it must stop reviling critics such as Sarris and begin examining its own words and actions. In film that can start by a rejection of the noxious notion that there is only one kind of "revolutionary" cinema. Again, here I agree with Sarris in his approval of Bazin's belief that deep focus is more democratic than cross-cutting. It is not only patently absurd but utterly totalitarian to defend the idea that there is only one way to make a movie, let alone a revolutionary one. Art is not a matter of formula but of form. To say that revolutionary filmmakers can only learn from Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov is not to praise those artists but, ultimately, to ridicule and belittle them.

I wrote at the beginning of this review that Andrew Sarris was the only significant film critic in the United States. There are, of course, a number of other intelligent and perceptive critics in this country (Roger Greenspun, Richard Schickel, and, coincidentally, Sarris's wife, Molly Haskell, immediately come to mind). Sarris is the only critic, however, who, by the continual elaboration of his work, has elucidated a critical framework—indeed, an esthetic vision—through which to see and understand the movies. In that sense, Sarris is no longer only a critic, but has also become an esthetician. His esthetics, however, are uniquely popular in basis and

perception, and, as such, represent the thinking of a man who still loves the movies. For, if there is one thing that Sarris has tried to convince us of for over the last twenty

years, it is that, in the final analysis, a film is a movie—and if you can't enjoy it as a movie, there is no point in discussing it as a film.

—Peter Pappas



Κοινωνικός μετασχηματισμός και στρατιωτική επέμβαση, 1880-1909 [*Social Change And Military Intervention, 1880-1909*] by GEORGE DERTILIS. Athens: Ἐκδόσεις Ἐξάντας, 1977. 285 pp. 250 drs.

Distinguishing between the myth and reality of the modern Greek experience has become the challenging crusade of a small group of younger scholars. How is it possible, a non-conversant outside observer might ask, for myths to exist about the recent history of a European nation? It is rather easy: the bibliography dealing with Greek politics and society includes few serious scholarly monographs. Because of the many sensitive issues and fratricidal conflicts which have divided Greeks, most social scientists in Greece, for reasons of expediency, have deliberately avoided investigating contemporary socio-political subjects—and the contemporary period, as defined by prevailing practice, can extend back into the nineteenth century. Another facet of this phenomenon is that when secondary school and university courses treat sensitive issues, it is usually done only by citing chronological events, thereby shunning discussion and analysis. Greeks, nevertheless, still continue to talk passionately about the his-

torical problems which have divided them and plagued the nation. Journalistic and popularized accounts abound to cover these earlier decades of Greek politics. And simplistic rightist and leftist versions of events perpetuate politically motivated myths and clichés to reinforce factional interests. The only appropriate weapons to counter these unrealities are rigorous, detached historical research and legitimate social science methodology.

This book by George Dertilis is an important and welcome contribution: myths fall left and right on its pages. Dertilis's general objectives are to provide accurate profiles of the Greek economy and society from 1880 to 1910, to associate this data with the main political currents, and then to place the social and political role of the military in its appropriate context.

In his first section the author relies on fifteen statistical tables to dispute the generally accepted contention that the three decades prior to 1909 witnessed the vigorous emergence of capitalism and the rise of the middle class. These figures indicate, contrarily, that the real transformation of the Greek economy came from 1910 to 1930. Moreover, the role of Greek diaspora capitalists should not be equated with that of the small middle class within the country. The wealthy

elements of the diaspora did considerable business with Greece in the areas of finance and commerce, but committed little money to national development, choosing instead to divert most of their profits towards investments elsewhere. This pre-1910 era is better viewed as pre-capitalist and, because of Greece's different conditions, should not be compared to the early stages of Western Europe's economic development.

Dertilis then goes on to describe the five decades preceding the 1909 revolt as an era during which class issues rarely influenced politics. Due to the legacy from the Ottoman Empire and to the nature of landholding, among other factors, no widespread agrarian movement with a fixed ideology emerged in Greece. In fact, the peasantry helped the ruling groups to maintain their influence, with patronage-clientage networks dominating national politics and distracting attention from ideological or class questions. Following the establishment of Greek independence, liberal bourgeois institutions were created before the customary precondition of capitalist development would have made imperative the abolition of feudal conditions in land ownership and the economy. The diaspora largely assumed the bourgeois role for the Greek economy, and its interests, as mentioned above, did not center on industrial investment.

The last part of the book deals with the military revolt of 1909 and its commonly accepted—but erroneous—definition as a "bourgeois revolution." Dertilis maintains that methodological failures and two false suppositions account for

this classification: the assertions that the years from 1880 to 1909 witnessed a significant rise in Greek capitalism and the middle class and that developments after 1909 naturally evolved from this bourgeois revolution (e.g., the invitation of Venizelos, birth of the Liberal party, rapid economic growth during the 1910-1930 years, and accompanying consolidation of the middle class's economic and political strength). Dertilis offers five propositions to clear up the distorted picture of events. First, the 1909 revolt of the Military League did not intend to install or assure the domination of the middle class and did not seek to inspire or guide this or any other class. Second, the middle class did not display revolutionary activity, either independently or in support of the 1909 movement. Third, rebellious tendencies did manifest themselves in the decade prior to 1909, but in the countryside and among the lower classes in urban areas. Fourth, the appearance of Venizelos and the Liberals, as well as the revolt, were neither symptoms nor conclusions of this non-existent bourgeois revolution; they were, however, serious factors for the bourgeois transformation of Greek society during the two decades after 1910. Last, this transformation occurred despite the non-existence of a bourgeois uprising and the potentially antibourgeois expectations of the urban lower classes. The remainder of the study details these interpretations and the army's role in the events of 1909-1910.

