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Linn seems too credulous of official pronouncements, often accepting orders or stated policy for what was actually done. Historians wishing to measure the gap between rhetoric and reality in that war should contrast Gen. Robert P. Hughes’s 1902 Senate testimony with the archival record of the army rampage on Panay under his command two years earlier. Many will reject various of Linn’s judgments out of hand. After conceding that the pacification of Batangas involved reconcentrating the entire provincial population, an astonishing death rate from consequent disease, and the deliberate destruction of most of the rural food supply, draft animals, and housing, Linn characterizes those measures as ranging “from mild to severe harassment” (p. 153). Nor does his implication that Filipinos were subjected to “physical abuse” in violation of the laws of war only “in several instances” accord with the facts (p. 167). Linn’s book is highly recommended, but it should be read in conjunction with the work of Philippine specialists like Reynaldo C. Ileto, Glenn A. May, and William Henry Scott—in which other truths emerge.
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As the Cold War set in during the mid-to-late 1940s, the United States undertook to secure the non-Soviet-dominated states of Europe by bolstering them economically and militarily. Greece was deemed to be in a very precarious position at the frontier of a now divided Europe. First through the Truman Doctrine and then under the Marshall Plan, the United States intervened directly and deeply in Greece to “contain communism.” As this study shows, this was a significant departure from American involvement in the small Balkan nation before the Second World War.

This book deals with what was the most turbulent era in Greece since the struggle for independence a century before. In his account the author concentrates on three general areas: diplomatic and political relations, financial and commercial interests, and humanitarian matters. An epilogue breaks away from the period that is under study and offers an overview of Greek-U.S. relations since World War II. Much of the interaction between the two countries that the author discusses was on a state-to-state basis. But the impact of these relations was on more
than just the governmental level. Therefore, the author has wisely used the broader term “American” in entitling his study. Also, as a contrast to the interventionist character of U.S. involvement in Greece after 1945, “influence” is employed to describe relations in the twenties, though “interests” would be a more apt choice in this case. The author’s careful selection of appropriate terms is important not merely as an accurate description of the period he has examined. After decades of close but sometimes problematic relations between the two countries, historically conditioned sensitivities over the nature of the relationship have developed so that this subject must be dealt with evenly, avoiding uncritical lauding as well as ideologically skewed criticism.

The key issue in the relations between the United States and Greece in the period examined was the issue of credits proffered to Greece by the Allies, including the U.S., to enable it to participate fully in the struggle against the Central Powers and the war debt that resulted. American resolve to clarify this matter and reach an accord influenced the position the U.S. took on all other issues with regard to Greece, including the recognition of the revolutionary government after 1922, the position of the king, George II, the declaration of a republic in 1924, and the refugee settlement problem. The episodic nature of these issues fragments the continuity of the narrative and makes it difficult to delineate policy developments among the governments of both countries.

Since the Greek state was created in 1830 it has been of geostrategic interest to great powers, which have intervened in its affairs in the role of “protectors.” During and after the Great War, the competing interests of the European powers, domestic political upheaval in Greece, and conflicting nationalist aspirations in southeastern Europe combined to produce conflagration and tragedy for the Hellenic world. As Greece sought to recover from the Asia Minor debacle and cope with the tidal wave of refugees, there was no recourse but to rely on the great powers. Though the author focuses on the United States, as is the emphasis of his documentary sources, he also delves into the diplomacy of the other interested great powers. He is critical of the French, though his sources are British accounts. Britain and France, the author correctly notes, were preeminent in Greek affairs at this time. It is clear from the issues examined in this account that the U.S. had to consider the interests of its major European allies first and working with them was a primary consideration in its relations with Greece. Relations with the
small state were further limited by the American commitment not to become politically involved in Greece or participate in the League of Nations. There were private American commercial interests, which U.S. diplomats were eager to promote in Greece. In terms of “influence” it would have been worthwhile for the author to have included a chapter on American cultural and social relations given the American sponsored educational institutions in Greece and the role of Greek immigrants who returned from the U.S.

As the author states, “Greece, both politically and economically, was inconsequential in American calculations” (p. 166). What then are we to conclude from this study? Should we argue, as the author does, that despite the limited interest, American influence “permeated” Greek society and the events of this time “profoundly” influenced relations between the two states? It would be better to note the popular sentiment for Greece in the U.S., the large number of Greek immigrants there, and the growing commercial interests between the two countries, but to conclude that the major American political, military, and economic interests were in other areas of the world at this time. This study adds historical perspective to our understanding of more recent American-Greek relations and points up how much the second Great War of the twentieth century created the conditions which brought Greek society under the pervasive influence of the U.S. with both its positive and negative effects.
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The treatment of anti-imperialist themes in the United States is a comparatively new development in the historiography of U.S.-Latin American relations. Until recently, attention has centered largely on armed resistance to U.S. military intervention—in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Nicaragua. This attention has been wholly justified for many reasons. It was immediate and arguably the most dramatic form of resistance to the United States. These themes have enjoyed favor, too, because of the comparative ease of research. They drew largely upon U.S. manuscript and archival records, many of which opened early and were easily accessible.