

# ***Challenges in Greek education during the 1960s: the 1964 educational reform and its overthrow***

**Vassilis Foukas**

e-mail: [vfoukas@edlit.auth.gr](mailto:vfoukas@edlit.auth.gr)

*Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Greece*

**Abstract:** In Greece, during the 1960s a new period began which marked a break with the past and the start of a new approach for the future. After the post-war period, Greek society began to balance the State budget and create the conditions for the country's accession to the European Common Market. This was the context in which, in 1964, the second meaningful educational reform of the 20th century was attempted. However, in 1965, the educational reform was quickly blocked on account of the unstable political situation and the imminent dictatorship. This paper examines the changes in Education adopted as part of the 1964 educational reform within their historical and political context, and provides an overview of the major political and educational events that led to their early overthrow in 1965.

**Keywords:** educational reform; modernization; democratization; Greek education; educational policy.

Recibido / Received: 11/11/2017

Aceptado / Accepted: 05/12/2017

## **1. Introduction**

After the Second World War, several European countries made systematic efforts to adjust their Education systems based on the post-war political, economic and social plans<sup>1</sup>. In particular, the emphasis was given to the principle of equal opportunities in education, the welfare state and social justice, and schooling was seen as a lever for social and economic development and progress<sup>2</sup>. These efforts

---

<sup>1</sup> The new guidelines expressed in England with the Education Act of 1944 and in France in 1947 with the Langevin and Wallon plan. These two proposals were supported by reform pedagogy and were considered the foundation of progressive educational thought. See McCulloch, 1994, Terzis, 2000<sup>2</sup>, pp. 90-91, 124-125; Dimaras, 2013, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> The recognition of the economic value of education («educational capital») is consistent with the theory of «human capital» which was introduced by Theodor Schultz (1902-1998) in 1950s USA.

were linked to both structural and methodological changes, which can be summarised as three major innovations: the establishment of Comprehensive Schools, curriculum reform, and teacher training<sup>3</sup>.

The paper examines the changes in Education which were adopted under the 1964 educational reform, analysing them within their historical – national and European – context, and provides an overview of the major political and educational events that led to their early overthrow in 1965.

## 2. The political context: from the civil war to dictatorship

During the period 1949-1967, Greek political life was scarred by the strong wounds left by the civil war. According to Tsoukalas (1981, p. 102), the most important legacy of the civil war was the ideological, political and cultural divide between the «*ethnikofrosyni*»<sup>4</sup> and what remained of the progressive parties. The first post-civil war governments represented the centre and centre-right of the political spectrum, and were divided as to the degree of justice that should be demonstrated to the losers of the civil war. On the one hand, political persecution was a major instrument of oppression – used to prevent the popular left-wing movement from regrouping – while on the other, the benefits arising from American economic aid (e.g. Marshall Plan) were used as a lure for the partisans (Miller, 2009, pp. 24-25, 31-33; Paschaloudis, 2009; Papastratis, 2011, p. 14).

These enticements notwithstanding, in a 1950s Greece, staggering under the weight of repression, the courageous communist Nikos Beloyiannis returned from exile, hoping to unite all «true Greeks» in a struggle against American imperialism (Miller, 2009, p. 23). However, the decade 1953-63 was the «golden age» of United States relations with Greece. Despite the strain created by the Cyprus issue, and strong disagreements on the amount of United States aid, the Greek and American governments shared basic objectives; paramount was to counter and contain the power of the Soviet Union while promoting Greek economic growth and integration into the Western economy (Miller, 2009, p. 66).

In this context, the 1952 elections brought the *Ellinikos Synagermos* (*Greek Rally*), headed by Alexandros Papagos, to power. This marked the beginning of an eleven-year period of right-wing government. During Papagos' term – he died in October 1955 – the basic method of political control was the mandatory submission of a certificate of social opinions from those seeking State employment. Although the right-wing party received direct support from United States agencies<sup>5</sup>, they failed to

---

See Pesmazoglou, 1999<sup>2</sup>, pp. 24-25. For the social welfare state see also Kelanides, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> This is the so-called *internal* and *external* educational reform. See Terzis, 1993, pp. 13-14.

<sup>4</sup> The *ethnikofrosyni* appeared during the interwar period, the later post-war and post-civil war Greece, as an entirely coherent ideology, and became the official ideology of the State. It was synonymous with ultra-patriotism and anti-communism.

<sup>5</sup> Between 1947 and 1949, US officials were able to make considerable progress towards their two primary objectives: creating a Greek national army capable of countering a communist-dominated insurrection, and beginning the reconstruction of the Greek economy (Miller, 2009, p. 21).

prevent the progress of the opposition party, which continuously won a large section of the popular vote (Svoronos, 1976<sup>2</sup>, 147 and Clogg, 1987, pp. 30-32).

Papagos' successor, Konstantinos Karamanlis (1907–1998), was named prime minister by King Paul in 1954. Young by the standards of Greek politics, Karamanlis had been an energetic and publicity-conscious Minister of Public works. Anxious to step out of the shadow left by Papagos, once installed as prime minister, Karamanlis dissolved the *Ellinikos Synagermos* (*Greek Rally*) in January 1956, replacing it with the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* (*National Radical Union*). New elections were called – under a reformed electoral law – for the 19th February 1956 (Clogg, 1987, p. 32)<sup>6</sup>; although *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis*' share of the vote, at 47.4 percent, was actually lower than that of the parties comprising the *Dimokratiki Enosis* (*Democratic Union*) (48.2%), it secured 55 percent of the seats (165 in a parliament of 300) versus 44 percent (132) (Clogg, 1987, p. 33; Nikolakopoulos, 2000; Paschaloudis, 2009).

At the 1958 elections, with 41.2 percent of the vote, *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* (*National Radical Union*) secured a comfortable majority of 171 seats in a 300-seat parliament. Much to the surprise of the bourgeois parties, however, second place was secured by the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera* (*United Democratic Left*), whose 24.4 percent of the vote gave it 79 seats in parliament (Clogg, 1987, p. 38). Both Karamanlis and the Americans drew the same conclusion: defeating the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera* (*United Democratic Left*) required resuscitating the centre by reunifying it (Miller, 2009, pp. 75, 80-81).

Meanwhile, a student movement<sup>7</sup>, which appeared in 1957, was gaining force, and played a very significant role in shaping the demands for significant change and democratisation of education (Papazoglou, 1975; Karamanolakis, 2010; Moraitidis, 2015).

Thus a period of great change began in the 1960s<sup>8</sup>, a decade which marked a considerable break with the past and opened up new avenues for the future (Tsoukalas, 2008, p. 41) of Greek society. Progress was made in terms of balancing the State budget, and this relative economic stability paved the way for Greece's accession to the European Common Market. After the civil war, Greece had become a member of several international organisations (O.E.C.D., Council of Europe, N.A.T.O.), but it was not until 1961 that it joined the European Economic Community<sup>9</sup> – the precursor to the European Union.

---

<sup>6</sup> The 1956 election was the first national election in which women had been eligible to vote. meant that the number of registered voters for the parliamentary election, 4,507,907, was more than twice that of 1952 (2.123.150). See, Clogg, 1987, p. 33.

<sup>7</sup> In the 1950s, the students movements had already demonstrated on the Cypriot issue, and this activity was reprised with the events that took place in the years 1963–1964. See, explicitly, Moraitidis, 2015, pp. 13-51.

<sup>8</sup> During the 1960s, the “scientific example” changed according to terms put forward by Thomas Kuhn; the relationship between education and economics changed, as did the efficiency and productivity of work, which were determined by the efficiency of the education system. See Pasmazoglou, 1999<sup>2</sup>, p. 28.

<sup>9</sup> The agreement, which connects Greece with European Economic Community, was signed on July 9th 1961. It provided for full integration of the country into the Community in the future. This proved unpopular with many, including Evangelos Papanoytsos, who characterised this agreement

All these events were conducive to the development of the country at many levels. In particular, membership of the European Economic Community highlighted the need for economic restructuring – and therefore educational reform – in order to create a workforce that would be fit for purpose<sup>10</sup>. Nevertheless, becoming officially European also led to unfair comparison and unequal competition with other Western countries.

