

# ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



**ISRG PUBLISHERS**

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

**ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)**

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – III Issue-I (January- February) 2025

Frequency: Bimonthly



## "Military Training, Espionage, and Counter-Espionage in the Modern History of the Greek Army (1821–1947): A Strategic Evolution in Military Pedagogy"

**Dr. Marios Kyriakidis**

Docent at the Hellenic Army Academy Higher Military Educational Institution, "Military Academy of Evelpidon"

| **Received:** 03.01.2025 | **Accepted:** 07.01.2025 | **Published:** 08.01.2025

**\*Corresponding author:** Dr. Marios Kyriakidis

Docent at the Hellenic Army Academy Higher Military Educational Institution, "Military Academy of Evelpidon"

### Abstract

*This study examines the evolution of military training, espionage, and counter-espionage within the Greek Army from 1821 to 1947, a period marked by Greece's struggle for independence, state-building, and participation in major global conflicts. It explores the foundational role of military pedagogy in shaping the Greek Army's strategic capabilities, tracing its development from informal guerilla tactics during the War of Independence to the establishment of structured training systems and academies in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.*

*The research highlights the interplay between military pedagogy and intelligence practices, focusing on how espionage and counter-espionage were integrated into broader strategic frameworks. Particular emphasis is placed on the modernization of these practices during pivotal moments, such as the Balkan Wars, World War I, and World War II, and their influence on Greece's ability to navigate external threats and internal conflicts, including the Greek Civil War.*

*Drawing from archival records, military documents, and historical analyses, the study underscores the transformative impact of training and intelligence operations on Greece's military effectiveness. By situating these developments within a broader historical and strategic context, this work contributes to understanding the dynamic interrelation of pedagogy, strategy, and national defense in modern military history.*

**Keywords:** Military Training, Espionage, Counter-Espionage, Greek Army, Military Pedagogy, Strategic Evolution, 1821–1947

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Greece's military history between 1821 and 1947 is a compelling narrative of resilience, adaptation, and transformation. The period begins with the Greek War of Independence (1821–1830), a defining struggle against the Ottoman Empire that culminated in the establishment of a modern Greek state. During this conflict, Greece relied heavily on irregular guerilla warfare and uncoordinated military efforts, reflecting the absence of a centralized military structure or formal training. Over time, the Greek Army evolved into a modern institution, influenced by foreign military advisors, shifting geopolitical realities, and technological advancements.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the Greek Army underwent significant modernization, including the creation of military academies and the formalization of training protocols. This evolution coincided with Greece's territorial expansion and its active participation in the Balkan Wars (1912–1913), World War I, and World War II. Each of these conflicts required the Greek military to adapt its strategies, improve its training methodologies, and develop robust intelligence systems. Espionage and counter-espionage emerged as crucial tools for navigating complex geopolitical challenges, such as Ottoman resistance, Balkan rivalries, and Axis occupation.

The study of military pedagogy and its strategic implications within this historical context is of paramount importance. Military pedagogy—the systematic training and education of soldiers and officers—played a central role in shaping the Greek Army's capacity to respond to external and internal threats. Simultaneously, the integration of espionage and counter-espionage practices into the military framework marked a significant shift in Greece's strategic thinking. Understanding these developments provides valuable insights into the interplay between education, intelligence, and strategy, not only in the context of Greece but also as a broader case study in modern military and political history. This manuscript seeks to answer two central research questions:

1. *How did military pedagogy evolve in the Greek Army between 1821 and 1947?*

This question explores the transformation of training practices and educational systems within the Greek military. It examines the transition from ad-hoc, experiential learning to structured pedagogy, including the establishment of military academies, officer training programs, and wartime adaptations.

2. *What role did espionage and counter-espionage play in the strategic developments of the Greek Army?*

This question investigates the development and application of intelligence practices in Greece's military history. It focuses on the evolution of espionage and counter-espionage tactics, their integration into broader military strategies, and their impact on Greece's ability to navigate challenges such as foreign occupation, insurgencies, and inter-state conflicts.

The temporal scope of this study spans from 1821, the beginning of the Greek War of Independence, to 1947, the end of the Greek Civil War's immediate post-war phase. This period encompasses the transformation of Greece from a newly independent state to a nation grappling with the repercussions of World War II and internal strife. By focusing on this era, the research captures the

critical phases of the Greek Army's evolution and its responses to both external and internal challenges.

The study is inherently multidisciplinary, combining elements of military and political history, military pedagogy, and intelligence studies.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Theoretical framework. The Historical Context of the Greek Army (1821–1947)

The evolution of the Greek Army from its nascent stages during the Greek War of Independence to the tumultuous post-World War II period reflects a multifaceted trajectory shaped by military training, espionage, and counter-espionage. This period (1821–1947) reveals not only a narrative of military pedagogy and strategy but also the unique challenges Greece faced in securing its independence, stabilizing its sovereignty, and adapting to the geopolitical complexities of the modern era. The historical context is best understood through four distinct phases: The Greek War of Independence (1821–1832), the establishment of the modern Greek Army (1828–1910), World War I and the Interwar Period (1918–1939), and World War II (1939–1945) and the Greek Civil War (1946–1949).

The Greek War of Independence marked the birth of modern Greece, and the military forces of this period were characterized by their decentralized, guerrilla-style operations. Local leaders, or *armatoloi* and *klephts*, led irregular militias that drew on centuries-old traditions of resistance against Ottoman rule. These groups were tactically adept in asymmetrical warfare, exploiting their intimate knowledge of local terrain.

However, the lack of centralized command posed significant challenges, particularly when faced with Ottoman forces supported by European-trained officers. To address these shortcomings, the Greek revolutionaries sought external assistance, leading to the establishment of the *Philhellenic Corps*. Foreign volunteers brought rudimentary elements of formal military training, introducing modern weaponry, drills, and tactical maneuvers. These influences were pivotal in transitioning Greek forces from purely irregular units to more structured entities capable of engaging conventional armies.

The War of Independence set a foundational precedent for military training as an essential element of Greek sovereignty. However, its focus on immediate survival over long-term strategy left the nascent Greek state with a fragmented military tradition that required significant reorganization post-independence.

The establishment of the modern Greek state in 1830 (Archives of the Academy of Athens, 1930), marked the beginning of a systematic effort to create a centralized military force. Under the leadership of Governor Ioannis Kapodistrias, early attempts at structuring the army were initiated, but it was the ascension of King Otto of Bavaria in 1832 that heralded a more comprehensive reorganization (Kyriakidis, 2016).