Criticisms of this book are few and minor. Dertilis has effectively used class analysis to disavow earlier

alleged class theories on the period under review, but historians may question some of the broader generalizations and the presence of gaps in factual information. This is not a book to be read by someone only casually interested in Greek politics and society, as it presupposes a good knowledge of the period's events and prominent issues. More frequent references to developments in neighboring Balkan states would have been enlightening for comparative purposes. Also, the impact on politics and society of mass emigration to the United States after 1897 has not been given adequate emphasis. As a point of information it should be noted that the best, short coverage of important population movements is the little known article by V. G. Va-

laoras, "A Reconstruction of the Demographic History of Modern Greece," in *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*.

On the whole, this is a provocative, well-conceived analysis. The use of sociology's tools in conjunction with existing historical studies to interpret this earlier period has been convincingly executed, at least in the eyes of this reviewer—a historian who has arrived at many of the same conclusions on the 1909 revolt by means of a different methodology. It should be encouraging for the future of scholarship on modern Greece that academics in the several divisions of the social sciences are exchanging skills and findings with each other. The collective benefits will be many. Only myths will suffer.

—S. Victor Papacosma



Ἡ Ἀθηναϊκὴ ἐπιθεώρηση [*The Athenian Review*] by THODOROS HATZIPANTAZIS and LILA MARAKA. Athens: Ἐρμῆς, 1977. Vol. I, 253 pp.; Vols. II & III, 583 pp. 500 drs.

Modern Greek theater is a peculiar phenomenon. At no stage of its history has it matured into a distinct and self-sustained form of art. Even today it seems incredible that, with more than forty theaters in full operation in Athens during any given theatrical season, there is still so little substance in modern Greek dramatic literature. This can best be explained if one looks closely into the structure of Greek society, first in its formative years (the end of the 19th and the begin-

ning of the 20th centuries), and second, in its later development. In both theater and society a lack of substance is easily recognizable. Greek theater is consciously a social theater because Greek culture as a whole relies heavily on social issues. Whatever theater, therefore, there is in Greece today is a reflection of Greek society, and shares all its peculiarities, successes, and failures. Such a development was inevitable. When modern Greece emerged from the War of Independence against the Ottoman Empire, it was confronted with the task of redressing its society into more familiar garments by shaking off its Levantine characteristics. This created a massive movement, no matter if it wasn't very deeply rooted, towards

Europe and the European way of life, which was regarded superior to the existing one. Everything European was copied: food, dress, manners, as well as theater, which was the very essence of European culture and Greek snobbishness. From 1800 to 1908 only 384 original Greek plays were produced in Greece—all the others were foreign. This xenomania did not allow, least of all encourage, the existing forces within the Greek theater to expand and fully realize their potential; the people simply would not support Greek plays. That form of Greek theater which managed to escape the taboo on local productions, the Athenian review, started as an adaptation of a foreign idiom on the Greek stage. By the time it developed and reached its peak, it had become synonymous with a rising new class in the social structure of the country, the Athenian middle class, which desired nothing more than to be European. Its success was phenomenal.

To assert, merely on the merit of its immense success, that the Athenian review is the most representative form of modern Greek theater is the same as to say that Grofe's *Grand Canyon Suite* is the finest example of American classical music. Measured in terms of the impact it had on the advancement of the Greek theater, the Athenian review's rise to the proscenium was definitely not monumental. It was more of a whisper, but whispers, when heard in the midst of silence, can be deafening. It is, therefore, this breath of life which the Athenian review offered to the Greek theater that renders it worthy of our attention today and ensures that

its study will be a rewarding experience.

The Athenian review, which took its name from its French prototype, was at its best a satirical portrayal of the Athenian social and political temperament, which was constantly changing as new ideas were being introduced into it. For this, it employed dialogue, music, and dance, and also, at its decline, phantasmagoric sets. It made its spectacular entrance onto the Greek stage in 1894 with the production of *A Bit of Everything*. By that time Greece had already declared "total bankruptcy" and had been placed under international economic supervision. Soon, many similar reviews were staged, but were unsuccessful and finally ceased after the defeat of Greece in the Greco-Turkish war of 1897. They reappeared ten years later in 1907, and dominated the Greek theater until 1922, the year of the great massacre of the Greek people in Asia Minor. After 1922 it dropped into oblivion, despite several abortive attempts to revive it, and it was never again produced in its original form. It is not by accident that the two disappearances of the Athenian review from the Greek stage, one temporary, the other final, coincide with two major national disasters. The same years also mark a pause in the social ascent of the Athenian middle class. With the repression of that strata of society, the Athenian review lost its voice, purpose, and reason to exist.

Roughly from 1907 to 1921 most major reviews were produced on an annual basis, each being associated with a particular group of writers, musicians, designers, actors, and even theaters. Each one, in an effort

to maintain its audience, emphasized its strongest contributions to the form and thus established the trademark by which the people promptly recognized it. It was not uncommon for Athenians to visit a specific show year in and year out to see a particular actress or hear a certain kind of music or simply enjoy more clever social satire. The greatest of all Athenian reviews, *Panathenaia*, owes its popularity to its well-balanced repertory, which suited the tastes of the average audience. Apart from the relative merit of its text, it also offered Marika Kotopouli, the greatest name in Greek theatrical history. *Panathenaia's* greatest rival was *Cinema*, the review most favored by intellectuals. Its satire was more abrasive, its text more articulate, and it also featured original songs by the legendary Attik, the country's most important name in the composition of popular songs. *Panorama* was the first review to incorporate moving pictures into its productions and, as a result, served as a forerunner of more advanced production techniques. It also had an excellent *corps de ballet*. The last of the great annual reviews was *Parrot*. It became popular as the "Parisian Review" and was closer to its French prototypes. It employed the maximum use of song, dance, and spectacle, as compared to other productions of a genre which owes a lot to cabaret.