On the home front, complex negotiations resulted in the foundation in September 1961 of the *Enosis Kentrou (Centre Union)*. The 1961 elections were therefore contested by three main groups: the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis (National Radical Union)* on the right; the *Enosis Kentrou (Centre Union)* in alliance with Markezinis' *Komma Proodeftikon (Progressive Party)* in the centre; and the *Pandimokratiko Agrotiko Metopo Ellados (Pan-democratic Agrarian Front of Greece)* on the left (Clogg, 1987, p. 40). Konstantinos Karamanlis' right-wing *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis (National Radical Union)* won the vote, sparking widespread protests (mass demonstrations, strikes, squatting, boycotting parliamentary activity). Students and teachers<sup>11</sup> joined the «unyielding/ ceaseless struggle» («*anendotos agonas*»)<sup>12</sup> declared by Georgios Papandreou (1888–1968) after the 1961 elections.<sup>13</sup> Revolutionary efforts were intensified (Karamanolakis, 2010; Christidis, 2012), and the loss of confidence in the ruling party was heightened by the murder, in May 1963, of Grigoris Lambrakis. A popular deputy affiliated with the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera (United Democratic Left)*, Lambrakis was killed in the course of a peaceful demonstration in Thessaloniki. His ultra-right-wing murderers were subsequently revealed to have links to the city *gendarmarie*, and, while no-one suggested that Karamanlis was directly implicated in the affair, opposition allegations of the existence

---

as a «new colonialism». See Hadjivasiliou, 2010, pp. 365-371.

<sup>10</sup> The adoption of the «human capital» theory led to changing opinions in Greek education. The conclusions of 1957 Educational Committee reflect the basic concept of the theory of human capital. Thanks to the activities of the international organisations, in particular the OECD, this new concept was consolidated in the 1960s; it dominated the 1962 secondary education curriculum and the 1964 Education Act, which expressed the view that productivity relies on education. See Conclusions of the Educational Committee, 1959, p. 11; Noutsos, 1979, p. 273; Kiprianos, 2004, pp. 262-263 and Terzis, 2013, pp. 334-336.

<sup>11</sup> The strike by the *Teachers' Federation of Greece* and of the *Federation of Secondary School Teachers* in 1961 caused Karamanlis' government to give teachers significant pay rises. However, when the strike action renewed in January 1963, the *Ethiki Rizospastiki Enosis's (National Radical Union)* government rejected their claims and force the teachers to return to work after twenty days of striking; the school year was extended for three weeks by ministerial decision. See Kiprianos, 2004, p. 253 and Dimaras, 2013, p. 234.

<sup>12</sup> Sophoklis Venizelos, the deputy leader of the *Enosis Kentrou (Centre Union)*, declared *Ethiki Rizospastiki Enosis's (National Radical Union)* majority and government to be illegal, and stated that his party had been fighting not only *Ethiki Rizospastiki Enosis* but also «the General Staff of the Army, the [Greek] Central Intelligence Agency, the *gendarmarie*, the National Security Battalions and other dark forces» (Centre Union, 1962, pp. 5, 8-9).

<sup>13</sup> The *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis (National Radical Union)* gained power in the 1961 elections. Georgios Papandreou challenged the results as a product of violence and gerrymandering. Claiming that the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* had rigged the vote, Papandreou announced an «unyielding/ ceaseless struggle». See Kasimates, Petridis, Sideratos, 1988, p. 232; Clogg, 1987; Miller, 2009, pp. 76-77.

of an illegal «para-state», prepared to engage in the violent suppression of any kind of left-wing dissent, acquired a new credence (Clogg, 1981, p. 43; Paschaloudis, 2009; Karamanolakis, 2010).

Unsurprisingly therefore, the next elections, held on November 3rd 1963, revealed a shift away from the right, with Papandreou's *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) winning, with 42 percent of the vote and 138 seats. Karamanlis went into exile in Paris. However, the social and political dynamics which emerged after the triumph of the Centre Union, went far beyond the framework of governmental change, and were therefore treated as a major threat by the three main extra-institutional players, namely the Crown, the Army, and the American agencies in Greece.

Hence the conditions were ripe for a dictatorship to emerge, and the complexity of the political and social context was reflected in the 1964 educational reform and its subsequent cancellation.

### 3. The educational context: the spirit of democratisation

Since the mid of 1950s, the Greek economy had displayed an upward trend, but Greece remained one of the poorest European countries<sup>14</sup>. During that period, production increased and infrastructure projects were developed, and this investment acted to level social inequalities and vastly improve people's living standards. The fast pace of the economy increased social mobility, which in turn led to a greater demand for secondary and higher education (Kiprianos, 2004, p. 236; Kiprianos, 2016, pp. 174-180 and Agelakos, 2017, pp. 13-23), making educational reform a priority.

Indeed, during the 1950s the Greek populace was largely illiterate. According to the 1961 census (National Statistical Service of Greece, 1962, pp. 5-31), of the roughly 7 million citizens over the age of 10, only 7.5 percent had a *Gymnasium* leaving certificate and only 1.9 percent held a higher education degree. In other words, less than 10 percent of the population – and only 3.8 percent of women – could boast an education, while 47 percent had not even finished primary school.

In order for Greece to align with the other Western countries, many changes in various sectors would be necessary, but education was clearly a prime concern. Initially, steps for consistency with Greece's European neighbours were slow and timid, but in 1960 substantive discussions on education were begun. Until this point, education had mainly comprised many hours of teaching Ancient Greek and Latin, but now technical and vocational education was spearheaded by the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* (*National Radical Union*), led by Konstantinos Karamanlis (1907-1998). Although a major political force from 1956 to 1963, Karamanlis' efforts for reform yielded few tangible results (Kiprianos, 2004, p. 237 and Terzis, 2013, p. 337). Indeed, the problems afflicting Greek education were many and varied, including inadequate school buildings, outdated curriculum and textbooks, lack of teachers, low teacher earnings, and high student tuition fees. Although the «15% for education» slogan was trumpeted, referring to the proposed increase in government

---

<sup>14</sup> In 1950, the income per capita in Greece was \$143 while in 1960 it reached \$429. See Kostis, 2014, p. 754.

spending (Dimaras, 2013, pp. 232-233)<sup>15</sup>, the reform efforts during this period, mainly by the 1957 Education Committee and 1959 Laws, were ineffective.

Hence, there was an urgent need for crucial intervention to bring about radical educational reform, a need recognised, according to Noutsos (1979, p. 270), by the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*). This party represented the liberal section of the bourgeoisie<sup>16</sup>, and supported teachers' demands for higher wages, as well as the students' demands for improvement, modernisation and democratisation of Greek education<sup>17</sup>.

In 1964, Greece endeavoured to create a reform that would bring such radical changes to the education system. This second major attempt at educational reform was also fuelled by the need to counter emigration for employment purposes. The belief that anachronistic education was promoting the labour drain was widespread, as was the expectation that proper educational reform would stem the flow (Haralambous, 1990, pp. 211-212).

The direction taken by the 1964 educational reform coincided with that of the other European countries during the postwar period; specifically, it aimed to modernise and democratise the education system in line with the new social, political and economic conditions (Hadjivasiliou, 2010, pp. 20-30). However, this new spirit of liberalism was quickly stymied in Greece in 1965 due to the unstable political situation and the emerging dictatorship. Thus the process of educational system adjustment in the postwar period was delayed due to political uncertainties, the civil war and the ongoing economic instability, and it would not be until 1976-1977, when the political climate changed – allowing the conservative party to take power – that educational reform would once again be attempted.

#### 4. The 1964 educational reform: pioneers and changes

Educational reform was championed by the then Prime Minister Georgios Papandreou (Bouzakis, 1999), during both the temporary government of 1963<sup>18</sup> and the strong government after the subsequent elections held on February 1964<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> In the period 1948–1955 public education expenditure was extremely low, reaching just 8–10% of the Gross Domestic Product. See Pesmazoglou, 1999<sup>2</sup>, pp. 75-78, 114.