Bavarian military advisors played a critical role in shaping the Greek Army during this period. They introduced European military doctrines, standardized training programs, and organizational frameworks. Alongside the Bavarians, French influence became increasingly prominent, particularly through the establishment of military academies such as the Evelpidon Military Academy in 1828. These institutions laid the groundwork for military pedagogy

in Greece, emphasizing discipline, technical proficiency, and leadership (Kyriakidis, 2016).

This period also witnessed the gradual professionalization of the officer corps. Young Greek officers were sent abroad, particularly to France and Germany, to study military science and engineering. Upon their return, they brought with them advanced knowledge of artillery, fortifications, and logistics, contributing to the modernization of the Greek Army (Kyriakidis, 2022).

Despite these advancements, challenges remained. The political instability of the 19th century, coupled with limited financial resources, often hindered the full implementation of training programs. Furthermore, Greece's reliance on foreign advisors occasionally resulted in cultural tensions, as imported doctrines did not always align with the realities of Greek warfare or geography.

World War I and the subsequent Interwar Period marked a turning point in the Greek Army's development. Greece's involvement in the war, alongside the Allies, necessitated the adoption of modern military practices. The Greek Army was exposed to large-scale mobilization, mechanized warfare, and advanced training techniques during the Macedonian Front campaigns. This experience catalyzed efforts to modernize the army's structure, equipment, and pedagogy (Kyriakidis, 2021).

Military training during this period emphasized mechanization and coordination. Tactical exercises, battlefield simulations, and the incorporation of new technologies, such as tanks and airplanes, became central to the army's curriculum. The influence of French military advisors remained strong, particularly in the reorganization of the infantry and the development of artillery units.

The Interwar Period also saw the emergence of organized espionage as a critical component of Greece's military strategy (Gerolymatos, 2018). As tensions in the Balkans escalated, intelligence gathering became vital for securing Greece's borders and countering potential threats. Early efforts to institutionalize espionage included the creation of specialized units and training programs focused on cryptography, reconnaissance, and counter-intelligence. These developments marked the beginning of a more sophisticated approach to military intelligence in Greece.

However, political divisions during this period—particularly between Venizelists and Royalists—undermined the army's cohesion. The National Schism (1915–1922) created parallel military structures, resulting in inefficiencies that persisted even after the resolution of the conflict (Kyriakidis, 2023).

World War II presented Greece with unprecedented challenges, but also opportunities for strategic innovation. The Greek Army's success during the Greco-Italian War (1940–1941) demonstrated the effectiveness of its training programs, particularly in mountain warfare. Greek forces capitalized on their mastery of challenging terrain to achieve remarkable victories against a more technologically advanced adversary.

However, the subsequent German occupation (1941–1944) fragmented the army, forcing many soldiers to join resistance movements such as ELAS and EDES. These groups relied heavily on guerrilla tactics, blending traditional methods of asymmetrical warfare with modern strategic objectives (Gregoriadis, 1964). Espionage and counter-espionage became crucial tools during the occupation, as resistance fighters gathered intelligence on German operations and coordinated with Allied forces.

The Greek Civil War (1946–1949) further highlighted the strategic evolution of military pedagogy in Greece (Army Headquarters, 1971). The conflict underscored the need for counter-insurgency training, as government forces faced guerrilla tactics employed by communist rebels. Counter-espionage efforts intensified during this period, with the establishment of networks designed to infiltrate and disrupt enemy operations.

The pressures of wartime and internal conflict drove the Greek Army to adopt a more holistic approach to training and strategy. By integrating traditional methods with modern doctrines, Greece laid the foundation for a more adaptable and resilient military force.

The historical context of the Greek Army from 1821 to 1947 reflects a dynamic interplay between tradition and innovation. From the decentralized militias of the War of Independence to the professionalized force of the mid-20th century, Greece's military evolution was shaped by foreign influences, geopolitical challenges, and the exigencies of war. The emphasis on military training, espionage, and counter-espionage not only bolstered Greece's defense capabilities but also established a legacy of strategic adaptability that continues to inform its military doctrine.

## 2.2 Research studies on the period under investigation (1821–1947)

The period from 1821 to 1947 in Greek military history has been the subject of various scholarly works, each contributing to our understanding of military training, espionage, and counter-espionage. However, these studies often leave certain aspects underexplored, presenting opportunities for further research.

André Gerolymatos (Gerolymatos, 1992) offers an in-depth analysis of British intelligence operations during World War II. Despite its comprehensive examination, the study does not incorporate material from the Special Operations Executive (SOE) archives in London, omitting potentially significant insights into British clandestine activities in Greece. Gerolymatos's later work, (Gerolymatos, 2018) similarly lacks this archival integration, suggesting a gap in the utilization of available primary sources.

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA, 1953) provides a detailed overview of the Greek military's structure and capabilities. While informative, the document offers limited analysis of the evolution of military training methodologies and the development of intelligence services during the specified period. This presents an opportunity to delve deeper into how training and espionage practices transformed over time.

The Combat Studies Institute's publication (Harris, 2013), examines the role of U.S. military advisors in enhancing Greek combat effectiveness during the Civil War. However, the study primarily focuses on the late 1940s, offering limited insight into the earlier periods of 1821–1947. Additionally, it concentrates on combat leadership, leaving the evolution of military pedagogy and intelligence practices underexplored.

The U.S. Department of State (Churchill, et. al., 1974) includes memoranda discussing U.S. military assistance to Greece. These documents shed light on strategic considerations during the late 1940s but do not extensively cover the historical development of Greek military training and intelligence operations from 1821 onwards. This indicates a gap in longitudinal analyses of Greek military evolution.



The Defense Technical Information Center (Sir Hinsley, 1988) discusses the transformation of intelligence services in Western Europe post-World War II. While it provides context for broader intelligence developments, it offers limited information specific to Greek counter-espionage services during 1821–1947. This suggests a need for focused studies on Greece's intelligence evolution within this timeframe.

In summary, while existing literature provides valuable insights into various facets of Greek military history between 1821 and 1947 (Koliopoulos, Veremis, 2010), significant gaps remain. Notably, there is a lack of comprehensive studies integrating primary sources from international archives, analyses of the evolution of military pedagogy over the entire period, and detailed examinations of the development of espionage and counter-espionage practices. Addressing these gaps would contribute to a more nuanced understanding of Greece's military evolution during this transformative era.

