

similarity in commitment that brings together socialist and non-socialist examples throughout the book of Hoffman. By following this commonality concerning approaches of regional planning and attention to lagging region, Hoffman attempts to promote also the discussion and the increasing importance of regional cooperation in the overall development strategies of the countries of Southeast Europe. One could agree with the concluding statement of the author that «the five countries of Southeast Europe, by their example, could show to their people, as well as to the rest of the world, the way to accomplish rapid economic growth based on closed-regional economic cooperation without losing their own identity in an area of great geographic, socio-economic, and political differences». Yet, the preceding 239 pages of the book seem to negate that wishful conclusion by pointing out how fateful are not only the natural and historical differences, but also the socio-cultural variations resulting from ideological commitments and from different assumptions as to desired social goals.

Overall, the book of Hoffman, a combination of his continuous interest and careful work on the region should provide beneficial reading for all persons interested in Southeast Europe. The Appendices, full of data, as well as the careful bibliographies also provide additional material for the researcher. One only would have wished that more careful editorial work and rearrangement of some topics would have provided a tighter text without the cul-de-sacs and the seemingly interminable discussions of regional policies of individual countries in Southeast Europe.

Colorado State University

EVAN VLACHOS

Newspapers of the Greek War of Independence, vol. IV: *Γενική Ἐφημερίς τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (General Newspaper of Greece), 7th year (1832), Athens (Publications of the Prefecture of Attica on the 150th Anniversary of Greek Independence), 1973, National Printing Press. Preface and Introduction by George D. Demacopoulos, pp. α'-ιβ' + I-XXIII. *General Newspaper of Greece*, pp. 1-144. Index pp. I\*-10\*. List of Official Acts, pp. 13\*-16\*.

On the occasion of the photostatic offprint by the Prefecture of Attica of the *General Newspaper of Greece* (*Γενική Ἐφημερίς τῆς Ἑλλάδος*), 7th year (1832), I would like to make a few comments about the significance of the press as a crucial unifying force for a people striving to progress towards individual and national advancement (see *Balkan Studies* 13.2 [1972], 332-334). The usefulness of the press as a source for the study of a particular historical period is considerable. Emerging nations, states as Greece was in 1832, require a systematic critical evaluation of their traditions, institutions and aspirations so that their newly won political freedom may find proper expression and gradually lead to political and social integration and effective representation. Over and above the economic situation, political figures, the law, the constitution, and other factors that make up the structure of an emerging nation, the press exercises a continuous and uninterrupted influence on the course of historical reality. Moreover, the process of a people's political and cultural growth inevitably leads to a variety of con-

flicts hinging on individual interests and affecting the nation's evolution substantially. In such cases, the press especially must follow the order of events in accordance with objective natural laws, taking into consideration both the welfare of the individual and of society at large. Perhaps there exist views which differ from this position on the role of the press. Yet for the political advancement of a people, especially in a revolutionary situation, the survival of social freedom calls for a penetration into the process which will transform the special conditions of the national revolution into an integrated political whole. An exceptionally important agency for expressing this course of development is, as has been pointed out, a press which understands that the social criticism which it will carry out is directed at a society consisting of individuals in a whole. For the individual must be led freely to embrace truth which is served by political action. At this point, the role of the press is of major importance as a means by which a people enriches its experience, develops, and conscientiously shares common problems, and mistakes as they are exposed, checked, and ultimately shaped into social truths. At the same time, objective reporting of the events in the political and social life of a nation leads to the political ethics of a free people, following which the revolutionary procedures lead to the improvement of a social organisation with a corresponding advancement in living standards and in the formulation of cultural levels. It is of importance to define in each instance the role of the press in these specific areas, so that its contribution is accordingly evaluated as a vital agency in the service of political and social progress. As such an agency, the Press is obliged to project actual reality by emphasizing the political views and social attitudes or the negative aspects of a particular experience with photographic exactness. The difficulty is that this presupposes a self-denial, but the press must practise this self-denial and even more so in the early stages of development of a political and social act which must be conveyed to the public in a way that can be understood. For it is a fact that the political and social life of a nation in all ages inescapably must struggle between two opposite forces at play, the static and the dynamic, and that a basic role of the press is to lay the social foundations for the actions of the individual which lead to liberty and to advancement. Only in such a manner is it feasible to put a brake on the ambitions of certain groups or on propaganda whose aims are totalitarian. For the objective of propaganda is to halt the forward march of individuals who are striving for truth and liberty and this is equally true in any part of the world. When, therefore, the Press does not express the truth, it is fighting against freedom, and becomes a tool of reaction. And when the Press does not fight for freedom, it endangers society by creating fissures in the very base of the national foundation and in the ideological, political and economic liberation of the nation, which is the aim of every «renaissance». Hence the power of the free Press is an agency exclusively in the service of the nation and of law and order. In other words in the service of political freedom, which in effect is the fundamental foundation for a free press.