<sup>16</sup> The *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) was created on September 19th 1961 through the union of smaller, mostly liberal groups, and included liberal, conservative, and radical but rebellious elements, i.e. people with very different ideologies. See Kasimates, Petridis, Sideratos, 1988, p. 191; Clogg, 1991, pp. 119-130; Diamantopoulos, 1991, pp. 131-150; Meynaud, 2002<sup>2</sup>, pp. 320-359; Bouzakis, 2011, p. 223; Terzis, 2013, p. 337.

<sup>17</sup> Ideologically, the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) adhered to liberal conservatism and appealed to all social classes. Its educational programme was aimed at restoring social democracy. See Haralambous, 1990, p. 20 and Meynaud 2002<sup>2</sup>, pp. 320-359.

<sup>18</sup> In the 1963 elections, the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) received 42.02% of the vote, the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* (*National Radical Union*) 39.37%, and the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera* (*United Democratic Left*) 14.35%. See Kasimates, Petridis, Sideratos, 1988, 191 and Nikolakopoulos, 2000, 301.

<sup>19</sup> On February 16th 1964, the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) secured the absolute majority (52.72%). See Meynaud, 1974<sup>2</sup>, p. 154 and Nikolakopoulos, 2000, p. 301.

During this period, the Prime Minister himself occupied the position of Minister of Education<sup>20</sup> – an indication of the importance attached to educational issues (Terzis, 2013, p. 338). The Cypriot novelist Loukis Akritas (1909-1965) was taken on as Under-secretary of Education<sup>21</sup>, and the Secretary General of the Ministry of Education post was filled by the philosopher Evangelos Papanoytsos (1900-1982). Through his writings and teachings, and participation in many committees on the political stage, Papanoytsos made a major contribution to raising awareness of the need and intensifying the demand for modernisation of the Greek education system (Papanoytsos, 1982, pp. 101-120; Foukas, 2017, pp. 437-467).

Accordingly, radical changes in Education were announced only a few days after the new government was sworn in. The proclamation had been drafted by Papanoytsos at the behest of Papandreou (Papanoytsos, 1982, p. 101). Thus, from November 17th, 1963, major changes would be implemented, including: the abolition of tuition fees, the extension of government scholarships, the division of secondary education into two three-year cycles, the elimination of university entrance exams, and the establishment of academic Baccalaureates, which high school graduates would sit for after their exams (Dimaras, 1998<sup>2</sup>, pp. 259-261).

Along these lines, on February 19th 1964, Papandreou's newly sworn-in second government began intensive action to get these important changes in Education implemented<sup>22</sup>. On April 12th 1964, Papandreou announced the educational measures that would be put in place, and on July 14th his government filed a Bill concerning «The Organisation and Administration of General Education» with the *Boule* (legislature). The explanatory notes accompanying the Bill, which would become Law 4379/1964, stated that the government intended to submit three separate Education Bills to the *Boule*: one regarding «General Primary and Secondary Education», which was submitted immediately, one concerning «Technical and Vocational Education», and one governing «Higher Education» (Bouzakis, 2002, p. 147). Unfortunately, however, although all three Bills were filed with the *Boule*, The growing political unrest meant that only the first could be passed.

The overall philosophy of the proposed educational reform was indicated in an explanatory report, which also outlined the main reasons behind the reform. In brief, the reform envisaged a new type of citizen, schooled in a truly democratic system. As part of this philosophy, free education and prolonging compulsory education would be associated with the democratisation of the educational system, and would

---

<sup>20</sup> Papandreou served six times as Minister of Education (1930–32, 1933, 1947, 1951, 1963, and 1964-65); in two of these governments he was also Prime Minister (1963 and 1964-65). The total time that Georgios Papandreou served in the Ministry of Education was approximately four and a half years, longer than any other Minister of Education during the first half of 20th century. See Bouzakis, 1999, p. 15.

<sup>21</sup> Akritas was characterised by Papanoytsos as a noble visionary and brave man. See Papanoytsos, 1965, p. 7.

<sup>22</sup> Papanoytsos gave lectures throughout Greece to raise public awareness of the new changes in education. In March 1964 in Athens, under Papanoytsos' chairmanship, He organised the «Symposium on the *dimotiki*» at the Athenian Technical Institute. Academics, teachers and writers participated in the public debate, and the Symposium's success was confirmed by the keen interest shown by the public. See Papanoytsos, 1982, p. 116; Andriotes, 1965.

in turn lead to gradual social transformation and economic growth. According to Papanoytsos (1965, pp. 259-263), this reform aimed to provide young people with essential knowledge that would allow them to later stand on equal footing with the other members of the European family.

After the first Bill was submitted, a fierce debate between all the political parties in the *Boule* erupted; although educational reform and advancement had cross-party support, it was the only issue on which there was a consensus. In contrast, there was considerable disagreement as to the individual measures proposed to bring about the reform. Discussion continued until early October 1964, when the *Boule* Special Committee voted in the new Education Act (Dimaras, 2013, p. 235). The main changes provided for in the ensuing 1964 educational reform were as follows (Dimaras, 2013, pp. 240-243 and Terzis, 2013, pp. 339-340):

- The abolition of fees in all three levels of schooling; textbooks and transport would be free of charge and a scheme to provide impoverished pupils with free school meals would be set up (Article 3).
- Division of the six-year *Gymnasium* into two three-year cycles, namely the *Gymnasium* (General, Technical and Agricultural) and the *Lyceum* (General and Technical) (Articles 8 and 10); primary school graduates would have unrestricted access to the *Gymnasium*, but *Gymnasium* graduates would have to pass an entrance exam in order to be accepted at the *Lyceum* (Article 1).
- The gradual extension of compulsory education to nine years, comprising six years of primary school and three years of *Gymnasium* (Article 4)<sup>23</sup>.
- *Dimotiki* (Modern Greek, a form spoken and used in everyday writing) being given equal weight to *katharevousa* (a purist form of Greek used in traditional literary writing) at all levels of schooling (Articles 5, 8, 10).
- Curriculum revision and the production of new textbooks (Article 6).
- Inclusion of increased spending on education in the State budget (Article 3).
- Improvement in teachers' financial position (Articles 14-15).
- Teaching of Ancient Greek at the *Gymnasium* with appropriate translations in the demotic (Article 8, § 3)<sup>24</sup>.
- Latin lessons confined to the *Lyceum* as an optional subject (Article 10, § 5).
- The introduction of new and elective courses to secondary education e.g., *Elements of a Democratic Regime*, *Sociology*, *Elements of Economic Science* (Article 10, § 9).
- Prolonging studies at Pedagogical Academies (institutions providing basic education for teachers) from two to three years, and abolition of teacher training at university (Articles 16-20).
- Reform of the system for the supervision and administration of General Education (Article 17).

---

<sup>23</sup> The nine-year compulsory attendance would be gradually implemented by Royal Order (article 4, § 2).

<sup>24</sup> On this topic see, the graduate thesis by Dimopoulou (2016).



- Establishment of the Academic Bacallaureate (article 13)<sup>25</sup>.-
- Abolition of the Education Council and the establishment of the Pedagogical Institute as the body that would oversee implementation of the educational reform (articles 21-26).
- The establishment Faculty of Philosophy at Ioannina.
- The establishment of the University of Patras.

It is clear that this educational reform was designed to be exhaustive and bring changes to every aspect of schooling; The 1964 Education Act was an attempt to modernise Greek education in line with Western European trends in Education, even if this effort was about twenty years behind the times. That being said, while some of the measures put in place were new, others were broader or variant measures of past attempts to reform. Requests for the validation of *dimotiki* and the teaching of translated versions of Classical texts, for example, had been articulated since the beginning of 20th century<sup>26</sup>.

