



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

CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Framework

The last chapter was largely empirical in nature, laying out the field in terms of a range of important particularities—its spatiality, its readership and the culture and technologies that shaped it over the course of the *long sixties* (and indeed beyond). As Chapter 1 laid out, political publishing during the Greek *long sixties* was highly complex and included a wide range of publishing activities and ventures, and sought to sketch the main lines of the conceptual map, covering terms like “underground” and “alternative” press, with details of the examples of the time.

The present chapter turns to theory. It will present the dissertation’s overall theoretical framework of analysis, first focusing on the relationship between print media and radical politics. It then offers a detailed overview of field theory as it relates to publishing, and includes a theoretical exposition on the various forms of capital—understood in the Bourdieusian sense—including economic capital, social capital and symbolic capital. This overview will therefore take the form of a condensed literature review.

Print Media and Politics

The centrality of print communication in radical politics, especially in countries with authoritarian states, is essential for assessing their socio-political history. As Herbert Pimlott notes:

The history of radical working-class movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Europe and North America has always been intimately connected to print media and radical journalists and pamphleteers. Although extensive scholarly and activist literatures exist on the problems and potential, and the successes and failures of Marxist philosophy, ideology, political strategy and parties during the 20th century, one key area central to Marxist organisation and political strategy that has been largely overlooked by scholars, despite its importance to the success of any political movement, is communication. Despite the scholarly neglect, however, the importance of communication was noted by leading Marxists, such as V.I. Lenin and Leon Trotsky.²⁵¹

Apart from the aforementioned communist leaders, we must add that others, like the Italian Antonio Gramsci, who was highly interested in the issues of culture and hegemony, also wrote extensively on these issues.²⁵² In May 1901, an article written by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin titled “Where to Begin?” was published in *Iskra*, a newspaper.²⁵³ The article raised the issue of founding an all-Russian political newspaper as a necessity to “develop, deepen and extend” the political organisation that he and his comrades were keen to establish, further on stating that a pamphlet developing this issue would be soon produced.²⁵⁴ The newspaper, according to Lenin, would serve the dual purpose of feeding the need for agitation and spreading propaganda:

Never has the need been felt so acutely as today for reinforcing dispersed agitation in the form of individual action, local leaflets, pamphlets, etc., by means of generalised and systematic agitation that can only be conducted with the aid of the periodical press. It may be said without exaggeration that the frequency and regularity with which a newspaper is printed (and distributed) can serve

251. Herbert Pimlott, “Marxism’s ‘Communicative Crisis’? Mapping Debates over Leninist Print-Media Practices in the 20th Century”, *Communication Studies Faculty Publications* 5 (2006): 58, http://scholars.wlu.ca/coms_faculty/5, accessed 28 June 2018.

252. See David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, ed., *Antonio Gramsci: Selection from Cultural Writings*, 2nd ed. (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 2012).

253. *Iskra* (*The Spark* in Russian), was a newspaper produced by Russian socialist immigrants in Europe from 1900 to 1905. For more on *Iskra*, see Helen Rappaport, *Conspirator: Lenin in Exile* (New York: Basic Books, 2010), especially chapters 2–4.

254. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, “Where to Begin?” in *Lenin: Collected Works*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1961), 13–24, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1901/may/04.htm>, accessed 9 May 2015).

as a precise criterion of how well this cardinal and most essential sector of our militant activities is built up.²⁵⁵

Almost a year later, the pamphlet announced in the aforementioned article was published. *What is to Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement* by Lenin was published in Germany and remains one of his most popular works among Greek leftists. Party propaganda via print is not the sole issue expanded on in this pamphlet but is nevertheless a crucial one. In reality, a lot more was attributed to the party newspaper than being a propaganda medium; the newspaper is considered to be the collective organiser, the precondition for the organisational and political advancement.²⁵⁶ Although some voices raised within the circles of the Russian socialist émigrés argued that “neither an all-Russian newspaper, nor a whole series of popular leaflets, nor a mountain of proclamations can be the fundamental beginning of a militant organisation for a revolutionary moment [such as we now face]”,²⁵⁷ it was Lenin that prevailed. And ever since, (self)proclaimed Leninists worldwide have used this pamphlet as a guide for building a revolutionary group.

The Greek political publishing field consisted of multidimensional publishing activity including books—and also pamphlets—but more often monthly reviews and more occasionally weekly or monthly newspapers. All the above are different expressions of publishing groups that use different publishing mediums to fulfil different needs. Pamphlets and books are used to provide general theoretical works while articles in reviews combine more contemporary and specific theoretical and mainly political topics and issues. In cases where the political group expands and thus accumulates more capital (symbolic, human, and partially economic), it attempts to reach a wider audience in a more consistent fashion by publishing a newspaper as in the above directive of Lenin.

In our case, the interest solely focuses on anti-establishment publishing,

255. Ibid.

256. Lars T. Lih, *What is to Be Done? In Context* (Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2006).

257. Lars T. Lih, *What is to Be Done? In Context* (Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2006).

in contrast to similar activities conducted in an institutionalised fashion, which has been contextualised in other works.²⁵⁸ The aim of the present research is not to exclusively reconstruct and narrate a publishing history but to use publishing history to shed light on the ways publishing and reading work as a political and cultural practice. We can state the central question succinctly; as one of viewing print (publishing) culture as part of a broader political culture. To do so, a number of issues that are not met in conventional trade publishing must be addressed. The unconventional—in relation to trade publishing—principles and organisation of radical or anti-establishment publishing raise a series of questions in respect to its functions as well as to the logic behind it. Issues such as the selection of works for translation or publishing (often far from being a rational business decision), the division of labour—or the lack thereof—as well as which individuals would work in the political publishing ventures, were choices based more on the level of political commitment than on expertise. These choices are indicative of both the distance that divides the political publishing field from trade publishing as well as on the diversity of issues that will be analysed in order to reconstruct and present the internal logic of the political publishing field, the general aspects of which will be analysed in the following section of this dissertation.

Publishing and Theoretical Models

This dissertation is written in the context of field theory, which was conceptualised by Bourdieu (1984, 1993), and modified by Thompson (2005, 2008). Due to the distinctive nature of the publishing activity in question, the political press of the *long sixties* in Greece—particularly the dissident press—rarely, if ever, followed the norms of a trade publishing house. Thus, I have adopted an approach that elaborates those elements of publishing

258. For an indicative but not exhaustive presentation of this issue, see Thompson *Books in the digital age*; Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*; Giles Clark and Angus Phillips, *Inside Book Publishing*, 4th ed. (Oxon: Routledge, 2008); Albert N. Greco, *The Book Publishing Industry*, 2nd ed. (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations, 2005).

field theory that are consistent with—or may be adapted to—this particular case. This also reflects the aforementioned statement on theory as a tool rather than a closed framework within which the narrative is confined.

