



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Greek political publishing field during the long 1960s, exemplified by the case of Istorikes Ekdoseis, 1963-1981

Mais, C.

Citation

Mais, C. (2020, September 22). *The Greek political publishing field during the long 1960s, exemplified by the case of Istorikes Ekdoseis, 1963-1981*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/136910>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/136910>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/136910> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Mais, C.

Title: The Greek political publishing field during the long 1960s, exemplified by the case of Istorikes Ekdoseis, 1963–1981

Issue Date: 2020-09-22

PROLOGUE

In 2001, I moved to Greece—more specifically, Thessaloniki—to study. Not long after I arrived, I became involved in student and social activism. This and my enduring interest in history and books saw me wandering the city for hours, visiting every bookstore I could find in search of material related to my new interests. I soon realised that the better-known bookstores stocked very few—and, in some cases, no—titles of relevance. In contrast, bookstores in specific areas, especially second-hand and antiquarian ones—often based in damp, poorly lit basements—had hundreds of titles. Most of these came from publishers I was not even aware existed. As I later came to understand, this was because the kinds of books that piqued my interest were typically produced by short-lived and long-defunct publishers that would rarely themselves be included in the Greek National Library’s bibliographic register.

One of my first observations was that, as one looked back in time (and especially to the period before the 1980s) the number of books, pamphlets, periodicals and newspapers related to radical politics, either extra-parliamentary Left or anarchist, was significantly higher than that in the 1990s or the 2000s. Although this was an observation about the Greek publishing field, it can be generalised: the phenomenon of the expansion of the radical publishing field during the “long sixties” (and its later decline) is a feature of many other countries as well. Archives specialising in labour and social movements, such as the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam and the Archives of Contemporary Social History (ASKI) in Athens,

contain troves of material from the *long sixties* from all over the world. The coverage in these collections, however, declines drastically from the 1980s onwards. Browsing the shelves of Greek second-hand bookstores, or even my own library, it slowly dawned on me that the vast majority of political publishing had occurred during the *long sixties*, a conclusion reinforced by the fact that the many books I borrowed from friends came from the libraries their parents had assembled as students back in the 1960s and '70s.

None of this really drew my attention until I began my MA studies when I came across Pierre Bourdieu's field theory.¹ Aspects of Bourdieu's theory helped me formulate the notion of the Greek political publishing field, which makes up the core of this PhD dissertation. Discovering field theory—especially John B. Thompson's later modification of it—intrigued me, especially Thompson's idea of publishing field theory. The term and its various aspects will be more thoroughly elaborated in later parts of the dissertation. Nevertheless, I would like to state here that I view field theory as a very adaptable framework that can be modified to fit different publishing genres, countries and historical periods. At the same time, it has a firm structure that assists the researcher to form a concrete idea of what should be assessed.

1. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

INTRODUCTION

This PhD dissertation serves a dual purpose. It aims to produce a revised picture of the historical development of (left-wing and anarchist) political publishing in Greece during the 1960s and 1970s. At the same time, it seeks to extend the application of Bourdieusian field theory to this subject, the first time—at least as far as I am aware—this has ever been attempted. My main hypothesis is that a distinctive publishing field, which I label the *political publishing field*, emerged within the Greek publishing sphere during the *long sixties*.

The theoretical framework draws heavily on elements of Pierre Bourdieu's field theory and especially John B. Thompson's adaptation of it for the publishing field. However, I argue that the field of *political publishing* has distinctive features and characteristics that mark it out from other publishing fields, such as general trade or academic publishing. These particularities militate against the uncritical adoption of either Bourdieu's or Thompson's theoretical framework. Instead, I seek to elaborate a critical engagement with Thompson's work, as he himself did with Bourdieu's.² For a start, economic capital—so central to field theory—is generally lacking in the political publishing field and is thus of decreased importance. Symbolic

2. As far as the trade publishing field is concerned, see the introduction of John B. Thompson's *Merchants of Culture: The Publishing Business in the Twenty-First Century*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012). For the academic publishing field, see the second and third chapters of John B. Thompson's *Books in the Digital Age: The Transformation of Academic and Higher Education Publishing in Britain and the United States* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005).

capital, however, is front and centre. As will also become apparent, one of the basic elements of field theory—the dichotomy between autonomy and heteronomy—does not apply in political publishing. The differentiation between political publishing and other fields briefly described above is not indicative of either an anomaly of the field or eclecticism on my behalf.

