

committed not to a theory of progress, but to a wish "to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of history" (Benjamin, *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* [1968], 255). More recently, Richard Rorty has posed a question nearly identical to that of the idealists, proposing the poverty of scientific materialism and its replacement by a literary culture.

Poole's publication of *Problems of Idealism* brings to the forefront a social-philosophical formulation of idealism and liberalism that, in its own way, is pristine and optimistic, for it precedes the problems and disappointments of the revolutionary and military experiences of the succeeding decades. By the same token, it crystallizes aspirations and features of Russian society before it was plunged into violent trials. This makes it an historical document that has until now been painfully underexploited. This publication coincides with an ever-increasing wave of interest in the liberal tradition within Russia; hence the equal significance of Kolerov's volume. Explorations of different branches of Russian liberalism have burgeoned over the last decade and may certainly prove useful in the eventual evolution of Russian political life. What is key here is that the "radical liberalism" of the idealists is an original formulation, both related to, and distinct from, Western variants of the same tradition; it therefore merits close examination.

Poole's translation is quite accurate, and in general deals successfully with what may come across as turgid prose. His extensive introduction deals carefully and wisely with some of the broad array of issues raised by the volume, nicely establishing the context of the Moscow Psychological Society, and focusing on certain key ideas—the irreducibility of the self, the search for an integral worldview, natural law and progress, and the autonomy of philosophy. There are some editorial cuts in the longer essays. The book is usefully supplemented by good, clear biographies of all of the participants, and a glossary of names. One can only thank Poole for this important contribution, and hope that this long-delayed publication will stimulate the debate and new research that it deeply deserves.

Catherine Evtuhov
Georgetown University

Nikos Marantzidis, *Yasasin Millet, Ζήτω το Έθνος. Προσφυγιά, κατοχή και εμιφύλιος: Εθνοτική ταυτότητα και πολιτική συμπεριφορά στους τουρκόφωνους ελληνορθόδοξους του Δυτικού Πόντου* (Yasasin Millet, Long live the nation. Uprooting, occupation, and civil war: Ethnic identity and political behavior in the Turkish-speaking Greek Orthodox of Western Pontos) (Herakleion: University Press of Crete, 2001), 327 pp.

This book may have a long-winded title, but it raises a series of important interlinked questions, all revolving around a little-known group, the Turkish-speaking Pontian Greeks. Rather than a folkloric essay, Nikos Marantzidis's groundbreaking book looks at this curious group in order to address four important historical, as well as theoretical, questions: How are ethnic identities formed and sustained over time? How do they result in political action and impact on political behavior? What were the ethnic bases of the Greek Civil War? How can the puzzling political behavior of this group be explained? Marantzidis ably addresses all four questions. He uses the theoretical questions to motivate the historical ones, and relies on the latter to illustrate the former. His highly readable book is an exemplar of how a fascinating case study can be woven together with a broader set of questions.

Who are the Turkish-speaking Greeks? Marantzidis focuses on one particular subgroup, the Turkish-speaking Pontians, a group of thirty to forty thousand Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians who came to Greece in 1922-23 from the Black Sea region of Asia Minor. These people lived mainly in the mountainous areas around the town of Bafra, in what is known among them as the Western Pontos; after 1915, they waged a violent guerrilla war against the Ottoman authorities and Muslim inhabitants of the region (which included Muslim refugees from the Balkans); this guerrilla war which mixed brigandage, clan frictions, religion, and nationalism caused them to suffer heavy casualties; the survivors left their homeland for Greece, where they settled mainly in villages of Western and Eastern Macedonia. Their Turkish language and unusual social outlook (they seemed primitive to both the Greek natives and the more

urbanized non-Turkish-speaking Eastern Pontians) contributed to their social isolation.

Their life was shattered once more with the onset of the occupation in 1941. Bulgarian-occupied Eastern Macedonia experienced a policy of violent repression and ethnic cleansing. Once again, the Turkish-speaking Pontians reacted by taking to the mountains and resorting to guerrilla war. In most cases, the local leaders of these guerrilla bands were the sons of the men who had fought in the Pontian mountains thirty years earlier. Relying on their strong social ties, closed social organization, and past guerrilla experience, they gradually mobilized their kin in German- and Italian-occupied Central and Western Macedonia.

By 1943, the Turkish-speaking Pontians were confronted with a critical dilemma: whether to collaborate with the rising National Liberation Front (EAM), the communist-controlled resistance movement. By this time, EAM and its armed wing, the National Popular Liberation Army (ELAS), had established their dominion over the rugged Greek countryside. The Italian capitulation at the end of 1943 combined with the German lack of resources and manpower to create a power vacuum in most of Greece which was quickly filled by the organizationally savvy communists. By basing their army on political organizations in every village, they were able to overpower and either defeat or absorb into their centralized and well-disciplined structure their competitors, mainly small officer bands and mountain brigands.

The Turkish-speaking guerrilla bands faced a similar predicament. Collaboration with EAM meant complete loss of autonomy and surrender to a centralized group that stood at the opposite end of their fiercely traditionalist and independent nature. However, unlike officer bands and mountain brigands, they could count on their considerable military experience and their ethnic network which spanned Macedonia. As a result, they allied with the Panhellenic Liberation Organization (PAD), a non-communist resistance organization run by officers. This alliance gave them some breathing space, but it was stillborn: the officers were weak to begin with, and the tensions between them and

the local Turkish-speaking military leaders were intense; yet, it is telling that the historiography of the occupation and the Civil War erased the ethnic identity of these bands by subsuming it under the PAD label; up to this day, these bands are almost exclusively referred to as PAD bands without any reference to the ethnic identity of their members.