Although publishing models such as the publishing chain may partially fit non-mainstream or unconventional publishing—from underground press to fanzines—they can not assist in unravelling the specifics of these publishing fields. The main issue is that while the publishing models developed have a certain rational or logic concerning the series of processes taking place, the unconventionality of the field in question is precisely the absence of this publishing logic.

Bourdieu schematised the field of cultural production as an analytical model in which there is a dialectic relation between the field—namely, the environment in which cultural production, in our case publishing, takes place—and the individual agents, which Bourdieu conceptualised as *habitus*.²⁵⁹ This relation between the agents and the field allows a researcher to move beyond a structuralist approach, as is the case for the publishing chain, or a strictly Marxian approach, in which culture—and thus cultural production and publishing—is perceived within a scheme of base and superstructure, specifically as part of the latter.²⁶⁰ In structuralism, the relations between the various agents that hold positions within the publishing procedure in, say, the publishing chain (editor, proofreader, designer, etc) are significant while the agents themselves, as occupants of the various positions of the chain, are less important or insignificant.²⁶¹ Theories and models that propose the use of a concrete structure often overlook the importance of the content and almost exclusively focus on the form of the structure.

Furthermore, it is not uncommon for these theories to ignore the so-

259. Regarding the concepts of the field and the habitus, see the works of Bourdieu, *Cultural Production* and *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

260. For an overview of publishing chain theory, see Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 20–26. In reality, this theory is problematic due to the fact that its structuralism—that is, its representation of publishing as a sum of fixed, inelastic activities as if it were a Ford assembly line—is far from publishing reality.

261. On structure and structuralism, see Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 301–308

cio-economic and political conditions within which the structure functions. In models such as the publishing chain—and even though a level of complexity and interplay among the different actors are recognised—the logic of the model is rather linear.²⁶² As already mentioned, formalist approaches do not take into account the content of the end products (i.e., book titles), and perceive publishers choices about what content to include as driven entirely by the motive to turn a profit.²⁶³ Another reason such a model would be inapt in our case relates to similar structures as a whole. Dissident press publishing is conducted in an out-of-the-box fashion, both due to resource limitations and the fact that the publishing ventures of the dissident press publishing field do not—on principle—correspond to the value framework or to the norms of trade publishing.

Moreover, a general property of structuralist models is their ahistoricism. In the case of dissident publishing, history played a dominant role in its birth. Thus, a framework that sets aside or underestimates the historical narrative is not fit for purpose.

On the other hand, an analytical or theoretical model that takes a marxist perspective is most probably unable to move beyond the base and superstructure scheme, despite possible differentiation among these theories.²⁶⁴ A rather common perception of the base and superstructure dialectic has been given by Stalin, a key figure for the Marxist–Leninist movement:²⁶⁵

The base is the economic structure of society at the given stage of its develop-

262. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 21–22.

263. *Ibid.*, 22.

264. Raymond Williams is a shining example of a non-deterministic Marxian perspective on culture. Nevertheless, the framework he provides—which can be described as cultural materialism—focuses on the socio-political aspects of culture but does not provide a tool that can adequately contribute to assessing political publishing in itself. In the case under examination, the socio-political factors that lead to the rise and fall of the field and that might be explained through Williams' work are equally important to the field itself. Marxian analysis cannot assist in the breakdown of the political publishing as a field distinctive from other publishing activities, structured by its own driving forces, guided by its own specific rationale, and with its own unique internal hierarchy in respect to the importance and categorisation of the different forms of capital.

265. During the *long sixties*, Marxism-Leninism was used by groups that were affiliated or were ideologically and politically close to Maoist China.

ment. The superstructure is the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and the political, legal and other institutions corresponding to them. Every base has its own corresponding superstructure. [...] If the base changes or is eliminated, then, following this, its superstructure changes or is eliminated; if a new base arises, then, following this, a superstructure arises corresponding to it. [...] Further, the superstructure is a product of the base, but this by no means implies that it merely reflects the base, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its base, to the fate of the classes, to the character of the system. On the contrary, having come into being, it becomes an exceedingly active force, actively assisting its base to take shape and consolidate itself, and doing its utmost to help the new system to finish off and eliminate the old base and the old classes.²⁶⁶

It is rather evident that within this spectrum—and although a level of autonomy is indeed recognised—cultural production is bound by the economic conditions within which it occurs. In other words, according to this assessment, in the age of capitalism, cultural production is doomed or restricted, at least, to a capitalist form. As we will see further along, one of the main characteristics of this publishing field was that economic capital and the maximisation of profit—two key elements of the capitalist mode of production—played the least significant role. This does not mean that no profitable publishing ventures have existed. Regardless of the actual financial conditions, profit and economic capital were simply not a priority, while other forms—especially symbolic capital—were.

The Frankfurt School also focused on issues of art and (mass) culture. Although scholars of this circle of critical theorists provided an insight in different aspects of the cultural production, mass culture and the culture industry, a general implementation of these theories is not possible for the publishing field in question and the Greek book industry in general at the time. The reason for this is the incompatibility between the reality of the Greek book market during the time under investigation and the notions of mass culture or culture industry. Despite print being categorised as mass media, Greek publishing had always been marginal, and political press and

266. J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1950), Marxists Archive Online, accessed 12 January 2013, <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1950/jun/20.htm>.

publishing were and still are even more marginal. Thus, critical theory's mass media criticism cannot be implemented productively in a non-mass publishing field.

Nevertheless, some aspects, as found in the work of Walter Benjamin and Theodor Adorno, allow us to get a better understanding of some dimensions of the field—namely, its aesthetics and the characteristics of its readership.²⁶⁷

The Political Publishing Field

In the following paragraphs, I will try to illustrate the key aspects of the political publishing field. To demonstrate this, where necessary I will further refer to Thompson's adaptation of Bourdieu's field theory before proceeding to my own variant, needed for the political publishing field.