On the contrary, this fact entirely supports Thompson’s argument that publishing fields have distinctive dynamics and characteristics with respect to each other.³ While publishing field theory is a structural theory, it is also dynamic. Thus, the fact that it allows us to introduce and elaborate on different findings—without fear of derailing from a very rigid theoretical path—is one of the two reasons I chose to use it. The other is that it has a lot of space for the social aspects of publishing that I believe to be of great importance in the present case.

It will become evident that in order to frame the political publishing field—or any field for that matter—two aspects must first be defined. First, it is crucial to delimit the various *agents* of the field—namely, its various subjects, the actors within it. The second aspect to define is the *habitus* of the field, which is “the practice-unifying and practice-generating principle”.⁴ One must always bear in mind what a publishing field is—namely, “a space of positions occupied by different publishing organisations” pervaded by a range of actors.⁵ Thus we must define the various subfields of political publishing that constitute the wider field. The identification and conceptualisation of the various agents and subfields are concomitant to establishing the “different publishing organisations”. In order to achieve this definition, I proceed to an elaboration of the various terms used within political publishing, such as “radical”, “alternative” and “underground”, drawing on a combination of theory and practice, the latter being a case study from the Greek publishing field.

The use of case studies serves a dual purpose. Because field theory is heavily based on practice, it seems contradictory to proceed to an abstract

3. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 4–5; Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 37–40.

4. Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984), 101.

5. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 30.

theoretical analysis that is disconnected from the actual publishing practices in question, which themselves structure the political publishing field. Thus, the dissertation adopts an applied theory approach. The second purpose is to familiarise the reader with the substance and development of Greek political publishing since it has until now remained relatively unexplored by scholars. The dissertation research has uncovered a lamentable dearth of literature regarding the Greek publishing field—and political publishing in particular. In this respect, I chose to present case studies that will assist the reader to acquire an outline of the Greek political publishing field during the *long sixties*.

As far as the historical framework is concerned, the reader will have noticed that I adopt the referent of “the long sixties”, a more general idea that I have adapted to take account of the political dynamics in the Greek case, especially the years of military dictatorship (1967–1974). This will assist us to set the publishing field in its historical context. I argue that the formation—as well as the decline—of the political publishing field was directly related to the historical conditions of the time and the rise of socio-political movements worldwide. Furthermore, accurate historicisation demands we also focus on technology. After all, print technology is a key factor in the development of publishing and one that itself emerges and evolves in historical time.

A variety of sources are employed in this dissertation to reconstitute the Greek political publishing field, to define the habitus, and determine the various agents and their positions within the field. The dearth of secondary literature regarding Greek publishing and Greek book studies led me to other sources. Turning my attention to archival resources was helpful but what was available was far from satisfactory. The marginal and ephemeral nature of the vast majority of political publishing houses operating in Greece is one of the reasons for the dearth of archival sources and quantitative data that would allow us to proceed to concrete qualitative analysis.⁶ What is

6. The political turmoil that led to the military dictatorship between 1967 and 1974 was a cause of much of the destruction of archives as well as to elliptic archiving, i.e. omission of full names from archives, for safety reasons.