### 3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research methodology

The research methodology aligns with the study's objectives, employing a historical-pedagogical framework enhanced by detailed source analysis. This approach is designed to explore the evolution of military strategy, military education, and intelligence practices, as exemplified in Greece's modern history through the development of training programs, espionage operations, and counter-espionage measures from 1821 to 1947. The study focuses on the following key areas:

- a) The progression of Greek military education, particularly the establishment and evolution of formal military academies and training protocols during pivotal historical periods.
- b) The role of espionage and counter-espionage in shaping Greek military strategy and its impact on broader geopolitical outcomes.
- c) An evaluation of political challenges during critical periods, including conflicts, territorial negotiations, and the influence of international treaties on Greece's geopolitical strategy.
- d) A critique of the military pedagogy's responsiveness to wartime demands and its alignment with evolving strategic imperatives.
- e) A historical investigation into the long-term impacts of military training reforms and intelligence practices on national sovereignty (Borg & Gall, 1989). This qualitative approach emphasizes the significance of connecting historical developments to educational and strategic innovations.

Drawing on primary archival sources, such as military training manuals, intelligence documents, and governmental records, provides a foundation for understanding the practices and policies of the Greek Army. On the other hand, it examines periods of uncertainty characterized by shifting alliances, ideological divides, and fluctuating national priorities. D. Mavroskoufis' classification of sources into primary (originating from the study period) and secondary (later analyses) serves as a guiding framework (Mavroskoufis, 2005).

The research confronts theoretical and practical challenges, including interpreting incomplete historical records and reconstructing events from the distant past (Verdi, 2015;

Athanasίου, 2003). These challenges are addressed through a historical lens, reflecting Jaspers' philosophy that modern science represents a continuous pursuit of understanding (Jaspers, 1950).

The primary method employed is historical analysis, focusing on uncovering facts, evaluating evidence, and establishing chronological narratives within the context of Greece's evolving sovereignty and geopolitical strategy. This method investigates causality, consequences, and societal attitudes while tracing institutional developments across key eras (Athanasίου, 2003). Cohen and Manion define historical research as "the systematic and objective identification, evaluation, and synthesis of evidence" to critically reconstruct the past and inform future developments (Cohen & Manion, 1977). This analytical approach is vital for understanding how Greece adapted military training and intelligence strategies to address evolving geopolitical and security challenges. The combination of primary and secondary sources, including academic studies and historical accounts, contextualizes the archival data and offers interpretive insights. It enhances the depth of this study, offering multiple perspectives on Greece's military diplomacy and its implications for national sovereignty (Cohen & Manion, 1977). However, the research is subject to certain limitations. The availability and accessibility of primary sources may vary, particularly for classified intelligence documents or wartime records.

Hill and Kerber underscore the benefits of historical research, which include:

- a) Resolving contemporary issues by drawing insights from Greece's historical negotiations.
- b) Identifying long-term trends in geopolitical strategy and military education.
- c) Revealing the dynamics of cultural and political exchanges during treaty negotiations.
- d) Refining and reevaluating established theories in light of Greece's role in international relations (Hill & Kerber, 1967).

The study concentrates on military pedagogy, intelligence operations, and strategic evolution. By analyzing Greece's military history and its responses to external and internal pressures, the research provides a nuanced perspective on Greece's efforts to assert sovereignty amidst shifting alliances and competing national interests (Verdi, 2015). In the fields of education and military training, historical research reveals the importance of connecting geopolitical contexts, political strategy, and pedagogy. By revisiting historical theories, the study extracts insights relevant to contemporary challenges, such as defense modernization and the role of education in national resilience. The analysis of archival records and key treaties demonstrates how military pedagogy evolved to address the demands of modern warfare and international diplomacy. The primary objectives include:

Examining the evolution of Greek military education and its impact on strategic outcomes.

Analyzing the integration of espionage and counter-espionage within broader military frameworks.

Applying the philosophies of influential thinkers to contemporary geopolitical and educational contexts (Bitsaki, 2005; Melanitou, 1957).

This research moves beyond documenting historical facts to address critical themes, including:

- The interplay between military education and geopolitical strategy.
- The strategic role of intelligence practices in shaping national policy.
- The broader implications of military reforms for sovereignty and diplomacy.

By synthesizing these elements, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of the dynamic interrelations between military pedagogy, strategy, and national sovereignty across a pivotal era in Greece's history

## 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Military Training and Pedagogical Evolution

The evolution of military training and pedagogy in Greece during the transformative years of 1821 to 1947 represents a critical facet of its strategic development. This period, spanning the Greek War of Independence, the establishment of the modern Greek state, and the tumultuous wars of the mid-20th century, reflects a gradual yet profound shift from informal, traditional systems to structured military education and adaptive wartime strategies. By examining three distinct phases—Early Training Practices (1821–1900), Introduction of Structured Military Pedagogy (1900–1939), and Training during Wartime (1940–1947)—this analysis uncovers the underexplored dynamics of Greece's military evolution.

#### 4.1 Early Training Practices (1821–1900): Informal Systems and Challenges

The Greek War of Independence (1821–1830) served as the crucible for the nascent Greek military. During this period, the revolutionary forces were primarily composed of irregular militias led by *armatoloi* and *klephts*, who employed guerrilla tactics deeply rooted in centuries of Ottoman resistance. These forces demonstrated remarkable resilience and ingenuity, but their lack of cohesion and formal training was a persistent limitation (Gerolymatos, 1992). The absence of centralized command structures often led to fragmentation, hindering the coordination of large-scale military efforts.

To address these challenges, Governor Ioannis Kapodistrias initiated efforts to professionalize the military by founding the Evelpidon Military Academy in 1828, Greece's first institution for officer training (Kyriakidis, 2016). Despite its establishment, the academy faced significant obstacles, including scarce resources, political instability, and limited enrollment. Its early curriculum, focused on foundational military disciplines like engineering and mathematics, laid the groundwork for formal military pedagogy, but the nascent state's financial and infrastructural limitations restricted its effectiveness.

Foreign military missions from Bavaria and France played a pivotal role in shaping early training practices. These advisors introduced European military doctrines, emphasizing discipline, hierarchical organization, and standardized training (Kyriakidis, 2022). However, their influence was not without friction. Cultural and operational disparities often hindered the seamless integration of foreign practices into Greek military culture, leaving a hybridized system that required further refinement. The reliance on foreign expertise underscored the need for a self-sufficient military education system tailored to Greece's unique geopolitical and cultural context.

#### 4.2 Introduction of Structured Military Pedagogy (1900–1939): Military

### Academies and Curriculum Development

The turn of the 20th century marked a pivotal transition in Greek military training, as the establishment of military academies provided a more structured framework for officer education (Stasinopoulos, 1933). The Evelpidon Military Academy expanded its role, becoming the cornerstone of Greece's efforts to professionalize its armed forces (Kyriakidis, 2022). By 1904, its curriculum incorporated advanced subjects, including artillery science, fortification engineering, and military law, reflecting a growing emphasis on technical proficiency (Gazette of the Government, 1904).

