

THE IONIAN ISLANDS AND THE ADVENT OF THE GREEK STATE
(1827-1833)

The diplomatic reactions of the British to the traditional crises of the Near East, such as the various Ottoman wars and Balkan insurrections, were often based upon the experiences of three centuries of Near Eastern trade. As long as Anglo-Ottoman trade remained unaffected, the British were not concerned with any modifications in the *status quo* of the Near East. Therefore, with the initiation of the Greek Revolution in 1821, the traditional diplomatic attitudes of the British prevailed. Unfortunately, the circumstances of Britain's presence in the Near East had changed radically over the past three centuries. Since the acquisition of the Ionian Islands in 1815, the British were actually stationed as a naval power in the Near East. In light of Britain's presence in the Ionian Islands and the successful results of the Greek Revolution, such traditional attitudes were difficult to maintain. In fact, since Britain was directly responsible for the emergence of the modern Greek state, such attitudes were completely hypocritical. With this situation, the British were forced to adopt new attitudes in their Near Eastern diplomacy. These new diplomatic attitudes were not just simply a matter of Anglo-Ionian-Hellenic relations. Instead, the element of early Russophobia complicated Britain's diplomatic policies in the Near East. As a result, the British became rather suspicious of the political and diplomatic policies of the new Greek state. Thus, the British safe-guarded their position in the Ionian Islands against all external threats¹.

1. On Anglo-Ionian diplomacy and the Greek Revolution, cf. D.C. Fleming, *John Capodistrias and the Conference of London, 1828-1831* (Thessaloniki: I.M.X.A., 1970), 17, 46, 48. On Britain's Russophobia and the Greek Revolution, cf. John Howard Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), 79f. Cf. also, Spiros Stoupes, *Oi "Xenoi" en Kerkyra* (Corfu: n.p., 1960), 215-221.

For the complicated matter of Ionian independence and the British protectorate, cf. Austria, *Convention entre les cours de Vienne, de St. Petersbourg, de Londres et de Berlin pour fixer le Sort des Sept Iles Ioniennes* (Vienna: L'Imprimerie Imperiale, 1815), 1-10; Johann Ludwig Klüber, ed., *Acten des Wiener Congresses* (10vols; Osnabruck: J.J. Palm, 1815), V/DX, 490-502/22, 161-163; Georg Frederick de Martens, *Nouveau Recueil de Traités* (8vols; Göttingen: Dieterich, 1817-41), II, 663; Nicholas Timoleon Bulgari, *Les Sept-Iles Ioniennes et les Traités qui les Concernent* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1859), 35-74; and Ionian Islands, *Le Tre Costituzioni (1800, 1803, 1817) delle Sette Isole Jonie* (Corfu: C. Nico-

THE IONIAN ISLANDS AND BRITAIN'S NEAR EASTERN DIPLOMACY, 1821-1826

The diplomatic policies instituted by the Anglo-Ionian administration of the Ionian Islands with the initiation of the Greek Revolution reflected the diplomatic policies of the British government. However, the diplomatic policies of the Anglo-Ionian government were designed to assure the basic security of the Ionian Islands, whereas the diplomatic policies of the British were designed to assure the continuance of the European *status quo*. The repercussions of the Greek Revolution would directly affect the Ionian Islands to a greater degree than in Britain. Therefore, the diplomatic measures adopted by the Anglo-Ionian government assumed a harsher character than the diplomatic measures instituted in Britain².

While the British foreign minister, Viscount Castlereagh, could successfully argue that the Ottoman-Greek hostilities were beyond the realm of European civilization, the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, Sir Thomas Maitland, could not present a similar, successful argument. There were too many problems of the Greek Revolution which confronted the Ionian Islands. For instance, members of the *Philike Etairia*, the secret Greek revolutionary society, were actively recruiting Ionian volunteers. The narrow straits of the Ionian Sea enabled these Ionian volunteers to reach the Greek mainland within a day's journey. Furthermore, the Ionian Islands served as a refuge for Greek civilians and insurrectionists. Apart from these elements of the Greek Revolution, the connections which the Russian foreign minister, Count John Capodistrias, maintained with his Corfiote family also presented some problems for the Anglo-Ionian government. It was felt that Capodistrias might promote a strong Russian influence on the Greek mainland; an influence that might later be extended to the Ionian Islands. In spite of all these problems, the Lord High Commissioner was expected to maintain the official neutrality of the Ionian Islands. At the same time, neither the Greek insurgents, nor the Ottoman Turks, intended to restrain their hostilities in respect of Anglo-Ionian neutrality. Although the Lord High Commissioner was not responsible for Britain's greater schemes concerning Continental di-

laides Philadelfeo, 1849), 55-74; Cf. also, Panagiotis Chiotos, *Istoria tou Ioniou Kratous* (2vols; Corfu: Christou S. Chiotou, 1874-77), I, passim.