In *Merchants of Culture*, Thompson gives us several reasons to adopt field theory to assess the publishing world.²⁶⁸ First, it enables us to see the publishing world as the sum of different worlds with distinctive characteristics, rather than as a unified domain. We can thus focus on a distinctive publishing field—such as the political one—without needing to make clarifications of what assessments can or cannot be generalised and which characteristics are shared with other fields (or not) and why. In other words, when we describe one particular publishing field, we identify its core features and characteristics. These may or may not apply to other publishing fields. Thus, any framework or theory developed for political publishing must be assessed for relevance and not used uncritically to analyse all areas of publishing. Researchers looking at other fields of publishing will surely

267. Walter Benjamin's concept of *aura* will be used while analysing the aesthetics of the political publishing field. Theodor Adorno's concept of *pseudo-culture* may be able to interpret, at least partially, the shift in the political publishing fields' readership from the 1980s onwards to non-political publishing. See Robert W. Witkin, *Adorno in Popular Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 16–32; Theodor W. Adorno, "Theory of Pseudo-Culture (1959)", *Telos* 95 (Spring 1993), 15–38.

268. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 4–5.

find *some* aspects salient and directly applicable—but will also, as I have done with Thomson, need to engage in critical borrowing and modification.

The second reason is that the field theory provides a framework that allows us to move beyond specific publishing firms or agents to assess publishing in terms of the relations developed among the agents and organisations of the field. Field theory presupposes that there are dynamics of the field and thus an action taken by an agent or an organisation should be addressed in the context of the field as a whole and not in an isolated manner. The third reason is that the notion of the field stresses the fact that—apart from the interdependence among agents and organisations referred to above—there is also a dependence between the capacity of an agent or organisation in the field to act and the amount of the different forms of capital it possesses. The five forms of capital—economic, human, social, intellectual and symbolic—will be analysed further below.

According to Thompson, the publishing field can be conceptualised as a space of social positions occupied by different agents and publishing organisations.²⁶⁹ These positions depend on the resources available to the agents and organisations or to what Bourdieu refers to as forms of capital. Thompson's first assessment of the publishing field, *Books in the Digital Age*, included four forms of capital—economic, human, intellectual and symbolic. In later works, he added a fifth—social capital.²⁷⁰ These five forms of capital are the key resources for publishing organisations or agents in the publishing field. I must stress that this is an assessment in regard to the general publishing field and thus the significance of each form of capital may vary from one field to another and the hierarchy among the different forms of capital may vary.

Economic Capital

According to Thompson, “economic capital is the accumulated financial

269. For Thompson's general analysis of the publishing field, see Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 30–46; Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 3–14.

270. For Thompson's assessment of the forms of capital within the publishing field, see *Books in the Digital Age*, 30–37; Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 5–11.

resources” that are available to a publisher. These resources include “stock and plant as well as capital reserves”. The latter may be directly available to the publisher or indirectly through his or her capacity to raise additional finance from either individuals or institutions.²⁷¹ While the accumulation of economic capital is a key variable while discussing the trade publishing field this—as I will present—is almost insignificant in the political publishing field and in other niche publishing fields, such as poetry.²⁷² This by no means implies that, in the aforementioned fields, the various publishing organisations and agents are indifferent to economic resources. Nevertheless, economic capital is not the determining factor with respect to their choices. On the contrary, choices that would most probably lead to losses rather than profits are made in full consciousness.

Thus, while in the trade publishing field the selection of titles to be published is more likely to follow economic rules—including delivering an economic return on funds invested, maximising profit or minimising risk-taking—in the political publishing field, the choices are often based on the desire to make a political or ideological statement. The latter choice should be seen as a means of accumulating symbolic capital. The choice of publishing a title written by a certain political figure or a foreign publisher that is related to a political organisation or an ideological current reflects an interest in accumulating prestige and creating a certain status for the publisher, even if it is an economically unorthodox or risky choice.

271. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 30–31.

272. It could be contended that this argument shares—or at least shared—validity in regard to university presses (i.e., publishing a title without expecting profit) since they are primarily concerned in disseminating knowledge and certifying a researcher’s or a research team’s legitimacy or scholarly value through publishing. There are two reasons this argument is only partially valid. The first is related to the shift within the field towards profit-making titles. The most important reason, which consequently led to the aforementioned shift, has to do with the ability to raise funding from institutions which is considered to be part of what Thompson frames as economic capital. The reason that university presses once had little concern for profits was that they could rely on subsidies from their universities. As these have been pulled back, the field’s internal logic has been reoriented towards profit-making. See Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 81–83, 108–109.

Human Capital

Similarly, individuals perform as agents of the political publishing field without pursuing either a career or profits—although the latter may be achieved unintentionally.²⁷³ This results in the accumulation of human capital that is not always skilled but at the same time is eager to contribute to the publishing organisation. The choice of low-skilled agents consequently leads to published materials of poor quality in respect to either form (as in poor design and layout) or content (as in poor translations and errata that often make the text incomprehensible), and frequently both.

Some interviewees blamed the low quality of human capital accumulated on the lack of economic capital, especially regarding the design and layout of publications. Limited economic resources meant organisations could not hire professional graphic designers, translators, editors or proof-readers, a reality faced by political publishing organisations on a regular basis.²⁷⁴ Yet, despite often having the opportunity to allocate human capital to the publishing process to improve quality, this did not occur. In the case of the publishing arms of political groups, it was not uncommon to have in their ranks members with the necessary skills. Students and graduates of philology, i.e., Greek literature studies, were available to assist in copy-editing and proofreading manuscripts, while fine arts students or even architects could help with graphic design. Instead, not only was the allocated staff—either assisting as volunteers or full-time—limited but it often lacked anything approaching the skills that a successful agent in a publishing field would require.

I want to provide some examples of the above. The publishing house Is-

273. My empirical research regarding contemporary political publishing organisations in Greece indicated that there is a continuity of agents eschewing profit as well as offering services at much lower rates than those offered in the trade publishing field.

274. Isaak Iordanides, Roza Economou, Tasos Parkosides and Loukas Axelos in interviews with the author referred to the fact that they had to strive hard in order for their publishing organisations to function. The first two interviewees mentioned the first period of *Istorikes Ekdoseis* (1963–1967), the third commented on the second period (1974–1981) and the last one referred to the political publishing house *Stochastis* during the years of the military dictatorship. Axelos also referred to other political publishers functioning during the same period of time and stated that they were all in a similar financial position.

torikes Ekdoseis, which will be presented in much greater detail in Chapter 4, was founded in 1963 by four individuals, only one of whom had worked professionally in the field, as a door-to-door bookseller. Two of them occasionally translated or proofread and the last was an accountant. Tasos Parkosides, a geologist, was in charge of Istorikes Ekdoseis from 1974 until 1981. Dionysis Kounades, a physics student, directed the Istorikes Ekdoseis bookstore from 1974 onwards. Yorgos Kotanides, a veterinary school drop-out and actor, was in charge of the publishing house Na Ipiretουμε Ton Lao [To Serve The People], the publishing branch of the Revolutionary Communist Movement of Greece or EKKE.