Apart from the well-established annual reviews, there were others which appeared not so regularly, but were ultimately more valuable for their contribution to the development of Greek consciousness. They were what came to be known as the provincial or "popular" reviews

(*The Broom, Something for Everybody*), with their headquarters in the suburbs of Athens. Their political satire and social critique was so acute and passionate that on several occasions the police had to move in and impose censorship. Nevertheless, their enormous popularity with local audiences brought Athenian society to the suburbs to intermingle with the "people." That magnetic attraction was their unique achievement, and foreshadowed what had to occur if the Greek theater was to establish its own identity.

The texts of the Athenian review were by no means intended for posterity. They were, rather, working texts, often written in the language of the newspapers by professional journalists with theatrical aspirations, and they were primarily used as prompts or sketches for the performances. Since all texts depended on current events, and a great deal of the material had to be reworked from week to week or even from day to day as news of national interest was being made, there are very few definitive texts of reviews in existence today. However, all of them follow more or less the same pattern. Basically, they are divided into three distinct parts and employ some sort of unifying factor, usually an actor who appears throughout the play. Each part consists of a succession of "numbers," a finale, and special songs sung by professional singers. The "number" was the very heart of the review. In its broad sense it is a short scene of dialogue and song satirizing almost anything and everything under the sun.

Subjects for satire were, first of

all, well-known personalities and public figures of the city of Athens such as politicians, criminals, writers, and actors. Politics appeared quite often in the reviews. Yet most of them politicized without taking a definite political stand or ever being specific. They spoke of a prime minister's beard, for example, but they would not criticize his political convictions. What is more, with a few exceptions, the Athenian review can at no point in its history boast of a clear-cut political orientation. It existed to please and amuse its public, not to divide it over politics. In political matters its satire was innocuous. Archetypal figures such as spinsters, beggars, maids, and artists were also subjects for satire. The characters were drawn directly from the sidewalks of Athens, and became the main source of amusement for the audience since they could be caricatured on stage without fear of complaint. So, the influx of gypsies in Athens, the existence of beggars, or the simplicity of the city's maids, were grossly satirized at one time or another. A third category prone to social satire was "creatures of the imagination" or, to be more precise, impersonations of ideas or institutions vital to Athenian everyday life. It was not uncommon, therefore, for "Town Hall" or "Common Sense" or "The Railroad" to appear as vivacious young girls or common prostitutes commenting on themselves to the delight of the audience. Having personifications of ideas on stage can be the most direct method of theatrical propaganda. Ideas in human dress were widely used by the reviews to influence their public on burning national issues, from

the Macedonian problem to disputes over the throne. Their treatment, was, nine times out of ten, reactionary.

Although the authors of *The Athenian Aevieiv* devote two entire volumes to the actual texts and are very careful to include only key texts in the history of the form, an examination of them is rather disappointing. Despite this careful selection of material, the reader finds himself more interested in the footnotes, which often offer better insights on what is going on than do the texts themselves. The reviews under examination are *A Bit of Everything* of 1894, *Cinema, 1908*, *Panathenaia, 1911* and *Ksifir Faler* of 1916.

In a way, *A Bit of Everything*, the first review to appear on the Athens stage, set the standards all subsequent reviews were to follow. It is important only in this respect for nothing else can recommend it to future generations. Written in an ungraceful language, it accurately reflects the equally ungraceful Athenian middle class which was just being incorporated, as an integral part, into Greek society. *Cinema, 1908* has been called the review of the "reconstruction" since it is mainly concerned with the reestablishment of the middle class after its partial eclipse in 1897 and, moreover, with the recovery of the entire nation. To accomplish this, Greece imported experts from Europe in many fields, which created a lot of confusion among the Athenians off and on the stage. *Panathenaia, 1911* is a general satire of Venizelos's restoration policies. It is also the review best remembered for its portrayal of

three types of Greeks: the opportunist parliamentarian, the man from the provinces who is unable to comprehend Athenian mannerisms, and the illiterate, self-deluded, idiotic police officer. In the last Athenian review to be included in the book, *Ksifir Faler* (meaning nonsense), the text is no longer as important as are dance, music, and, above all, spectacle. Impressive and expensive sets of the kind that Athenians had never seen before, and would never see after, were introduced to the stage and created an atmosphere of nouveau riche fetishism. Gods descended from Mount Olympus, ancient Greeks joined the moderns, allegorical figures floated around with ease, and all this phantasmagoria for the glorification of the king!

There is an assumption in Greece today that if you have a group of actors, a script, and a lighted stage, you also have a performance. Many Greek theaters have opened their doors to the public on that assumption, and they have all failed pitifully as they lacked not motivation so much as credibility—a basic factor in the process of creating art. With the publication of the three volumes of *The Athenian Review*, a historical account of the form, Greek theater moves one step further into the realm of credibility so vital for its very existence. Previous to *The Athenian Review*, Greek dramatic

history was recorded either in the form of memoirs dressed up as histories or in short and incomplete studies of specific subjects of theatrical interest which appeared in magazine, newspapers, or as introductions to books. It is amazing how little has been written on the modern Greek theater in a scholarly manner. Hatzipantazis' and Mavrouka's "history" is the first work of such scope and magnitude to rise above this limited concept of dramatic history and open up new horizons for the documentation of Greek theatrical literature. It is history in all its glory, well-documented, and, above all, enjoyable not only for the scholar, but for the average reader who has some interest in drama. Moreover, it fills a great gap in the Greek theater since no previous comprehensive account of the Athenian review has ever been set on paper with the exception of some cursory accounts.