2. For the initial Anglo-Ionian diplomatic policies on the Greek Revolution, cf. C. W. Crawley, *The Question of Greek Independence* (Cambridge: University Press, 1930), 19-22. On greater British diplomacy, cf. Douglas Dakin, *The Greek Struggle for Independence, 1821-1833* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), 135-165; C.K. Webster, *The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1812-1822* (2vols; London: G. Bell, 1925), II, 349f, 355, 361; and Paul W. Schroeder, *Metternich's Diplomacy at Its Zenith, 1820-1823* (Dallas: University of Texas Press, 1962), 123f, 168.

plomacy and the Greek Revolution, Sir Thomas was responsible for maintaining British neutrality in the Ionian Islands³.

The repercussions of the Greek Revolution in the Ionian Islands were handled by Sir Thomas in a ruthless, methodical manner. On 9 April 1821, Sir Thomas prohibited all Ionian Greeks from participating in the mainland insurrection. By 7 May 1821, Sir Thomas had ordered all Ionian Greeks to respect the Ottoman blockade of the Morea. One month later, the Lord High Commissioner proclaimed the official neutrality of the Ionian Islands. In addition, all Ionian ports were closed to both the Ottoman navy and Greek corsairs. Finally, the entire civilian population of the Ionian Islands was disarmed by the British authorities. The punishment for violating these measures, or of participating in the mainland insurrection, was proscribed as banishment and confiscation of all personal property. Although the Ionian Greeks complained that these measures were harsh, Sir Thomas was determined to prevent the spread of Ottoman-Greek hostilities to the Ionian Islands. As an additional disciplinary measure, the Lord High Commissioner ordered the execution of several Ionian Greeks who attacked an Ottoman ship which had wandered into Ionian waters. The severity of these measures did not bother Sir Thomas, because he intended to maintain Anglo-Ionian neutrality at all costs⁴.

As previously mentioned, the diplomatic policies of the Anglo-Ionian government reflected the diplomatic policies of the British government during the initial years of the Greek Revolution. Therefore, as long as the British government refused to intervene in the Ottoman-Greek hostilities, the Anglo-

3. C. M. Woodhouse, *Capodistrias* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 199-205; C. Willis Dixon, *The Colonial Administrations of Sir Thomas Maitland* (London: Frank Cass, 1939), 248f; and Arthur Foss, *The Ionian Islands* (London: Faber & Faber, 1969), 22, 40f, 54f.

4. Maitland to Goulburn, 25 October 1821, Public Record Office/Colonial Office 136/20 [Hereafter: PRO/CO 136]; Proclamation, 29 October 1821, Malta, no. 432, PRO/CO 136/20; *Malta Government Gazette*, 29 May/27 June 1821, PRO/CO 136/20; Maitland to Bathurst, Corfu, 1 March 1822, PRO/CO 136/20; and Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 21f. Maitland executed several Ionian Greeks for attacking an Ottoman ship which beached at the Bay of Laganas. In the fight, two British soldiers were killed, thus five Ionian Greeks were hung and their bodies preserved in pitch. Cf. Foss, *Ionian Islands*, 54.

The regulations governing banishment from the Ionian Islands specified that a Justice of the Peace, not the Lord High Commissioner, could banish Ionian offenders—only after eight violations. Exports of munitions were also forbidden. Cf. Ionian Islands, Risoluzione del Parlamento, *L'Organizzazione Generale dei Tribunali Giudiziarî, ed il Codice di Procedura* (Corfu: Stamperia del Governo, 1821), 33, 55. On Ionian navigational codes, cf. Marino Salomon, *Progetto di un Codice Commerciale et di Navigazione per gli Stati-Uniti delle Isole Jonie* (Bologna: Nobili, 1824), passim.

Ionian government would similarly follow a policy of non-intervention. However, if the British government decided to actively intervene in the Greek Revolution, then the Anglo-Ionian government would be obligated to follow a similar course of policy. Of course, the repercussions of the Greek Revolution might necessitate an Anglo-Ionian policy which would adjust to the actual situation in the Ionian Islands. Such a change in Britain's official stand on the Greek Revolution would confront the Anglo-Ionian government in the duration of its official neutrality⁵.