known is that in 1982, there were more than five hundred publishing houses in Greece, 80% of which were based in Athens. But as noted, the picture is quite misleading since more than two hundred of them were “niche, elliptic or marginal presences”.⁷ Political groups and parties have long deployed press and publishing to serve their goals. Often—at least initially—the publishing or editorial team was identical to that of the political group. Publishing—of which the political press was a basic component—during the period under examination was on the rise. Statistics tell us as much: in 1958, there were 1,400 businesses in the Greek printing–publishing sector, employing 9,619 people, often on a seasonal basis, over the year. Twenty years later, in 1978, this had risen to 2,848 enterprises with 17,285 employees.⁸

As I began to explore what archives I could find, I encountered former activists and agents of the political publishing field from the *long sixties*. While, in the beginning, I saw conducting interviews or engaging in discussions with these people as a supplementary source or research method, oral history, in the end, proved to be highly significant. This was not an easy source to tap; many former activists were reluctant to talk, let alone be recorded, and memories had faded in time, as they are wont to do. Nevertheless, these discussions were tremendously beneficial, not just because I could use them to supplement the paucity of written sources. Indeed, as the next chapter lays out in greater detail, the oral history I conducted unveiled the critical importance of symbolic capital to political publishing, which in turn underpinned the human and social capital that each publisher was able to generate. My interlocutors thus formed part of the human and social capital of the political publishing field of their time and through the interviews and discussions the habitus of the field resurfaced, many years after it had disintegrated.

7. Loukas Axelos, *Ekdostiki drastiriotta ke kinisi ton ideon stin Ellada* [Publishing Activity and Circulation of Ideas in Greece] (Athens: Stochastis, 2008), 160 [in Greek].

8. When we talk about businesses in the Greek publishing sector of the time, we must imagine small workshops rather than large companies. The statistics were drawn from Periklis Papadopoulos, *E taxiki diarthrosi tis sichronis ellinikis kinonias: Kinoniologika ke ideologika zitimiata* [The Class Structure of the Contemporary Greek Society: Sociological and Ideological Issues] (Athens: Sygchroni Epochi, 1987) [in Greek].

(Autobiographic) novels were also used to reconstruct and understand the *long sixties*, especially since the amount of fiction written on the period is quite extensive compared with the non-fiction produced on the same topics. Of course, I used these novels to draw out the sense of the values and visions—and the disappointments—of the youth of that time, rather than to gather “facts”. This context matters. As I will elaborate in detail through the chapters that follow, participation in the social and political movements of the *long sixties*—and the disappointment that attended demobilisation later on—was directly linked to involvement in political publishing, either as active agents of the field or as readers.

The first chapter provides an overview of the Greek political publishing field during the *long sixties*. This chapter should not be taken as a mere historical narrative. It is not possible to conceive in full the function of the political publishing field without understanding the historical context and socio-economic, political and cultural conditions within which it emerged. A number of crucial developments in the 1960s—the Sino-Soviet split and the Cultural Revolution, new technological advances and the widespread embrace of the mimeograph and offset technology, increased access to university education, and Greece’s turbulent political firmament—all influenced the formation, evolution and disintegration of the Greek political publishing field in the period.

In the second chapter, I apply Thompson’s field theory to show that political publishing in Greece during the *long sixties* constituted a publishing field in its own right. That such a distinct publishing field existed is shown by the importance of symbolic capital and the virtual absence of economic capital, making it an anomaly in the trade publishing subfield. In other words, unlike trade publishing’s conventional sub-subfields, political publishing exhibited virtually no influence from economic capital. Other publishing fields are likewise not affected by the historical context in the way political publishing is. Of course, time and space transform all publishing fields to a greater or lesser extent. Technological advances, increased literacy and standards of living, or an increase of attendance in higher education all affect the way a publishing field or subfield will develop, grow or progress. This is hardly a novel observation; Thompson’s *Books in the Digital*

Age demonstrates this point conclusively in exploring the transformation of the academic publishing field. In the case of the Greek political publishing field, however, historical time and context did not merely *influence* developments—they literally constituted the field itself. I argue that the rise of social movements in the *long sixties* and the respective politicisation of the youth—today’s “baby boomers”—were essential to the very rise of the field, while the end of the *long sixties* and the decline of the same social, cultural and political movements brought the field to its end.