The Athenian review, and, for that matter, the Athenian middle class it portrayed so well, leaves today's student of dramatic history amused, but in a different way from the audiences of that period which flocked to the theaters night after night to see themselves on the stage. The atmosphere that emanated from the Athens stages of the famed reviews was that of gross euphoria—and it was a euphoria at the expense of the people.

—George Valamvanos

Resistance, Exile and Love edited and translated by NIKOS SPANIAS. New York: Pella Publishing Company, 1977. 170 pp. \$8.00 cloth, \$15.00 paper.

More has been done, deservedly, to expand Greek literature in the Anglophone world in the last thirty years than in the previous three centuries. In Greece itself, too, more has been done in that period in order to develop a "Greek consciousness," to gain a sense of proportion about the Greek psyche, than in all the years since Greece was liberated from the Turks. That does not mean, of course, that there is a genuine, comprehensive perspective; it does not mean that a Greek *zeitgeist* has been satisfactorily defined. It means simply that—against tremendous odds—Greek writers have been honing and chiseling the rock underneath which the features of a marvelous statue are beginning to reveal themselves. Greece is still in need of good critics and good reviewers, evaluators who will guide the collective taste, values, and methods which will better express and assess the Greek experience.

In *Resistance, Exile and Love* we have one more volume that embodies both the conscientious work done in English on behalf of Greek literature and the literature (in this case poetry) being written in Greece revealing this new kind of awareness. During these postwar years, of course, there were prose writers such as Hatzis in Hungary, Alexandrou and Kazantzakis in France, Tsirkas in Egypt, Vassilikos, and many others—all working in their own genre, and chiseling upon

the same exquisite rock. But it is in poetry that, since the war, Greece has had a kind of renaissance. While poets such as Seferis, Elytis, Ritsos, Varnalis, and Gatsos have been among those in the lead, dozens of younger poets have followed, many of which are included in Spanias's useful anthology.

Though the verse in the volume is not limited to (and does not fully treat) the subjects proclaimed in the title, the eighteen poets and the eighty-three poems translated by Nikos Spanias are an accurate representation of the Muse in post-war Greece. What one notices in studying the anthology is a bitterness, a frustration, a sardonic tone, an outrage against personal and national betrayals, disillusionment, pain, and death. "My generation," Klitos Kyrou writes, "partook of life and death like consecrated bread"; "Your sunrise is always stormy, Greece," exclaims the late and talented Theodosia Athas. For Iason Depountis, "faces of massacre groaned"; and Spyros Kokkinis shouts: "How cruel these days are . . . / I cannot contain this boundless bitterness."

Still, there is a heartening vitality coexisting with this bitterness, an underlying love for life, a sensuality, as in Spanias's own poems in the volume; a subtle harmony of love and expectation, as in Papaditsas' verse; an enchantment with the world's gifts, as in Dallas's historical poems. Unlike most American poetry in the last three decades, these Greek poets deal with themes that are somehow more substantial, more mature, more worthy of poetry. Not that driving on Highway 5 during sunset or

speaking of one's divorce cannot be made to contain an emotional immediacy, but the young Greek poets, having collectively suffered on a scale unknown to their Amer-

ican counterparts, dramatize issues that have passed through our century's "shock of recognition" in an experiential way. As Klitos Kyrrou writes in his "Cries of the Night":

My generation was a lightningbolt whose thunder
was stifled, my generation was hunted down
like a brigand, was dragged behind barbed wire
. . . my generation did not die
in hospital beds, they shouted down the firing squads.

There is indeed conflict and anguish in the voices that shout or whisper from the book. "The dreams were reefs/and the old wound erupted/like a volcano tossing up images of gall," writes Athas. There is less hyperbole in Yannis Dallas's "city flaring up like a firecracker." Sen-

timentalizing does enter the stanzas of Michalis Katsaros, who imagines the Rosenbergs "smiling at every child/stretching their great human hands even to those who killed them," and in the poetry of Tasos Livaditis, who asks the Italian guard who keeps watch over him:

when they order you to shoot me,
fire—
but don't aim at my heart!
Somewhere deep inside it remains your face of a child.
I don't want you to wound it.

Emotionalism seems to prey on most of these poets. If, in fact, there is a general drawback in many of these poems, it is the propensity (so Greek, but often detrimental to

poetry) for emotional overstatement. If the quoted lines above have not illustrated this point already, here are some samples:

He was a perfect man who loved people . . .
all the drums dumbfounded by his dead body.
(Fotiadis)

we wept and tore down our hearts . . .
(Geranis)

People mad from despair, people dead from the routine of life . . .
other people sanctified by their enormous sins . . .
people who give themselves wholeheartedly to a great hopeless passion
until they are consumed by it.

(Livaditis)

All will tremble and palpitate till eternity . . .
(Manousakis).