The difficulties of the Anglo-Ionian government greatly increased with the signing of the St. Petersburg Protocol (4 April 1826). While the new British foreign minister, George Canning, deluded himself with the supposed advantages of this accord, the new Lord High Commissioner, Sir Frederick Adam, struggled to maintain Anglo-Ionian neutrality. Unfortunately, since the Anglo-Russian pact specified that these two particular states would exclusively impose a truce upon the Greeks and Ottoman Turks, Sir Frederick could only acquiesce to this policy by implementing the spirit of the St. Petersburg Protocol. This acquiescence was rather reluctant on Sir Frederick's part, because the Lord High Commissioner had intended to reaffirm his predecessor's policy of strict Ionian neutrality. Such intentions had been expressed to the Ionian Assembly in 1825 when Sir Frederick condemned the Greek insurgents for violating Anglo-Ionian neutrality and disrupting Ionian commerce. The Lord High Commissioner also criticized the Ionian legislators for their cautious manner concerning such incidents, and he further threatened to order the Royal Navy to enforce Anglo-Ionian neutrality. Of course, the articles of the St. Petersburg Protocol diluted the force of Sir Frederick's threats and criticisms. As a result, the Lord High Commissioner sought to implement the spirit of this Anglo-Russian accord⁶.

To this end, Sir Frederick attempted to mediate a truce in the Ottoman-

5. Cf. Dakin, *Greek Struggle*, 173-217; St. Clair, *Greece*, 132f; and Douglas Dakin, *British Intelligence of Events in Greece, 1824-1827* (Athens: Myrtides, 1959), 1-15.

6. On British diplomacy surrounding the Greek Revolution in the years 1826-1827, cf. M.S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968), 55-65; and M.S. Anderson, *The Great Powers and the Near East, 1774-1923* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), 31f. Cf. also Harold W.V. Temperley, *The Foreign Policy of Canning, 1822-1827* (London: G. Bell, 1925), 326-362; Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967), 238; and Gleason, *Russophobia*, 75-77.

For Sir Frederick's efforts at maintaining Anglo-Ionian neutrality, cf. Adam to Strangford, Zante, 5 August 1822, PRO/CO 136/20; Adam to Ionian Assembly, Corfu, March 1825, PRO/CO 136/28; Adam to Wilmot Horton, Corfu, 15 April 1824, PRO/CO 136/26; and Adam to Strangford, Corfu, 5 August 1822, PRO/CO 136/20.

Greek hostilities at Missolonghi (April, 1826). Unfortunately, neither the commander of the Ottoman-Egyptian army, Ibrahim Pasha, nor the Greek insurgents accepted the Lord High Commissioner's suggestions. A month later, this resistance to local Anglo-Ionian intervention was supplemented in Paris by the new Greek president, John Capodistrias. In a discussion over Anglo-Ionian neutrality and the Greek Revolution, Capodistrias intimidated Sir Frederick in an unfriendly manner. Although Sir Frederick attempted to adjust Anglo-Ionian neutrality to the spirit of the St. Petersburg Protocol, the results of these two experiences convinced him to ignore the articles of the Anglo-Russian pact. Furthermore, while Sir Frederick's distrust of all Greeks generally increased, his suspicions concerning Capodistrias particularly increased. All in all, the Lord High Commissioner returned to the policy of strict Anglo-Ionian neutrality. A year later, after the Anglo-Russian pact had been expanded to include the French, Sir Frederick refused to observe the spirit of the new Treaty of London (6 July 1827). The Lord High Commissioner would not adjust the diplomatic policies of the Anglo-Ionian government in accordance with the new diplomatic policies initiated in London⁷.

THE IONIAN ISLANDS AND THE GREEK STATE, 1827-1831

Along with the usual intransigence of the Ottoman Porte, the determination of the Allied admirals to impose a "forceful" truce, as vaguely defined in the Treaty of London, in the Ottoman-Greek hostilities led to the annihilation of the Ottoman-Egyptian naval forces anchored in Navarino Bay. As a result, Ottoman-Greek hostilities were virtually terminated and an independent Greek state was successfully established. Of course, as Britain's Mediterranean fleet had heavily participated in the defeat of the Ottoman Turks at Navarino, the British were now actively involved with the course of Greece's foreign and domestic policies⁸.

7. Cf. George Finlay, *A History of Greece*, ed. by H.F. Trozer (7vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1877), VI, 388f; C.W. Crawley, *John Capodistrias: Some Unpublished Documents* (Thessaloniki: I.M.X.A., 1970), 81; Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, 334, 342; and St. Clair, *Greece* 238-242.

8. On British participation at Navarino and the subsequent role of Britain in Greek politics, cf. Anton Prokesch von Osten, *Aus dem Nachlasse* (2vols; Vienna: Karl Gerold, 1881), I, 78-83; Georges Donin, *Navarin* (Cairo: L'Institut d'Archeologie Orientale, 1927), 283-312; C. M. Woodhouse, *The Battle of Navarino* (London: Dufours, 1965), 72-141; R.C. Anderson, *Naval Wars in the Levant, 1559-1853* (Princeton: University Press, 1952), 505-537; John Anthony Petropoulos, *Politics and Statecraft in the Kingdom of Greece 1833-1843* (Princeton: University Press, 1968), 46f; Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 68-78, 92-94, 101-105; and Anderson, *Eastern Question*, 66-68.