During this period, curriculum development became increasingly aligned with European military advancements (Gazette of the Government, b, 1904). The influence of French and German military doctrines was particularly pronounced, with many Greek officers studying abroad to acquire expertise in modern warfare techniques. Upon their return, these officers introduced innovative practices, such as tactical simulations and war games, which became integral to military training (General Staff of the Army, 1997). These methodologies not only enhanced the practical skills of Greek officers but also fostered a strategic mindset that emphasized adaptability and foresight.

Non-commissioned officer (NCO) training also underwent significant reform. Recognizing the pivotal role of NCOs in maintaining discipline and operational efficiency, the Greek military introduced specialized training programs to professionalize this cadre. These programs emphasized leadership, technical skills, and battlefield adaptability, contributing to a more cohesive and effective military structure (Dimakopoulos, 2000).

Despite these advancements, the interwar period presented unique challenges. Political instability, including the National Schism (Kyriakidis, 2023) and subsequent military coups, often disrupted the continuity of training programs. Additionally, the Balkan Wars and World War I placed immense strain on the Greek military, exposing gaps in logistical preparedness and operational coordination. While the foundational elements of structured pedagogy were in place, their implementation was inconsistent, reflecting the broader challenges of a nation grappling with internal and external pressures.

#### 4.3 Training during Wartime (1940–1947): Adaptive Strategies in Response to Wartime Needs

The onset of World War II marked a period of profound transformation in Greek military training. The Greco-Italian War (1940–1941) demonstrated the effectiveness of pre-war training programs, particularly in preparing soldiers for mountain warfare. Greek forces successfully leveraged their familiarity with rugged terrain and harsh conditions to achieve notable victories against a more technologically advanced adversary (Kyriakidis, 2021). However, the rapid escalation of conflict necessitated further adaptation in training methodologies.

During the German occupation (1941–1944), formal military institutions were largely incapacitated, forcing resistance groups to develop alternative training systems. Organizations such as ELAS (Greek People's Liberation Army) and EDES (National Republican Greek League) established clandestine training camps that emphasized guerrilla tactics, sabotage, and intelligence gathering (Mazower, 2001). These improvised programs blended traditional resistance strategies with modern military principles, creating a

hybridized approach to warfare that proved effective against occupying forces.

Espionage and counter-espionage training also became critical components of wartime strategy. Resistance groups collaborated with Allied intelligence agencies, such as the Special Operations Executive (SOE), to develop skills in cryptography, reconnaissance, and covert operations. While these collaborations provided valuable expertise, they also highlighted gaps in Greece's pre-existing intelligence capabilities, underscoring the need for institutionalized training in this domain (Gerolymatos, 1992).

The Greek Civil War (1946–1949) further underscored the importance of adaptive training strategies. The conflict's asymmetric nature required government forces to focus on counter-insurgency tactics, which had not been a significant component of pre-war training programs. The involvement of foreign advisors, particularly from the United States, introduced new methodologies, such as psychological operations and air mobility training, which were instrumental in combating guerrilla forces (Clogg, 2002).

## 5. Espionage and Counter-Espionage in the Greek Army

The history of espionage and counter-espionage within the Greek Army from 1821 to 1947 illustrates the interplay between local ingenuity, external influences, and evolving geopolitical challenges. This analysis delves into three critical phases: Espionage Practices during the Greek War of Independence, the Formalization of Espionage (1900–1939), and Counter-Espionage during World War II and the Greek Civil War. Each phase marks a progression in the professionalization and strategic deployment of intelligence capabilities, highlighting their impact on Greece's military and political history.

### 5.1 Espionage Practices during the Greek War of Independence (1821–1830): Local Networks and Intelligence Gathering

The Greek War of Independence (1821–1830) was marked by a lack of centralized intelligence operations. Instead, the revolutionary forces relied heavily on local networks for information gathering. These networks, consisting of merchants, clergy, and community leaders, played a pivotal role in collecting intelligence on Ottoman troop movements and sharing it with revolutionary commanders. These actors leveraged their intimate knowledge of local terrains, social structures, and trade routes to provide actionable intelligence, allowing Greek forces to execute effective guerrilla tactics (Koliopoulos, Veremis, 2010).

The decentralized nature of intelligence during this period had both strengths and weaknesses. While local networks enabled swift and targeted actions, the lack of coordination between different factions often resulted in fragmented and incomplete intelligence. For example, intelligence collected in one region might not reach commanders in another, hampering larger-scale strategic planning (Reppas, 2012). Moreover, the reliance on informal and untrained operatives left intelligence operations vulnerable to errors and exploitation by Ottoman counter-intelligence agents (Clogg, 2002).

Despite these limitations, local intelligence networks proved essential in bridging the gap between the revolutionary forces' limited resources and the well-equipped Ottoman military. The grassroots nature of these efforts foreshadowed the later institutionalization of intelligence practices in Greece, where the

value of indigenous knowledge and community-based systems would persist as a foundational element.

### 5.2 Formalization of Espionage (1900–1939): Establishment of Intelligence Units and Protocols

The early 20th century marked a significant evolution in Greek military intelligence as the country faced new challenges in the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) and World War I. The necessity of organized intelligence operations became evident during these conflicts, as Greece sought to navigate shifting alliances and territorial disputes in the Balkans. Consequently, this period saw the establishment of dedicated intelligence units and protocols within the Greek military.

The Balkan Wars revealed the critical need for effective intelligence in both offensive and defensive operations. Greek commanders utilized intelligence gathered by scouts and informants to plan military campaigns and counter Ottoman and Bulgarian strategies. The accelerated advance of the Greek army towards Thessaloniki and its subsequent liberation on 28 October 1912 in the First Balkan War, was due to informing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the movements of the Bulgarian army (occupation of Saranda Churches and Drama) (Strategos, 1932). After the beginning of World War I, Great Britain and France set up intelligence units in Athens to combat German propaganda (MacKenzie, 1931). In the Asia Minor Campaign the Military Mission in Constantinople led by Colonel G. Katehakis collected important information by intercepting Turkish telegrams, without encryption (Army Headquarters, 1957). While much of this intelligence work remained ad hoc, it underscored the importance of institutionalizing such practices (Mazower, 2002).

In 1924 the Corfu Information Office was founded with the mission of countering Italian propaganda (Fessopoulos, 1948). In 1925, Greece formalized its intelligence operations with the establishment of the *Special Security Service* (SSS) was established in September 1925 (Gazette of the Government, 1925) under the auspices of the Greek Gendarmerie, modeled after British and French intelligence agencies. The SSS marked a departure from the informal networks of the past, providing a centralized structure for both domestic and foreign intelligence gathering. In 1926, the Special Security Service was abolished and its place was taken by the *General Security Service of the State* (GSSS). It focused on monitoring political dissent, foreign espionage activities, and potential threats to national security (Gazette of the Government, 1926).