I am aware that it is not only through *litotes* that intensification and irony may be manifested in poetry. "An elegant straining of the truth," in Quintilian's words, may allow for a tone of anger, a tone that confirms the passion appropriate to the subject. But the straining of the truth in these poets, I feel, is not always elegant and subtle. It is—uncomfortably, too often—blunt overstatement which could be conveyed more effectively through ingenious understatement. This is an instance where perceptive critics could have been of help to the poets. Personally, I would wish that these poets could learn from Seferis and Ritsos to use understatement which, more often than hyperbole, creates better attenuation and impact. Manolis Anagnostakis, included in this collection, is another example of how allusions and metaphors can be used effectively to convey, without hyperbole, power and irony.

Besides Anagnostakis, there are poets in this collection who do harness their emotionalism and let their direct and awful encounter with history to be "recollected in tranquillity." It is not easy. Tranquillity has not been easily available to Greece; it is not a Greek luxury. Hyperbole or not, then, the verse of these poets informs experiences and feelings that need to be shared; it is eloquent verse, a collective voice which, even when it shouts, speaks of substance.

As an anthologist, Nikos Spanias overrides the Edgar Guest pretense, and includes his own verse among that of the other seventeen poets. Though he has selected good company, he holds his own. His poems are as good as most, and better than some in the volume. Furthermore, he has treated his companions well by translating them faithfully and perceptively.

—*Minas Savvas*

Letters

To the Editors:

I must say that your magazine is becoming more impressive with every issue—impressive in quality and diversity. Congratulations!

In your Winter 1979 issue, I was particularly attracted to the Papacosma article on the Greek press in America, which was packed with good information and balanced analysis.

Inevitably, in an article dealing with such a major subject and based principally on secondary sources and some replies to a questionnaire, there are bound to be omissions. It might be a useful idea for your magazine to ask its readers to send whatever additional data they may possess and follow up with some sort of an addendum.

For my part, let me call attention to a couple of items that deserve mention. For many years, *Campana*, published mostly weekly in New York by Mr. [Costas] Athanasiades, provided a useful antidote to the "established" Greek-American press. Despite its excessive polemics, it managed to expose wrong-doing in high places and to keep important issues in the limelight. It played a particularly important role during the junta years, when the established media either were outright supportive of the junta or at least ridiculously wishy-washy. The fabled Paul Nord was a regular contributor to *Campana*. Speaking of those years, please allow me to refer to the

New York anti-junta biweekly *Greek-American* of Mr. Paul Grivas, which a group of us joined in 1967, adding *Eleuthero Ethnos* to its title. Quite a number of issues were run in the presses of the present Pella publisher before we ran out of money!

The New York City scene is incomplete without reference to Mr. Babis Malafouris, whose contributions to the history of Greeks in America, to the preservation of democratic sentiments on Greek issues, and to keeping the authorities in line should be recognized by all, including those, like myself, who were wary and weary of his exaggerations and his personal attacks. Malafouris's more recent newspaper, *Homogeneia*, principally in reaction to the inimitable *Acontion* (Lance) of the Knights of St. Andrew, gave us many enjoyable moments!

On the cultural side, one should also include the "Greek Heritage" series out of Janus in Chicago. Finally, and closer to my present home (Columbus, Ohio), I should mention the biweekly *Phoni* of Cleveland, published by Mr. Harry Papouras since 1976.

Professor Papacosma made no reference to the support given to the Greek-American press by the Greek government in the form of advertisements and otherwise. Recognizing the sensitivity of the issue and the fact that such support was often proper and welcome, I

would nevertheless suggest that some of the roots of the tendency, especially of the Greek-language press, to rally behind the incumbent Greek government, including the junta, are not too hard to find!

In another context, I would like to raise a question on the relative scarcity of local original talent in the Greek-American press. There is too much "lifting" from the American and Greek newspapers, too much serialization of detective and sentimental novels, too much dull reporting of local news, mostly incantations of names and hackneyed descriptions of happenings!

I must confess my jealousy when

I read, for example, about the talents in the Yiddish press, including Isaac Bashevis Singer, and can think only of very few quality regular writers in our press during my time, e.g., Theano Margari, Nikos Spanias, and Athena Dallas.

Another aspect of Greek-American ethnicity which remains even less explored than the press for lack of adequate secondary sources (only "*scripta manent*"!) is the Greek-American radio and T.V. Let us hope that Professor Papacosma or another expert will be motivated to turn soon to that rich subject.

Thank you for your patience.

Sincerely,

P. J. KOZYRIS

Columbus, Ohio

ERRATA

The following corrections are for the article, "The First Greek Book," by Evro Layton, published in the winter 1979 (Vol. V, no. 4) issue of the *Journal*.

- Page 63, note 1, line 2. After Society, add 8
- Page 64, delete Actual size
- Page 66, after Venice, add Nicolas
- Page 67, line 2, This is . . . one takes
- Page 67, note 4, line 3, biblioteche, not bibloteche
- Page 68, after Venice, add Adam
- Page 68, delete Actual size
- Page 69, after Venice, add Adam
- Page 69, delete Actual size
- Page 70, note 8, last line, first word, should read: stampa not tampa
- Page 71, after Brescia, add Thomas
- Page 76, paragraph 3, line 8 should read: to chapter headings and to grammatical examples . . .
- Page 77, delete Damilas and add in its place, D. Paravisinus
- Page 77, delete Actual size
- Page 79, after Venice, add Aldus

Publications Received

Books

"Αξιον ἔστί τὸ τίμημα: εισαγωγή στήν ποίηση τοῦ Ὀδυσσεῆ Ἐλύτη [*Worth is the Price: An Introduction to the Poetry of Odysseas Elytis*] by Kimon Friar. Translated by Nasos Vagenas. Athens: Κέδρος, 1978. 93 pp. np. Criticism.