In spite of Britain's recently established role in the political affairs of Greece, the existence of an independent Greek state was still regarded as a threat to Britain's position in the Ionian Islands. The new Greek president, Count John Capodistrias, was still viewed with suspicion, and the recent Russian victories against the Ottoman Empire convinced the British that strong Russian influences would be established in Greece. Such fears were prevalent among British diplomats in the Near East who also foresaw an eventual Greek annexation of the Ionian Islands with Russian assistance. These suspicions were repeatedly expressed by the British administrators and diplomats in the Near East during the years that Capodistrias served as president of Greece⁹.

Since the existence of the Greek state was regarded as a serious threat to the security of the Ionian Islands, Sir Frederick Adam initiated several measures to reassure this security. Although he welcomed the British naval action at Navarino, Sir Frederick reaffirmed the Anglo-Ionian policy of strict neutrality. The British forces stationed in the Ionian Islands would not interfere with the remnants of the Ottoman-Egyptian naval forces. In addition, the Lord High Commissioner ordered an embargo of all Ionian shipping by denying clearance to those Ionian ships intending to embark for the Morea. While the Allied powers exhibited a neutrality policy of questionable sincerity, the Anglo-Ionian government would be more circumspect¹⁰.

The embargo of Ionian shipping was only one aspect of Sir Frederick's preoccupation with the possible Greek threats to the Ionian Islands. Another aspect concerned some 20,000 Greek refugees who had fled to the Ionian Islands after the Navarino action. The Lord High Commissioner intended to return these refugees in order to reduce the possibility of a Greek *irredentista* movement aimed at the Ionian Islands. Another measure concerned the increasing violation of Anglo-Ionian neutrality by the Greek insurgents. These Greek insurgents were also attacking Austrian shipping in the Ionian Sea. To correct this situation, Sir Frederick allowed the French Mediterranean fleet to anchor at Corfu; a measure which slightly violated Anglo-Ionian neutrality. In spite of his success in the implementation of these measures, Sir Frederick was convinced that these relatively minor problems with the main-

9. Cf. E. Driault & M. Lheritier, *Histoire Diplomatique de la Grèce* (5vols; Paris: Universitaire de France, 1925), I, 408-419; Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, 330-434; and Fleming, *Conference*, 102-105.

10. Circular # 107, Corfu, 4 April 1828, and Circular # 113, Corfu, 5 May 1828, both in PRO/CO 136/1274; and Letter, Corfu, 23 November 1828, PRO/CO 136/1274. Cf. Woodhouse, *Navarino*, 154.

land Greeks were only small manifestations of larger threats which would materialize in the near future¹¹.

Like most British administrators and diplomats in the Near East, Sir Frederick suspected that Capodistrias was a Tsarist agent. Not only was Capodistrias serving the Russians, but he was also alleged to be the source of the major Greek threat to the Ionian Islands. Since several Ionian Greeks had been appointed to the new Greek government, Sir Frederick suspected that Capodistrias intended to annex the Ionian Islands. Furthermore, reports from the Resident of Cephalonia, Colonel Charles James Napier, that one hundred Cephalonioties had departed for positions in the new Greek state finally confirmed the Lord High Commissioner's worst suspicions. Capodistrias' former career in the Russian service and past years in the Ionian Islands convinced Sir Frederick that the establishment of strong Russian influences in Greece would be followed by the Greek annexation of the Ionian Islands. As a result, Russia would replace Britain as the primary power in the Mediterranean¹².

To further counter Capodistrias' supposed designs on the Ionian Islands, Sir Frederick initiated several important measures. The Lord High Commissioner refused to lend any funds to the Capodistrian government. Furthermore, orders were issued to erect new fortresses on the Ionian Islands. More important, Sir Frederick commissioned George Lee, a former philhellene, to consult with Andreas Zaimis, the former Greek provisional president (1826-27) and current Interior minister, on Anglo-Hellenic matters. Zaimis, the leader of the pro-British faction in the Capodistrian government, convinced Lee that Capodistrias was planning to annex the Ionian Islands with Russian assistance. In order to reverse this Capodistrian intrigue, Zaimis promised to support the political movement which demanded a Greek monarch. Of course, British financial assistance was a necessary prerequisite to assure the success of Zaimis' efforts. If Britain could not guarantee any assistance, then Zaimis could not promise any results¹³.

11. Adam to Colonial Office, Ithaca, 5 October 1828, public Record Office/Foreign Office 32/2/188 [Hereafter: PRO/FO 32]; Adam to Murray, Poros, 7 October 1828, PRO/FO 32/2/204f; Adam to Capodistrias, Ithaca, 7 October 1828, PRO/FO 32/2/200; and Goschen to Aberdeen, Agina, 7 December 1828, PRO/FO 32/2/260. Cf. Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 134; and R.C. Anderson, *Naval Wars*, 508f.