A look at two excerpts from the «Proclamation» which was circulated by Theoclitos Pharmakides upon learning of his appointment as «editor» of the *General Newspaper of Greece* proves very revealing on the role of the press: through the newspapers, people are instructed on what their interests are in a rapid and easy manner, and are advised and admonished. Through these newspapers, those in control are checked whenever they stray from their obligations, especially in such a regime as that of Greece. Good citizens are publicly acclaimed and erring citizens are controlled. Any abuse of trust is exposed and its cure recommended . . . ». Referring to a particular case, he says: «. . . however, I believe it

is the duty of every law-abiding citizen and good patriot when aware of the plight of his compatriots and the poor state of his country, that he makes known through the press, those conditions and situations that are beneficial to the country, in order that, when one does stray from the straight and narrow, he may reform, cease practising evil and be admonished, and that the citizen who so reports the abuse should not be harmed . . .».

These views of Pharmakides have special significance when bearing in mind that the *General Newspaper of Greece*, was from the very beginning published as a government, and not a private newspaper, and Pharmakides in his politics did not always agree with the government policy. Thus, while the newspaper published the official acts and decrees of the government, Pharmakides was indirectly politicking against the regime. This was deemed generally as totally unacceptable. Pharmakides was therefore removed from his position when he published in his columns the first part of a letter from an unknown individual to the editor which was considered «insulting . . . to the administration» and «harmful to the interests of the nation». Concerning the position of Pharmakides it must be emphasized that he was a person noted for his independent character and wide education. He had given proof previously, however, of his political experience with the publication of the newspapers *Hermes o Logios* (Vienna), of which he had been co-publisher during the years 1816-1821, and *Salpigs Elliniki* (Hellenic Tribune) (Kalamata 1821) of which he was the editor and publisher until the third issue, when he stopped his collaboration with the newspaper because he could not tolerate the despotic measure of censorship. Although the archimandrite Pharmakides finally retained the position following the written protests of friends who were parliamentary deputies, his case is a good example to illustrate my point, for in view of the fact that Pharmakides disagreed with the election of John Capodistrias as the head of State, he resigned finally in June of 1827 from the editorship declaring among other things in his «Notice» (*General Newspaper of Greece* 47, June 4, 1827, p. 188), that «he entered politics because he deemed it to the greater good». This expression of Pharmakides has been commonly used ever since—even in our day—and is an attempt to justify the attitudes of politicians to public service in general.

From the point of view of the year 1832, known as the dark period, when the last issue of the *General Newspaper of Greece* appeared, a study of the administrative edicts and acts is certainly very necessary if the scholar is to understand the political history of this period. For the *General Newspaper of Greece* was founded to «fulfil the need to publish the acts of the administration and to make known as quickly as possible the news events, those at least that are in the interests of the people». This fact acquires even greater significance when one bears in mind that from the very beginning, the *General Newspaper of Greece* was issued as a government paper and not as a private news sheet. Moreover, it was the longest surviving and the best organized newspaper of the Revolution. Furthermore, there are to be found in its pages official government, administrative and court acts and decrees, political news from both Greece and abroad, the remainder of the copy including letters from readers, reports, political editorials, and so on.