Although delayed, the reform did bring about two major social changes, namely the abolition of all school fees, and the extension of compulsory education from six to nine years. These changes gave the opportunity to children from all social classes to receive an adequate education, and was the first time since the 1929 educational reform<sup>27</sup> that the Greek *Boule* had legislated a comprehensive plan for education.

Nonetheless, Law 4379/1964 made no attempt to change the centralised nature of the Greek education system (Dimaras, 2000a, p. 553). Moreover, the aim of the 1964s reform was the creation of European citizens, but not citizens of little Greece, which was about to undergo a period of profound political turmoil.

## 5. Political criticism and reactions: arguments and counter-arguments

Even at the beginning, the process of implementing the 1964 educational reform was not seamless; from its inception there was vociferous criticism from conservatives, who stood in direct opposition to the Faculty of Philosophy of Athens University, and even the backing of progressives of the calibre of Panayiotis Kanellopoulos and Konstantinos Tsatsos (Dimaras, 2000b, p. 179) would not be enough to guarantee the consent of the senior members of the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* (*National Radical Union*).

The push-back began before Education Act was even published in the Government Gazette, as the content of the law had previously been amply discussed in the *Boule*. Opposition newspapers<sup>28</sup> spoke out against the new measures,

<sup>25</sup> See, extensively, Agelakos, 2017, pp. 13-23.

<sup>26</sup> The 1964 reform «copies» key points from the 1929–1932 reform. See Terzis, 2000<sup>2</sup>, pp. 40-71.

<sup>27</sup> We should highlight that as Minister of Education in 1929–1932, Georgios Papandreou had attempted another important educational reform that was also thwarted at an early stage.

<sup>28</sup> The main right-wing newspapers of Athens were *Kathimerini*, *Akropolis*, *Vradyni*, *Imera*, and *Apogevmatini*. The newspaper *Estia* expressed the opinions of the *Kommatos ton Proodeftikon* (*Party of Progressives*). *To Vima*, *Ta Nea*, *I Eleftheria* and *To Ethnos* expressed the opinions of the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*), while the left faction expressed by the newspaper entitled *Avgi*.

expressing doubts about the intentions of its promoters, and concerns about the possible consequences of the reform. They published articles by professors from the University of Athens Faculty of Philosophy and politicians who opposed the new measures. At the same time, teachers' associations like the *Etaireia Ellinon Filologon* (Greek Philology Company), the *Omospondia Leitourgon Mesis Ekpedefsis* (Official Federation for Secondary Education) (Pyrpyres, 2010, 225-316), as well as many ecclesiastical associations, resented the proposed reform and launched an intense offensive against the government (Mavroskoufis, 2002, pp. 121-141 and Dimopoulou, 2016).

To counter such attacks, the proponents of educational reform, especially Papanoytsos, used the daily press to raise awareness of the goals of the reform and thereby create social consensus behind it. Loukis Akritas, Under-secretary of Education, was a strong proponent of educational reform (Papanoytsos, 1982, 107), and enthusiastically supported Papanoytsos – the driving force behind the educational reform and the object of constant criticism.

In contrast, Papandreou, serving as both Prime Minister and Minister of Education, chose not to clash with the Education Reform Bill's critics in the press, and instead laid out his arguments before the *Boule*. Having won the consensus of the voters, Papandreou felt that it was not necessary to defend educational reform further. In any case, any contribution from Papandreou would have been redundant, considering the frequent and exhaustive editorials by Papanoytsos.

After submitting the Bill to the *Boule*, Papanoytsos, in order to head off malicious responses, remarked in a newspaper article that the issue of Education should not become the object of personal conflict (Papanoytsos, 1965, pp. 247-251). He addressed future critics of the reform, asking them to present meaningful objections backed up by strong arguments, rather than merely raising objections based on prejudices towards him and his politics. However, this statement only served to trigger a flood of articles – mainly published in the *Kathimerini* newspaper – criticising not only the proposed educational reform but also its proponents. Opponents<sup>29</sup> of the reform did not pass up the opportunity to accuse the latter of attempting to corrupt the nation. There was particularly vociferous opposition to the introduction of *dimotiki* in schools, as this was seen as associated with social ills such as atheism, Communism and treason. For that matter, even the announcement that tuition fees would be abolished was roundly criticised for being misleading, since this abolition did not cover all associated costs. In the same vein, opponents were against the establishment of the Pedagogical Institute, which, after its model in Eastern Germany, would be solely staffed by Communist professors. Likewise, a new textbook (*Roman and Medieval History* by Konstantinos Kalokairinos) was denounced as a «propaganda pamphlet», and vehemently criticised as contrary to official position on official national history (Athnasiades, 2015).

---

<sup>29</sup> Panayotis Mpratsiotis, Professor of Faculty of Theology of Athens University, philologist Konstantinos Georgoulis, ex-Secretary-General of the Ministry of Education, and Ioannis Theodorakopoulos, Professors from the Faculty of Philosophy of Athens University were leaders of the opposition to the reform.

It was not only right-wing opposition that undermined the reform, however; the attitude of the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera (United Democratic Left)*<sup>30</sup>, mainly articulated through systematic interventions by pedagogues and educators such as Rosa Imbriotis and George Athanasiades, was far from enthusiastic. Furthermore, the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera (United Democratic Left)* drew attention to a series of contradictions, inconsistencies, vague conceptual compositions and distinct class options that limited the prospect of the reform and weakened its progressive agenda.

Such was the intensity and number of negative reactions to the reform that it was effectively dead in the water by July 1965. Despite the centrist origin of successive governments, not only were the outstanding two Bills abandoned before they could become law, but also certain measures that had already been introduced were reversed. On September 9th 1965, for example, it was announced that the new textbooks commissioned in 1964 would be revised, and if judged unfit, destroyed.

## 6. The Athens Faculty of Philosophy Memorandum: criticism under conservatism and youthism

As exemplified above, the Athens University Faculty of Philosophy of was among the first and loudest voices against educational reform. After the changes were announced, the Faculty held four meetings, from March to April 1964, to extensively discuss them. They published their opinion in a Memorandum (Scientific Yearbook, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Athens, 1963-1964, pp. 587-599)<sup>31</sup>, which clearly stated at the beginning their view that the cause of the poor educational situation was not the current system, but could be ascribed to the shortage of teaching staff, inadequate school buildings and lack of teaching resources. This gave the impression that they failed to recognise that the education system was anachronistic and unable to meet the new social needs. They characterised the aforementioned reform as a risky experiment, which would break up the educational system in order to restructure it at the expense of Classical education. This, they saw as necessary for a certain subset of society, even though it was not in demand by the general population of Greece (Scientific Yearbook, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Athens, 1963-1964, pp. 588-589).

The Memorandum also makes clear that many of the announced changes would oppose the national interest; there was particular controversy regarding the sub-division of secondary education into two three-year cycles<sup>32</sup>, as well as the

---

<sup>30</sup> For the stance taken by the *Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera (United Democratic Left)* on the 1964 educational reforms see, extensively, Paschaloudis, 2009 and Mitrosili, 2013.

<sup>31</sup> The Faculty of Philosophy of Athens prepared an important Memorandum, as they had in both the 1914 and 1929 reforms, in which they strongly criticised the proposed changes in education. See Bouzakis & Simeni, 2009, pp. 73-92.

<sup>32</sup> In his article, Professor Ioannis Theodorakopoulos argued that the separation of the secondary school into two cycles would lead to disintegration. Papanoytsos responded that this change was included in the proposed 1951 reform, which was not opposed by neither Theodorakopoulos nor Konstantinos Georgoulis, nor the Faculty of Philosophy of Athens, nor the *Etairia Ellinon Filologon (Greek's Philology Company)*. Indeed, as a member of the 1957 Educational Committee Theodorakopoulos himself supported the separation of the secondary school into two cycles. See

abolition of secondary school (*Gymnasium*) examinations and the establishment of the Pedagogical Institute. Even less popular was the idea that Latin would no longer be taught as a compulsory subject<sup>33</sup>, that *dimotiki* and *katharevousa* would be treated on an equal footing, and that the Ancient Greek texts would be taught in translated form. According to the Memorandum, translations could not replace the ancient texts because the latest linguistic form would be unable to convey their inherent timelessness<sup>34</sup>. As a result of these changes the unity of the Greek nation would be shattered (Scientific Yearbook, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Athens, 1963-1964, p. 594).