The translators used by these publishing groups are of particular interest. While they often disregarded the significance of form, at the same time, they stressed the significance of content. These publications were mostly translations of foreign works and so translating should have been a high priority. However, the vast majority of the translators used by the publishing branches of political groups did not practise translation outside or after their political engagement. In general, these agents were not even from a humanities or social sciences background, leaving them without even a modest connection between their studies and their practice.

The only real grounding of their position as agents within the political publishing field is the fact that they were all politically active at the time they translated. Nor did any have a family background in the field, at least not in general.²⁷⁵ The hierarchisation regarding the human capital accumulated was not based on the quality of their skills but rather their level of political commitment, even though this sometimes jeopardised the quality of political publishing outcomes.

Intellectual Capital

Another form of capital is intellectual capital, that is, the intellectual property possessed by a publisher. While discussing biogenetics, the acclaimed

275. The only exception I was able to trace is Thomas Kakoulidis, the son of a bookseller and publisher, who was involved with political publishing and then continued as a trade bookseller and publisher until his retirement a few years ago.

philosopher Slavoj Žižek argued about “the inappropriateness of private property for the so-called ‘intellectual property’” and furthermore made a parallel with Napster²⁷⁶ to show how the free circulation of music collides with the logic of profit.²⁷⁷ In an ironic twist of fate, Žižek’s work was one of the reasons the open-access online library aaaarg.org was taken down after a copyright controversy between the library and Verso Books, the “largest independent, radical publishing house in the English-speaking world”.²⁷⁸ Similar controversies occurred between the publisher Lawrence & Wishart—the website of which claims it is an “independent radical publisher”—and the Marxist Internet Archive, an online, open-access library of Marxist texts.²⁷⁹ While intellectual capital is very significant today, even for political publishing presses, it was rather unimportant during the *long sixties*, at least as far as Greece is concerned.

Although there were a few cases of copyright controversy during the Greek *long sixties*—in general, but especially in political publishing—these were the exception and not the rule. The vast majority of copyright lawsuits were related to trade publishing houses that published political books.²⁸⁰

276. Napster was a very popular peer-to-peer music file sharing internet service of the late 1990s that was shut down during the early 2000s after a number of lawsuits brought by musicians and record companies, the first of which came from the heavy metal band Metallica.

277. Slavoj Žižek, “Censorship Today: Violence, or Ecology as a New Opium for the Masses”, accessed 23 May 2016, <http://www.lacan.com/zizecology1.htm>.

278. For a defence of aaaarg.org, see “Deconstructing Verso: A Brief Word on the Pseudo-Leftist Publisher”, accessed 23 May 2016, <http://ebookcollective.tumblr.com/post/31062648947/deconstructing-verso-a-brief-word-on-the>. For a defence of Verso, see Stuart Elden’s “Ill-informed critique of Verso”, accessed 23 May 2016, <https://progressivegeographies.com/2012/10/20/ill-informed-critique-of-verso>. Information on Verso Books can be found at <https://www.versobooks.com/pg/about-verso>, accessed 23 May 2016.

279. On the controversy between Lawrence & Wishart and the Marxist Internet Archive, see Dylan Love, “A Publishing Company is Enforcing a Copyright on the Works of Marx and Engels and People are Freaking Out”, *Business Insider*, 29 April 2014, accessed 23 May 2016, <http://www.businessinsider.com/lawrence-and-wishart-copyright-on-marx-and-engels-collected-works-2014-4>.

280. Fifteen cases regarding intellectual property controversies during the *long sixties* were traced in the archives of the trade publisher Kalvos, which had a political orientation even though its team was not affiliated with any political party. These cases were connected to Greek authors and mainly with novelists trying to break their contracts at the end of the *long*

The most intriguing case of copyright infringement within the Greek political publishing field took place during the colonels' dictatorship. One of the first political publishing groups that appeared during the period of the junta was *Nei Stochi* [New Goals].²⁸¹ This group was the legal publishing branch of the small, underground Trotskyite group *Kommounistikos Epanastatikos Syndesmos*, under the leadership of Thimios Papanikolaou.²⁸² In 1970, *Nei Stochi* began publishing books and a year later it extended its activities by publishing an eponymous monthly review, subtitled *Miniea Ekdosi Economicon Kai Kenonikon Meleton* [*Monthly Edition of Economic and Social Studies*]. The backbone of its book list was reproduced, pre-dictatorship Trotskyite publications of either known Greek Trotskyite figures of the interwar years, such as Pantelis Pouliopoulos, or translations—mostly of works by Leon Trotsky and Ernest Mandel.

The review published nine issues, one of which was a double, from 1971 until 1972. In issue three, there are articles against the suppression of political publishing. While the first two referred to suppression by the regime, the last one had a rather distinctive aspect.²⁸³ The first article of issue 10 (July 1972) is entitled “E kratiki ke e idiotiki astinomefsi ton marxistikon

sixties, when fiction started dominating the Greek book market. Folder 1, Subfolders 6 and 7, Kalvos Archive, ASKI, Athens.

281. Its first books appeared under the name *Stochi* [Goals] and later became *Nei Stochi*.

282. *Epanastatikos Kommounistikos Syndesmos* [Revolutionary Communist Link]. Giorgos Alexatos, *Historical Dictionary of the Labour Movement*, 2nd ed. (Athens: Geitonies tou Kosmou, 2008), 256 [in Greek].

283. In issue 5 (November 1971) the last article of the review was entitled “Tha parthoun metra enanta sto aristero vivlio?” [Will There Be Measures Against Left-Wing Books?] (pp 110–112). This, in reality, was a mere compilation of three texts published in the newspapers of the time—an article, a comment and a letter—against the circulation of left-wing books. The first article of the next issue (6–7: January 1972) was entitled “E skotadistiki ekstratia enantia sto marxistiko vivlio” [The Obscurantist Campaign Against the Marxist Book] (pp 5–7). This two-page article, accompanied by a page of caricatures against censorship, was in a sense a continuation of the previous one. After referring to passages used in issue 5, it cited some additional excerpts from newly published articles from the press. The author, probably Thimios Papanikolaou himself, informed readers that this “orchestrated obscurantist campaign” (p. 6) had been combined with the fact that the police in Thessaloniki pressured a number of bookstore owners to withdraw the legally circulated copies published by *Neoi Stochoi* from their showcases. He stated how the publishing house was independent, unaffiliated with political

kimenon” [“The state and private policing of Marxist texts”]. The article starts with a short overview of the difficulties that Greek left-wing publishers were up against, especially at that moment in time. It then moved on to provide a description of what it referred to as “private book policing”. In particular, it presents a rather odd case where the spouses of leading figures of the Greek interwar communist movement were plaintiffs against a left-wing publisher for republishing their spouses’ translations:

Three ladies (Mrs Ekaterini Flessa-Lili, on behalf of her husband; Mrs Filisia, widow of P. Pouliopoulos; and Mrs Zacharenia, widow of G. Doumas) are judicially persecuting the Neoi Stochoi editions for the photo-reproduction of translations or original works by L. Trotsky, K. Marx, P. Pouliopoulos, claiming such a publishing act is illegal and punishable and demanding that the copies [of these texts] be withdrawn and confiscated. All three plaintiffs rejected reasonable financial compensation, which Neoi Stochoi proposed and was willing to pay, for the intellectual property rights of publishing books that were until then out of print or hard to find. This rejection, regardless of the plaintiff’s pretexts, more or less shows their disposition for obstructing the circulation of the aforementioned texts, which are the legacy of the labour movement and not the private “intellectual property” of some ladies. How could K. Marx imagine that the latest Greek edition of his *Critique of Political Economy* would be banned by the two translators’ widows; or L. Trotsky imagine that his works were requested to be confiscated by their translators’ relatives; or P. Pouliopoulos imagine that his own widow would solicit the confiscation of his work *Democratic or Socialist Revolution in Greece* (which was indeed dedicated to “the Greek communist youth for its struggles, for its communist enlightenment, of which the party was bereft”)? On our behalf, we report to the progressive readership and stigmatise these particular incidents as manifestations of a spiteful and obscurantist attitude.²⁸⁴

The aforementioned case was unique, and thus far from being the norm. It is most likely that the reasons for the legal actions of the relatives of the translators against the publishing group were political and not financially driven. This assumption is made on the basis that the publishing group had

parties, and that its publications comprised works that are freely published and circulated in the Western world.

284. “E kratiki ke e idiotiki astinomefsi ton marxistikon kimenon”, *Nei Stochi*, 10 (July 1972), 4–5.

asserted that the copyright owners had not accepted the offer of financial compensation. In addition, the latter did not sell the rights to any other publishers, suggesting that the Neoi Stochoi offer was not turned down on account of a better offer.²⁸⁵

The fact that publishing groups were not able to accumulate intellectual capital in terms of acquiring publishing rights for specific titles and authors does not mean that there were not such attempts. According to Loukas Axelos, one of the main publishers of Antonio Gramsci's works, an incident occurred during the colonels' dictatorship. While Gramsci's works were published by several different publishers during the military dictatorship, a newly arrived publisher from Italy claimed she had the copyrights and all other publishers should withdraw their editions. After communicating with the Gramsci Institute in Italy, Axelos was notified that they had never issued such a decision and anybody willing to publish Gramsci's works was more than free to do so. Evidently, had this bluff succeeded this new venture would have been able to establish a brand name as a *Gramscian* publisher.²⁸⁶

The collapse of the dictatorship put an end to the collaborative spirit among publishers, who more or less shared the same ideals and anti-authoritarian spirit. This led to the gradual acquisition of copyrights by publishers although even today there are a number of cases where copyrights are not acquired.²⁸⁷

285. I was not able to arrange an interview with Thimios Papanikolaou, despite the fact I tried to reach him on several occasions via email. When asked, Loukas Axelos, of Stochastis publishing house—who was active in publishing from 1969—confirmed the fact that this case of copyright infringement should not be seen as such, but as a case of a political conflict among the two parties. Loukas Axelos, interview with the author, 13 September 2013.

286. Gramsci's works were published on the personal initiative of several political prisoners during the dictatorship without any prior discussion among them. The fact that they were published by different publishers was more than a mere reflection of different translators addressing their proposal for publishing the works they published to different publishers. There had been cases where works of Gramsci were sent to publishers, who—due to a lack of economic capital—passed the proposal to other publishers until one was found that was willing and able to proceed with the publication. Loukas Axelos, interview with the author, 13 September 2013.

287. In 2008, while working for a publishing house, it came to my attention that a number of publishers would still not acquire copyrights for all the works they translated and published.

Istorikes Ekdoseis did not acquire any copyrights for the vast majority of the works it published during its two periods of operation: 1963–1967 and 1974–1981. This can be easily explained for the period 1963–1967, since all their book lists with the exception of one title were made up of translations of FLP’s publications, which were not bound by copyright restrictions.²⁸⁸ According to Isaak Jordanides, a co-founder of Istorikes Ekdoseis, they notified the Chinese official book exporter, Guozi Shudian, which supplied the primary texts that Istorikes Ekdoseis translated for the Greek market, but this was a mere informational act and not a copyright request.²⁸⁹

These findings are confirmed by interviews with people involved in the political publishing field. These field agents stated that copyright acquisition was never a priority nor a precondition for translating and publishing a book.²⁹⁰ In the post-dictatorship era, we often come across documentation of copyright acquisition. This correspondence between Greek publishers and their foreign counterparts or contracts for translation and publishing rights of foreign works provide no evidence that political publishers were striving to accumulate intellectual capital. The fact that the majority of political publishing houses in Greece were heavily geared towards publishing translations, rather than publishing Greek writers, meant that the purchase of subsidiary rights was a rarity and intellectual capital failed to accumulate.

Social Capital

Social capital is “the network of contacts and relationships that an individual or organization has built up over time”.²⁹¹ Given the absence of intel-

288. China had no copyright legislation during the *long sixties*. Mais, “Marxist–Leninist Publishing Field” 19.

289. For Guozi Shudian, see Mais, “Marxist–Leninist Publishing Field”, 17–19; Isaak Jordanides, interview with the author, 28 September 2012.

290. Loukas Axelos, interviews with the author, 8 March 2013; 13 September 2013; Yorgos Hatzopoulos, interviews with the author, 29 November 2012, 28 September 2013; Yorgos Garbis, interview with the author, 13 June 2013; Vasilis Tomanas, interview with the author, 17 July 2013.

291. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 6.

lectual capital in the form of a legal entitlement (e.g. copyright) to publish specific titles, social capital has increased importance within the political publishing field. These ties and relationships were often built by the political groups behind publishing houses, but there have been cases where the ties between publishing branches preceded the strictly political affiliation.

Istorikes Ekdoseis developed relations with the Chinese state publishing apparatus—through Guozi Shudian, China’s book and press exporter—long before a political group was officially built by its cadres and even longer before this political group formed any official ties with the CPC.²⁹² In July 1980, the then head of Istorikes Ekdoseis, Tasos Parkosides, wrote a letter to the Italian trade publisher and leftist author Giorgio Bertani, who printed a lot of left-wing works. According to the historian Antonio Scalia, Bertani was “very much popularising the so-called Italian ‘season of the movements’ (1967–1977), but it later faded from the scene”.²⁹³ Bertani was the publisher of Dario Fo and Franka Rame, a married couple who were both authors, playwrights, actors and activists.

