

*A Glorious place
called Greece*

A collection of essays



Risto Stefov

A Glorious place called Greece

A collection of essays

Published by:

Risto Stefov Publications
rstefov@hotmail.com

Toronto, Canada

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system without written consent from the author, except for the inclusion of brief and documented quotations in a review.

Copyright © 2019 by Risto Stefov

e-book edition

September 12, 2019

INDEX

The Documentary that Shocked Greece.....	4
ДОКУМЕНТАРЕЦ КОЈ ЈА ШОКИРА ГРЦИЈА.....	22
Discussion with Ilias Petropoulos regarding Macedonian and Greek Issues	41
Macedonian was never a part of the Hellenic city-states.....	57
The Greek President is Albanian!	65
About the Greek Language	69
Modern Greece according to David Holden	78
G. A. Henty on 19 th century Greece and the Modern Greeks ..	83
After two centuries of living a myth Greece now faces reality	86
How Macedonia became Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian	92
How Macedonians were made into Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians?.....	98

The Documentary that Shocked Greece

By Sotir Grozdanovski

October 13, 2015

Translated and Edited by Risto Stefov

“Every nation must think of its own history, being based on truth...”
Dionysios Solomos 1847.

<https://macedoniannewssite.wordpress.com/2015/10/15/%D0%B4%D0%BE%D0%BA%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%82%D0%B0%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%86-%D0%BA%D0%BE%D1%98-%D1%98%D0%B0-%D1%88%D0%BE%D0%BA%D0%B8%D1%80%D0%B0-%D0%B3%D1%80%D1%86%D0%B8%D1%98%D0%B0/>

Recently an unexpected video clip, at least for us Macedonians, suddenly appeared on Facebook which shocked the entire population of Greece. The clip was about the creation of the modern Greek state; a result of the 1821 Greek Revolution. There would have been nothing unusual about it had it been based on what is known about ancient history and the historical processes familiar to people. But it was not like that. The reason it was shocking and disastrous for the Greek public was because this video clip revealed the lies and untruths upon which the rotten foundations of today’s so-called “democratic” Greece was built, which has nothing to do with the ancient City States or the ancient Athenian culture, the centre of science on which today’s Western civilization is based.

The video clip is a documentary which reveals the atrocities the Greek clergy had committed since the inception of the Greek state and continue to commit to this day; especially against the national minorities living in Greece, including the Macedonian people.

The facts that are boiling in this video clip are delivered by many participants, including by the Greek scientific elite, who are educated in higher learning institutions worldwide.

The video clip which I am discussing in this article was delivered in part in the Greek language but mostly in English. I believe many Macedonians, especially those in the Diaspora, had an opportunity to view this important document and follow its content without much difficulty. But there are also those who had difficulty understanding the English language, which is why I took the opportunity to present the clip's theme in the Macedonian language... as best I could.

Now let us begin with the story that describes the creation and development of today's modern Greek state, one of Macedonia's supposedly "good" neighbours. Let us have a look at how Greece was truly created and how Greece treats the Macedonian people. Allow us to also remind the reader that no good could come from negativity; bad for bad, from which no one benefits and only leads to more harm. And even though this information comes too late for us Macedonians, the truth is slowly revealing itself and justice will surely prevail.

The conscience of honest people should not be underestimated, as can be seen from the professionals who themselves are representatives of the Greek scientific environment and who are important for the future development of good neighbourly relations between the Greek and Macedonian people.

Let us begin:

“On September 27, 1831 Ioannis Kapodistrias, the new Greek state's first president, was murdered on the main road to Naphplion (port city and first Greek capital). With his assassination the country hit a new cycle of civil war. It soon became clear that all the effort made by the Greek president to create a new functionally independent and virile state was fruitless. It came to light that the Greek people were incapable of having a state, let alone governing it successfully.”

These were words spoken by the host of the Greek TV program “Sky”, referring to historical events that led to the formation of today’s Greek state, formed for the first time under the name “Greece”. He continued:

“Trapped in the Ottoman Empire they were unable to look the future in the eye. They made enormous efforts to keep the privileges which they had enjoyed until then, stubbornly opposing any changes in their status, which undoubtedly would have come with the new Greek state, in which the rule of law, order and justice would prevail.”

“Being particular about what was happening in that part of the world, the European powers were able to find a simple cure for the Greeks. All they needed now was to find a leader and an ideology to unite them. It was time to bring a monarchy and form the first Greek Kingdom. The cards were thrown on the table and the game began...”

FORMATION OF THE FIRST NATIONAL MYTH

In 1832 the Greek royal crown was not something that was desired, its necessity was imposed from the outside. After continuous unrest and ruthless destruction, the country had nothing better to offer. Much more important than the formation of any new state was the idea that would link the present with the past; link the present people with the ancient Greek culture, (dead in this region for many centuries). This idea was manufactured in the heads of the people in the present.

The Bavarian monarch Ludwig I, one of the great supporters of philhellenism, took this project even further. His comprehensive support of the Greek Revolution for independence and the formation of the Greek kingdom, headed by his still adolescent son Otto, was not a random act.

At the time when the English were stealing the marble legacies from the Parthenon and moving them to museums and private collections, most “distinguished” by Lord Elgin, Ludwig I carefully made copies

of them and placed them in prominent places in the German state. With that he created a new Athens in Munich, in the heart of Bavaria, whose beauty is present to this day, far from present-day Greece, as a perpetual memorial to his love of Hellenism and its values.

During Ludwig I's time, the educational system of this tiny German state introduced the Greek language as an obligatory subject, together with the literary and scientific legacy of the learned people of ancient Greece. Thus in 1830 Bavaria became the centre of the lovers of Hellenism and Munich looked more Greek than Athens. Many Bavarian artists, supported by Ludwig I himself, often traveled through the Greek lands and were inspired by the classical past of that country and the deep romanticism of the time.

Peter Von Ness, one of those Bavarian artists, received a special assignment. His task was to perpetuate the 1821 revolution by recording all important events with portraits and drawings. These portraits, especially those of prominent heroes and important events, remained the most important works of art in Greek history to this day.

