

nevertheless, scholarly, straightforward, and based on the best historical evidence available to the author.

Professor Mitsakis begins with antiquity and emphasizes the Greekness of the geographical name «Macedonia», the Greekness of the proper names and the Greekness of the names of cities and of the months, but most decisively the Greekness of the Macedonian dialect and their Dorian origin. The achievements of Alexander the Great are noted and the significance of his work «because he first brought down the frontiers of ancient Greece and raised Greek *paideia* from a local affair to an international cultural background; because the cities he and his successors built in the East became the great political, economic and intellectual centers of the ancient world, and it was here in the East where Greece and Rome met; because without the Greek-speaking world of the East, Christianity might not have been able to cross the borders of Judea and change the face of the world» (p. 13).

The Roman occupation and St. Paul's activities are surveyed, as are developments leading to Macedonia's role in the Byzantine Empire and its relation to the Slavs. The greatest contribution of Macedonia, next to Alexander, was undoubtedly the missionary work of the two brothers Cyril and Methodius who «brought Christianity and, with it, Greek Christian *paideia* from Thessaloniki to the Slavs in the ninth century A. D. with all the far-reaching consequences in both cases» (p.22). Naturally, Mount Athos figures prominently in any discussion of Macedonian achievements as does the Hesychast Movement of the fourteenth century and the monk Gregory of Mount Sinai. The rise of the Serbs and the conflict with the Bulgarians claim due attention, as do the Turkish occupation of Thessaloniki, the coming of the Spanish Jews, the Russo-Turkish War of 1768-1774, the Greek War of Independence of 1821, the liberation of Macedonia in 1912, Bulgarian national awakening and Hellenism, the Bulgarian Schism and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Berlin Treaty of 1878, the Young Turk Movement, and the decisive Treaties of Neuilly in 1919 and Lausanne in 1923.

The book ends with the hopeful note that the Balkan countries can exist and cooperate peacefully among each other for the greater stability and prosperity of all concerned.

Colgate University

JOHN E. REXINE

Heinz Richter, *Griechenland zwischen Revolution und Konterrevolution (1936-1946)*, Frankfurt am Main, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1973, pp. 623.

As certain sections of this book make new contributions to our understanding of events in «Mountain Greece» during the Second World War but others present some wrongheaded points of view, Richter's thick volume presents the reviewer with a frustrating task of evaluation. In the introduction the author promises the reader an «objective» re-interpretation of a critical period in modern Greek history, and he suggests a social and political model of clientage politics as the means of his re-evaluation. Richter succeeds in presenting a useful new synthesis, but he fails in his two stated overall objectives. The model of clientage politics is dropped after the first section and the text trails off into a straight political narrative. The wrongheadedness of the study is found in the author's conspiratorial view of history and in his penchant to try scoring political points by making facile historical analogies between the past and current Greek politics. These two tendencies negate the author's claim to objectivity. Another problem is that the book was published just as the British and United States archives on the Second World War were opened in 1972 and has been dated by these new documents.

Richter thoroughly researched materials available to scholars before 1972, and his use of German army records gives a detailed analysis of Axis occupation policies and of Zervas' relation to the German authorities. In his recording of these events Richter is careful, unsensational, and irrefutable. The author's treatment of British policy towards the Greek resistance stands in marked contrast.

Those readers who know the works of the Greek historian of the occupation and resistance, Kornnenos Pyromaglou, who contributes a preface and an appendix to the book, will find the central theme of Richter's study familiar. Indeed, the author adopts Pyromaglou's term the «trojan horse» to refer to the exploitation of anticommunism by Britain, the Greek government in exile, and the Germans to rally noncommunist Greeks against the resistance. The Germans used this theme to rally «nationalist» elements against EAM/ELAS to suit Nazi strategic needs. Britain and the exiled government of King George II, continues Richter, exploited anticommunism as the most fruitful means of neutralizing the antimonarchist resistance which had made both King and pre-1936 politicians redundant by 1943. In Richter's view the democratic and republican goals of the Greek resistance were thwarted in the main by Great Britain and to a lesser extent by the «Stalinists», a term left vague in this context, in EAM/ELAS. There are objections to this view but also elements of legitimacy. In Richter's hands, however, he negates his own interpretation by postulating a conspiracy on the part of Britain to smash the resistance and by viewing Britain as an omnipotent actor manipulating every facet of Greek affairs to meet its imperial needs. All the while Richter cannot refrain from intruding his own political bias into the text. Two examples should suffice.

The first section of the book is titled, «Monarchofascism 1936-1941», and strains unsuccessfully to picture the Metaxas regime as fascist. Then Richter adds, without citing any supporting evidence, that Britain installed the Metaxas dictatorship in the interest of imperialism as the United States allegedly acted in 1967. The Public Record Office documents reveal this claim to be false. Britain was neither consulted nor advised by King George II on his decision to initiate the Metaxas coup d'état. A far more serious distortion of history occurs in the section on the civil war of 1943. Richter argues that British Liaison Officers under Col. C. M. Woodhouse fomented the civil war as part of British policy to destroy EAM/ELAS and the republican resistance. This case is built on political commitment rather than evidence, and the Public Record Office documents once again expose Richter's charge to be false. The Foreign Office in pursuit of its policy to return the monarchy called for the cessation of all aid to the resistance in March 1943 and for a break with EAM/ELAS in November 1943, but in both instances they were overruled in favor of a policy to expand and unify the resistance in 1943.

The sections on the Cairo conference, the Lebanon conference, Caserta, the December revolt, and the reaction of 1945-1946 are based on published materials and provide a good leftist synthesis of these events but break no new ground. The December revolt is better served by the recent book by John Iatrides *Revolt in Athens*, (reviewed in *Balkan Studies* XIII, 2), and a forthcoming publication edited by Richard Clogg and based on the Public Record Office documents will clear the confusion sown by Richter's account of British policy. Indeed, the opening of the United States and British archives should now make possible a critical and scholarly re-evaluation of this period of modern Greek history. Until then Richter's book must be used with caution.

The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio

JOHN L. HONDROS