The full Memorandum was published in the newspaper *Kathimerini*. This newspaper set itself up as a voice against the proposed reform. Its position was that the changes would lead to a retrograde education, something that Akritas, the Under-Secretary of Education, denounced in his response to the Memorandum. He highlighted several inaccuracies, and clarified that Classical education would not be neglected, but for the first time creatively included in compulsory education courses. He also pointed out that at the time of writing, 85 percent of children were leaving school after primary education, and therefore did not benefit from a Classical education in any case; for those who continued on to high school, Ancient Greek would not be abolished, but would be taught better. He also stressed that Latin too would not be removed from the curriculum, but would instead be offered as an optional course.

Papanoytsos also criticised the Athens Faculty of Philosophy. He thought that the real cause of its dissent was not the fear of losing the spiritual relationship between students and the Classics, but rather the establishment of the Pedagogical Institute, which would henceforth be in charge of investigating educational issues and training teachers. In fact, he suggested that if the government had opted to leave the Faculty of Philosophy to control education undisturbed, they would not have spoken out against the changes (Papanoytsos, 1965, 237-241). He also portrayed the Faculty of Philosophy professors as «*glossamyntores*» (those who despise the living language of Greek people). According to Papanoytsos, the Faculty displayed a pathological conservatism and youthism, akin to their position in 1901, 1903 and 1925<sup>35</sup>. He especially suggested that the Athens Faculty professors believed that only they had the right to determine the educational fate of Greek nation. After all, the Faculty had sent the Prime Minister a telegram demanding that Papanoytsos be dismissed – the only proper political solution to the issue.

---

Papanoytsos, 1965, pp. 237-241.

<sup>33</sup> The argument was that Roman culture was the cultural source of Europe, and that Greek students should not neglect the alphabet of European civilisation. See Scientific Yearbook, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Athens, 1963-1964, p. 597.

<sup>34</sup> See Scientific Yearbook, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Athens, 1963-1964, p. 590. To this argument, proponents of the measure respond that the ideas and values contained in the Classical texts are timeless, and can be expressed in any language.

<sup>35</sup> He mentioned so-called Evangelika (1901), Oresteika (1903) and Marasleika (1925) educational controversies. See Carabott (2005) and Repousi (2012).

## 7. The support of the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy for the reform: a step in the right direction

Until the establishment (1925) of the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy, the University of Athens, i.e., its Faculty of Philosophy, had been in sole charge of training teachers for secondary education. The Faculty of Philosophy was the first in the newly established University of Thessaloniki – an ideological and political decision made by the *Komma Phileleftheron* (*Liberal Party*) (Foukas, 2016, pp. 37-40); the aim of the Ministry of Education was to establish a counterweight to the conservative spirit demonstrated by its sister Faculty at Athens (Terzis, 2013, p. 316). Hence, the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy was largely, although not exclusively, staffed by proponents of *dimotiki*<sup>36</sup>, who felt that demotic Greek should be allowed to permeate secondary education (Terzis, 1993, p. 151). These included the linguist Manolis Triantafyllidis, the Neo-Hellenist Giannis Apostolakis, the philosopher Haralambos Theodoridis and the pedagogue Alexandros Delmouzos. In this Faculty the proponents of Modernism gradually prevailed and, thus, the Faculty of Philosophy of Thessaloniki became the place where a new breed of secondary education teachers was formed, eager to introduce the demotic philosophy to their students (Terzis, 1993, pp. 164-165). The progressive character of the Thessaloniki Faculty was maintained from the mid-1960s, when many former graduates were elected as professors. Indeed, the majority had also trained in England (Foukas, 2011, pp. 504-505), and this furthered Thessaloniki Faculty's aim of bringing the Greek education system in line with those of other European countries.

Furthermore, they contributed to the creation of the «early majority» that came out in support of the 1964 Educational Reform Bill (Terzis, 1993). Many professors from the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy responded to critics of the Bill in articles published in the press. In particular, professors Michalis Sakellariou, Nikolaos Andriotes, Ioannis Kakrides and Demetrios Maronites set out to highlight the errors in the arguments put forward by the Athens Faculty of Philosophy. They focussed primarily on the educational benefits of the proposed reform, and relied heavily on points included in the explanatory report accompanying the draft law (Dimopoulou, 2016).

Sakellariou in particular mentioned that a more modern education system would be necessary to interrupt the bad tradition of pseudo-Classical education – to cater to needs of the place without being removed from the national tradition and humanitarian values; a new system would be required to show to students the real face of Ancient Greece, and to create the conditions conducive to the acquisition of a true Classical education (Sakellariou, 1964, pp. 1, 5). Andriotes, on the other hand, considered that it was socially unfair to oblige all of Greek youth, primarily destined for the practical professions, to struggle with the grammar and syntax of «dead languages» just because some wanted to go on to study Literature and the Law.

During a round-table on the issue organised by the *Alpha* journal in 1965, Kakrides expressed his sorrow that half of the country's children, were leaving

---

<sup>36</sup> A few supporters of the *katharevousa* taught at the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy, like Hariton Haritonides, Ioannis Papadopoulos, and Ioannis Vogiatzides. See Foukas, 2016, pp. 90-93.

school without being taught Homer, the tragic poets and other ancient Greek authors (Kakrides, 1964, p. 5); he stressed that it was the right of secondary school students to learn about their ancestral treasures, even in translation. He noted that:

...If we accept that the main purpose of teaching is the spiritual and aesthetic content of the ancient text, I think that now with the translations we have much greater benefit, because kids once were fighting to learn the ancient language, but they could not... (Kakrides, 1965, p. 24).

He also mentioned that with the translations:

...the child knows very well the ancient world, its cultural elements, its religion, its customs, its mythology; the child is familiar with the ancient world, so later in the *Gymnasium* he/she could emphasize learning language, which will disclose the beauty of Greek language, where language and content are an indissoluble unity... (Kakrides, 1965, p. 24).

Sakellariou also emphasised that even if the teaching of ancient languages in the *Gymnasium* were abolished, students who would not go on to study at the *Lyceum* would still be able to get to know certain ancient works in their entirety through the translations. At the same time, the proposed educational changes would ensure that those who continued to the *Lyceum* would learn ancient grammar more rapidly, as they would already know the grammar and syntax of the *katharevousa*. This was an important point, as, while much time was spent on teaching Ancient Greek to children who would never benefit from it, not enough was being taught to the future philologists and theologians; he therefore proposed that a parallel branch of secondary education, beginning from the first years of the *Gymnasium*, be set up to focus on a Classical education. In conclusion, he reiterated that the Education Act would end the current pseudo-Classical education, which he considered useless and dangerous for the spiritual health of the nation, and would reconcile students with their Classical heritage (Sakellariou, 1964, pp. 1, 5).

This kind of support from the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy professors was extremely valuable to the passing of the Bill. Their role was twofold: on the one hand, they defended the reform against its critics, demonstrating that most of their arguments were easily overturned as they were built on weak and unreasonable foundations, and on the other, they raised public awareness of the issues at stake by repeating and expanding upon the arguments that had already been raised by the Ministry of Education. The government, in turn, recognised their contribution, selecting, for example, Ioannis Kakrides as Chairman of the newly founded Pedagogical Institute.