TRANSFORMING POLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS INTO SOCIAL CAPITAL

In the remainders of the Istorikes Ekdoseis archive from 1974, correspondence with publishers and contracts can be found, mainly with Italian publishers and literary agents. Interestingly, there is a distinction between political and trade publishers regarding the approach. Tasos Parkosides, head of Istorikes Ekdoseis at the time, undersigned two letters to the leftist

292. Remainders of the correspondence between Istorikes Ekdoseis and Guozi Shudian can be found in ASKI in Athens and date back to August 1964. The first unofficial visit of a cadre of Istorikes Ekdoseis to China was in late 1966, and the first official visit by the Organisation of Marxists–Leninists of Greece—which was formed out of members of Istorikes Ekdoseis—took place ten years after the beginning of this publishing relationship, in 1974. Folder 483.7, EDA Archive, ASKI; Isaak Iordanides, interviews with the author, 23 February 2012, 28 September 2012.

On the visit to China in 1974, see Polydoros Danielidis, *O Polydoros thimate...* [Polydoros Remembers] (Athens: Istorikes Ekdoseis, 1990), 293; Stelios Manousakas, interview with the author, 21 May 2011.

293. Antonio Scalia, email correspondence with the author, 6–11 June 2016.

publisher Bertani Editore Verona and the trade publisher Giulio Einaudi Editore, on 6 and 7 July 1980, respectively.²⁹⁴ Both letters were written as inquiries about the intentions of Istorikes Ekdoseis to acquire permission, as in copyrights, to translate and publish works of Dario Fo in Greek. The letter to Bertani Editore Verona began with “Cari compagni” and ended with “I miei piu fraterni saluti militanti”—that is, “Dear comrades” and “My most fraternal militant greetings” respectively, in Italian. The letter to the trade publisher was structured in a formal manner, starting with “Egregi Signori” and ended with “Cordiali saluti”, that is, “Dear Sirs” and “Yours sincerely” respectively, in Italian.²⁹⁵

In the former, there is an attempt to build a relationship based on common values and even a common past by emphasising the ideological and political status of Istorikes Ekdoseis and its personnel, while in the latter there is an attempt to stay within a formal and politically neutral framework. The letter to *Einaudi* was less than a page long and half of it was a list of Dario Fo’s works published by *Einaudi* that were of Istorikes Ekdoseis interest. The letter to *Bertani* was a page-and-a-half long. It is structured in a quite odd manner concerning a copyright inquiry letter. It begins with an introduction regarding theatre in Greece and the reception of Dario Fo’s work in particular. Translating and publishing Fo’s work is presented as an act of politics rather than a business proposition. As the following excerpt shows the reason Fo’s works were chosen for publication was the fact that they had socio-political content:

From our point of view, we believe it is appropriate to publish the works of Dario Fo and bring them closer to the Greek people. We are certain we will not only offer [the Greek people] a healthy entertainment—which is extremely difficult in these days—but more importantly, we will provide political stimulus and provide knowledge of the Italian issues that are so similar to those of their own.

In my long stay in Italy as a student and as a member of the Greek political organisation AMEE, I myself had the opportunity to closely follow the political theatre and the struggle of the comrades of the “Comune” and Dario Fo and

294. Folder Istorikes Ekdoseis, KKE (M–L) (Athens branch) archive.

295. *Ibid.*

Franca Rame [...] and now as a publisher, I would be really pleased to present these works to my compatriots.²⁹⁶

But there is a prehistory regarding Dario Fo's works that adds to the correspondence itself. According to Stelios Manousakas—until 1981 a leading cadre of KKE (M–L)—he personally knew Dario Fo from his days in Italy, where he had lived from the late 1950s until the mid-1970s. Thus, when KKE (M–L) cadres and Istorikes Ekdoseis considered publishing his works, Manousakas initiated a correspondence with Dario Fo for this purpose, which was later on continued between Dario Fo's publishers and Istorikes Ekdoseis publishing house.²⁹⁷

In the International Institute of Social History, one may come across the archive of the British group Solidarity. Initially a Trotskyite outfit, it was very soon influenced by the work of the Greek philosopher Cornelius Castoriadis and is mainly categorised as a libertarian socialist group.²⁹⁸ Greek anarchist and anti-authoritarian groups were intrigued by Castoriadis and libertarian ideas, such as were expressed by Solidarity. Castoriadis therefore sought contact with Solidarity to translate and publish the work produced by the group.²⁹⁹

Folder 123 is one of the ninety-five correspondence folders (out of one-hundred and ninety folders in total) of the Solidarity archive and is titled "Greece" and subtitled "1972–80".³⁰⁰ This folder, along with a few others in the International Institute of Social History collections,³⁰¹ revealed

296. Letter from Anastasios Parkossidis to the publisher of Dario Fo, 6 July 1980 [in Italian]. KKE (M–L) (Athens Branch) archive.

Circolo "La Comune" was the theatre group of Dario Fo and Franca Rame. The groups' address was also found in the remainders of Istorikes Ekdoseis' archive. KKE (M–L) (Athens Branch) archive.

297. Stelios Manousakas, interview with the author, 21 May 2011.

298. Archives Solidarity (London), IISG, Amsterdam; Libcom Blog, "Solidarity and Me", blog entry by Paul Anderson, 12 March 2005, accessed 19 June 2016, <http://libcom.org/library/solidarity-me-paul-anderson>.

299. Greek anarchists spoke highly of *Solidarity* even though it was not an "orthodox" anarchist group. Yorgos Garbis, interview with the author, Athens, 13 June 2013.

300. See <https://search.socialhistory.org/Record/ARCH01366>, accessed 19 June 2016.

301. Similar letters from Greek anarchists were found in the papers of the Spanish anar-

a relatively small and unknown anti-authoritarian and anarchist publishing world to me, reflected in correspondence between Solidarity and various Greek publishers, translators, or even friends of Greek anarchist publishers. The folder tells us that correspondence between Solidarity and Greek groups was initiated in late 1972, first with a trade bookseller affiliated with the revolutionary left-wing circles in Greece and concerned to order the complete series of the Solidarity review. Someone likely ordered them through a trade bookseller not to raise suspicions. 1972 was marked by the loosening of control of the press and publishing known as *fileleleftheropiisi* [liberalisation], two years before the authoritarian regime would fall.

