

Abstracts

C. G. PATRINELIS

THE PHANARIOTS BEFORE 1821

This paper is not a historical survey of the world of the Phanariots; it rather aims to discuss and commend on some controversial points of the history of Phanariots, and on some generally accepted views about them but not sufficiently documented. The main conclusions of this discussion are the following:

1. The social origin of the Phanariots must be sought not in the class of merchants, as it is often said, but in the cycle of those Greeks of the 16th and 17th centuries, who served the Ottoman state or did business with it (secretaries, dragomans, tax farmers, suppliers of various goods to the sultan's court etc.).

2. There is no official text expounding the political, and social principles of the Phanariots. However, their practice in handling several political matters, their behavior, their correspondence etc. permit us to restore their ideological world:

i) The Phanariots (as well as the Church) believed in the absolute necessity of peaceful co-existence and submission to the Ottoman state. The theory that they served the Turks, but really aimed at undermining and substituting them one day is a pious myth. ii) The Phanariots often played the role of the protector of the orthodox church, and they had adopted some ritual forms of Byzantine origin, but they never declared that they were here to the Byzantine imperial tradition. Besides, none of the Phanariot families had a bond of blood with any Byzantine aristocratic family. Moreover, they did not aim at restoring the Byzantine Empire. The often referred "Idée imperial" of the Phanariots is a posterior invention. iii) The Phanariots did not try to Hellenize their Roumanian subjects; first, because they rejected nationalistic theories, and second, because Greek culture had begun entering the Roumanian lands much before the Phanariot era.

3. It is true that the Phanariots exploited ruthlessly their subjects but not more than their Roumanian predecessors of the native boyars.

4. The Phanariots favoured some forms of modern culture (schools, books, theater etc.), but only to the extent that all these were harmless to them, to the church and the Ottoman state. The nature of their position, as voluntary

servants of a theocratic and despotic state, was quite incompatible with the basic principles of the Enlightenment. It was the phanariotic entourage (teachers at the two Greek High Schools in Bucharest and Iassi, various scholars, generous merchants, polyglot officials at the two princeley courts etc.) that contributed considerably to the movement of the Greek Enlightenment.

5. Contrary to what is often said, neither the Phanariot princes nor their sons used to study abroad; the exceptions are not more than two or three.

6. The view that the Phanariots represented in some way the so called "Enlightened despotism" is groundless. The phanariotic law codes and relative texts indicate a strong inclination to an authoritative, if not machiavellian, administration.

7. Their attitude to the common Greek desire for liberation, as well as to the Greek Revolution was negative (with the exception of the Ypsilanti brothers, Alex. Mavrocordatos, Th. Negriz and a few others).

8. Only after the establishment of the Greek state, and the fashioning of the Great Idea, romantic Greek historiographers exalted the Phanariots as apostles of hellenism and forerunners of the Great Idea.

JOHN A. MAZIS

THE GREEK ASSOCIATION OF ODESSA: NATIONALIST POLITICS ON TWO FRONTS

The Greek Benevolent Association of Odessa (GBAO) represents the crowning achievement of Greek civil society in Late Imperial Russia. Between 1871 and 1917 the GBAO supported a number of philanthropic organizations such as the School for Boys, the School for Girls, the Church of the Holy Trinity, and the Home for the Elderly. The activities of the GBAO were part of the greater phenomenon of private charity in Russia, which came into existence as the Great Reforms, instituted in the 1860s, were being implemented throughout the empire.

While the organization's stated goals were strictly charitable, many of its actions were political. At the time the Russian government was pursuing a policy of russification, which was in direct opposition to the goals of the Greek community. Through education of its members and behind the scenes lobbying, the GBAO was able to avoid the most onerous provisions of the russification laws. The purely political/national activities of the GBAO demonstrate that while the tsarist regime had a well-deserved reputation for political repres-

sion, an organization could pursue political goals provided it was protected by wealthy and or powerful individuals and did not openly antagonize the regime.

ARGYRIOS K. PISIOTIS

RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY AND THE POLITICS OF NATIONAL IDENTITY
IN EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

In the wake of the 1905 revolution some of the prelates and the lower clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church joined the politics of the newly-emerged Right and radical Right. Contrary to the assumptions of Soviet and Western historians, the Orthodox clergy did not do so primarily out of innate conservatism of loyalty to the autocracy. Church leaders sought to substitute empowerment through rightist support for what they felt the tsarist state had abandoned. That was the Church's traditional privileges in Russia, such as the exclusive right to missionary activity and the identification of the character of the tsarist state with Orthodoxy. Yet Orthodox hierarchs approached the Right as ideological teachers seeking to redefine nationalist beliefs about "Russian-ness" according to the Orthodox faith. Participation in rightist political activity also compensated rank-and-file Orthodox clergy for the contempt of Russia's educated élite and for the state's negligence towards clergymen's pressing material needs.

GEORGIOS KRITIKOS

INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES IN A RELIGIOUS CONTEXT

This paper seeks to investigate the religious context of the integration of the Asia Minor refugees, who fled to Greece after the Greek-Turkish compulsory exchange of populations of 1923. The traditional studies of this issue adopt the attitude that since religion was the exclusive criterion of the transfer of populations, there is no reason for discussing further the religious aspect of their settlement. The present research examines a number of issues: whether and why the refugees remained a religious flock after their establishment in the secular Greek state and which was the role of their Christian belief in the process of their settlement; which was the contribution of Church to their integration in material and spiritual terms; last but not least, refugees will be approached not only as products, but also as creators of the system created after 1923. Within this framework, this paper will explore to what extent the

Orthodox Church came up to the expectations of the new congregation, which was in real need of philanthropic work and will evaluate the effect, if any, of the refugee Christian flock upon the Church of the Greek state.

THEODORA KALAITZAKI

TURKEY AND BULGARIA IN THE POST-COLD WAR ERA: A SUCCESS STORY

This article attempts to analyze the Turkish-Bulgarian relations in the post-Cold War period. The first part summarizes the historical background of the bilateral relations between Turkey and Bulgaria. Then, the Bulgarian policy towards the Turkish minority and its impact to the Turkish-Bulgarian relations during the decade of the 1980s is discussed. The last part focuses in the shifts and the new challenges for the Turkish and the Bulgarian foreign policy since the end of the Cold War and analyzes the political and military cooperation in the 1990s. This study concludes that the changes in the international system have provided both Turkey and Bulgaria a conducive environment in their political and security orientations and thus created a necessary ground for the establishment of a more stable and long-lasting form of relationship.