It should be specially noted that the items in this newspaper are not one-sided, and they included many articles critical of the government. Typical is the manner in which each of the three «editors» ran the newspaper, each giving his views on public matters and the political scene. This is particularly true in the case of Pharmakides who was the first «editor» of the *General Newspaper of Greece* from 1825 until June 1827. Pharmakides

considered himself the editor of a political newspaper and he wished to keep an indirect check on the government.

Similar attitudes were held by his successors George Chrysides, from Macedonia, who retained his position as editor of the newspaper until mid-December 1831, and John Galiatsas, a lawyer and man of letters from Epirus, who was the last editor of the *General Newspaper of Greece* and left when the paper tacitly ceased publication with the issue of March 23, 1832. The reason for the sudden termination of publication was that on March 27, John Colettis entered Nauplia at the head of an anti-Capodistrian army and the government of Augustinos Capodistrias collapsed. In the efforts to eliminate all reminders of the Capodistrian period, a new paper was founded, but in fact the *General Newspaper of Greece* (Γενική Ἐφημερίς τῆς Ἑλλάδος) was renamed the *National Newspaper* (Ἐθνική Ἐφημερίς). As a friend of Capodistrias, Galiatsas was removed and the editorship was again given to George Chrysides.

One should point out here that the unbridled political bitterness and caustic criticism of anti-government news sheets which published items by the opponents of Capodistrias were not practised by the *General Newspaper of Greece*, which had always maintained a dignified attitude, and strove to limit its articles to straightforward service items. Soon, the bitterness of political passions, expressed mostly through the press, especially in the second Capodistrian period, inevitably led to the proclamation of the press law, with the approval of the Senate, which was published in the *General Newspaper of Greece*.

The articles of this law were surprisingly harsh, although it is true that in 1831 it did not stop criticism of the government by A. Polyzoides in the columns of his newspaper *Apollo, Political and Literary Newspaper of Hydra* (Ὁ Ἀπόλλων. Ἐφημερίς τῆς Ὑδρας, πολιτική καὶ φιλολογική). Polyzoides did not hesitate, while the law was in force, to applaud publicly, as a citizen but not as an individual, as he says, the murder of Capodistrias, and to cease publication of the *Apollo* since it no longer served any useful purpose after the death of the head of state.

When to this political turmoil one adds the problems of the Church, of land ownership, and the large landowners, and relates these to the actions of Capodistrias, one can well understand the significance and the need for a systematic study of the Press for a better understanding of the period when the foundations of the young Greek nation were being laid. The study of these items could lead to a reevaluation of Capodistrias' policy as the President of Greece. At the same time it will shed much light on his attitude to the serious problems facing Greek society in the early 19th Century. The difficulty in fathoming this attitude lies in the fact that there were two facets to the character of Capodistrias: he saw the problem through the eyes of a Greek patriot, and through those of a Russian diplomat. I think it is important to underline this point because it provides some explanation for his actions as a leader of free Greece in relation to the political and social condition of the country, as it was after the war of independence of 1821. Furthermore, the repercussions of this policy on Greek society could be discerned (see John Anthony Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece 1833-1843*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1968; Const. Șerban, «Mișcarea revoluționară din 1821 în presa europeană», *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie* 6 [1973], 277-288). From this point of view, I think, the press has not been used seriously for research concerning Capodistrias' policy during this period (see for example Domna N. Dontas, «John Capodistrias and the Greek historians: a selective bibliographical review», *Balkan Studies* 7.2 [1966],

411-422, and C. M. Woodhouse, *Capodistria, The Founder of Greek Independence*, London, 1973). It is with this in mind that I should like to repeat that the systematic study of the great variety of material in the press would help to enrich the sources that deal with the vital period of Greek history when Capodistrias served as President, and will help to shed more light on the actual historical and political interpretations of those events which laid the foundations for the establishment of free Greece.

*Institute for Balkan Studies*  
*Thessaloniki*

K. A. DIMADIS