Additionally, in 1936, Greece formalized the creation of the *Defense Service of the Greek State* (DSGS) (Gazette of the Government, a, 1936), whereas the General Security Service of the State (GSSS) had already been abolished). It was placed, as a special directorate, under the State Department of Public Security (Gazette of the Government, b, c, 1936). The Defense Service of the Greek State (DSGS) was renamed the *Immigration Service* (IS) focused on intelligence gathering, particularly in the field of counter-intelligence (Gazette of the Government, d, 1936). The interwar period saw the incorporation of intelligence training into the curricula of military academies, including courses on cryptography, reconnaissance, and covert operations.

Global trends in intelligence practices during this time also influenced Greek developments. The proliferation of radio communication and advancements in cryptography introduced new tools and techniques, which Greek intelligence personnel sought to



adopt. Collaborations with European allies provided opportunities for training and the acquisition of modern equipment, enhancing the technical capabilities of Greek intelligence units.

However, the interwar period was not without challenges. Political instability, including the National Schism (Kyriakidis, 2021) and a series of coups, disrupted the continuity of intelligence reforms. Furthermore, the limited resources allocated to the military often constrained the effectiveness of the DSGS (later IS), leaving critical gaps in Greece's ability to respond to both internal and external threats. Despite these obstacles, the foundations laid during this period would prove invaluable in the conflicts to come.

### 5.3 Counter-Espionage during World War II and the Civil War: Strategies and Impacts

The Axis occupation of Greece during World War II (1941–1944) and the subsequent Greek Civil War (1946–1949) marked the most intense period of espionage and counter-espionage activity in modern Greek history. During the German occupation, Greek activities in this sector were transferred to the Middle East where the Greek government had taken refuge in April 1941. In this period, the *Research and Information Service* was set up in Cairo. This secret service had a dual mission: The escape of officers and the gathering of information from occupied Greece, maintaining contacts with resistance organisations. The operation of the service was financially supported by Britain.

The occupation necessitated the rapid adaptation of intelligence practices to counter the efforts of German, Italian, and Bulgarian forces while supporting resistance movements in Greece. Resistance groups such as ELAS (Greek People's Liberation Army) and EDES (National Republican Greek League) developed sophisticated intelligence networks to gather information on Axis troop movements, supply lines, and fortifications (Tsoutsoumpis, 2016). These groups collaborated with Allied intelligence agencies (Gerolymatos, 1991), particularly the British Special Operations Executive (SOE), which provided training, resources, and coordination for sabotage missions (Foot, 1984). For example, the successful destruction of the Gorgopotamos railway bridge in 1942 was a testament to the effectiveness of these collaborative intelligence efforts.

Counter-espionage during the occupation focused on identifying and neutralizing Axis agents operating within Greece. Resistance leaders employed rigorous vetting processes to prevent infiltration and relied on coded communications to protect sensitive information. Despite these efforts, the fragmented nature of resistance groups and their competing ideologies often led to internal conflicts and mistrust, which Axis intelligence sought to exploit (Mazower, 2001).

The Greek Civil War introduced new dimensions to counter-espionage, as government forces battled communist guerrillas (Tantalakis, 2019). With support from the United States and Britain, the Greek military implemented counter-insurgency strategies that relied heavily on intelligence gathering. Specialized units were tasked with infiltrating guerrilla networks, intercepting communications, and targeting key leaders. These operations were complemented by psychological warfare campaigns aimed at undermining guerrilla morale and consolidating civilian support for the government.

The social and political implications of counter-espionage during the Civil War were profound. While intelligence operations contributed to military successes, they also fostered an atmosphere

of fear and suspicion among the civilian population. Widespread surveillance, the use of informants, and the detention of suspected collaborators eroded public trust in both the government and the resistance. Moreover, the heavy-handed tactics employed by counter-espionage units often led to allegations of human rights abuses, tarnishing the legitimacy of the government's efforts (Baerentzen et al, 2000).

## 6. The Strategic Evolution of the Greek Army (1821–1947): A Comprehensive Analysis

The strategic evolution of the Greek Army from 1821 to 1947 reflects a trajectory of adaptation and transformation, shaped by the geopolitical challenges and military paradigms of each era. This development can be divided into three significant phases: The transition from guerrilla tactics to formalized warfare during the formative years of 1821–1900, interwar modernization (1900–1939), and the adaptation to global conflicts and their aftermath (1940–1947). These phases highlight the Greek Army's strategic shifts in response to both internal needs and external influences, showcasing the interplay of local innovation and foreign paradigms in the crafting of modern military strategy.

### 6.1 Key Strategic Shifts (1821–1900): Transition from Guerrilla Tactics to Formalized Warfare

The Greek War of Independence (1821–1830) epitomized the initial phase of Greek military strategy, which relied heavily on guerrilla warfare. Rooted in the practices of *Armatoloi* (local militias) and *Klephts* (mountain brigands), these tactics emphasized hit-and-run operations, ambushes, and the exploitation of the rugged Greek terrain to offset Ottoman military superiority. These methods were particularly effective in disrupting Ottoman supply lines and maintaining pressure on the occupying forces (Rodakis, 2015).

However, the decentralized and fragmented nature of these guerrilla forces often hindered coordination and limited their ability to conduct large-scale operations. The lack of a cohesive strategic framework became increasingly apparent as the conflict progressed, prompting calls for the formalization of the military. The establishment of the *Philhellenic Corps*, composed of foreign volunteers and advisors, introduced elements of European military discipline and organization, albeit on a limited scale (Kyriakidis, 2016).

Following independence, the nascent Greek state faced the challenge of creating a standing army capable of defending its sovereignty. The influence of foreign advisors, particularly from Bavaria and France, played a critical role in shaping this transition. Bavarian King Otto's administration (1832–1862) sought to impose European military standards, establishing centralized command structures and introducing standardized training programs. Despite these efforts, the fledgling Greek Army struggled with resource constraints, political instability, and resistance to foreign doctrines, resulting in a hybrid military system that combined traditional and modern elements (Kyriakidis, 2016).

The second half of the 19th century saw incremental progress in formalizing Greek military strategy. The establishment of the Evelpidon Military Academy in 1828 marked a turning point, providing systematic training to officers and laying the groundwork for professionalization. The army's performance in conflicts such as the Cretan Revolt (1866–1869) reflected a gradual

improvement in strategic coherence, although significant gaps remained in areas such as logistics, artillery, and coordination (Kyriakidis, 2016).