Γκριζοὶ ὁρίζοντες: ἐκλογή ποιημάτων 1962-1976 [*Gray Horizons: A Selection of Poetry, 1962-1976*] by Anestis I. Ghanotakis. Athens: Κέδρος, 1977. 55 pp. np. Poetry.

Διήμερο νεοελληνικῆς λογοτεχνίας καὶ ἱστορίας [*A Two Day Conference of Modern Greek Literature and History*] edited by the Editorial Committee of the Democratic Association of Greek Scientists in Great Britain. Birmingham: Democratic Association of Greek Scientists in Great Britain, 1978. 100 pp. np. Scholarly papers.

Disaster and Fiction: Modern Greek Fiction and the Impact of the Asia Minor Disaster of 1922 by Thomas Doulis. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1977. X+313 pp. \$12.75. Criticism.

Father Kosmas the Apostle of the Poor by Nomikos M. Vaporis. Brookline, Mass.: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977. 164 pp. np. Church history.

Greece in the Nineteen Forties: MGSΑ Symposium 1978 Abstracts. Washington, D. C.: 1978. 22 pp. np. Abstracts of Scholarly papers.

Ἡ ἀσφάλεια τοῦ καθεστώτος: πολιτικοὶ κρατούμενοι, ἐκτοπίσεις καὶ τάξεις στήν Ἑλλάδα, 1924-1974 [*The Security of the Regime: Political Prisoners, Internal Exile, and Class in Greece, 1924-1974*] by Roussos S. Koundouros. Prologue by Aristovoulos I. Manesis. Athens: Ἐκδόσεις Καστανιώτη, 1978. 171 pp. np. Sociology of Law.

Ἡ ζωή μου ὅλη (Στέλιος Καζαντζίδης) [*My Whole Life (Stelios Kazantzidis)*] by Vasilis Vasilikos. Athens: Ἐκδόσεις Φιλιππότη, 1978. 162 pp. np. Non-fiction.

Im Fadenkreuz der NATO: Ermittlungen am Beispiel Cypern [*In the Sights of NATO: An Examination of the Cypriot Problem*] by Niels Kadritzke and Wolf Wagner. Berlin: Rotbuch Verlag, 1976. 144 pp. np. Political Science.

Kazantzakis: The Politics of Salvation by James F. Lea. Foreword by Helen Kazantzakis. University, Ala.: The University of Alabama Press, 1979. XIII & 207 pp. \$13.50. Political Theory.

L'économiste français Arthémond de Regny et son rôle dans l'histoire financière de la Grèce (1831-1841): Recherches sur la période

- de la monarchie* [*The French Economist Arthémond de Regny and his Role in the Financial History of Greece (1831-1841): Studies on the Period of the Monarchy*] by Constantin A. Vacalopoulos. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1977. VIII & 266 pp. np. History.
- Lemaître et la crise financière de la Grèce (1842-1843)* [*Lemaître and the Greek Financial Crisis (1842-1843)*] by Constantin A. Vacalopoulos. Thessaloniki: 1979. 111 pp. np. History.
- Life in the Tomb* by Stratis Myrivilis. Edited and translated by Peter Bien. Hanover, N. H.: University Press of New England for Dartmouth College, 1977. XIX & 325 pp. \$15.00. A novel.
- Μηχανισμοί τῆς ἀγροτικῆς οἰκονομίας στὴν Τουρκοκρατία (ΙΕ'-ΙΣΤ' Αἰώνας) [*Mechanisms of the Agrarian Economy during the Tourkokratia (XVth-XVIth Centuries)*] by Spyros Asdrachas. Athens: Θεμέλιο, 1978. 300 pp. np. History.
- Μικρασιατικά κείμενα [*Asia Minor Texts*] by Nikos E. Milioris. Athens: Ἴωλκός, 1977. 246 pp. np. Non-fiction.
- Modern Orthodox Saints: St. Arsenios of Paros* by Constantine Cavarnos. Belmont, Mass.: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1978. 123 pp. np. Church history.
- Ὁ Ἅγγελος Σημηριώτης καὶ τὸ νεοελληνικὸ πρόβλημα [*Angelos Simiriotis and the Modern Greek Problem*] by Nikos E. Milioris. Athens: Ἴωλκός, 1976. 19 pp. np. History.
- Ὁ αἰσθηματίας [*The Sensualist*] by Michalis A. Moiras. Athens: 1979. 183 pp. np. A novel.
- Ὁ ξεκαπistrwτος Πήγασος [*The Unbridled Pegasus*] by Eugenia Palaiologou-Petronda. Nicosia: Αὐγή, 1978. 31 pp. np. Poetry.
- Pegasus* by John Melidonis. Boulder Creek, Cal.: Triton Press (printer), 1978. 22 pp. np. Poetry.
- Photo Album of the Greek Resistance* by Costa G. Couvaras. Preface by L. S. Stavrianos. San Francisco: Wire Press, 1978. 139 pp. \$5.95. Photography.
- Πανόραμα [*Panorama*] by Kostis Kokorovits. Athens: Μαυρίδης, 1977. 126 pp. np. Non-fiction.
- Τὰ περισωθέντα ἔργα τοῦ Ἀργύρη Φιλίππιδη: μερικὴ γεωγραφία διελίου ἠθικοῦ [*The Preserved Works of Argyris Filippidis: A Partial Geography of the Book of Ethics*] edited by Theodosios K. Sperantzas. Athens: 1978. 355 pp. np. Philosophy.
- Ταριχευτήριο πουλιῶν καὶ ἄλλα ποιήματα [*A Gallery of Stuffed Birds and Other Poems*] by Yorgis Manousakis. Athens: Οἱ ἐκδόσεις τῶν φίλων, 1978. 53 pp. np. Poetry.
- Τὸ ἄλλο ἔγαλμα [*The Other Statue*] by Dimitris Doukaris. Athens: K. G. Simopoulos (printer), 1976. 37 pp. np. Poetry.