## 8. *Plato vs. Filologos*: the confrontation

The *Etaireia Ellinon Filologon (Greeks' Philology Company)* would be a key agent in any educational reform. Established in 1949, the purpose of the organisation was to improve education and scientific knowledge among its members. Its focus

was the restoration of a nationalist ideology, based on the idea of the nation's continuity and on the indisputable value of an Ancient Greek education (Adamou, 2011, p. 70). Its *Plato*, first published in 1949, contained literary studies (about linguistic, philosophical, interpretive, grammatical and pedagogical issues), book reviews, as well as educational news on topical issues. This journal also promoted the conservative ideals on education of its creators and promoted the professional demands of the philologists (Adamou, 2011, p. 92), in columns by P. Georgountzos, N. Skouteropoulos, G. Megas, I. Tzannetakos, K. Grollios, F. Korres, P. Stamatakos and, of course, K. Georgoulis. It also provided a handy mouthpiece for the Athens Faculty of Philosophy, whose views on educational policy issues coincided with its own.

Naturally the Company disputed all of the changes proposed in the 1964 educational reform: the teaching of ancient Greek through translations, the division of secondary education into two cycles, the abolition of Latin teaching and entrance exams the Lyceum, as well as the establishment of the Pedagogical Institute. They most often took a nationalist stance – the teaching of Ancient Greek and Latin were keystones to the unity and continuity of the nation.

On November 1963, immediately after the announcement of the educational changes, *Plato* made its first attack, expressing its dissatisfaction with the government's decision. An article by Georgountzos floated the idea that translations of the Classics would be counterproductive, as each translator renders the meaning of the text differently. Although the Company was pleased that Georgios Papandreou had taken over the Ministry of Education, and that he was attempting to improve Greek education (which they acknowledged was poor, citing a lack of literacy, meagre vocational training, insufficient funding, etc.), they were unable to support the reform on the subject of Ancient Greek, and very soon came out against the reform in its entirety.

The Company discussed the Education Act in two general assemblies – on 29th April and on 28th June 1964 – and deemed that it ought to publish a special edition about the issue. This was something that they had done twice, before, in 1952 and 1958<sup>37</sup>. The 1964 special edition reiterated the views of the critics of the reform, e.g. the members of the Academy of Athens, and re-published the Memoranda by the Athens Faculties of Philosophy and Theology. It also included the deliberations of the *Enosis Genikon Epitheoriton Mesis Ekpedefsis (Union of General Inspectors of Secondary Education)*, some anti-reform articles that had previously been published in the newspaper *Kathimerini* (e.g., by S. Marinatos, P. Mpratsiotis, I. Theodorakopoulos, K. Georgoulis and P. Georgountzos), extracts from I. Skouteropoulos' self-published report,<sup>38</sup> the findings of the 34th General

---

<sup>37</sup> The first special edition was issued in 1952, and was entitled «Greek Philologists' views on educational problems» (vol. 3) and the second, in 1958, was entitled «Greek Philology Company's views on the findings on Educational Committee» (vol. 10). The third was that of 1964.

<sup>38</sup> According to Skouteropoulos – experienced philologist and educator, and former President of the Educational Council – the meagre language teaching, which would be limited to the demotic, would compromise the spiritual health of the Greek people. Skouteropoulos highlights the tremendous educational and spiritual power of Ancient Greece. See Skouteropoulos, 1964, pp. 11, 14, 16-17, 19. As we can see, his arguments primarily relate to the pedagogical value of ancient Greek and to the

Assembly, and Memoranda from the *Omospondia Leitourgon Mesis Ekpedefsis* and the *Didaskaliki Omospondia Ellados*.<sup>39</sup> More fuel for the fire was provided by the results of the Third Conference of the *Hellenic Mathematical Society*<sup>40</sup>, as well as the views of the *Panhellenic Association of Theologists*.

The Company considered that it was its duty to inform the Greek people about the opposing voice, and the risks that the educational reform would pose to the future of the Greek nation. In the conclusions of the special issue of *Plato*, only two points from the 1964 Education Act were acknowledged as proper, namely the abolition of school fees and the extension of compulsory education. The Education Act was criticised for its unscientific content, its stance against the national educational tradition, and for the harm that would consequently be caused to the education of young people. The journal accused the government of not discussing their views or proposed amendments, and warned that should the proposed changes be enacted, they would destroy Helleno-Christian civilisation, and mentally damage its youth.

However, once the Education Act had passed into law, the Company, whose influence had not been enough to avert it, made no further mention of the topic.<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, the main representatives of *Plato*, K. Georgoulis and P. Georgountzos, flooded the press with their publications railing against the educational changes and proponents of the Act. Essentially, therefore, the views of the Company continued to permeate society, and, in 1966, once again appeared in its journal when the first sad results of the implementation of the reform started to become evident. The Company claimed that teachers were frustrated by the lack of a clear curriculum, textbooks and guidelines, and *Plato*, taking advantage of the volatile political circumstances, tried to aggravate the situation even further by highlighting the deficiencies and delays in issuing the new textbooks; it accused the government of apostasy, and, in 1967, when the dictatorship had been established, welcomed the return of Ancient Greek to the *Gymnasium*.

On the other side of the fence, the journal *Filologos (Philologist)*, published every four months by the *Alumni Association of the Faculty of Philosophy of Thessaloniki University*, came out in support of the 1964 educational reform. Its mission was to comment on education policy news and literary science, but from the opposite

---

inability of translations to reach the spirit of the original content.

<sup>39</sup> The Memorandum by the *Didaskaliki Omospondia Ellados (Greeks Teacher's Federation)*, published in the *Didaskaliko Vima* on 5/8/1964, included the proposed amendments to the Education Act. One of the main *Didaskaliki Omospondia Ellados'* disagreements concerned retraining teachers in the new Pedagogical Institute – no longer at the Universities of Athens and Thessaloniki.

<sup>40</sup> The conclusions of the Third Conference of the *Hellenic Mathematical Society* were published in the *Deltion Omospondias Leitourgon Mesis Ekpedefsis (Bulletin of the Greeks Secondary Teachers Federation)* on 27/5/1964. They recommended that Mathematics be taught for six hours per week in the *Gymnasium* and expressed objections to the academic Baccalaureate.

<sup>41</sup> Certainly, the members of the Company continue to express the same views at their assemblies. For example, in the Company meeting on February 21st 1965, Konstantinos Georgoulis said that reformers want «freshwater» philologists and that children were at risk if the old ways were removed from the *Gymnasium*. The newspaper *Ta Nea (The New)* responded to this statement in an article entitled «When you are memorizing, you get taught. When you are thinking, you are dazed!».



standpoint to *Plato*. A strong proponent of Modern Greek education, the *Filologos* was accused of political posturing and identifying with a particular party.

From the very beginning of the discussions about the Education Act, the *Filologos* defended the new changes and their proponents. It commended Prime Minister Papandreou for his contribution in the Senate during the debate on the Education Act, in which he vigorously defended the *dimotiki* and condemned the *katharevousa* (*Philologist*, 1964, pp. 49-50). With regard to the translations of the ancient texts, the journal expressed the view that their use in school would be a necessary, useful and democratic compromise, even though translations would in no way qualitatively equal the original. In an article in the journal, Maronites argued that the new changes would serve Classical education in a meaningful way, finally making the idea of Helleno-Christian civilisation a reality. Introducing translated versions of the Classics would break down the barriers preventing the majority from accessing the content of ancient texts, limiting them only in grammar and syntax. It was therefore Maronites' conclusion that the new changes would be «democratic and healthy» (Maronites, 1964, pp. 61-66).

After the end of the school year 1964-1965, in which the new programme was applied in the *Gymnasium*, the *Philologist* expressed its intention to devote pages of the following issues on the debate around the data obtained after implementation of the new measures. Analysis would not only be provided by its in-house philologists, but the opinions of teachers who taught in *Gymnasium* would also be heard. It offered justifications for the contradictions and technical problems that had brought confusion and embarrassment to the new system, pointing out the lack of required testing time. It also blamed secondary education teachers for their attachment to the old conservative methods, for their refusal to train others, and for organising conferences focussing on the difficulties of the new system, thereby hindering its implementation. Furthermore, it stressed that the teachers who were fighting against the new educational changes were either frightened of them or reacting from pure political bias (*Philologist*, 1965, pp. 153-156).