According to William St. Clair from the centre of History at the University of Cambridge, in 1830 Greece was the first independent nation state in Europe, largely thanks to the "star" qualities of Ancient Greece. So according to the traditional views of the monarchic governments of that time, a free Greece meant the resurgence of the ancient civilization that was appreciated and respected all around the world.

"And so the dream of Bavarian monarch Ludwig I, the great lover of Hellenism, began to unfold. On the morning of February 6, 1833 Ludwig's 17 year-old son Otto arrived in Naphplion, and soon after that he landed in Athens; the new capital of the new Greek state. But of course the new king did not arrive alone. He arrived with more than 3,500 military and administrative instructors in order to establish an administrative model in the image of Bavaria. Despite those, young king Otto and his staff had other, more important objectives to accomplish. They needed to conquer and annex the

various separate parts of the Greek territory and unify them under the new Greek state and ultimately create a new national identity.”

“The new government that was hastily installed met with many difficulties and ran into various obstacles. It found itself in a divided society with a non-existent economy. Its priorities were not only to bring peace and order to the country but, above all, it was charged with the task of creating a new Greek national identity: an identity capable of uniting a society and bringing change to the traditional understanding of identity. In other words create an identity for a modern nation.”

In his presentation Pashalis Kitromilidis, a political science professor at the University of Athens, explains.

There were valid and specific reasons for choosing Athens as the capital of the new Greek Kingdom. One of those reasons, highlighted as a key reason, was the international recognition of Ancient Greece. This was the basis or starting point for the recognition of the new Greece. This idea was brought to life at the very beginning when Ludwig I initiated the Greek project to place his young son Otto on its throne. At that time the state bore the name Hellas and not Greece.

In their projects regarding the new Greek kingdom, the Bavarians had many other surprises; - To remove every trace and memory of the Ottoman past in Athens and beyond, thereby restoring all ancient monuments in the city and, amazingly, following the Munich model. But all this was not totally unexpected; the top priority of the new state and beyond was to recognize the Greek originality.

The first thing that Otto did after landing on Greek soil was to put public finances in order and restore the old drachma from 2,000 years ago, thus lifting the Phoenix which assassinated Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first Greek president elected in 1831. After that the new monarch renamed all the streets in Athens and gave them the names of ancient philosophers, ancient playwrights and the names of the heroes of the 1821 uprising. So everything was linked to ancient Greece, which became the symbol of the new state overnight.

The Bavarians introduced the official Greek language of the time with great sensitivity and love, confident that they spoke ancient Greek. And so the idealization of the Greek language became a foundation for the Greek intelligentsia. If that did not happen, today's Greeks would still be speaking "Arvanitika" (Albanian), as the vast majority did in those days in that part of the world.

Cooperation in the Greek kingdom was not an easy job. Greeks were constantly in conflict with each other and could not find common ground, not even for the most elementary needs of their society. Politically they existed amid lingering discords and it was simply impossible for their political parties to coexist. National unity among the Greeks could only be achieved by mixing fantasy with history. They could only manage to draw the necessary energy for their survival from their alignment with myths.

In this kind of chaotic situation, while composing the new Greek society, it was necessary to invoke the assistance of legends in order to coexist and move forward. A new identity was needed that would unify all the subjects of the realm. But where could one begin in the case of the new "Greeks"? Of course the first thing to do was to "reduce" history in which facts that held no water were deleted.

It may sound a little strange when one talks about "reducing" historical "facts", but this practice did not start in Greece. In fact it began in Munich, in the new Athens in Ludwig's neo-classical Kingdom. In attempting to "reduce" Greek history by building memorials and neoclassical monuments in his own capital in Munich, Ludwig in fact reduced his own history. One such building that Ludwig I raised in his capital was the Propylaia. To honour the 1821 Greek Revolution, Ludwig built a grand monument in the centre of Munich and on it he ordered all the names of those who participated in the Revolution, as well as the names of all those who played a significant role in the creation of the new Greek state, to be written in large Greek letters. Besides the names already mentioned, here he also wrote the names of all those who played an important role in the political, social, ideological and ecclesiastical importance in the liberation of Greece. Included side by side, the names Rigas Fereos and Patriarch Gregory were written even though they were ideological opponents. Other names included Ioannis Kapodistrias,

Adamantiou Kora and many other “heroes” of the revolution who, on several occasions, fought each other and even shot at one another. But they were historical figures and contributed to the liberation of the new Greek state for which they were respected.

The Bavarian monument clearly shows the logic, the path and the way that the history of the 1821 Revolution would have to be written. This was the so-called “myth” of 1821. This also shows that the nation can be regenerated, renewed and live well despite all the types and sizes of tragedies experienced, despite the various acts of crimes committed and criminal organizations involved whose activities included various executions organized by senior government, army and church officials. This is how the legend of 1821 was created and based on something... in order to justify the evil done as something desirable and necessary for the “greater good”. However, all legends have a beginning and do not appear out of thin air like random events. This was the road and means to construct a platform for the unification of the Greek state and its ideology, which on the one hand confounded historians and on the other spread a sense of community and security to a people needing to survive.

After all that was said and done there was still discontent in the kingdom that would create problems in the future, but a powerful amalgam was found that would adequately give the masses peace and tranquility. This was the Greek Orthodox Church which, among other things, played a major role in the unification of Rumelia and the Peloponnesus and, despite the irony, helped the Greek nation connect with ancient times.

Realizing the power of the Church, the Bavarians in 1833 created an autocephalous (independent) Greek church and then placed it in the service of the crown.

It was said that during the Revolution, the Church stood aside undecided. It did not want to take sides for fear of losing its acquired rights. Now it was put in a position to provide some recognition and thus began its story of the oversimplification of its former role. If the church did not support the revolution and its goals, it was said, it was because of some “tactical” reasons. Its dignitaries, it was said,

were like-minded supporters of the struggle against the Ottomans from the start of the revolution, which in reality was not true.