In the third chapter, I elaborate on the dialectics of form and content of published works within the political publishing field. I argue that the form, as in the graphic design and the material quality, was directly related to symbolic capital. Two distinct patterns or publishing practices emerged in relation to the distinct form of the period. The first was the copying of originals in an attempt to draw on and transmit the symbolic capital that inhered in them—from the publisher, author or title of the original—through to the copied works. The second pattern was the production of first-hand cheap editions with poor aesthetics when there was no symbolic capital in the original that might be transmitted via copying. As far as the form is concerned, I again chose to use case studies in order to illustrate the arguments made. I chose two works of Mao Zedong published by the same publisher, Istorikes Ekdoseis, during two different periods of time.

The fourth and fifth chapters explore in detail the dissertation’s case study: Istorikes Ekdoseis, a Greek publishing venture prominent during the *long sixties*. This is one of the few political publishing houses that operated through the entire period, save the seven years of military rule from 1967 to 1974. The ideological motivations of its founders and contributors throughout its operation and its highly political and ideological content, as well as the fact it operated across the entire *long sixties*, are sufficient reasons to select Istorikes Ekdoseis as a representative case study of the Greek political publishing field. Chapters 4 and 5 cover, respectively, the first and second operational periods of Istorikes Ekdoseis (i.e., pre- and post-junta) and include both a narrative of the publishing activity per se as well as an application of publishing field theory. To reconstruct the history of this publishing project—and position it and its agents within the polit-

ical publishing field—a series of methodological and research tools were employed. Elements of Bourdieu’s field theory—especially as modified by Thompson—have been pivotal in grounding the framework of the research. The focus on a single publishing formation should be perceived as a micro-historical approach, which is used to support and substantiate the arguments regarding the greater narrative. In this sense, it is not an attempt to scale down the research as this would be contradictory to the *long sixties* approach, itself a core element of the research framework.

Since the microcosm of the Greek extra-parliamentary Left is rather complicated, I will try to briefly shed some light on it here so that the reader can better follow the history of Istorikes Ekdoseis. In the early 1960s, a small group of political exiles from the Greek civil war gathered in Athens. They decided to form a publishing house, Istorikes Ekdoseis, to project their ideas, and those of their revolutionary role models, Mao Zedong and the Communist Party of China. This Marxist–Leninist circle was under the leadership of Isaak Iordanides and Yannis Hontzeas who oversaw all publishing projects of the group until the military coup of 1967. After the coup, the OMLE (Organisation of Marxists–Leninists of Greece), a clandestine group, was established by the members of the circle that escaped captivity led by Hontzeas. In 1974, after the collapse of the military dictatorship, OMLE re-established Istorikes Ekdoseis. In 1976 OMLE underwent a split. The majority, including Hontzeas, formed the KKE (M-L) (Communist Party of Greece (Marxist–Leninist)) keeping Istorikes Ekdoseis as its publishing arm. The minority led by Iordanides formed the M-L KKE (Marxist–Leninist Communist Party of Greece). By the end of the 1970s, extra-parliamentary formations of the Left had undergone an identity crisis and by the early 1980s, most had disintegrated. One of the difficulties faced in terms of archival research is tied to this disintegration due to which the fate of most of the archives, concerning both political publishing ventures and the political groups linked to many of the publishing projects, remain unknown.

Archival research has been used to reconstruct the universe of Istorikes Ekdoseis. Yet the fact that only fractions have been traced of an archive that, in all likelihood, was not that organised in the first place, means it was

far from adequate to the task of offering a clear view of the processes and transformations of either *Istorikes Ekdoseis* or the field itself. According to oral testimony from Roza Economou, a cadre of *Istorikes Ekdoseis* and *Anagennisi* [Renaissance], the monthly review it published from October 1964 until the April 1967,⁹ the archive of the pre-junta (1963–1967) period that comprises the largest part of *Istorikes Ekdoseis*' publishing history, was shredded. This was the handiwork of Economou, who, along with Panagiotis Kyriazis and Yiannis Hontzeas, destroyed the archive on 21 April 1967—the day of the colonels' coup—to prevent the civilian police from capturing it. What remains of the *Istorikes Ekdoseis* archive, and those of *Anagennisi* and the fraternal *Laikos Dromos* [*People's Road*] newspaper, now belongs to the collections of the ASKI in Athens.