Through these interventions the *Philologist* became the key advocate of the 1964 educational reform. From beginning to end, its authors were staunch supporters, and deplored the attempts of the «apostatic» government to undermine it. Indeed, this positive attitude was to be expected, as the journal was published by graduates of the Thessaloniki Faculty of Philosophy, who wholeheartedly embraced the Modernist philosophy.

## 9. The overthrow of the 1964 reform

Despite the efforts expended to get the reform enacted quickly, it was almost immediately overturned when Georgios Papandreou's government was ousted in July 1965.<sup>42</sup> The government resigned on July 15th, and the same evening a new government was formed by Ministers from the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*), who

---

<sup>42</sup> King Konstantinos did not accept the suggestion of Georgios Papandreou to take on the Ministry of Defense, and he was therefore forced to resign. See Kasimates, Petridis, Sideratos, 1989, p. 313.

had decided to secede from it. The fall of the government posed an immediate danger to the new Education Act (4376/1964), whose fate was now extremely uncertain. The new, centrist, government did not resist educational reform (Meynaud, 1974<sup>2</sup>, pp. 54-79), but they did not have the majority in the *Boule*, and relied on the parliamentary votes of the conservative party – the *Ethniki Rizospastiki Enosis* (*National Radical Union*). As mentioned, this party was vehemently opposed to the idea, and so educational reform had to be abandoned (Bouzakis, 2011, p. 239).

Thus, the 1964 Education Act became essentially redundant after Georgios Papandreou's government fell, but its fate was definitively sealed by the military coup d'état that occurred on April 21st, 1967. Indeed, the new dictatorship was founded on conservative ideals, and their education policy was far from progressive. In fact, all the changes brought about by the 1964 reform were gradually reversed (Papanoytsos, 1982, p. 128); *katharevousa* was reinstated as the official language of education, curricula and textbooks were changed, removing the new courses that had been introduced. The Pedagogical Institute was disbanded and the Academic Baccalaureate removed. The only change they retained was the abolition of fees for education. The repeal of the 1964 reform was completed by Compulsory Law 129/1967, which came into force on September 1967 (Dimaras, 2013, pp. 244-245 and Doukas, 2011, pp. 242-243). Thus, the overthrow of the reform was triggered by a confrontational political situation and ended by the Aprilian regime.

## 10. Conclusions

Europe in the 1960s enjoyed the fruits of post-war reconstruction, capitalised on the Marshall Plan, restored national educational traditions and optimistically looked to the prospect of economic unification. In Greece, the educational reform proposed by the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) was geared towards this positive European outlook. However, it could not be fully assimilated because the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) chose not to forge immediate and radical connections with this milieu, and due to the increasingly unstable political situation. As the government of the *Enosis Kentrou* (*Centre Union*) remained in authority for only eighteen months, there was no time to make the changes that had been announced.

The 1964 educational reform reflected the multiple social and political contradictions of the era, but also represented a milestone in the history of Modern Greek education. However, just as all the previous reform efforts of the 20th century, the 1964 Education Act proved to be ineffective. Consequently, it would be unfair to judge the reform by its results. Instead the Act should be seen as a declaration of intent; in this regard it marked a substantial break with the past, and showed a clear attempt to modernise and democratise the Education system. On February 16th 1966, speaking at Klafthmonos square in Athens, Georgios Papandreou promised to reinstate the Act and complete its implementation upon his return to power, but he unfortunately died on November 1st, 1968 (Bouzakis, 1999).

Nevertheless, the post-dictatorship governments – even the opposition government of 1976-1977 – adopted the main characteristics of Papandreou's progressive reform – an important indication of the validity of its precepts. Indeed, even though the political, economic, social and educational conditions had changed

significantly by 1976–1977 it was the governing conservative faction that reprised the educational reform (Kontoula, 2011).

It is evident from these events that meaningful educational reform is difficult to enact without first achieving economic and social change. The fact that the opposing party found fertile ground on which to plant the seeds of its opposition to the government's proposal proves that the time for the introduction of such a progressive educational reform was not yet right. The number and nature of the arguments used by critics of the 1964 changes in Education demonstrated that there would be a long road to travel before consensus could be reached as to reforming the Greek school system. That being said, despite their opposite intentions, it is clear that the strong reactions to the idea of reform in 1964 raised awareness in society of the issues, and eventually helped to consolidate educational reform, giving power to the idea of change.

## 11. References

- Adamou, G. (2011). *The journal entitled «Platon» and the 1964 educational reform*. Msc. (Thesis). School of Philosophy, Pedagogy, and Psychology. Ioannina, University of Ioannina. [in Greek]
- Agelakos, K. (2017). *Access to Higher Education (1964-2014): The unbearable repetition and the unbearable lightness of public political discourse and dialogue*. Athens: Metaixmio. [in Greek]
- Andriotes, N. (Eds.) (1965). *Symposium on the «dimotiki» (Modern Greek)*. Athens: Athens Technological Institute. [in Greek]
- Athanasiades, H. (2015). *The withdrawn books: Nation and school history in Greece, 1858-2008*. Athens: Alexandria. [in Greek]
- Bouzakis, S., & P. Simeni (2009). The Faculty of the University of Athens and the educational reforms 1913, 1929 and 1964. *Issues in History of Education*, 8, 73-92. [in Greek]
- Bouzakis, S. (1999). *George A. Papandreou, 1888-1968: Political education*. Vol. 2. Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- Bouzakis, S. (2002). *Educational reforms in Greece. Primary and Secondary General, Technological and Vocational Education*. Vol. 2. Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- Bouzakis, S. (2011). The educational reform of 1964-1965. In Bouzakis, S. (Eds.), *Panorama of the history of education. Sides and opinions. Modern education 1821-2010*. Vol. 2 (pp. 223-240). Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- Carabott, Ph. (2005). *Evangelika (1901) - Oresteia (1903): Modern pressures and social resistance*. Athens: Etaireia Spoudon Neoellinikou Politismou kai Genikis Paideias. [in Greek]

- Centre Union (1962). *Mavri Vivlos: The Chronicle of the Election Conspiracy of 29-10-1961*. Athens: Centre Union. [in Greek]
- Christidis, Chr. (2012). *The «unyielding struggle» of the Centre Union: From the 1961 elections to K. Karamanlis' resignation*. (Ph.D.). University of Athens, School of History and Archeology. [in Greek]
- Clogg, R. (1987). *Parties and Elections in Greece: The search for Legitimacy*. Durham-North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Clogg, R. (1991). Enosis Kentrou (Centre Union): Liberals in power? In *Liberalism in Greece* (pp. 119-130). Athens: Hestia. [in Greek]
- Demotic praise. *Philologist*, n. 2, September 1964, pp. 49-50. [in Greek]
- Diamantopoulos, I. (1991). Enosis Kentrou (Centre Union): Party of Authorities or Power Group? In *Liberalism in Greece* (pp. 131-150). Athens: Hestia. [in Greek]
- Dimaras, Al. (1998<sup>2</sup>). *The reform has not happened: Evidence of history*. Vol. 2. Athens: Hestia. [in Greek]
- Dimaras, Al. (2000a). Reform and counter-reform (1964-1976). In: *History of the Greek nation*. Vol. 16. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon. [in Greek]
- Dimaras, Al. (2000b). School education: The new reforms. In Panayotopoulos, V. (Eds.), *History of modern Hellenism, 1770-2000* (pp. 167-180). Athens: Greek Letters. [in Greek]
- Dimaras, Al. (2013). *History of Greek Education: «The intercepted jump». Trends and resistances in Greek education 1833-2000*. Athens: Metaixmio. [in Greek]
- Dimopoulou, I. (2016). *The teaching of ancient Greek literature of translation in the context of the educational reform of 1964: Welcome, opinions, reactions*. (MSc thesis). Thessaloniki: Department of Philosophy-Education, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. [in Greek]
- Doukas, T. (2011). The school during the era of the dictatorship (1867-74). In Bouzakis, S. (Eds.), *Panorama of the history of education. Sides and opinions. Modern education 1821-2010*. Vol. 2 (pp. 241-252). Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- Foukas, V. (2011). The Faculty of Philosophy of Thessaloniki University from its establishment to the regime change: Peoples and programs, continuity and discontinuity. In Bouzakis, S. (Eds.), *Panorama of the history of education. Sides and opinions. Modern education 1821-2010*. Vol. 2 (pp. 485-509). Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- Foukas, V. (2016). *The Faculty of Philosophy of Thessaloniki University, 1926-1940: People and programs, course and forefront*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides publications. [in Greek]