When Patriarch Gregory V withdrew from the Revolution he cursed its leader Alexander Ypsilantis. Gregory did not do that for tactical reasons, as some would like to claim. He did that for more interesting reasons, noting ostensibly Church principles, claiming that the Church prohibits all violence and injustice; a fact that had never before preoccupied the minds of most clergy.

By cursing the Revolution, continued the documentary announcer on Sky TV, Gregory saved many Ottoman lives, a fatal mistake which church dignitaries never managed to understand. His move only inspired the other side to take part in the mass actions of the military revolution and come out as winners at the cost of enormous damage to the country as well as the many crimes committed against the innocent, unarmed Turkish population.

The degenerate role played by the Greek Orthodox Church during the most critical times in the formation of the new Greek state was very different from its glorified supposed role of being “the guardian of the national treasury and protector of the people since their enslavement, when heroes lit the fire of national ideals and raised the masses to rebuild the Fatherland”.

Linking the Church with nationality corrupted modern nationalism and so did the national myths, of which the most famous was the myth of a secret school. The most important part of this myth is the suffering and “great sacrifice” priests had to make in order to disseminate the Greek language among the people, especially among children despite the ban by the Turkish authorities. This myth was perpetuated in the works of painter Nikolaus Gisis under the name “Secret School” released in 1886. Gisis belonged to the Munich School of art, which continued the Philhellenic Bavarian tradition of Hellenic painters projecting events from the 1821 Greek Revolution.

From a historical point of view, the “Secret School” message was totally false. No such school had ever existed. This was a false projection of the events of those times, created to provide a pleasing atmosphere. It was a strong message which read: “This is how it was

then children! Even you, in your early youth, need to do everything for our country to be free again...”

The “Secret School” was an afterthought, a creation of the state, created in 1886 for specific reasons – to further consolidate religion and make it important, give it a place in the education of the country, as one of the State defense mechanisms.

The myth regarding the role of the Greek Orthodox Church in the new Greek society did not end there. It continues even today with much arrogance and brutality.

“After strengthening the newly established Greek state on the foundations of the 1821 Revolution, it was decided to find an active place for the Church in it. Of course, as is in many popular uprisings, some priests did take part in the Greek Revolution. This, however, does not entitle the official church hierarchy to appropriate their courage and patriotism and claim things that are not theirs to claim. The Greek Orthodox Church in those days did not support and was not part of the Revolution. In fact, the Greek Orthodox Church was both spiritually and practically against the Revolution. Its material interests were against the interests of the people”. Wrote one of the participants and continued.

“I don’t think that the Turks were too concerned about what language the subjects of the Empire spoke, whether it was Greek or Slav. They only cared about their own people speaking the language of Islam. Whatever language the Christians spoke it was the same to the Turks. They did not care about anything other than keeping the peace in the Empire. I am confident that the language was not a major concern. Everything that was said outside of that was a fable for the children.”

Speaking about languages, the truth is that when Greece was under Ottoman rule, the so-called Greek Church played an important role in the spread of the Greek language among the people ensuring its survival. A century before the Revolution took place the middle class fought for the right to be educated in its mother tongue. Schools were opened in cities with a Greek majority and lectures were held in Greek, mostly about ancient Greek science. Little by

little this renaissance began to proliferate everywhere in the cities of the Ottoman territory where traditionally Greek schools existed. Included among these cities were Ioannina, Smyrna (Izmir), Kidonis and later Istanbul. Such educational centres also existed in the Peloponnesus in which children and adults were educated and later employed around cities with Greek schools. The revival also initiated other social and intellectual changes, which aided the country during the Revolution.

THE 1821 REVOLUTION

Seven years after the Revolution ended, the European governments inquired of President Ioannis Kapodistrias as to how many Turks lived in the Peloponnesus. Kapodistrias gave them two numbers, one for 1821 and one for after the Revolution. The number for 1821 was 42,000 and the other number was 0. Today's Greeks do not want to believe or refuse to believe that a sizable Turkish population lived in the Peloponnesus and disappeared without a trace. Turkish families lived everywhere on the Greek territory in small communities working in farms, as craftsmen, traders, employees of state institutions, etc. Those families had lived there for many generations; this was their home. They did not know of any other country and would not have moved, yet they disappeared without a trace in a short time. What happened to these people? It would appear that, regardless of sex or age, they were all killed a few weeks after 1821. All 42,000 Turks; men, women, children, old and young vanished from the face of the earth. They faced no court and none was proven to be guilty of anything... And yet no one took responsibility for their disappearance...

This mass slaughter was perpetrated during the “glorious” 1821 Greek Revolution from which the Greeks have distanced themselves, believing that they won their freedom through a “courageous” military struggle; yet another 1821 myth. To justify this dishonest barbaric act, some Greeks claim that “the Turks also committed such criminal acts” and that the slaughter was committed in retribution.

There are countless legends of events circulating in the schools, created to justify the terrible crimes committed against the innocent

Turkish population. But such crimes are not easy to explain or to forget because they have left deep imprints in the souls, especially in the children. How can anyone explain to a child that his father, grandfather, or a close relative ruthlessly killed Turks? That they slaughtered innocent children along with their parents and then threw them into city wells? How could they explain the many items they had in their homes which had been stolen from the homes of those innocent people who no longer were alive to tell the truth about their untimely death? If they told their children the truth, they would have wondered what kind of people they themselves were and surely they would have asked: “Grandpa, how are we better than them? What is the difference between us and them? Where is our moral superiority?”

The island Chios rightfully became a true example of a heinous place which devoured thousands of innocent people. Chios became a heinous place of the Turkish tragedy during the Greek Revolution. Even though there are many other places where massacres were committed against innocent Turkish citizens by various regular and paramilitary formations, Chios remains the landmark of crimes and the most famous killing field in this world.

Violence in those days was a common event. It was not strange to enter some place and exterminate people as if they were not people. The bloodlust of the Greek gangs had no boundaries. The right to rule was gained by the blade and the bullet. Violence was a means of survival and a means to rule the weaker. Many well-meaning people today often wonder: “Is it true that heinous atrocities were committed in Tripolikas?” Yes indeed massacres were committed in Tripolikas, but didn’t the Turks also commit mischief and massacres in many places in their empire? But for the sake of the truth, of all the mass exterminations of unarmed Turkish civilians, according to existing documents, the worst and most heinous was the one in Tripolikas. There were 35,000 Turkish people living in that city when the Greeks conquered it. Of these, no one was left alive.