Folder 483.7 of the AKSI collection contains the remainder of *Istorikes Ekdoseis* (1963–1967) correspondence, documents concerning the finances of the publications, statements that designated representatives of *Istorikes Ekdoseis* in other cities, and other documents that cannot be categorised. The archive seems to have been well organised, but at the same time, its creators had been very casual in recording the names of their affiliates. Surnames, apart from those of Hontzeas or Iordanides, were almost never used although there are numerous first-name-basis references, probably as a precaution in case the archive fell into the hands of the state, as indeed happened. Of course, this is a mere assumption, one that perhaps naturally arises when working with archival remainders, since it is certain that documents that could incriminate people affiliated with *Istorikes Ekdoseis* existed and were destroyed. The majority of the correspondence concerns publishers and suppliers abroad, primarily Guozi Shudian¹⁰—the official Chinese state distribution channel for all state literature,¹¹ established in

9. Roza Economou, interview with the author, Athens, 16 February 2012.

10. This is generally translated as China Publications Centre although it literally means "international bookstore". See Audrey Donnithorne, *China's Economic System*, 5th ed. (Routledge: London, 2008), 325.

11. The most significant of which were publications by the FLP in Beijing, the *Peking Review* and the newsfeed of Xinhua, the New China News Agency. See Christos Mais, "The Marxist–Leninist Publishing Field in Greece During the 1960s–1970s" (master's thesis, Leiden University, 2009), 14–17.

December 1949. Another belongs to a reader who wanted to place an order.

Before proceeding with *Istorikes Ekdoseis*, we will elaborate both the Chinese policy regarding the foreign press and the use of press and publishing during the *long sixties* within the international revolutionary movements. To do so, extensive use is made of the digitised archive of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Background Reports and the Open Society Archives based at the Central European University in Budapest. This exceptional digitisation project has made it possible to trace and retrieve a number of documents, especially from the late 1950s and the 1960s, related to the distribution and dissemination of communist literature worldwide. One cannot fully comprehend the political publishing field if the global aspect is neglected. Various political trends developed a sense of universality, both in terms of beliefs but also of the movements that championed them.¹² The exchange of literature—translations, hosting articles or publishing works produced by comrades from all around the world—between “true believers” in different countries was a prevalent practice at the time, and in reality, it was nothing but the publishing embodiment of the perception of being part of a global revolutionary project.

Beyond the need to address this issue in terms of the global perspective of the political publishing field, there is another significant element here. During its first period, as it will be further analysed in Chapter 4, *Istorikes Ekdoseis*’ publishing programme was heavily based on translations of works produced by China’s Foreign Languages Press (FLP), mainly provided by Guozi Shudian. According to the archival remainders, there were some plans—or thoughts at least—to produce other publications until the 21 April 1967 coup. In reality, however, all volumes but one—probably the last title published—were translated works of Chinese texts, mainly Mao Zedong’s works. For this reason, its rivals often characterised the political group behind *Istorikes Ekdoseis* as Sinophile.

The publishing project, as we will take up in further detail a little later, served as the primary political and organisational platform of the so-called

12. This was very common in political trends like Soviet communism, Maoism, Trotskyism, etc.

anti-revisionists in Greece. In brief, anti-revisionism was a political term used by those aligned primarily with the Communist Party of China (CPC) and, secondly, with the Albanian Labour Party during the Sino–Soviet split from 1963 onwards. Thus, the production and dissemination of Chinese political literature were crucial during this period, for both the Chinese and the Greek anti-revisionists.