These letters reveal long-existing but at the same time intermittent contacts among the Greek and foreign anarchist publishers as well as the visits of Greek anarchists—mainly students—to the UK, serving as carriers of pamphlets, money or correspondence. Most of the letters are directly and indirectly connected to Diethnis Vivliothiki [International Library], the most influential anarchist publishing house in Greece from its early days during the military dictatorship. It also shows the secondary importance of the financial nature of the relationship between political publishing field agents and organisations. A letter from Solidarity to the publishing group Praxi, based in Athens, states the following:

[W]e are sending you in the same [unreadable word] some copies of our magazine. Please tell us if you received them all right and also which pamphlets you would like to receive. If you can't afford to pay, we will send you them free of charge.³⁰²

It is evident that all the correspondence among political publishing field agents and organisations evinces comradely and fraternal feelings. The main intention of these collaborations was to serve a political cause and not to acquire profit. Individuals that were related to publishing groups and occasionally served as translators were in contact with foreign publishing groups to promote international(ist) collaborations. This set of cor-

chist Antonio Téllez Solá, Folder 477, accessed 1 June 2016, IISH, <https://search.socialhistory.org/Record/ARCH02915>.

302. Folder 123, Archives Solidarity (London), IISG, Amsterdam.

respondence is indicative of the significant role of social capital and how political ties are transformed into social capital within the political publishing field.

Symbolic Capital

Symbolic capital is the most significant form of capital in the political publishing field. Indeed, for Bourdieu, it was a central thematic in every work incorporating field theory.³⁰³ Its significance has also been stressed by Thompson. In his assessment of the different forms of capital in the publishing field, symbolic capital dwarfs that of the other forms of capital; indeed, his treatment of symbolic capital is more extensive than all the others combined.³⁰⁴

According to Thompson, all “forms of capital are vital for the success of a publishing firm, but the structure of the publishing field is shaped above all by the differential distribution of economic and symbolic capital”.³⁰⁵ As already stressed, the Greek political publishing field lacked financial resources, and thus economic capital is of secondary importance to the analysis. It is in this sense that symbolic capital must be understood as the most significant form of capital within the Greek political publishing field. Positioning symbolic capital at the core of the analysis of the field enables us to comprehend the logic of political publishing. According to Thompson, “symbolic capital is best understood as the accumulated prestige, recognition and respect accorded to certain individuals or institutions. It is one of those intangible assets that is enormously important, indeed essential,

303. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991); Pierre Bourdieu, “The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods”, *Media, Culture, Society* 2, no. 3 (July 1980): 261–293; Pierre Bourdieu, “The Market of Symbolic Goods”, *Poetics* 14 (1985): 13–44; Pierre Bourdieu, “Symbolic Power”, *Critique of Anthropology* 4, no. 13–14 (January 1979): 77–85; Michael Swartz, *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 65–94.

304. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 32–36. See, also, John B. Thompson, *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 16–18.

305. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 9.

for publishing firms”.³⁰⁶ Publishers function at many levels, one of which is that of “cultural mediators”.³⁰⁷ In the case of the political publishing field, publishers and publishing groups primarily function as ideological and political mediators. Thus, symbolic capital derives from the authors or the subject matter (or both), adding value to the publishing houses and the respective political groups. Symbolic capital is essential for publishers since “it is important for their image, to the way they see themselves and want to be seen by others”.³⁰⁸

In this particular field, the significance of symbolic capital is linked to the fact that publishing groups are mainly publishing arms of specific political organisations. Thus, the symbolic capital acquired by the publisher reflects the image of the political group behind the publisher. Within the field in question, it is not books of great publishing and design quality that add symbolic capital to their publishers but books of a specific political stature; although there were cases within the political publishing field that books of quality were produced, enabling these political publishers to transform into trade publishers.

A striking example of this process comes from Norway. *Forlaget Oktober* is a Norwegian publishing house established in 1970, named after the Russian October Revolution of 1917 and at one point the imprint of the Norwegian AKP (M–L) [Worker’s Communist Party (Marxist–Leninist)]. In the late 1970s, *Forlaget Oktober* shifted its publishing programme from hardcore politics to fiction while still being under AKP (M–L)’s remit. The shift from politics to fiction was not enough to prevent the publishing house from going under. However, as, over time, *Oktober* had acquired extensive symbolic and intellectual capital, it attracted the interest of a leading Norwegian publishing group, H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard), which acquired the bulk of its shares in 1992.³⁰⁹

The history of *Oktober* and its shift from the political to the trade pub-

306. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 32.

307. Ibid.

308. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 8.

309. For more on the publication, see “About Oktober”, accessed 12 July 2016, <http://www.oktober.no/In-English/About-Oktober>.

lishing field is detailed in an article in one of the biggest Norwegian newspapers, *Dagbladet*. The article was published in Norwegian and its title is translated in English as “Started with Lenin and Mao, ended up with Knausgård”.³¹⁰ The focus on Karl Ove Knausgård—an acknowledged Norwegian author—in the article highlights the shift of *Oktober* from its early Marxist–Leninist years to its later literary ones.³¹¹ Revolution was no longer in the air in Norway in the late 1970s, and when Geir Berdahl took over the reins of *Oktober*, he opted for fiction.³¹² The intellectual capital of AKP (M–L), accumulated through these intellectuals and authors who had been members or sympathisers, was transferred into intellectual capital for *Oktober*. Apart from Berdahl, others like Knut Johansen, a renowned Norwegian translator, and Jon Michelet, a well-known Norwegian author, were party members and in this way added value to *Oktober* through their contributions.³¹³ Overall, the intellectual capital accumulated by *Oktober*—and by implication also its symbolic capital (the status of the publishing house)—in the country’s publishing field resulted in its passage from political publishing to trade publishing.

A publishing or political group that wants to create a name for itself and form a specific identity within, say, the Maoist³¹⁴ or Trotskyist

310. Fredrik Wandrup, “Startet med Lenin og Mao, endte opp med Knausgård”, *Dagbladet*, 25 October 2010, accessed 11 July 2016, http://www.dagbladet.no/2010/10/25/kultur/bok/litteratur/karl_ove_knausgard/oktober_forlag/13995307/.

311. Liesl Schillinger, “Why Karl Ove Knausgaard Can’t Stop Writing”, *Wall Street Journal Magazine*, 4 November 2015, <<http://www.wsj.com/articles/why-karl-ove-knausgaard-cant-stop-writing-1446688727>>, accessed 13/07/2016.

312. Apart from being a party cadre, Berdahl had an academic background in comparative literature of which he took advantage in his position within the publishing field.