The devastation and carnage that took place during these military acts in Greece was captured in one of Dionysios Solomos’s poems of freedom. Forty years later Dionysios Solomos’s poetry was used to fashion the Greek national anthem. From his entire collection of

poems, totaling about 158 works, only a few stanzas are known. “If you read more than two stanzas,” said one of the Greek participants in this documentary, “you will find that our national anthem is not only a hymn to freedom, but also a testament to the atrocities committed against innocent people. This is a graphic view of terrible events: “Look how desperate hands pluck life. They cast off the feet, the hands and the heads of the dead victims. Swords and chains mixed with the gray brains knocked out on the ground. Cracked skulls and parts of the internal abdomen... Everything in one indescribable horror. Oh, oh! What is enough, enough!”

“The knowledge and memory of these crimes will last a long time. Our national anthem contains everything else and least of all words about freedom. It contains the horrors and violence of the revolution. I believe that Solomos was not as naïve as he leads us to believe. Reading his verses about freedom in our national anthem, one begins to discover, in poetic terms, the real truth about what happened during our Revolution. Our 1821 Revolution, like every revolution, was a bloody story. It is a testament to the expulsions, revenge, epidemics, famine, murder, robbery, violent migrations and bondage. Both the Greeks and the Turks insisted that these events be put behind and forgotten. If they could be forgotten! A new government had to be organized and function on the ruins of a Revolution, but how could it achieve that if the past was deleted and forgotten? Well, this was done with ideological patriotism based on the Bavarian model, where uncomfortable events were replaced with the “glorious” heritage of ancient Greece. Unfortunately reality is extremely difficult to change overnight. In Athens and everywhere in Greece, however, there were visible signs of hundreds and hundreds of crushed monuments that needed to be put back together; centuries old historical traces that were long gone. So the Greek state began to work to erase the existence of the Ottoman Empire and everything associated with it. All this work was done so that Greece could achieve complete purity and a continuous, long unbroken link with its ancient Greek culture.”

These invitations of the newly composed country can be considered invitations of people who lost their compass and common sense, who were funny and not serious, but mostly existing outside the norms of civilized behavior in historical science. As a matter of fact,

other emerging countries made the same mistakes, some more and some less, in order to deny parts of their past and create a favourable present and future in the eyes of their people and before their common community. Some historians are saying that other people from science, even from the other side, opponents of such an approach to history, are grabbing their heads in disbelief that something like this is even possible. “This kind of direct connection with an ancient old culture contributes to resurgence without interrupting historical trends”, say the proponents while patting themselves on their shoulders as if they are miracle workers.

The false path that the new Greek state took began with the arrival of its Bavarian rulers. The people were already disfunctional in every respect when the Bavarians arrived in Greece. There was poverty and despair everywhere in frightening proportions. Their disappointment was great when they did not find a people with the Hellenic spirit with which they were in love. They instead found street beggars who spoke Arvanitika (Albanian) in place of ancient Greek. Many of the philhellenes who came to Greece were asking: “How can someone be a Hellene when they are a poor and desperate street beggar in Athens speaking Arvanitika (Albanian)?” The fact was that there was no logical connection between any of this on the ground. What the Bavarians believed and what they saw after their arrival were two different things. Their discovery was disappointing and those who returned to Bavaria were inclined to say: “There is nothing we can do down there in Greece. No one can save this country. These are no connections and nothing in common between the modern Greeks and the ancient world.”

Even the Greek kingdom had difficulty standing on its feet. Fallmerayer, a Bavarian historian, came up with his own ideas, working against the theory that there was a continuous link between ancient and modern Greece.

What was Fallmerayer’s purpose in all this? The fans of Hellenism at home were responsible for the “tie of the pillar of shame” because of their crazy ideas.

Fallmerayer argued that the current Greeks, as a race, have nothing to do with the ancient Greeks. Of course his claims and theories

created great panic in the kingdom not just because he did not accept their desires to transform a lie into truth, but because he wanted to sabotage the promotions of legends favourable to the monarchist regime and the people in that country.

Fallmerayer bitterly blasted the philhellenes and their fans in Bavaria by taking another bold step; by producing evidence, solid evidence to show everyone that all the claims made by the current government, that there was a continuous link between the Greek kingdom and the ancient Greeks, was just fiction and completely false.

For his deeds Fallmerayer soon found himself in trouble. He was named the greatest enemy of the Greeks because he went too far. He took the subject much further than what was expected from his opponents and the circles of power in Greece and particularly in Bavaria. In doing so Fallmerayer brought evidence to light stretching back to Roman times, to the arrival of the Slavs in the Balkans in the sixth century and to the relocation of the Albanians to that part of the country in the 14th century.

So according to Fallmerayer the links that would link the present day Greeks with the Greeks from ancient times were invented, false and therefore did not exist. These links, according to Fallmerayer, were broken not once but three times. Therefore Fallmerayer rejected all links that would link today's Greeks with the ancient Greeks, as false and non-existent and the continuity of Hellenism as a nation, as fiction.

This well-known German historian and keeper of historical truths who had risen to piety was now "Greece's greatest enemy".

Two names that surfaced in the constellation of forces opposing each other on the Greek stage of Greek history were: Spiridon Zabeli expert on Byzantine history and folklorist and historian Constantine Paparigopoulos.

According to what they wrote, the continuity of Hellenism in Greece was put in place before the 1850's. They alleged that there was no interruption of continuity in history. "But it was possible to have

both unstable and stable periods, which their colleague Fallmerayer from Bavaria calls breaks or interruptions in continuity, which in fact are links.”

Therefore, according to Paparigolopoulos and Zabel, “the nation is restored and continuity is established. Unfortunately disagreements between historians remain unresolved, not only ideologically or historically, but also politically. And thus a multi-ethnic society like Greece needs to create a single unified Greek Nation.”