At the onset of the military dictatorship (1967–1974), the publishing activity of this Greek Marxist–Leninist circle abruptly ceased. Some members were imprisoned and then exiled; others fled to Europe or went underground. The offices where they housed their publishing activity were ransacked by the regime and the remaining stock of titles and the archive confiscated. The group based in Greece that had gone underground initiated a mimeographed bulletin (and later a mimeographed newspaper), while its counterpart in Europe published bulletins, a monthly review and later a monthly newspaper, along with the occasional publication of pamphlets.¹³

A single folder has been salvaged from the Metapolitefsi period—i.e., from the fall of the military dictatorship in 1974 until the dissolution of the Communist Party of Greece (Marxist–Leninist) [KKE (M–L)] (the political force behind *Istorikes Ekdoseis*) in 1976. Also recovered are a number of films and manuscripts (both published and unpublished), including those forthcoming editions that remained unpublished due to the party’s liquidation. The folder contains correspondence and copyright contracts with foreign publishers, a few handwritten notes related either to timeframes concerning translations or publishing costs for planned forthcoming editions, plus a few notes regarding revenues from sales due to be collected by party branches based in small cities nationwide. To the best of my knowledge,

13. The underground group OMLE [Organosi Marxiston–Leniniston Elladas (Organisation of Marxists–Leninists of Greece)] published the *Information Bulletin of the OMLE* and the newspaper *Proletariaki Simea* [*Proletarian Flag*]. Its European counterpart, AMEE [Agonistiko Metopo Ellinon Eksoterikou (Militant Front of Greeks Abroad)], published different bulletins in each country in which it was active (i.e., Italy, Germany and France) and the monthly review *Laikos Dromos* and later on the monthly newspaper *Laiki Enotita* [*People’s Unity*].

none of these archives has been used by other researchers or published in other research until now.¹⁴

But even if a complete archive had been recovered, it would still be inadequate for a full reconstruction of the publishing project. In the archives of any mainstream (in terms of operations) publishing firm—be it trade, academic or otherwise—what you find is most likely what it appears to be. In our case, however, surfaces can be deceiving. As we will see in more detail as we proceed, the names of owners or shareholders and the details of tax returns are certainly there to be found. However, in reality, these served as nothing more than an obligatory *facade of legality*, necessary for the venture to function. Shareholders and owners were nothing more than trusted comrades-in-arms, and no profit was divided among individuals, since even where a profit existed, it remained within the political and publishing collective. All the information, or clarifications regarding the archival material—as well what is needed to fill the gaps where such material is missing—would not be recoverable were it not for the extensive use of oral history. The latter also allowed me to develop an idea of the audience and readership of the publications since this information could not be acquired any other way.

The internet and social media have proved to be crucial sources. During the past few years, numerous digital archives related to this research have been created, the most important of which is the Encyclopaedia of Anti-Revisionism Online (EROL). This forms part of the Marxists Internet Archive (MIA),¹⁵ as well as digital libraries initiated by Greek Marxist–Leninist groups and websites/blogs affiliated with or related to them.¹⁶ Primary doc-

14. The only use of the ASKI archives in relation to Istorikes Ekdoseis until now has been in Christos Mais, “E ekdotiki drastiriotita os meso politikis stratefsis ke sigrotis taftotitas: O ekdotikos ikos ‘Istorikes Ekdoseis’” [Publishing Activity as a Means of Political Commitment and Identity Formation: ‘Istorikes Ekdoseis’ Publishing House, 1963–1967], *Archeiotaksio 14* (October 2012), 66–79 [in Greek].

