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όποιας Πρεσβέλου

Έπισκέψεις Κοινωνικών Παιδευμάτων,


As curious as it may sound, the civil- ization of one third of Eurasia still awaits defintion. Traditionally cut between the classical distinction of West and East, the «cradles of world civilization» which lies in a circle around Eastern Mediterranean and more precisely around a fabulous city, Istanbul (otherwise called Byzantium, Constantinople, Polis, Tsargrad) has never been presented by historians in its unity. This «intermediary region» between West and East, encompasses the Orthodox Christian Slavs (including the Russians) the Rumanians, Albanians, Greeks, Turks, Jews, Arabs, Persians, that is from Belgrade 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 Intermediary 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 The Balkans since 1453. This book encompasses only one part of the Intermediary 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 Boulou, 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 Intermediary 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.

The absence of Russia is a great mistake in a book like this which has the ambition to help understand the unity of the Intermediary 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 Intermediary 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 Ist.). It equally fails to understand why so many prominent Greeks continued their close
collaboration in Istanbul with the Ottoman Emperor, even after the making of a small independent kingdom of Greece in 1832. In fact it very much resembled the present Canadian situation. As there are French separatists in Quebec and French federalists in Ottawa, in the same way there were Greek separatists in Athens and Greek «federalists» in Istanbul, for ideological and not just opportunistic reasons.

However the main value of this work, which far exceeds its weaknesses, is that for the first time it gives us a very clear textbook of the last two centuries of the history of nearly the whole of this area, of civilization lying in the middle of Eurasia, it situates the Balkans in the Near East where they really belong and bans from its vocabulary the illogical and confusing term of Middle East, Eurasia, it situates the Balkans in the stick and confusing term of Middle East, Eurasia, it situates the Balkans in the pull of Western and Eastern influences because of the «inward» and not from the Western angle.

The bibliography of both volumes is not satisfactory. The once more repeated, although very weak, argument that «for practical reasons» it was necessary to limit it to works available in English, does not save it from criticism as useful books in English are not mentioned while others of highly doubtful importance are brought in.
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Αι περί ιδιοκτησίας άποψες εν τῇ εκκλησίᾳ κατά τοὺς τρεῖς πρώτους αἰῶνας

'Εκδοσις Πατριαρχικού Ιδρύματος Πατριαρχικά Μελετάν, 'Ανάλεκτα Βλατάδων 13, Θεσσαλονίκη 1972, σ. 201, ἀπὸ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Νεκταρίου Χατζημάχη.

Εἰς καλλιτεχνικὰς καί λίιοντερικὰς Μελετάς, 'Ανάλεκτα Βλατάδων θέμα : 'Απί περί Ιδιοκτησίας άποψες εν τῇ εκκλησίᾳ κατά τοὺς τρεῖς πρώτους αἰῶνας. 'Η διατριβή αὕτη ἐπιλείπεται ἐν τῇ τεχνολογίᾳ Ελληνικὸς θεσμός διότι τῶν διαφόρων τάξεων τῆς ἐλληνορωμαϊκῆς κοινωνικῆς φιλοσοφίας. 'Η διατριβή αὕτη ἐπιλείπεται ἐν τῇ τεχνολογίᾳ Ελληνικὸς θεσμός διότι τῶν διαφόρων τάξεων τῆς ἐλληνορωμαϊκῆς κοινωνικῆς φιλοσοφίας.

'Η διατριβή αὕτη ἐπιλείπεται ἐν τῇ τεχνολογίᾳ Ελληνικὸς θεσμός διότι τῶν διαφόρων τάξεων τῆς ἐλληνορωμαϊκῆς κοινωνικῆς φιλοσοφίας.