At this point they were thinking primarily of the Albanian minority being the most numerous, credited in many struggles for independence. The Albanians were a people divided into two groups; the Orthodox and Muslims or as some would call them Turko-Albanians. The most important leaders in the struggle for Greek independence in the 1821 Rebellion came from the ranks of Orthodox Albanians, who distinguished themselves with their great abilities and courage, especially those from the islands of Hydra, Ostriva and Spetses, as well as the Souliots who fought on land. It is not too much to mention the fact that the people of those times were quite educated and capable of intellectual work. Markos Botsaris compiled a Greek Albanian dictionary. A very interesting dictionary indeed! He knew both Greek and Albanian well and dared to engage in such linguistic adventures. I would say that Botsaris also knew the Turkish language and I can freely say that he served with Kolokotronis.

While praising the Albanians for their compatibility and suitable features for integration into the new Greek society, historian Paparigolopoulos, as a scientist, went a little too far praising only the Orthodox Albanians and completely neglecting the Muslim Albanians rendering them unacceptable strictly because of their religious inclinations.

Further on in his “scientific” debate, Paparigolopoulos deviated from the path of science and entered the muddy waters of racism and intolerance, making things even more confusing in his controversy with historian Fallmerayer.

Arguing about the qualities of the two peoples, the Greeks and the Albanians, and the idea of combining them into the new Greek nation, he said that the Greeks were more civilized and intellectually and culturally more advanced than the Albanians and that the Greek race will get vitality, strength and unity. The unity of these qualities, even today, confirms the “notable qualities” of the “modern” and “democratic” Greek state. In this context it is worthwhile to mention the fact that, the Albanians who integrated into Greek society feel more Greek than the Greek Cypriots, something that speaks for itself. This confirms Fallmerayer’s thesis of a fully extinct connection between today’s Greeks with those of many centuries ago.

LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY IN 1821

Language and identity are closely related. Without language there is no identity and there is no identity without a language; such an identity is worthless. That is why the struggle for a language is a constant and a priority. As it does in every nation, language played an important role in the Greek state. The language that was adopted for the new Greek people was first utilized by Orthodoxy and trade. Then, with the organization of the state’s education system, it played a major role in the unification of the fragmented social groups in the Greek state. The language was the tool that created a common culture by which the nation identified. The language also contributed to the enlightenment of the revolutionary leaders who eventually won freedom and independence. Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first president of this new state, understood this even during the first year of the “heroic war” when, seeking to lay the foundation of the state, he opened a university and other schools which, at the time, played an important role in the development of war-torn Greece. Language and education are elements that have the power to unite the community and align the nation. We can freely say that education was the Greek state’s strength in the beginning. Greek schools were the real winners.

What identifies the national unity of a society? It’s culture of course! What then should identify the culture? Language of course! As it is now, that too was achieved and it opened the doors wide to progress. All who participated in one way or another in the Greek education

system were and still are Greeks. The Isocratic concept, an open nationalistic concept of the 19th century, different from that of the 20th century but similar to the biological continuity concept professed by Fallmerayer's theory, was wide open and beautiful. A typical example of that beauty and acceptance was the men's dress worn in the Balkans, and only by the Albanians. (And what about the Macedonian dress? Were the Macedonians not integrated into the Greek nation... Yet? S.G).

The same Albanian dress and moccasins with pompons are worn even today by the Greek presidential guard.

In addition to the discussions offered, toward the end of the events that revealed the creation of a new and civilized spirit in the false Greek history, the documentary participants from the Greek side continued with conciliatory and flexible language.

“We are looking at this issue from the inside in order to find information that will allow flexibility for compromise. We believe that flexibility is needed for every nation to find suitable ways to personalize new circumstances. And perhaps in this lies our conscience that prevails today in Greece, passing through many changes and personalizing our way through time. Our adjustment has reached a high level. Even the Romei permitted us to officially call them by that name. Not just the children of Greeks and their descendants but also the modern Greeks.” (What about the Macedonians? Why are they not permitted to be called Macedonians? S. G.)

For this occasion it is worth mentioning the words of poet Giorgos Sefaris, spoken during the award ceremonies when he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Stockholm in December 1963. He said: “I don't want to say that we have the same blood as the ancient Greeks, because I hate racist theories. But I do want to say that we live in the same country that they lived in and saw the same mountains they saw which end in the same sea.”

“Almost a century and a half has passed since 1821. Two Balkan and two world wars have also passed since we, according to the words of poet Sefaris, have renewed our Greek identity on an

international level with a modern definition and, if there is something for which to be proud, it is the following: the place where we live, our history, the ability to decide our own destiny as much as possible. Finally, this was not possible without our 1821 Revolution, without struggle, without ideas for our future, without our legends. How we use this freedom depends on us. But there must be benefits for our patriotism, love for the place we live in, to shed just or unjust blood with respect and, above all, to enjoy the revival of our country, today's modern Greece.”

Our views

It took great courage for the participants in this scientific debate to present the truth about the foundations of today's Greek state. They deserve our attention and respect but the story will be complete and even more credible if today's Greek politicians accept the bitter truth about themselves and extend a hand to the Macedonian people as a sign of peace and broader neighbourly relations.

The truth is slowly coming to light and there is no need to “negotiate” our name. Macedonia has never been part of Greece and our history is ours alone as theirs is only theirs.

Macedonian politicians and scientists have the opportunity to defend the honour and dignity of the Macedonian people from injustice and humiliation. The Macedonian people have suffered greatly from the true thieves of history; only if they know how much and why. The chance to find out has been given to them. Therefore we Macedonians need to accept this challenge because the dishonored conscience of our enemies is eating away at their souls and they pray for forgiveness.

Sotir Grozdanovski
October 13, 2015
Brooklyn, New York, USA

ДОКУМЕНТАРЕЦ КОЈ ЈА ШОКИРА ГРЦИЈА

Posted on [Октомври 15, 2015](#)[Ноември 1, 2015](#) by [sotir](#)

СКАЈ ТВ – 1821

“Секоја нација треба да ја смета за своја онаа Историја, која е втемелена врз вистината”.