On the Foreign Office documents for Greece, cf. Eleutherios Prevelakes & Filippos Glytses, eds., *Epitomai Eggraphon tou Bretannikou Ipourgeiou Exoterikon, 1827-1832* (2vols; Athens: Academy of Athens, 1975), I, passim.

12. Fleming, *Conference*, 67, 181-187; and Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 153f.

13. Adam to Murray, Corfu, 16 December 1829, PRO/FO 32/7/181-189. Cf. E.A. Bessant, ed., *Epistolai I.A. Kapodistria* (4vols; Athens: Konstantinou Palle, 1841), 11, passim; Fleming, *Conference*, 61-71, 187, 191, 234f; and Petropulos, *Statecraft*, 95, 100, 102.

Sir Frederick had previously attempted to infiltrate the Greek provisional government.

Since his suspicions were so intense, Sir Frederick neglected several important points concerning the external Greek threats to the Ionian Islands. Foremost among these neglected points was the fact that Capodistrias had terminated all Russian connections in 1826. Furthermore, Capodistrias was not considering the re-establishment of any connections with the Russians. In addition, Capodistrias had appointed several Ionian Greeks to the new Greek government, because these particular Greeks were better educated than their mainland contemporaries. These Ionian Greeks, educated at the Ionian academy and in the various Italian universities, would serve as constructive examples for the mainland bureaucrats in the Greek government. Besides, there were only two Ionian Greeks serving in the highest echelon of Capodistrias' administration¹⁴.

Sir Frederick also exhibited some gullibility by accepting every fragment of intelligence that Andreas Zaimis related to George Lee. Zaimis intended to discredit Capodistrias in order to promote the cause of monarchism in Greece. Zaimis required British assistance to continue this movement and to maintain his leadership of the pro-British faction in Greece. No better method existed than to emphasise the British fears of Russo-Hellenic intrigues directed at the Ionian Islands. As a result, Zaimis deceived the Lord High Commissioner with these fears, thus confirming Sir Frederick's worst suspicions. Unfortunately, Sir Frederick despatched all reports from Zaimis to his superiors in the Colonial Office¹⁵.

Apart from the external threats, Sir Frederick also feared some internal threats to the security of the Ionian Islands. One of these threats concerned the possibility of an Ionian insurrection, especially an insurrection that would receive encouragement from the expatriate Ionian Greeks. In order to gather more intelligence on these expatriate Ionians, the Lord High Commissioner initiated extensive inquiries on twenty-four of these expatriates, nineteen of whom were former Cephaloniotas. These inquiries were to be conducted by various British Residents in the Ionian Islands, and these officials were instructed to procure their information in an inconspicuous manner. Unfortunately, Sir Frederick expected to secure the greatest amount of intelligence from the British Resident on Cephalonia; however, Colonel Napier never responded to the Lord High Commissioner's orders. As a result, Sir Frederick never obtained any concrete evidence to prove that any internal, or external,

Unfortunately, the three agents hired by the Lord High Commissioner had already formed a Zantiote partisan committee for the *Philike Etaireia*! Cf. Dakin, *British Intelligence*, 57-62.

14. Cf. Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 134f; and Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, 324f.

15. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, 68, 71-73, 184; Petropoulos, *Statecraft*, 100, 102f, 136f; and Foss, *Ionian Islands*, 59, 84, 135-137.

threats were directed against the Ionian Islands. The Lord High Commissioner only possessed his unfounded suspicions on Capodistrias and the Russian influences in Greece. Of course, Sir Frederick posted all rumours of such threats, both external and internal, to his superiors in London¹⁶.

Overall, Sir Frederick was forced to guard only against the external threats which demanded the annexation of the Ionian Islands to the new Greek state. Whether such conspiracies actually existed is difficult to determine, but for Sir Frederick Adam, these conspiracies were serious threats to the security of the Ionian Islands. The Lord High Commissioner felt that the continuance of Capodistrias' administration in Greece was a major threat to the Anglo-Ionian administration in the Ionian Islands. With the constant increase of expatriate Ionians serving in the Greek government, the threat of annexation appeared even greater. As a result, Sir Frederick attempted to institute a regulation which would permanently banish these expatriates from the Ionian Islands. Although the Ionian Assembly would not accept this measure, the Lord High Commissioner did possess enough executive power to prohibit the return of Capodistrias and other expatriates to the Ionian Islands. So intense was Sir Frederick's preoccupation with the external threats to the Ionian Islands, that even an official denial from Tsar Nicholas I on Capodistrias' non-duplicity in these matters was rejected. Furthermore, the assurances of Sir Richard Church, the one philhellene who possessed an insight on these matters, were also rejected. Sir Frederick would retain his suspicions as long as Capodistrias remained the President of Greece¹⁷.