EAM decided to punish hard the insubordination of the Turkish speakers and, by 1944, it launched an all-out attack against their villages, which Marantzidis describes in chilling detail, using both written and oral sources. Resistance became a side show to what was a savage civil war that included the mass killing of civilians and the wholesale burning and looting of villages. In some areas of Western Macedonia, the civil war took on an openly ethnic character under its ideological and revolutionary cloak, pitting Pontian and other refugees against Slavophone natives, in various political configurations: refugees would join the EAM where the Slavophones had been drafted into collaborationist militias and vice-versa.

Facing certain defeat and fearing complete elimination, the Turkish-speaking bands turned to the Germans who were only too happy to arm them and willing to respect their independence. Clearly, the collaborationist behavior of the Turkish-speaking Pontians was a byproduct rather than a precondition of the civil war which culminated in the bloody battle of Kilkis, on 4 November 1944. This battle, which was followed by the execution of hundreds of Turkish-speaking Pontians, was the bloodiest battle fought in Greece during the entire occupation period, and involved exclusively Greeks on both sides (not surprisingly ignored by most Greeks, this battle is absent from most history textbooks). It was rather predictable, then, that the Turkish-speaking Pontians would become staunch anticommunists and fight on the army's side during the 1947-49 Civil War. Indeed, to this day they are voting overwhelmingly for right-wing parties.

Marantzidis, a political sociologist rather than a historian, was originally motivated by the puzzling electoral behavior of the Turkish-speaking Pontians. Why, he asked, does a refugee group vote *en bloc* for conservative right-wing parties, when it is a fundamental fact of Greek electoral

sociology that refugees (and their descendants) have tended to support the Liberal Republicans? The answer he initially got was that the Turkish speakers were a backward group and hence could not have possibly supported the progressive Republican cause. The decisive proof was thought to lie in the collaborationist stance they adopted during the occupation: who but royalists or backward elements (or both) could ally with the Nazis against the Resistance? However, after investigating their electoral behavior during the interwar period, Marantzidis found that the Turkish speakers had overwhelmingly supported Eleftherios Venizelos's Liberal Party, very much like the other refugees. What, then, appeared as socially overdetermined became puzzling. And the solution to the puzzle was to be found in the events of the occupation which shaped their postwar political identity and voting behavior. The Turkish-speaking Pontians defected from the Republican Venizelist camp and became staunch Royalists as a consequence of the war. In fact, Marantzidis is able to show that the degree of the Turkish-speaking villages' electoral support for the Right is directly related to the level of fatalities they suffered during the civil war of 1943-44.

A key measure of good social science research is whether it succeeds in reversing conventional causal claims. Marantzidis does precisely that: he shows beautifully that collaboration was caused by civil war and that right-wing political behavior followed rather than preceded collaboration. His book should be read by all those interested in recent Greek history, but also by those looking for an exemplar of modern social science at its best—interdisciplinary (bringing together work from political science, sociology, history, and anthropology), based on a rich variety of archival and oral sources, primary and secondary sources, weaving analysis and narrative, and truly groundbreaking.

Stathis N. Kalyvas
Yale University

Yiorghos Leventis, *Cyprus: The Struggle for Self-Determination in the 1940s. Prelude to Deeper Crisis* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002), 278 pp.

This book deals with two issues of fundamental importance in the history of Cyprus and of the Cyprus question. First, it discusses British attitudes on the future of the island before, during, and in the aftermath of World War II. Second, it presents the search by the Greek Cypriot majority for a satisfactory strategy in the quest for enosis (union of Cyprus with Greece): was it better to pursue a policy of "unyielding" demand for immediate union with Greece, or a gradualist/pragmatic policy which would accept a constitution and a measure of self-government as a stepping stone to enosis?

The period under examination—the 1940s, although the book also covers the years 1935-39—was crucial in the shaping of events. After the 1931 Cyprus revolt, the British established authoritarian government by decree; the regime was relaxed to some extent during the war years. After 1945 the new British Labour government debated the future of the island, decided to retain it as a colony indefinitely (but also to reform its internal regime), and finally (1947-48) tried to introduce a constitution. At the same time, important developments took place within the Greek Cypriot majority community: the church retained its leading role in the claim for enosis, although its authority was to a large extent challenged by the rise of the communist movement, especially after the establishment of the Progressive Party of the Working People (AKEL) in 1941. After the war, the tense political antagonism between the Greek Cypriot Left and Right—largely reflecting the civil conflict in Greece—coincided with the search for a strategy to solve the Cyprus question, and with British decisions on the future of the island, including the constitutional proposals of 1947-48. Thus, by the second half of the 1940s, different developments and processes reached their peak simultaneously and manifested themselves mainly on the level of constitutional discussions; this is why the period and the subject covered in the book are of particular importance for the student of Cypriot history.

Leventis has done extensive research, mostly in Britain (Cabinet, Colonial Office,