

the initiative, King Constantine and his Queen still vainly hoping for German intervention.

The story of Constantine's dethronement is less vividly and less elaborately told than that of the events which over some two years had led to it. Indeed the book comes hurriedly to an end, there being no conclusion. Perhaps the author has another volume on the way. (If so, it will certainly be welcomed if it maintains the excellence of the volume already published). Nevertheless the author's reflections on the story he has told so well would have been useful especially for the general reader and student who at the end of five hundred pages may have begun to wonder what they were all about.

Birkbeck College  
London

DOUGLAS DAKIN

D. George Kousoulas, *Modern Greece: Profile of a Nation*, New York, Charles Scribner's, 1974, pp. XVIII + 300.

Scholarly neglect of Greece, and other countries on the European Mediterranean periphery such as Portugal and Spain, has perpetuated historical myths regarding these countries—conventional wisdoms with little foundation in empirical reality. Most studies have been superficial historical surveys often riddled with time-honored assumptions leaving the reader with little feeling for or understanding of Greek or Portuguese society or politics. However, this situation is changing. In recent years intellectual stirrings, stemming from extensive historical research of hitherto neglected data and the application of contemporary social science conceptualizations and methodologies are focusing on previously ignored problem areas and are gradually providing greater insights into these societies. Studies on Greece, for example, in such diverse issue areas as social change in villages, the impact of traditional cultural patterns on political behavior, the role of the Philiki Hetairia, the modernizers vs the traditionalists in the early post-independence period and United States foreign policy, among others, are producing marked changes in Greek scholarship.

It was to be hoped that the recently published book by D. George Kousoulas; *Modern Greece: Profile of a Nation* would fall into this category; unfortunately it does not. The study purports to be a history of modern Greece from the war of independence in 1821 to 1973. Inevitably, any attempt to cover a sweep of history of more than 150 years within one short volume places severe constraints on the possibility of engaging in in-depth analysis. Yet even granting this limitation, the work lacks an overall conceptual framework within which the author's material could be organized. An inevitable consequence is the presentation of a series of facts and events in chronological order with neither an overall theme tying them together nor with a sense of historical evolution or change. Rather, the reader is presented with a series of unrelated happenings detached from the substance of Greek politics and society.

It is difficult to surmise whether this was intended as a journalistic or scholarly effort. If it is to be judged as journalism designed for a wide reading audience, the style is obtuse and there is no story-flow to engage the interest of the reader. Greece comes across as consisting of a series of mysterious actors on a stage articulating senseless lines in a plotless performance. The reader acquires no sense of why things have happened and cannot even be certain of what has happened.

If *Modern Greece: Profile of a Nation* is to be judged as a scholarly endeavor it violates the canons of scholarship. There is no documentation except for a «Note on Biographical Resources» citing a number of books which can be picked up in library card catalogues. More serious perhaps is the author's failure to bring to bear the analytic tools of any of the social sciences, including history. It is difficult to believe that Kousoulas is a political scientist, so unaffected is he by intellectual thought or by developments in the discipline and so free is he of any of the academic concerns of political scientists or historians. One could have viewed Greek history in terms of the problems of the formation of a nation-state and/or modernization, or one could have analyzed the problems of political legitimacy, or provided an analysis of Greek political culture or of Greek political elites, or organized Greek history around other core concepts or issues. But the author has done none of these.

The absence of an analytic framework leaves unanswered a critical issue regarding his study; on what basis did he determine relevancy of the facts and events which he included. Why was the red terror during the Greek civil war discussed while the white terror at the end of World War II ignored, why was the role of Chi and Grivas towards the end of World War II in Greece ignored, as was U.S. Ambassador Peurifoy's exact role in 1952, as was the continued existence of political prisoners in Greece throughout the Papadopoulos regime. And why does the author present interpretations as if they were facts such as the statement that in 1936 the choices were between a Metaxas dictatorship or a communist-led revolution and that Papadopoulos was moving towards democracy in the 1970's.

Perhaps Kousoulas' cardinal sin is the facility with which he accepts as fact propaganda statements of politicians, particularly those of dictators, instead of making independent judgements. Particularly striking is the last chapter, where, in discussing the Papadopoulos dictatorship he has paraphrased as his own analysis Papadopoulos' statements regarding steps ostensibly taken to bring Greece to democratic rule. The blatant distortion of history in his discussion of the pre-coup and coup periods pinpoint the bias from which the author operates. He is essentially an authoritarian ideologue who was personally involved with the Papadopoulos regime. And it is this ideological commitment which permeates the entire study albeit presented as an objective study. One cannot fault a scholar for his/her ideological stance but one can fault an analyst for the pretence of objectivity and even moreso for the shabbiness of his work. *Modern Greece* is a work of little merit either for an expert in the field or for the general public. This reviewer finds no redeeming qualities about it.

*The Graduate Faculty  
New School for Social Research*

ADAMANTIA POLLIS

Dimitri Kitsikis, *Ἡ Ἑλλάς τῆς 4ης Αὐγούστου καὶ αἱ Μεγάλαι Δυνάμεις. Τὰ Ἀρχεῖα τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ὑπουργείου Ἐξωτερικῶν, 1936-1941*, Athens, Ikaros, 1974, pp. 155.

Among the many chapters of modern Greek history which need scholarly investigation none is more neglected than that of the five-year regime of the «4th of August». The widespread hatred which the Metaxas dictatorship succeeded in arousing in most segments of the population — but especially the intellectuals, who were the principal targets of much of its oppression — has resulted in a near-univer-