THE IONIAN ISLANDS AND BRITISH DIPLOMACY IN THE NEAR EAST, 1828-1831

Although anti-Capodistrian attitudes were quite prevalent among the leading British statesmen, the rumours and faulty despatches received from Sir Frederick Adam would greatly increase these anti-Capodistrian sentiments. During the period 1828-1831, both the Prime Minister, the Duke of Well-

16. Dawkins to Foreign Office, London, 16 May 1829, PRO/FO 32/7/95-97; Adam to Napier, Corfu, 26 July 1829, Private and Confidential, PRO/CO 136/1275; and Letters by Adam: 2 June 1829 & 21 January 1830, both in PRO/CO 136/1275. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, 239f; Dakin, *Greek Struggle*, 156; and Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, 363, 370. For Colonel Napier's neglect in obeying Sir Frederick's orders, cf. W. David Wrigley, "Dissension in the Ionian Islands: Colonel Charles James Napier and the Commissioners (1819-1833)", *Balkan Studies*, Vol. XVI (December, 1975), 16f.

17. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, 135f, 241, 248, 251, 257, 269-272, 298f. Cf. also: Alexander von Reumont, *Sir Frederick Adam: A Sketch of Modern Times* (London: By the Author at Lincoln's Inn, 1855), 41.

ton, and the Foreign Minister, Lord Aberdeen, suspected that Capodistrias' bankrupt government coveted the prosperous Ionian Islands. After all, the Greek mainland had endured several years of destructive warfare and uncollectable taxes, whereas the Ionian Islands had experienced several years of surplus currant harvests. In addition, the large numbers of expatriate Ionian Greeks serving in the Greek government alarmed the British statesmen who felt that a Greek *irredentista* movement might be initiated under Capodistrias' sponsorship. This latter fear, which was first suggested by Sir Frederick, was connected with possible military and diplomatic influences which the Russians might exert in Greece. If Capodistrias and his followers really possessed pro-Russian sentiments, then the Greeks would not hesitate to utilize Russia's assistance in the annexation of the Ionian Islands. This fear was especially prevalent as the previous Russian occupation of the Ionian Islands (1798-1807) had witnessed the establishment of the independent Septinsular Republic, whereas the present British occupation of the Ionian Islands, which did not encourage an independent Ionian state, was rather unpopular. In order to reverse these external threats to the Ionian Islands, the leading British statesmen unanimously agreed that Capodistrias and his administration were no longer desired for Greece¹⁸.

The opinions expressed in London concerning the Capodistrian administration were similarly expressed by the British diplomats in the Near East. The British ambassador at the Ottoman Porte, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, possessed a similar outlook. As his mission had been hastily transferred from Constantinople to Poros, Redcliffe could concentrate his energies on the political developments in Greece. Before the naval battle at Navarino, Redcliffe had advised his superiors that the western coast of the Morea should remain with the Ottoman Turks. After all, Great Britain and the Ottoman Empire were still diplomatic allies. In addition, both powers had always held cordial and mutual opinions regarding this particular region. Unfortunately, the repercussions from Navarino greatly reduced these plans. As a result, the new Greek state faced just opposite from the Ionian Islands. According to Redcliffe, this frontier, which was only divided by the narrow straits of the Ionian Sea, would eventually collapse. The Ionian Greeks would assist in this collapse since the policies of the Anglo-Ionian government were far harsher than the policies of the Capodistrian administration. Redcliffe did not realize that this situation was partially his own fault as he had advised the com-

18. Hamilton to Admiralty, London, 30 April 1829, PRO/FO 32/7/95-97; Wellington to Adam, London, 30 April 1829, PRO/FO 32/17/100-103; and Dawkins to Foreign Office, London, 16 May 1829, PRO/FO 32/3/24-27.

mander of Britain's Mediterranean fleet, Admiral Sir Edward Codrington, to utilize extremely "forceful" methods at Navarino. Such advice had resulted in the liberation of the Morea from Ottoman control. Redcliffe was now confronted with the effects of his own miscalculated advice¹⁹.

The British Resident at Nauplia, Edward Dawkins, expressed similar sentiments on the possibility of a political union between the Ionian Islands and the new Greek state. However, unlike his contemporaries, Dawkins was not absolutely certain about the source of these threats. Even though he was stationed at Nauplia, the seat of the Greek government, many months passed before Dawkins admitted that a Greek threat to the Ionian Islands did exist. Despite this admission, the British Resident still possessed some doubts on whether Capodistrias personally desired this annexation. After all, the Greek president had denounced all secret Greek societies. Instead, Dawkins was convinced that the expatriate Ionians serving in the Greek government, which included several of Capodistrias' brothers, had organized a conspiracy to annex the Ionian Islands. This belief was later substantiated by the Greek proclamation of an economic blockade of the Ionian Islands. In addition, Russian diplomatic influence at Nauplia indicated that the Greeks were prepared to annex the Ionian Islands; yet, the British Resident was still not entirely convinced of Capodistrias' complacency in these annexationist designs. Although he was stationed in the most convenient region for the determination of such matters, Dawkins wrote to his superiors that the evidence required for the confirmation of these suspicions could best be determined in the Ionian Islands. As a result, Dawkins ordered Sir Frederick Adam to gather all the required intelligence that was available. The British Resident reasoned that the Lord High Commissioner was the best choice for this task. Of course, such a decision does not lessen Dawkins' neglect in refusing to acquire such information for himself. In the end, it was only much later that Dawkins realized that Capodistrias' sole interest in the Ionian Islands concerned the movements of his deadly rivals, the Mavromichalis family²⁰.