Τό εμπόριο τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης, 1796-1840 (σύμφωνα μέ ἀνέκδοτες ἐκθέσεις Ἑὐρωπαϊῶν προξένων) [*The Commerce of Thessaloniki, 1796-1840 (According to the Unpublished Reports of European Consuls)*] by Konstantinos A. Vacalopoulos. Reprint from Volume XVI of *Makedonika*. Thessaloniki: Society of Macedonian Studies, 1976. 101 pp. np. History.

Τό πορτραῖτο ἐγὸς ἀγωνιστῆ: Νίκος Ζαμπέλης [*Portrait of a Freedom-Fighter: Nikos Zambelis*] by Vasilis Vasilikos. Athens: Πλειάς, 1974. 114 pp. np. Non-fiction.

Thucydides: The Speeches of Pericles translated, with an introduction, notes, and comments by H. G. Edinger. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1979. VIII & 68 pp. \$2.45. Classics.

Periodicals

Ἄγωνιστής, No. 85, February 16, 1979; No. 86, March 2-16, 1979.

Ἀδούλωτη Κύπρος (also published in English as *Cyprus Bulletin*), Volume XVII, No. 1, January 6, 1979; No. 2, January 13, 1979; No. 3, January 20, 1979; No. 4, January 27, 1979; No. 5, February 3, 1979; No. 6, February 10, 1979; No. 7, February 17, 1979; No. 8, February 24, 1979; No. 9, March 3, 1979; No. 10, March 10, 1979; No. 12, March 24, 1979.

Ἄγι, No. 111, November 2, 1978; No. 112, November 18, 1978; No. 113, December 2, 1978; No. 114, December 16, 1978; No. 115, December 29, 1978.

Ἐσωτερικό Δελτίο τῆς Δημοκρατικῆς Ἐνώσεως Ἑλλήνων Ἐπιστημόνων Βρετανίας, April 1978.

Θούριος, No. 95, February 1, 1979; No. 96, February 15, 1979; No. 97, March 1, 1979.

Modern Greek Society, Volume VI, No. 1, December 1978.

Newsletter of the Panhellenic Committee for Solidarity with Cyprus (PESK), February 1979.

Ὁδηγητής, No. 227, December 22, 1978; No. 228, December 29, 1978; No. 229, January 5, 1979; No. 230, January 12, 1979; No. 231, January 19, 1979; No. 232, January 26, 1979; No. 233, February 2, 1979; No. 234, February 9, 1979; No. 235, February 16, 1979; No. 236, February 23, 1979; No. 237, March 2, 1979; No. 238, March 9, 1979; No. 239, March 16, 1979.

Ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ νότου, No. 2, September 1977; No. 3, February 1978.

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review, Volume XXIII, No. 2, summer, 1978.

Τομέας, No. 37, June 1978; Nos. 38-39, July-August 1978; Nos. 40-43, September-December 1978; Nos. 44-45, January-February 1979.

Index

The following index covers not only Volume V but the fourth number of Volume IV, which was the first issue of the *Journal* to be published by Pella.

ARTICLES

- "American Institutional Penetration into Greek Military and Political Policymaking Structures: June 1947-October 1949," Michael Mark Amen, Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- "Cavafis and his Translators into English," Kimon Friar, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- "Greece: Portraits and Landscapes" (photoessay), Niki Tipaldou, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- "Kazantzakis, Bergson, Lenin, and the 'Russian Experiment'," N. Georgopoulos, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- "Kazantzakis's *Odyssey*: A Modern Rival to Homer," Morton P. Levitt, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- "Makronisos Journal," Aphrodite Mavroede, Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- "On the Problem of Political Clientelism in Greece in the Nineteenth Century" (Parts 1 & 2), Constantine Tsoucalas, Vol. V, nos. 1 & 2, spring & summer 1978.
- "Reciprocities Between a Text and Two Translations: Thucydides, Venizelos and Kakridis," Daniel P. Tompkins, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- "The 'Anomalies' in the Greek Middle East Forces, 1941-1944," Hagen Fleischer, Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- "The Case for a Treaty Between Greece and the United States on Mutual Assistance in Connection with Illegal Payments by Multinational Corporations," Dimitris C. Conostas, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- "The First Printed Greek Book" (illustrated), Evro Layton, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- "The Greek Army in the Late Forties: Towards an Institutional Autonomy," Nicos C. Alivizatos, Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- "The Greek Labor Movement and the Bourgeois State, 1910-1920," George B. Leon, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- "The Greek Press in America," S. Victor Papacosma, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.

- "The Latin American Agro-Transformation from Above and Outside and its Social and Political Implications," James F. Petras, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- "The Living Mask and the Humanist Myth: Thoughts on the Art of Nicholas Sperakis" (illustrated), Stephen Eric Bronner, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- "The 1958 Greek Elections: A Reassessment," Spyros Linardatos, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- "Yannis Ritsos and Greek Resistance Poetry," Kostas Myrsiades, Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).