313. Information on *Forlaget Oktober* and its relation to AKP(M–L) were provided by Jan Erik Skretteberg, a Norwegian activist, through Facebook correspondence with the author, 12 July 2016.

Another noteworthy fact is that in 2015 AKP (M–L)’s daily newspaper, *Klassekampen* (Class Struggle), according to the newspaper’s website, had a readership of over 21,000, almost 12.5% of the Norwegian market. <<https://www.klassekampen.no/article/20160309/ARTICLE/160309965>>, accessed 2 January 2019.

314. Hans Petter Sjøli makes an important assessment that has a universal application regarding the term “Maoism”: “While the term ‘Maoists’ has been coined retrospectively—the most common terms used at the time were ‘AKP-er’, ‘ML-er’ or ‘Marxist–Leninist-er’—it is a

movement will publish works of Mao or Trotsky, respectively, to acquire symbolic capital. Symbolic capital is transformed into political capital, allowing these groups to attract followers and members or to supplant rival political groups. Paraphrasing Thompson, one reason why symbolic capital can be advantageous to political groups is that it helps them to position and promote their ideas in a highly competitive political arena.³¹⁵ The panspermia of political groups during the *long sixties* saw a fierce struggle among them, each articulating minuscule ideological and political differences from the others, albeit with often almost identical names, as they jostled for position within the political field. It is of no coincidence that it is not a rare phenomenon for different political groups to publish the same titles to fortify their political status. The fifth volume of the *Selected Works* of Mao Zedong was published in Greek in 1977. The publishers were none other than the two publishing arms of two political groups—the Marxist–Leninist Communist Party of Greece (M–L KKE) and the EKKE—that strived to be recognised as the official Greek counterpart of the CPC.³¹⁶ International figures of the communist movement from Vladimir Lenin to Rosa Luxemburg and Antonio Gramsci to Mao Zedong “acquired large stocks of symbolic capital” as popular “brand names” among the existing left-wing readership.³¹⁷ Accumulated symbolic capital formulated a specific identity for the publishing group, which then raised expectations of the readership for future publications. In an interview with the author, the late Isaak Iordanides, co-founder of Istorikes Ekdoseis, noted that the publishing house—and the publications affiliated with it—were singled out for being too Sino-centric, “but that [Chinese texts] was what people asked for”.³¹⁸

useful term to separate this distinct political wing from the many and various fractions on the radical left in this period”. Hans Petter Sjøli, “Maoism in Norway: And How the AKP (M–L) Made Norway More Norwegian”, *Scandinavian Journal of History* 33, no. 4 (1988), 487.

315. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 32.

316. Mais, “Marxist–Leninist Publishing Field”, 59; Stelios Kouloglou, “E eksokino-vouleftiki aristera: Diaspasi, polydiaspasi, thrimmatismos...” [The Extra-Parliamentary Left: Splitting, Fragmentation, Crumbling...], *Anti* 200 (5 March 1982), 39 [in Greek].

317. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 9.

318. Iordanides did not clarify who raised those criticisms but it is safe to assume that the

A diversity of social movements emerged at the global level during the *long sixties*. Anti-colonial movements in Third World countries, labour movements, and a wide range of social movements, such as the student, the feminist and the environmental movements emerged—mainly in Western countries.³¹⁹ The fan base of readers in the political publishing field, at least in our case, was not built by the publishing groups but rather by other players in the field, such as authors who had taken a stance in favour of or been highly active in those movements. Herbert Marcuse, Jean-Paul Sartre and Franz Fanon are but three examples of a wide array of intellectuals considered integral to the movement politics of the *long sixties*. Their works were deemed to be invaluable for activists at the time and had a place on shelves in student houses, reading groups and social centres.³²⁰ The impact of these authors in the various movements raised their symbolic status to such an extent that readers sent letters to publishers urging them to translate and publish them. I came across several such letters in the archives of the Kalvos publishing house.³²¹ The correspondents proposed that the publishers publish the works of Marcuse, Fanon and Günter Grass, among others.³²² These proposals were often made after discussions or correspondence exchanged with Greek students living abroad, or even due to references to these intellectuals in the Greek press that intrigued the readers.

critics were left-wingers who did not adopt Maoist dogma. Isaak Iordanides, interview with the author, 28 September 2012.

319. On the movements of the 1960s, see Samantha Christiansen and Zachary A. Scarlett, eds., *The Third World in the Global 1960s* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2013); Christos Mais, “Anti-Colonialism and Imperialism (1960s–1970s)”, in *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism*, vol. I, ed. Immanuel Ness and Zak Cope (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 806–812.

320. On the influence and impact of intellectuals during the *long sixties*, see Fredric Jameson, “Periodizing the 60s”, *Social Text* 9/10 (Spring–Summer 1984), 178–209; Richard Wolin, *The Wind From the East: French Intellectuals, the Cultural Revolution and the Legacy of the 1960s* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010); Chapter 4, “Cultural Warfare”, in Kostis Kornetis, *Children of the Dictatorship: Student Resistance, Cultural Politics and the “Long 1960s” in Greece* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2014), 158–224.

321. Kalvos was a trade publisher that was established as a means of cultural resistance. A detailed presentation of this publisher can be found later in the dissertation.

322. Folder 3, Subfolder 1, Kalvos Archive, ASKI, Athens.

In my MA research, I made the assumption that the first title published by Istorikes Ekdoseis in 1963—the leather-bound volume *Istoria tes Sygchrones Kinezikes Epanastasis* [A History of the Contemporary Chinese Revolution], edited by Ho Kan-Chi (and a financial failure)—was published out of inexperience, due to the amateurism of the publishers.³²³ I now argue that the main reason for publishing a book that was destined for economic failure was *not* inexperience. The book was priced quite highly, and its audience comprised mostly formerly exiled left-wingers, progressive students, and workers—all of whom had limited financial capacity.³²⁴ Nevertheless, a leather-bound volume would strike the eye and make a statement for the newly formed publishing house. It was a commercial failure and thus only served to diminish the publisher's economic capital. Nevertheless it contributed significantly to boosting its symbolic capital.

In the next chapter, I will expand further on the way symbolic capital defined the aesthetics of the Greek political publishing field, where original book covers were copied in the Greek versions for the express purpose of exploiting their symbolic capital.

323. Mais, "The Marxist–Leninist Publishing Field", 42–43.

324. Soon after the end of the Second World War, the Greek Civil War kicked off. The war saw thousands of left-wingers expelled, many of whom remained in exile until the early 1960s. The founders of Istorikes Ekdoseis were among those banished.