19. Cf. Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 83f; Dakin, *Greek Struggle*, 221; Woodhouse, *Navarino*, 69f; and Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, 325f.

20. Adam to Capodistrias, Corfu, 13 June 1829, PRO/FO 32/7/122f; Dawkins to Foreign Office, London, 16 May 1829, PRO/FO 32/2/24-27; Dawkins to Adam, Agina, 12 July 1829, PRO/FO 32/5/92-97; Adam to Napier, Corfu, 26 July 1829, Private & Confidential, PRO/CO 136/1275; Dawkins to Heytesbury, London, 31 August 1829, PRO/FO 32/3/460; and Dawkins to Aberdeen, Argos, 25 December 1829, PRO/FO 32/6/302f. Cf. also: Dawkins to Aberdeen, Argos, 11 February 1830, PRO/FO 32/10/58; Dawkins to Aberdeen, Argos, 27 March 1830, PRO/FO 32/10/128; Dawkins to Aberdeen, Nauplia, 22 December 1830, PRO/FO 32/15/191f; Capodistrias to Dawkins, Nauplia, 4 February 1831, PRO/FO 32/20/136f. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, 224f, 235, 325.

Those Englishmen who were responsible for the direction of Britain's Near Eastern policies believed that several Greek-oriented threats to the territorial integrity of the Ionian Islands did exist. Oddly enough, these same statesmen, who also possessed a great amount of military and diplomatic resources, refused to initiate any measures which would diminish these threats. Of course, Russia's Near Eastern policies had greatly succeeded at British expense, while France had similarly triumphed at the same British expense. Nevertheless, these British statesmen, especially those British diplomats who were stationed in the Near East, only echoed the fears which Sir Frederick Adam had originally expressed. Even Edward Dawkins, who was posted at Nauplia where the threats supposedly originated, was content to despatch rumour after rumour to his superiors in London. Perhaps, Dawkins' failure to readily accuse Capodistrias as the major source of these Greek threats indicated that such threats possessed rather little credence. At any rate, these British statesmen and diplomats were content to permit Sir Frederick Adam to oppose these Greek threats. After all, these Englishmen reasoned that the Lord High Commissioner was the only administrator who could reverse any external threats to the Ionian Islands. Although Sir Frederick was an able administrator and a remarkable soldier, he was no diplomat. In fact, the only diplomatic responsibilities which were charged to the Lord High Commissioner concerned Anglo-Ionian diplomacy, not the entire course of Britain's Near Eastern policies. This particular instance, among many others, illustrated that the British statesmen and diplomats who were responsible for the determination of Britain's Near Eastern policies possessed almost no comprehension of Near Eastern affairs, nor of Britain's actual role in the Near East²¹.

CONCLUSION

Since Sir Frederick Adam was the one British administrator who attempted to reverse the alleged Greek threats to the Ionian Islands, his despatches were accepted unconditionally by his superiors in Britain. Unfortunately, these particular despatches, along with the despatches from other British diplomats in the Near East, only confirmed the worst fears of those British statesmen who were responsible for Britain's Near Eastern policies. Often, the sources for this information were pro-British Greeks who actively sought to discredit their rivals in the Capodistrian government. Suspicions and ru-

21. Dawkins to Aberdeen, Nauplia, 22 December 1830, PRO/FO 32/15/191f; and Capodistrias to Dawkins, Nauplia, 4 February 1831, PRO/FO 32/20/136f. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, 66-75, 118-130, 153-162.

mours were accepted at face-value by the British. As a result, the British statesmen and diplomats were led to believe that the new Greek state would eventually annex the Ionian Islands, and the presence of many expatriate Ionians in the Greek government served as some substantiation for these beliefs. Since Capodistrias himself was a former Corfiote, these suspicions were further magnified, and Capodistrias' former career in the Russian service added some credence that the Greek government was administered on a pro-Russian orientation. The possibility of Russia's diplomatic hegemony in the Near East, especially in Greece, worried the British. After all, George Canning had failed to harness the Russians into a solid diplomatic alliance, and Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Wellington were similarly failing. Even Aberdeen's successor, Lord Palmerston, the personification of Britain's Russophobia, would require at least twenty-five years before he could direct Britain's Near Eastern policies, which included the mastery of the Mediterranean, at Russian expence. In the meantime, the British could only possess their suspicions and accuse Capodistrias of initiating pro-Russian and anti-Ionian intrigues. The only British hopes at that time was the possible resignation of Capodistrias and the establishment of a Greek monarchy²².