AUTHORS

- Nicos C. Alivizatos, "The Greek Army in the Late Forties: Towards an Institutional Autonomy," Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- Michael Mark Amen, "American Institutional Penetration into Greek Military and Political Policymaking Structures: June 1947-October 1949," Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- Stephen Eric Bronner, "The Living Mask and the Humanist Myth: Thoughts on the Art of Nicholas Sperakis" (illustrated), Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- Dimitris C. Conostas, "The Case for a Treaty Between Greece and the United States on Mutual Assistance in Connection with Illegal Payments by Multinational Corporations," Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Hagen Fleischer, "The 'Anomalies' in the Greek Middle East Forces, 1941-1944," Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- Kimón Friar, "Cavafis and his Translators into English," Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- N. Georgopoulos, "Kazantzakis, Bergson, Lenin, and the 'Russian Experiment'," Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- Evro Layton, "The First Printed Greek Book" (illustrated), Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- George B. Leon, "The Greek Labor Movement and the Bourgeois State, 1910-1920," Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Morton P. Levitt, "Kazantzakis's *Odyssey*: A Modern Rival to Homer," Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- Spyros Linardatos, "The 1958 Greek Elections: A Reassessment," Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- Aphrodite Mavroede, "Makronisos Journal," Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).
- Kostas Myrsiades, "Yannis Ritsos and Greek Resistance Poetry," Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).

- S. Victor Papacosma, "The Greek Press in America," Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- James F. Petras, "The Latin American Agro-Transformation from Above and Outside and its Social and Political Implications," Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Niki Tipaldou, "Greece: Portraits and Landscapes" (photoessay), Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- Daniel P. Tompkins, "Reciprocities Between a Text and Two Translations: Thucydides, Venizelos and Kakridis," Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- Constantine Tsoucalas, "On the Problem of Political Clientelism in Greece in the Nineteenth Century" (Parts 1 & 2), Vol. V, nos. 1 & 2, spring & summer 1978.

POETRY AND PROSE

- "Alexis Lykiard" (poetry), Alexis Lykiard, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- "George Philippou Pierides: A Selection" (prose), George Philippou Pierides, translated by Jack Gaist, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- "The Poetry of Maria Polydouri: A Selection" (poetry), Maria Polydouri, translated by Athan Anagnostopoulos and the Thursday Night Group, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- "Yannis Ritsos: A Selection from the Forties" (poetry), Yannis Ritsos, translated by Athan Anagnostopoulos, Vol. V, no. 3, fall 1978 (special issue).

BOOK REVIEWS/ENGLISH LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS

- Beginning With O* by Olga Broumas, MARY MOUNDROS GREENE, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- By Fire and Axe: The Communist Party and the Civil War in Greece, 1944-1949* by Evangelos Averoff-Tossizza, THEODORE A. COULOUMBIS, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.
- Foreign Interference in Greek Politics* by T. A. Couloumbis, J. A. Petropoulos and H. J. Psomiades, MARIOS L. EVRIVIADES, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Greek Women Poets*, edited and translated by Eleni Fourtouni, FRANCES LEFEVRE, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- I Should Have Died* by Philip Deane, JIM JACOBS, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- Island of the Winds* by Athena Dallas-Damis, GEORGE VALAMVANOS, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.

- Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War and the National Security State* by Daniel Yergin, LAWRENCE S. WITTNER, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- The Military in Greek Politics: The 1909 Coup d'Etat* by S. Victor Papacosma, THANOS VEREMIS, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic* by Kyriacos C. Markides, JANOS N. KRANIDIOTIS, Vol. V, no. 1, spring 1978.

BOOK REVIEWS/GREEK LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS

- Βαρβάρα, Βίος και Ύπολιτεία [*The Life and Hard Times of Varvara*] by Kostas Pavlou Panayotopoulos, GEORGE VALAMVANOS, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- Έντολή [*Command*] by Dido Sotiriou, REGINA PAGOULATOU, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- Έξάρτηση και αναπαραγωγή: ο κοινωνικός ρόλος των εκπαιδευτικών μηχανισμών στην Ελλάδα (1830-1922) [*Dependence and Reproduction: The Social Role of the Educational Apparatus in Greece (1830-1922)*] by Constantine Tsoucalas, PASCHALIS M. KITROMILIDES, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Η σύμβαση των δικαιωμάτων του ανθρώπου και το σύνταγμα [*The Convention on Human Rights and the Constitution*] by Phaidon Th. Vegleris, ΝΙΚΟΣ ΡΑΤΟΥΡΙΣ, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- Η Χαμένη Άνοιξη [*The Lost Spring*] by Stratis Tsirkas, PETER PAPPAS, Vol. V, no. 2, summer 1978.
- Θέατρο στα Βουνά [*Theater in the Mountains*] by George Kotzioulas, GEORGE VALAMVANOS, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- Κράτος και οικονομική πολιτική στον 19ο αιώνα [*State and Economic Policy in the 19th Century*] by Kostas Vergopoulos, KATERINA GARDIKAS, Vol. V, no. 4, winter 1979.
- Κύπρος '74: Το άλλο πρόσωπο της Αφροδίτης [*Cyprus '74: The Other Face of Aphrodite*] edited by Emmanuel Ch. Kasdaglis, PETER PAPPAS,
- Συναξάρι Άντρέα Κορδοπάτη [*Recollections of Andreas Kordopatis*] by Thanasis Valtinos, GEORGE VALAMVANOS, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Το Άγροτικό Ζήτημα στην Ελλάδα [*The Agrarian Question in Greece*] by Kostas Vergopoulos, THEODORE C. KARIOTIS, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.
- Το Διπλό βιβλίο [*The Double Book*] by Dimitris Chadzis, PETER PAPPAS, Vol. IV, no. 4, winter 1978.