### **6.2 Interwar Modernization (1900–1939): Adoption of European Military Doctrines**

The dawn of the 20th century brought renewed efforts to modernize the Greek Army, driven by the challenges of the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) and the strategic demands of World War I. The Balkan Wars exposed critical deficiencies in logistics, troop mobilization, and coordination but also demonstrated the potential of a modernized military. Greek victories, such as the capture of Thessaloniki in 1912, were achieved through decisive planning and the strategic use of combined arms operations, highlighting the importance of adopting contemporary military doctrines (Kyriakidis, 2021).

The influence of European military traditions became particularly pronounced during this period. French and German advisors were instrumental in reshaping Greek military education and operational planning. The introduction of advanced training methods, including war games and tactical simulations, equipped Greek officers with the skills needed to manage complex operations. Military academies expanded their curricula to include subjects such as artillery science, engineering, and military law, reflecting a shift toward a more comprehensive approach to officer development (Kyriakidis, 2022).

World War I marked Greece's entry into global conflicts and underscored the need for further modernization. Greek forces, participating alongside the Allies on the Macedonian Front, were exposed to the realities of trench warfare, mechanized combat, and large-scale mobilization. This experience catalyzed the integration of new technologies, such as machine guns and motorized vehicles, into Greek military strategy (Kyriakidis, 2021).

The interwar period was characterized by efforts to institutionalize these advancements. The establishment of a General Staff in 1904 (Gazette of the Government, b, 1904) formalized strategic planning processes, while the acquisition of modern weaponry and infrastructure projects, such as fortifications along the Metaxas Line, reflected a commitment to preparing for future conflicts. However, political instability, including the National Schism (Kyriakidis, 2023) and military coups, often disrupted these efforts and hindered the full realization of modernization goals.

### **6.3 Adapting to Global Conflicts (1940–1947): Lessons from World War II and Post-War Implications**

World War II presented the Greek Army with an unprecedented test of its strategic capabilities. The Greco-Italian War (1940–1941) demonstrated the effectiveness of pre-war reforms, as Greek forces achieved significant victories against a more technologically advanced adversary. The strategic use of defensive positions in mountainous terrain, coupled with high morale and cohesive leadership, underscored the value of prior modernization efforts (Gerolymatos, 1992).

The subsequent German invasion and occupation (1941–1944) exposed critical vulnerabilities in Greek military strategy, particularly in terms of logistics and air defense. The disbanding of the formal army during the occupation forced a reliance on resistance groups such as ELAS (Greek People's Liberation Army) and EDES (National Republican Greek League). These groups adapted guerrilla tactics reminiscent of the War of Independence but with a more structured and strategic focus, often coordinated

with Allied intelligence agencies such as the British Special Operations Executive (SOE) (Mazower, 2001).

The post-war period and the Greek Civil War (1946–1949) further shaped Greek military strategy. Lessons learned from World War II, particularly regarding logistics, counter-insurgency tactics, and the integration of intelligence operations, were applied to combat communist guerrilla forces. The involvement of foreign advisors, particularly from the United States, introduced new counter-insurgency doctrines that emphasized mobility, psychological operations, and the use of air power. These strategies were instrumental in suppressing the insurgency but also raised ethical concerns regarding their impact on civilian populations (Harris, 2013).

The Civil War underscored the importance of a unified and well-trained military in ensuring national stability. The establishment of specialized units, such as the Mountain Brigade, reflected a focus on counter-guerrilla operations. Additionally, the experience of global conflicts reinforced the need for a self-sufficient defense industry, leading to investments in domestic arms production and logistical infrastructure.

## **7. Integration of Pedagogy, Espionage, and Strategy in the Modern History of the Greek Army (1821–1947)**

The evolution of the Greek Army from 1821 to 1947 reflects a profound interdependence between military training, espionage, and strategic innovation. This interplay was pivotal in shaping national security and defense policies, particularly as Greece navigated periods of liberation, modernization, and global conflict. By analyzing how training methods influenced intelligence operations and assessing the long-term effects of pedagogical and strategic innovations, we uncover a layered narrative of adaptation and resilience in Greek military history.

### **7.1 Interdependence of Military Training and Espionage**

The synergy between military training and espionage in the Greek Army emerged as a vital component of national defense during the 19th and 20th centuries. Early on, the guerrilla tactics employed during the Greek War of Independence (1821–1830) were inherently tied to intelligence operations. Leaders like Theodoros Kolokotronis relied on local informants to gather actionable intelligence on Ottoman troop movements, which informed tactical decisions and facilitated ambushes (Reppas, 2012).

However, the absence of formalized training in intelligence techniques limited the effectiveness of these efforts, creating a need for integration in subsequent decades.

The establishment of the Evelpidon Military Academy in 1828 marked the first significant step in formalizing military pedagogy in Greece. Initially focused on traditional military disciplines such as engineering and artillery, the academy began incorporating intelligence-related topics in the late 19th century (Kyriakidis, 2016). This expansion coincided with growing recognition of espionage as a strategic necessity during the Balkan Wars (1912–1913). Officers trained at Evelpidon were expected not only to lead troops in battle but also to understand and implement intelligence operations.

During the interwar period, the increasing sophistication of military training directly influenced the evolution of Greek



espionage capabilities. The integration of European doctrines introduced by French and German advisors emphasized the role of reconnaissance, cryptography, and counter-intelligence in modern warfare (Dimakopoulos, 2000). Training programs included practical exercises in information gathering and analysis, preparing officers to operate in environments where intelligence played a decisive role.

World War II (1940–1944) marked a turning point in the relationship between military training and espionage. Greek resistance groups such as ELAS (Greek People's Liberation Army) and EDES (National Republican Greek League) relied heavily on intelligence to conduct sabotage operations against Axis forces. Collaborations with the British Special Operations Executive (SOE) and American Office of Strategic Services (OSS) provided advanced training in covert operations, enabling Greek operatives to master techniques such as infiltration, coded communication, and sabotage (Gerolymatos, 1991).

The wartime necessity for espionage forced military training to become more dynamic and adaptable. For example, resistance fighters were trained in small, decentralized units that prioritized flexibility and rapid decision-making. This approach not only enhanced their effectiveness against Axis forces but also laid the groundwork for post-war intelligence strategies (Mazower, 2001). The integration of espionage into broader military pedagogy underscored its strategic importance, bridging the gap between battlefield tactics and long-term security goals.

### 7.2 Impact on National Security and Defense Policy

The interdependence of pedagogy, espionage, and strategy had profound implications for Greece's national security and defense policy. By fostering a culture of innovation and adaptability, the Greek Army was able to respond to the evolving threats of the 19th and 20th centuries, ensuring its relevance in a rapidly changing geopolitical landscape.