15. See <http://marxists.org/history/erol/erol.htm>, accessed 29 October 2014.

16. Morfotikes Ekdoseis [Educational Press], the publishing branch of the Marxist–Leninist Party of Greece (M–L KKE), initiated a digitisation process as a tribute to the fiftieth anniversary of the launch of the *Anagenisi* review. The digital library can be found at <http://morfotikesekdoseis.gr/?q=biblia-pdf>, accessed 10 October 2014. The blog “Antistasi stis geitonies” (“Resistance in the neighbourhoods”), affiliated with the Communist Party of Greece

uments and secondary literature, including personal accounts and memoirs of Marxist–Leninist or Maoist movements worldwide can be found there, providing researchers with the means to construct a comparative perspective. The dissolution of the revolutionary movements of the *long sixties* resulted in the dispersal of their members, not only across Greece but even worldwide. The internet has provided not only the possibility to track them down by searching the web or various databases. Indeed, since the Greek radical student movement was very strong in the Polytechnic Schools, the use of the online membership registry of the Technical Chamber of Greece proved very useful in tracing and contacting potential interviewees.¹⁷ The recent social media boom—and especially Facebook—offered the opportunity to contact former agents of the field or readers, and either interview them in the traditional fashion or engage in online discussions. In June 2014, a Facebook group named “I was in PPSP, PPEKT, PESP, PMSP [in Greek]”¹⁸ was formed, in time becoming a valuable source of material and recollections of that era. Engaging in such groups and discussions triggered a memory boost, forcing people to either write down part of their experiences or dig up their personal archives—or to be more accurate, what is left of them—scanning and uploading things either that they believe should be preserved or that fellow groupies have requested. The importance of these discussions—be they in Facebook groups or forums—lies in the fact that people have the sense of an informal chat among friends or comrades, which entails much less pressure than a one-on-one, on-the-record interview. This often leads to narrate anecdotes and experiences that may well be insignificant in a political sense but help us capture the atmosphere of the time.

The two chapters on *Istorikes Ekdoseis* are thus, in a way, the combi-

(Marxist–Leninist) [KKE(M–L)], has launched a digital library with documents of the Marxist–Leninist movement, including some that are related to *Istorikes Ekdoseis* and its political/publishing affiliates and counterparts. See <http://antigeitoniesbooks.blogspot.com>, accessed 10 October 2014.

17. See <http://teeserver.tee.gr/regdds/>, accessed 29 October 2014.

18. These were mass organisations of the KKE (M–L)) and of that political trend in general, dating from the mid-1960s until 1982.

nation of the core of the first two chapters of the dissertation; a historical narrative where publishing field theory is applied in order to reconstruct the field and at the same time determine its distinctive characteristics.

The conclusions that follow sum up the key arguments made and proven throughout the dissertation. These are:

- a) Political publishing in Greece during the *long sixties* constituted a distinctive publishing field.
- b) A fundamental characteristic of this field is the centrality of symbolic capital. This form of capital is the heart of not only every agent within the field but of the field itself. The decline of symbolic capital, as I will show throughout the dissertation, is closely intertwined with the decline of ideological and political currents at the time. This decline not only brought political publishers to their knees but also forced most of them to close down or migrate to other publishing fields, thereby turning them into relics of a once vivid and flourishing publishing space.
- c) Another fundamental characteristic differentiating this publishing field from trade publishing is the relative insignificance of economic capital. One may think that this is due to the very real dearth of financial resources available to the agents of the field. In reality, this scarcity of financial resources is not the reason for the insignificance of economic capital. This circumstance, instead, reflects the fact that the majority of the agents in the field did not enter publishing to make a profit nor were they driven by the profit motive in the publishing decisions they made. The main reason for this was political, rather than economic since publishing was seen and understood first and foremost as a political task or duty. This is true both of individual agents and publishing entities. Publishing entities recruited individuals based on their political commitment; their skills (writing, editing, marketing and so on) were a secondary concern if they were even considered at all. Since individuals were driven to the field by a sense of political duty, they took up the work even when not particularly suited to it and with little concern for the monetary compensation.

- d) The political publishing field reflects the underlying sociality of space. The majority of the field's agents were concentrated in central city locations, close to the social spaces frequented by the youth, mainly student, target audience (i.e., university faculties, bars and cafes).