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The absence of Russia is a great mistake in a book like this which has the ambition to help understand the unity of the Intermediate Region, because of the great importance this people played in the last millennium of the internal history of this area of civilization. To present, as the author does, the Russian State as an external factor to the Eastern Question, on the same level as England for instance, is a very common mistake among historians which prevents us once again from understanding the significance of the internal struggle of the area, which has always been the will of each one of the peoples of the Intermediate Region to hold the sceptre of its Oecumenical Empire in Istanbul. Thus we fail to understand the process by which an external power, England, intervenes in the civil war going on in the area for the succession of the Istanbul throne and helps the Turks maintain the throne by repelling both the internal contender from the South (the Arabs of Mohammed Ali) and the internal contender from the North (the Russians of Nicholas 1st.). It equally fails to understand why so many prominent Greeks continued their close relation which lies in a circle around Eastern Mediterranean and more precisely around a fabulous city, Istanbul (otherwise called Byzantium, Constantinople, Polis, Tsargrad) and has never been presented by historians in its unity. This intermediate region between West and East, encompasses the Orthodox Christian Slavs (including the Russians), the Rumanians, Albanians, Greeks, Turks, Jews, Arabs, Persians, that is from Belgrad in the West to the Indus River in the East and from Archangelos in the North to Ethiopia in the South.

No textbook has ever been written on the history of this Intermediate Region. The first important effort in this direction was made however by L.S. Stavrianos when, in 1958, Rinehart of New York published his remarkable book, titled *The Balkans since 1453*. This book encompasses only one part of the Intermediate Region, the western quarter of it, describing five centuries of its history. At the same time a parallel effort was made in French by a Lebanese historian, Jawad Boulos, published in five volumes by Mouton of The Hague, under the title *Les peuples et les civilisations du Proche-Orient*. But the ambition of this work was so great that it made a failure of the last volumes. With the exception of Russia it tries to encompass the history of the whole Intermediate Region from prehistoric times to the present day. The book by Arnakis, the third volume of which is still to be published, also studies the whole area with the exception again of Russia, but only covers the 19th and 20th centuries.
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Η έργασία θεωρεί τον αντίκτυπο των οικονομικών και κοινωνικών δυνάμεων στον διαδικασιογόνο λίθο ανάπτυξης της \( \sigmaίματος \) και των δυνάμεων στον διαδικασιογόνο λίθο ανάπτυξης της \( \sigmaίματος \).

Σημαντικό είναι ότι οι ιδιοκτήτες συμμετέχουν στη διαδικασία με την προσωπική τους συμμετοχή, στον κοινωνικό και τον πολιτικό κόσμο της Εκκλησίας. «Η έτνη άρχην έμεινε επί την \( \sigmaίματος \) και τον κοινωνικό κόσμο της Εκκλησίας.»

Η συμμετοχή στην διαδικασία της έντυπης συμμετοχής είναι και τον πολιτικό κόσμο της Εκκλησίας. «Η έτνη άρχην έμεινε επί την \( \sigmaίματος \) και τον κοινωνικό κόσμο της Εκκλησίας.»