- Foukas, V. (2017). Evangelos Papanoytsos and the chair of Systematic Philosophy at the Faculty of the University of Thessaloniki: Fallow struggles and suspense. In Foteinos, D., Simeni, P., & Papadakis, N. (Eds.), *Education and educational reform: Historical-comparative approaches* (pp. 437-467). Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- Hadjivasilou, Eyan. (2010). *Greek liberalism: The radical tide, 1932-1979*. Athens: Patakis Publications. [in Greek]
- Haralambous, D. Ph. (1990). *Educational policy and educational reform in post-war Greece (1950-1974)*. (Ph.D.). Faculty of Philosophy, Education and Psychology, Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. [in Greek]
- Kakrides, I. (1964). The Educational Bill and its critics. The age-old Greek tradition and the new needs of the era. *To Vima*, 29/8/1964, p. 5. [in Greek]
- Kakrides, I. (1965). Educational reform: For and anti. Roundtable. *Alpha*, 28, 25/11/1965, p. 24. [in Greek]
- Karamanolakis, V. (2010) (Eds.). *The military dictatorship, 1967-1974*. Athens: Ta Nea. [in Greek]
- Kasimates, G., P. Petrides, A., & Sideratos (1988). *George Papandreou (1888-1968). Highlights of modern political History*. Athens: Nea Sinora. [in Greek]
- Kelpanides, M. (1997). *Welfare State and education: equality of opportunity and equality of outcome-Education as an individual achievement or social benefit*. Vol. 1. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides Brothers Publishing House. [in Greek]
- Kiprianos, P. (2004). *Comparative History of Greek education*. Athens: Vivliorama. [in Greek]
- Kiprianos, P. (2016). *The magic of the degree: Universities, alumni, social trajectories (1837-2015)*. Athens: Vivliorama. [in Greek]
- Kontoula, O. (2011). *From the «late majority» to «laggards»: A comparative study of reforms of 1964 and 1976 as «incidents» during the diffusion process of an educational innovation in Greece*. (MSc thesis). School of Philosophy-Education, Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. [in Greek]
- Kostis, K. (2014). «*The spoiled children of history*»: *The establishment of Modern Greek State 18th-21st century*. Athens: Polis. [in Greek]
- Law 4379/1964. «About the Organisation and Administration of the General Primary and Secondary Education». FEK. 182/vol. 1/24.10.1964. [in Greek]
- Maronites, D. (1964). The Ancient Greek by translations. *Philologist*, 2, September 1964, 61-66. [in Greek]
- Mavroskoufis, D. (2002). Christian clubs and educational policy (1964-1999): The rebellion of the «good homemaker» as an element of normalcy. In Bouzakis, S.

- (Ed.), *Topical issues of History of Education. 1st Scientific Conference History of Education* (pp. 121-141). Patra 28-30 September 2000, Athens: Gutenberg. [in Greek]
- McCulloch, G. (1994). *Educational Reconstruction: The 1944 Education Act and the 21st century*. London: Woburn.
- Meynaud, J. (1974<sup>2</sup>). *Political forces in Greece. The diversion of parliamentarians in July 1965*. Translated by P. Merlopoulos. Vol. 2. Athens: Bairon. [in Greek]
- Meynaud, J. (2002<sup>2</sup>). *The political forces in Greece 1946-1965*. Translated by Merlopoulos, P., & Notaras. G. Vol. 1. Athens: Savalas. [in Greek]
- Miller, J. E. (2009). *The United States and the making of modern Greece: History and power, 1950-1974*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Ministry of Education (1959). *Conclusions of the Committee on education*. Athens: National Press. [in Greek]
- Mitrosili, El. (2013). *The educational reform of 1964 in Primary and Secondary Education and the critique of Eniaia Dimokratiki Aristera (United Democratic Left)*. (MSc thesis). Panteion University of Athens-Faculty of Political Science and History. [in Greek]
- Moraitidis, M. (2015). *The student movement in Greece: Political radicalisation and collective action (1956-1964)*. (Ph.D.). Volos: School of History, Archeology, and Social Anthropology. [in Greek]
- National Statistical Service of Greece (1962). *Results of the population and housing census of 19 March 1961*. Vol. 2: Education. Athens: Kindom of Greece-N.S.S.G. [in Greek]
- Nikolakopoulos, El. (2000). *Political parties and elections in Greece 1946-1964: The Electoral geography of political forces*. Athens: National Centre for Social Research. [in Greek]
- Notes. *Philologist*, 4 June 1965, pp. 153-156. [in Greek]
- Noutsos, H. (1979). *Secondary Education: Programs and social control (1931-1973)*. Athens: Themelio. [in Greek]
- Papanoytsos, E. (1965). *Struggles and suspense in education*. Athens: Ikaros. [in Greek]
- Papanoytsos, E. (1982). *Autobiography*. Athens: Filippotis. [in Greek]
- Papastratis, P. (2011). *Foreword in the book of Michalis Limperatoy of the IPU in the SES versions Thinker*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Papazoglou, M. (1975). *Students' movement and dictatorship*. Athens: Epikairotitia. [in Greek]

- Paschaloudis, H. (2009). *The 1940s in the rhetoric of Greek factions: The political crisis of the past in the period 1950-1967*. (Ph.D.). Thessaloniki, School of Balkan, Slavic and East Studies, University of Macedonia. [in Greek]
- Pesmazoglou, St. (1999<sup>2</sup>). *Education and Development in Greece 1948-1985: The inharmonious of a Relationship*. Athens: Themelio. [in Greek]
- Pyrpyres, P. (2010). *Omospondia Leitourgon Mesis Ekpedefsis (Officials' Federation for Secondary Education) and educational policy (1949-1967)*. (Ph.D.). School of Sociology, Panteion University. [in Greek]
- Repousi, M. (2012). *Marasleiaka (1925-1927)*. Athens: Polis. [in Greek]
- Sakellariou, M. (1964). The revitalisation of education. The Educational Bill, its aim and its opponents. C'. *To Vima*, 26/8/1964. pp. 1, 5. [in Greek]
- Scientific Yearbook of the Faculty of Philosophy of University of Athens (1963-1964). *Memorandum of Faculty of Philosophy of Athens University in governmental changes on education*. Vol. 14 (pp. 587-599). Athens. [in Greek]
- Skouteropoulos, I. (1964). *A short check of main provisions of 1964s educational Bills*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Svoronos, N. (1976<sup>2</sup>). *Overview of Modern History*. Athens: Themelio.
- Terzis, N. P. (1993). *Educational policy and educational reform: Program and reality, things and persons*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides Brothers Publishing House. [in Greek]
- Terzis, N. P. (2000<sup>2</sup>). *High school as a grade of compulsory education: Critical inventory and comparative research*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides Brothers Publishing House. [in Greek]
- Terzis, N. P. (2013). *Study of education of Neohellinism. Before the State-in the State-out of the State*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides. [in Greek]
- Tsoukalas, K. (1981). *The Greek tragedy*. Translated by Iordanidis, K. Athens: A. A. Livanis. [in Greek]
- Tsoukalas, K. (2008). The Greek 1960s: short or long? In Regos, A.I, Séphériadès, P., & Hadjivasiliou, E. (Eds.), *The «short» decade of the 1960s: Institutional framework, partisan strategies, social conflicts, cultural processes* (pp. 41-46). Athens: Kastaniotis. [in Greek]

*página intencionadamente en blanco / page intentionally blank*