Дионисос Соломос 1847.

<https://macedoniannewssite.wordpress.com/2015/10/15/%D0%B4%D0%BE%D0%BA%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D1%82%D0%B0%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%86-%D0%BA%D0%BE%D1%98-%D1%98%D0%B0-%D1%88%D0%BE%D0%BA%D0%B8%D1%80%D0%B0-%D0%B3%D1%80%D1%86%D0%B8%D1%98%D0%B0/>

Неодамна, на интернетската мрежа Фејсбук (Facebook) изненадно се појави Видео со неочекувана содржина, барем за нас Македонците, но шокантна за цела Грција. Се работи за создавањето на современата грчка држава, како резултат на нивната Револуција од 1821 година. Ништо неби било необично, кога би се темелила врз вистинската античка историја и врз вистинските историски процеси од тие времиња, но пошто тоа не е така, шокот на грчката јавност е катастрофален. Катастрофален, зошто овај Видео ги открива сите лаги и невистини за гнилите темели на денешнава “демократска” Грција, која нема никаква врска со античките државички и со центарот на културата и науката во Атина, врз која се темели денешната западна цивилизација.

Овој документарец ги открива сите сверства и на грчкиот клер од тие времиња, а кои се протегаат до денес, а нарочито врз националните малцинства, меѓу кои се и Македонците.

Тежината на фактите со кои врие ова Видео му ја даваат многубројните учесници во разговорите, а кои доаѓаат од многу високообразовни светски институции, меѓу кои и од самата грчка научна елита.

Видеото, за кој е збор во овој мој текст е делумно на грчки, а повеќето на англиски јазик. Верувам, дека многу од нашите иселеници во странските земји кои имаа можност да го видат овој важен документ, без потешкотии ја следеа неговата содржина, но исто така, многу имаа извесни потешкотии со енглескиот јазик. За оние кои имаа потешкотии со јазикот, се потрудив да им помогнам – им ги преведов текстовите на македонски, најдобро што можев.

А сега, да ја започнеме прикаската за стварањето и развојот на денешната современа грчка држава, една од нашите не’ баш најдобри соседи, за која би се можело нешто добро или пофално да се рече од наша, македонска страна. Но сепак, нема чаре од поплаки или враќање лошо за лошо, од што нема никој ќар, туку само штета. И ако доцна, но сепак, вистината и правдата пополека но сигурно излегува на виделина.

Совеста кај чесните луѓе не е за потценување, што се гледа и од исповеста на самите претставници од грчката научна средина, важна за идниот развој на добрососедските односи по меѓу грчкиот и македонскиот народ.

Еве, вака да започнеме:

“На 27 септември 1831 година, на главниот пат за Нафплиос, беше убиен Јоанис Каподистрија, првиот претседател на новата грчка држава. Со неговото убиство, земјата ја зафати нов циклус на граѓански војни. Наскоро потоа постана јасно, дека сите напори на грчкиот претседател да створи нова функционално независна и при тоа снажна држава, останаа бесплодни. Излезе на виделина, дека Грците не се кадри да имаат држава, а камоли со неа успешно да владеат.”

Овие беа зборовите на водителот на грчката ТВ Скај, поведувајќи не низ историските настани, кои доведоа до стварање на денешната грчка држава по прв пат со името Грција и продолжи:

“Заглавени во времето на Отоманската империја, не беа способни да и’ погледаат в’ очи на иднината. Правејќи огромни напори да си ги задржат привилегиите кои ги уживаа до тогаш, упорно се противеа на секакви измени во нивниот статус, кои неспорно би дошле со новата грчка држава, во која би владеел редот, правото и правдата.”

“Гледајќи од страна што се случува на овие простори, европските сили веќе им најдоа лек на несложните Грци. Само требаше да се изнајде лидер и идеологија, кои би ги обединиле. И така и’ дојде времето на монархијата: – формирање на првото грчко кралство. Картите беа фрлени на маса и потоа отпочна играта, како следи.”

СТВАРАЊЕ НА ПРВИОТ НАЦИОНАЛЕН МИТ:

Во 1832 та година, грчката кралска круна не беше нешто што се посакува како потреба, туку како нужда, наметната од надвор. После долгите немири и безмилосни уништувања, земјата немаше што добро да понуди. Многу поважно од самото стварање на некаква нова држава беше идеата, која би ја поврзала денешницата со старата грчка култура, која нестана од овие простори пред многу векови, но со тоа и од главите на сегашните луѓе.

Баварскиот монарх Лудвиг I, еден од најголемите хеленољубеници, отиде најдалеку во реализација на тој проект. Неговата сестрана подршка на грчката Револуција за самостојност и стварање на кралството грчко на чело со својот се’ уште малолетен син Ото, не беше случаен чин.

Во времето кога англичаните ги крадеа мраморните оставштини од Партедон и ги пренесуваа во своите музеи или приватни збирки, при што најмногу се “истакнал” Лордот Хелгин, Лудвиг

I внимателно од нив правел копии и ги поставил на видни места во својата германска држава. Така, тој од Минхен направил нова Атина во срцето на Баварија, чија убавина и денес е присутна, далеку од самата денешна Грција, како вечен спомен на неговата љубов кон Хеленизмот и неговите вредности.

За времето на Лудвиг I, во образовниот систем на оваа мала германска држава је воведен старогрчкиот јазик како обавезен наставен предмет, заедно со литералната и научна оставштина на учените луѓе од античка Грција. Така, Баварија до 1830 тите години постана центар на вљубените во Хеленизмот, а Минхен изгледаше повеќе грчки од самата Атина. Многу баварски уметници, поддржани од самиот Лудвиг I, често патуваа низ грчките простори инспирирани од класичното минато на земјата и длабокиот романтизам на времето.

Петар Вон Несс, еден од тие баварски уметници доби и специјална задача. Имено, неговата задача беше да ја овековечи револуцијата од 1821 година, забележувајќи ги сите важни настани со портрети и цртежи. Тие портрети на истакнати херои и на поважни настани до ден денешен останаа најважни уметнички дела во грчката историја.