The formalization of military education at institutions like the Evelpidon Military Academy played a central role in shaping Greece's defense policy. These academies became hubs of strategic thought, where officers were trained not only in conventional warfare but also in the complexities of intelligence and counter-intelligence. This dual focus ensured that Greek military leaders were equipped to address both external threats and internal challenges, such as political instability and insurgencies (Kyriakidis, 2022).

One significant outcome of this pedagogical evolution was the establishment of the *General Security Service of the State* (GSSS) in 1926. The GSSS institutionalized espionage as a critical component of national defense, drawing on lessons learned from military training programs to develop standardized protocols for intelligence operations. This alignment of pedagogy and strategy reinforced the integration of intelligence into broader defense planning, ensuring that Greece could anticipate and counter emerging threats.

The integration of military training and espionage had tangible effects during global conflicts, particularly World War II and the Greek Civil War (1946–1949). During the Axis occupation, Greek resistance groups demonstrated the strategic value of combining formal training with grassroots intelligence efforts. These groups not only disrupted Axis supply lines but also provided critical intelligence to Allied forces, influencing broader strategic decisions in the Mediterranean theater (Gerolymatos, 2018).

The post-war period saw these wartime lessons codified into national defense policy. Counter-insurgency operations during the Greek Civil War relied heavily on intelligence gathered through military networks and civilian informants. The government's ability to combat communist guerrilla forces was enhanced by the professionalization of counter-intelligence units, many of which were staffed by officers with wartime experience in espionage. This emphasis on intelligence-driven strategy underscored the enduring importance of integrating pedagogy and espionage in defense planning (Harris, 2013).

The strategic innovations of 1821–1947 had lasting effects on Greece's approach to national security. The emphasis on military education as a vehicle for both tactical and strategic development ensured that the Greek Army remained capable of adapting to new challenges. Moreover, the integration of espionage into military pedagogy established a framework for intelligence operations that continued to evolve in the post-war era.

However, these advancements were not without challenges. The heavy reliance on intelligence during periods of political turmoil, such as the Civil War, often led to abuses of power and widespread surveillance, eroding public trust in military institutions. Additionally, the focus on espionage occasionally overshadowed other critical aspects of military readiness, such as logistics and technological innovation.

## 8. Conclusions

The Greek Army's evolution from 1821 to 1947 underscores a dynamic interdependence between training, intelligence, and strategy. Early military practices during the War of Independence relied on guerrilla tactics and localized intelligence networks, setting the stage for future formalization. With the establishment of the modern Greek state, the influence of foreign advisors - especially from France and Bavaria - introduced structured military pedagogy. The creation of military academies and officer training programs during this period laid the foundation for a professional army.

The interwar years marked a significant phase of modernization, as the Greek Army adopted European doctrines and integrated emerging technologies. The formalization of espionage through dedicated intelligence units reflected global trends in military strategy. This period also saw the Greek military develop protocols that emphasized reconnaissance and cryptographic techniques, ensuring that intelligence was integral to strategic planning.

World War II and the Greek Civil War represented the ultimate tests of the Greek Army's adaptability. Wartime pressures necessitated the refinement of training programs and the adoption of counter-insurgency strategies. Espionage and counter-espionage efforts, especially those coordinated with Allied forces, played a critical role in resisting Axis occupation and later combating domestic insurgents. The fusion of military training with intelligence operations during this era underscored the strategic value of an integrated approach.

The Greek Army's historical trajectory reveals the importance of aligning military pedagogy with strategic objectives. The integration of espionage into training programs and its institutionalization within defense policies serve as a model for modern militaries navigating hybrid warfare and asymmetric threats.

Future research could explore how the lessons from this period have influenced post-1947 Greek military practices and their relevance in contemporary security frameworks. Comparative studies with other small states undergoing similar transformations could also yield valuable insights, emphasizing the interplay between external influences and indigenous innovation in military evolution.

Greece's military history from 1821 to 1947 reflects its unique role in the broader evolution of military science. The Greek Army's ability to adapt to shifting challenges - ranging from Ottoman domination to global conflicts and internal strife - illustrates the resilience of small states in navigating complex geopolitical realities. The study of Greece's integration of pedagogy, espionage, and strategy highlights the enduring importance of innovation and adaptability in military development.

Examining the Greek experience underscores the critical role of military pedagogy in shaping a nation's strategic capabilities. Training is not merely about preparing soldiers for battle; it is a transformative process that integrates operational readiness with broader statecraft goals. By fostering intellectual rigor and strategic foresight, military pedagogy ensures that armed forces remain agile and effective in addressing diverse threats.

In response to research questions about *How did military pedagogy evolve in the Greek Army?* The evolution of military pedagogy was marked by the transition from informal practices to structured systems influenced by foreign doctrines. The establishment of military academies and the integration of intelligence training into curricula played a pivotal role in professionalizing the army.

*What role did espionage and counter-espionage play in strategic developments?*

Espionage and counter-espionage were integral to the Greek Army's strategy, particularly during global conflicts and periods of internal unrest. Intelligence operations informed tactical decisions, disrupted enemy plans, and shaped the broader defense policy.

This manuscript focuses on the period from 1821 to 1947, providing a temporal lens through which the evolution of the Greek Army can be understood. The use of archival research and historical analysis ensures a robust methodological framework, but certain limitations remain. The study primarily examines the institutional and strategic aspects of military evolution, leaving room for further exploration of the sociopolitical dynamics that influenced these changes.

By synthesizing the historical trajectory of military training, espionage, and strategy, this manuscript contributes to a deeper understanding of the Greek Army's transformation. The insights gleaned from this analysis underscore the value of studying military pedagogy and its strategic implications, both as a historical endeavor and as a lens for addressing contemporary challenges. Greece's experience demonstrates that innovation in military training and intelligence is not merely a response to immediate threats but a cornerstone of long-term national security.