The only action, practical and otherwise, came from the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands. Sir Frederick's actions in reversing the supposed Greek threats against the Ionian Islands were applauded by the Colonial Office, and the Lord High Commissioner was encouraged to continue his efforts. In further accordance with the Treaty of London, Sir Frederick imposed a blockade of the western Peloponnese. However, this blockade, much to the dislike of the Colonial and Foreign Offices, was soon lifted by the Admiralty. Furthermore, the Lord High Commissioner was instructed to order the Greeks to lift their blockade of the Epirus coastline. Since the Lord High Commissioner feared an imminent conflict between the Greek navy and the Anglo-Ionian merchant fleet, he acted immediately upon these instructions. Surprisingly, the Greek government hastily complied with Sir Frederick's request to lift the blockade of Epirus. Above all else, the alacrity of the Greek government in honouring this British request should have illustrated to the British that the Greeks feared the consequences of ignoring any British request. Thus, the Greeks were in no position to successfully annex the Ionian Islands²³.

22. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, passim; and Woodhouse, *Capodistria*, 445, 460f. Cf. also: Charles Kingsley Webster, *The Foreign Policy of Palmerston, 1830-1841* (2vols; London: G. Bell, 1951), I, 82, 257; and Gleason, *Russophobia*, 138f.

23. Colonial Office Memorandum, London, 8 June 1830, PRO/FO 32/18/94f; J.H. Hay to Admiralty, Argos, 8 June 1830, PRO/FO 32/18/96f; Murray to Adam, London, 30 April

The British fears that the Greek government would annex the Ionian Islands continued to be strongly expressed until 1831; even through 1833, these fears were sometimes expressed. However, only in one instance were these fears ever based upon any substantial evidence. This particular instance occurred in 1830 when Agostino Capodistrias, the younger brother and successor of the Greek president, proclaimed that the Greek government would indeed annex the Ionian Islands. Fortunately, this particular threat, which was supported by several over-zealous philhellenes, proved to be an ephemeral threat. In fact, with the assassination of John Capodistrias in October 1831, all external threats to the Ionian Islands, imagined and otherwise, abruptly ended. The main source of the fears and suspicions expressed by the British diplomats had been removed. Furthermore, no new threats were ever expected from the Capodistrias as they were quickly losing the struggle for the political control of Greece. Naturally, with the removal of Capodistrias, the British diplomats no longer feared the possible Russian hegemony of diplomatic influence in Greece. As a result, the British Resident, Edward Dawkins, quickly formed a pact with his Russian counterpart, Baron Rückmann, to reverse the dominant diplomatic and military influences of the French. Fortunately, Sir Frederick Adam was not so quick to modify the policies of the Anglo-Ionian government. In fact, the Lord High Commissioner continued his original policies of neutrality until 1832. In that year, Sir Frederick, weary with the long years of the Greek Revolution and the resultant chaos, resigned his commission in the Anglo-Ionian government. With the establishment of the Wittelsbach dynasty in Greece, Sir Frederick's immediate successors would not be troubled with any Greek threats to the security of the Ionian Islands²⁴.

Seabrook, Maryland

1829, PRO/FO 32/18/101; Adam to Church, Corfu, 12 May 1829, PRO/FO 32/18/101; Church to Adam, Plajia, 15 May 1829, PRO/FO 32/18/102.

24. Cf. Fleming, *Conference*, 148; Crawley, *Greek Independence*, 184f; Petropoulos, *Statecraft*, 127-134; and von Reumont, *Adam*, passim.

On Anglo-Ionian history in this period, cf. these personal accounts: Captain Rasil H. Liddell Hart, ed., *The Letters of Private Wheeler* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951), passim; and Charles James Napier, *The Colonies: Treating of their Value Generally—Of the Ionian Islands in Particular* (London: Thomas & William Boone, 1833), passim. The reader should be prepared for many inaccuracies in the former account and many falsehoods in the latter account. Cf. also: George William Hamilton Fitzmaurice (Viscount Kirkwall), *Four Years in the Ionian Islands* (2 vols; London: Chapman and Hall, 1864), passim; Captain Henry Jervis-White-Jervis, *History of the Island of Corfu and of the Republic of the Ionian Islands* (London: Colburn, 1852), passim; and Captain Henry Jervis-White-Jervis, *The Ionian Islands during the present Century* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1863), passim.