Спрема зборовите на Вилиам Сент Клер (William St. Clair) од центарот за историја при Универзитетот во Кембриџ, до 1830 тата година Грција била првата независна национална држава во Европа, благодареејќи и' на "Свездата", односно на Античка Грција. Па спрема традиционалните погледи на монархистичките влади во тоа време се сметало, дека слободата на Грција значела препород на една стара цивилизација, која ја ценат и почитуваат сите во светот.

"И така по ред, сонот на големиот вљубеник во Хеленизмот, баварскиот монарх Лудвиг I, засилено почна да се остварува. Утрото на 6 ти февруари 1833 година, 17ет годишниот негов син Ото пристигна во Нафплиос, а наскоро по тоа, тој се скраси во Атина, новата престолнина на грчката држава. Се разбира, новиот крал не допатува сам. Со него пристигнаа повеќе од 3500 воени и административни инструктори со цел да воспостават административен модел по урнекот на онај во

Баварија. Покрај ова, тие имаа и други, поважни цели од наведените. Требаа одвоените делови од грчката територија да ги припојат и така да створат обединета нова грчка држава и на крајот да креираат нов национален идентитет.”

“Новата власт која беше наскоро формирана, се сретна со многу тешкотии и пречки во својата работа. Се сретна со поделено општество, уништено стопанство и т.н.т. Нејзините приоритети не беа само воспостава на мирот и редот во државата, туку пред се’ креирање на новиот грчки национален идентитет. Идентитет, кој би го обединил општеството и би го изменил традиционалното сваќање за идентитетот, во идентитет на модерна нација.”

Во своето излагање појасна Пашалис Китромилидис, професор по политички науки при универзитетот во Атина.

Во поглед изборот на Атина за престолнина на новото грчко кралство констатирано беше, дека тоа е направено од посебни и логични причини. Една од нив е истакната како клучна, а таа е поврзана со меѓународното признавање на Античка Грција, како појдовна база за признавање на новата државна творевина, како Грција. Впрочем оваа идеја беше оживотворена уште во самиот почеток на грчкиот проект од страна на Лудвиг I, кога тој одлучи на престолот на новата држава, која го носеше името Хелас а не Грција, да го постави својот уште не полнолетен син Ото.

Во своите проекти спрема новото грчко кралство, Баварците имаа и многу други изненадувања; – да избришат секоја трага и спомен од отоманското минато на Атина и пошироко, при тоа обновувајќи ги сите антички споменици во главниот град и тоа за чудо, по минхенскиот модел. Но, не сосема неочекувано, главен приоритет на новата држава и понатака остана, признавање на грчката оригиналност.

Прва работа по стапувањето на грчко тло што Ото ја направи беше средување на државните финансии и враќање на старата Драхма од пред 2000 години, укинувајќи го Фениксот, што го избра убиениот прв претседател Јоанис Каподистријас во 1831

година. Потоа, новиот монарх ги преименува сите улици во Атина со имињата на античките филозофи, античките драмски писатели, како и со имињата на хероите од востанието од 1821 та година. И така, се што беше поврзано со античка Грција, преку ноќ постана симбол на новата држава.

Користењето на официјалниот грчки јазик од тоа време, Баварците го правеа со особена чувствителност и љубов, уверени, дека зборуваат на старо грчки. И така, ова идеализирање на старогрчкиот јазик постана темел во одгојот на грчката интелигенција, за среќа или можеби несреќа. До колку тоа не се случеше, највероватно денес Грците се' уште би збурвале Арванитика, односно Албански.

Но, соработката во грчкото кралство не беше лесна работа. Грците постојано се во меѓусебни судири и никако да најдат заеднички јазик ни за најелементарните потреби на своето општество. Нивната политичка сцена е толку разединета, да е напосто невозможен заеднички соживот на нивните политички субјекти. Национално единство Грците можат да постигнат само со мешање на фантазијата и историјата, при што успеваат да си створат митови, од кои ја црпат потребната им енергија за преживување. Ништо чудно! Нели?

Во една ваква, скоро хаотична состојба во ново компонираното грчко општество потребно е да се повикаат легендите во помош, како би се тргнало напред во некаков соживот. Да се створи некој нов идентитет, што ќе ги обедини сите субјекти на кралството. Но, од каде да се започне во случајов со новиве "Грци"? Секако, прво со редукција на Историјата и со бришење на некои факти кои не држат вода.

Можеби е малку чудно кога се зборува за редукција на историските "факти", зошто тоа не почна да се практикува прво во Грција, туку во Минхен, новата Атина, за времето на неокласичното кралство на Лудвиг I. Тој, впрочем, наместо да ја редуцира грчката историја, со градење неокласични монументи и споменици во својата престолнина Минхен, заправо ја редуцира својата сопствена историја. Една од таквите градби која Лудвиг I ја издигна во својата престолнина е и

Пропилаја. Исто така, тој во чест на грчката Револуција од 1821 година, во центарот на Минхен изгради велелепен споменик на кои со големи грчки букви се исписани имињата на сите оние учесници во неа, кои одиграа значајна улога во стварањето на новата грчка држава. Покрај веќе спомнатите, тука се и имињата на сите оние кои одиграа важна улога од политички, општествен, идеолошки, црковен и други значај за ослободување на Грција. Еден до друг со своите имиња можат да се видат и Рига Фереоу и патријархот Грегори и ако биле идеолошки противници. Не е занемарено ни името на Јоанис Каподистријас, како и името на Адамантиоу Кора и многу други “херои” на Револуцијата и ако биле повеќе пати на овај или онај начин меѓусебно спротоставени и дури пукале еден врз друг. Но, сепак биле историски личности и придонеле за ослободување на новата грчка држава и како такви биле почитувани.