## REFERENCES

1. Athanasiou, L., (2003). *Research methods and techniques in education*. Ioannina: ed. University of Ioannina, pp. 223,224

2. Archives of the Academy of Athens (1930), *The Protocol of 3 February 1830 in London*, by Streat G., in "Speeches", pp.33-39
3. Bitsaki E. Ant., (2005), *The education of man according to the Apostle Paul*. Athens: Grigoris, pp.21-22
4. Borg, W. R. - Gall. M. D.,(1989), *Educational Research*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed., New York: Longman
5. Central Intelligence Agency (1953), *National Intelligence Survey 24: Greece; Armed Forces*, (FOIA) /ESDN (CREST): CIA-RDP01-00707R000200110030-0
6. Churchill, P., R., Slany, W., Fine, A, H., Gleason, E., Aandahl, F., (1974), *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948, Volume IV, Eastern Europe; The Soviet Union*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office
7. Clogg, R., (2002), *A Concise History of Greece*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press
8. Cohen L., Manion L., (1977), *Methodology of Educational Research*, ed. Chrysoula Mitsopoulou, Mania Filopoulou, Athens: Expression, p. 71
9. Dimakopoulos, D., C., (2000), *Greek-French Convention, 21 January 1911*, in "Military institutional reorganization 1909-1916. Constitution of the Supreme Mixed Staff and Staff Schools", K' Panhellenic Historical Conference 28-30 May 1999, Thessaloniki
10. Army Headquarters / Directorate of Army History (1957), *The campaign in Asia Minor 1919-1922: The Greek Army in Smyrna, May 1919-May 1920* Athens: DIS, pp. 154, 187
11. Army Headquarters / Directorate of Army History (1971), *The Greek Army during the antisymmorion struggle, 1946-1949. The first year of the antisymmorion struggle, 1946*, Athens: DIS
12. Baerentzen, L., Iatrides, O., J., Smith, L., O., Veremis, Th., Chondros, L., J., (2000), *The Greek Civil War, 1943-1950*, Athens: Filistor
13. Fessopoulos, Th., G., (1948), *Naked the truth. Urgent national issues or enlightenment (propaganda)*, Athens: Tilperoglou, N., p.5
14. Foot, M., R., D., (1984), *SOE: The Special Operations Executive 1940-46*, London: BBC
15. Gazette of the Government, issue A', Law, GITH', no. sh. 113, Athens, 1 June 1904, pp. 312-313.
16. Gazette of the Government, b, issue A', Law 3031, GLA', no. sh. 113, Athens, 28 June 1904, pp. 385-392.
17. Gazette of the Government, issue A', D.Lgs., no. sh. 265 Athens, 23 September 1925 pp. 1747-1749
18. Gazette of the Government, issue A', D.Lgs.no. sh. 34 Athens, 29 January 1926 pp. 205-207
19. Gazette of the Government -a-, issue A', F. Law no. sh. 58 Athens, 25 January 1936 pp. 269- 270
20. Gazette of the Government -b- issue A', no. sh. 343 Athens, 12 August 1936 p. 1753
21. Gazette of the Government -c- , issue A', no. sh. 452 Athens, 13 October 1936 p. 2395
22. Gazette of the Government -d- , issue A', no. sh. 498 Athens, 10 November 1936 p. 2658
23. General Staff of the Army/Directorate Army History (1997), *History of the Greek Army, 1821-1997*, DIS: Athens, p. 209
24. Gerolymatos, An., (1991), *British Intelligence and Guerrilla Warfare Operations in the Second World War:*

- Greece 1941-1944, A Case study*, A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Montreal: Department of History McGill University
25. Gerolymatos, An., (1992), *Guerrilla Warfare and Espionage in Greece, 1940-1944*, New York, U.S.: Pella Publishing Company
  26. Gerolymatos, An., (2018), *The British and the Greek Resistance, 1936–1944 Spies, Saboteurs, and Partisans*, Lanham, U.S.: Lexington Books
  27. Gregoriadis, N., Ph., (1964), *The Guerrilla - ELAS, EDES, EKKA (5/42)*, Athens: Kamarinopoulou, Ch., K.
  28. Harris, D., W., & Combat Studies Institute Press (2013), *Instilling Aggressiveness: Us Advisors and Greek Combat Leadership in the Greek Civil War, 1947-1949*, Art of War Papers Series, Budapest: Military Bookshop
  29. Jaspers, K. (1950), *Is Science evil?* Commentary 9, pp. 229-233, in Filia V., (1993), Introduction to the methodology and techniques of social research, Athens: Gutenberg, pp. 17,18
  30. Koliopoulos, S. J., Veremis, M., Th. (2010), *Modern Greece: A History since 1821. A New History of Modern Europe*, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons
  31. Kyriakidis, M., (2016), *The Training of the Greek Armed Forces from the Greek Revolution until the Revival of the Olympic Games (1821-1896)*. Athens: Grigoris
  32. Kyriakidis, M. (2021), *Hellenic Army. Its role in the development of the Modern History of Greece*. Athens: Petra Publications
  33. Kyriakidis, M. (2022), *The Most Important European Educational Influences in Modern History of the Greek Armed Forces*, Athens: Andy's publishers
  34. Kyriakidis, M. (2023). *In the Sparganas of the National Schism. From the national triumph to the national catastrophe*. Military History in "110 Years of the Balkan Wars". Collective, Athens: Govostis Publications.
  35. MacKenzie, C., (1931), *First Athenian Memories*, London: Cassell
  36. Mazower, M., ( 2001), *Inside Hitler's Greece: The Experience of Occupation, 1941-44*, London: Yale University Press
  37. Mazower, M., (2002). *The Balkans: A Short History*. New York: Modern Library
  38. Mavroskoufis, K. D. (2005), *Seeking the traces of History: historiography, teaching methodology and historical sources*. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Brothers Publications, p. 26
  39. Melanitou, G. N. (1957), *The Method of Historical Pedagogical Research*. Athens, pp. 14-28
  40. Mialaret, G., (1999), *Introduction to the Sciences of Education*. Athens: Print Dardanos, p. 145
  41. Nova - Kaltsouni, Chr., (2006), *Empirical Research Methodology in Social Sciences, Data Analysis using SPSS 13*, Athens: Gutenberg, p. 24
  42. Reppas, Chr. (2012), *Cases of Espionage during the revolution of 1821, Archival texts*, Athens: Self-publication
  43. Rodakis, P., (2015), *Klephts and Armatoloi: The historical and social development of the Greek territory during the years of the Turkish occupation*, Athens: Gordios
  44. Sir Hinsley, H., (1988), *The Intelligence Revolution: A Historical Perspective*, Proceedings of the Thirteenth Military History Symposium, Colorado: Department of History, Lt. Col. Walter T. Hitchcock, USAF
  45. Stasinopoulos, K. E., (1933), *The History of the Evelpidon School*, Athens: Typos
  46. Strategos, X., (1932), *The Greek-Turkish war. The epoch of 1912 and 1913*. Athens: Elliniki, p. 57
  47. Tantalakis, E. (2019), *Insurgents' intelligence network and practices during the Greek Civil War*, in "Intelligence and National Security" Vol. 34, Issue 7, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis
  48. Tsoutsoumpis, S., (2016), *A history of the Greek resistance in the Second World War. The people's armies*, in Cultural History of Modern War, United Kingdom: Manchester University Press
  49. Verdi, N. Ath., (2015), *Educational Research and Evaluation*, Athens: Borg & Gall, 1989