Баварскиот монумент јасно ја прикажува логичноста, патот и начинот на кој и како историјата на Револуцијата од 1821 би требала да биде напишана. Ово е, како е наречен, мит од 1821. Тој исто така докажува, на свој начин, дека нацијата може да се препороди, обнови и покрај доживеаните трагедии од секакви врсти и величини, па дури и од разни криминални или злосторнички настани во чие организирање или извршување учествувале високи функционери од државните институции, војската или црквата. Така е створена легендата од 1821, која се темели негде и врз нешто, со цел да го оправда злото како пожелно, во стварањето на “доброто” како нужно. Меѓутоа, сите легенди имаат свој почеток и не се појавуваат само така, како некој случаен настан. Ова беше патот и начинот да се конструира платформата за унификација на новата грчка држава и нејзината идеологија, која од една страна ги збунуваше некои историчари, а од друга страна пак, ширеше чувство на заедништво и некоја сигурност на луѓето за да преживеат.

Покрај се’ горе реченото, а да би се избегале некои идни потреси и незадоволства во кралството, нужно било да се изнајде некој силен амалгам кој на адекватен начин би ги држел во мир и спокој широките народни маси. Тука дошла во помош

грчката православна црква, која, меѓу другото, одиграла голема улога и во обединувањето на Румелија и Пелопонез, дури и многу повеќе од Богослуженијата, во античките времиња.

Увидувајќи ја моќта на Црквата, Баварците во 1833 та година и' овозможиле автокефалност (самостојност) и потоа ја ставиле во служба на кралската круна.

Бидејќи за време на Револуцијата Црквата стоеше настрана и неодлучна кон кого да се приклони, а при тоа да не ги изгуби стечените привилегии, сега требаше да и' се даде некое признание. Така се започна со симплификација на приказната за нејзината тогашна улога, како небаре и ако не ја подржувала Револуцијата и нејзините цели, таа тоа го правела од некој си "тактички" причини. Инаку, нејзините великодостојници од почетокот биле истомисленици и подржувачи на идејата за борба против Османлиите, што в'сушност не е вистина.

Кога патријархот Грегориј V се повлече од Револуцијата, при тоа проколнувајќи го водачот Александар Ипсилантис, тој не го направил тоа од никакви тактички причини, како што некои го тврделе тоа. Не, ни пошто! Тоа го направил од интересни причини, истакнувајќи ги божемните принципи на Црквата да се бори против сите насилства и неправди, што заправо такво нешто никогаш не било во мислите на мнозинството клерици.

Со проколнување на Револуцијата, продолжуваа соговорниците во документарецот на ТВ Скај, тие неги спасија животите на Османлиите. Тоа беше фатална грешка, која црковните великодостојници никогаш не успеа да ја разберат. Нивниот потег беше само инспирација на другите да земат масовно учество во воените дејствија на Револуцијата и да излезат како победници, по цена на огромни штети по земјата, но особено со злосторства врз невооруженото и недолжно турско население.

Како производ од симплификацијата на улогата која грчката православна црква ја изигра во најклучните времиња за стварање на новата држава, се изроди и нејзината глорификација како, божем, "нашата Црква беше прави чувар на националната ризница и заштитница уште од времињата на

робовласништвото, кога хероите го запалиле оганот на националните идеали и ги покренале масите за обнова на Татковината.”

Поврзувањето на Црквата со националноста, изроди модерен национализам, а со него пак и митовите, од кои најпознат беше митот за тајното училиште. Важноста на овој мит се состоеше во “големите жртви” кои свештениците ги претрпиле при ширењето на грчкио јазик меѓу народот, а особено меѓу децата и покрај забраната од страна на турските власти. Овој мит е овековечен во делото на сликарот Николаус Гисис под името : “Тајно училиште” од 1886 г. Инаку сликарот Гисис и’ припаѓа на минхенската школа која ги продолжува баварските традиции на љубителите на Хеленизмот и на хеленистичките сликари, проектирајќи настани од грчката револуција 1821.

“Тајно училиште”, од историско гледиште е потполно лажна проекција на настани од тие времиња, и ако пленува со својата реализација и угодна атмосфера. Нејзината силна порака гласи : “Така деца мои! Дури и вие, во вашата рана младост, треба да сторите се’, како би нашата татковина била пак слободна.”

“Тајно училиште” е подоцнешна креација на државата, во 1886 та година, од посебни причини;- Религијата да се зацврсти уште повеќе и да и’ се даде важно место и во образованието на земјата, поред другото и како еден од одбранбените механизми на Државата.

Митот за улогата на грчката православна црква во новото грчко општество не престанува тука. Тој продолжува дури и во денови денешни, со нејзината арогантност и бруталност.

“Со зацврстувањето на новокомпонираната грчка држава врз темелите на Револуцијата од 1821 та година, одлучено е и Црквата да си го најде своето место во неа, како нејзин активен актер. Се разбира дека во Револуцијата, како и во секое народно востание, зедао учество и некои свештени лица, но тоа не и’ дава за право на официјалната црквена хиерархија да ја присвојува нивната храброст и патриотизам и да ги прикажува како своје дело, зошто тоа не е вистина. Грчката православна

црква во тие времиња не беше дел од таа Револуција ни најмалку, туку против неа и духовно и фактички. Нејзините материјални интереси беа изнад интересите на народот.” Истакнува еден од учесниците и продолжува.

“Јас не мислам дека Турците беа загрижени со кои јазик се служат поданиците на Империјата. Дали со грчкиот или со славјанскиот. Тие се грижеа за своите луѓе да се служат со јазикот на Исламот. Што и да зборуваа Христијаните, на Турците им било се’ едно. Со тоа не се занимавале се’ дури мирот во Империјата бил сочуван. Јас сум уверен, дека јазикот не ги загрижувал ни малку. Се’ друго се бајки за деца.”

Кога се зборува за јазикот, вистина е дека за времето на владеењето на Турците грчката црква играше важна улога во ширењето на грчкио јазик меѓу народот, како и во генерациското културно преживување во тие времиња. Меѓутоа, 100 години пред Револуцијата, граѓанското движење на средната класа веќе се избори за своето право да се школува на својот мајчин јазик. Во градовите со мнозинство на грчко становништво се отвараа училишта во кои предавањата се изведуваа на грчки јазик, а материјата беше претежно од старогрчката наука. Малку по малку, Ренесансата почна да допира на секаде, па и во градовите на мнозинската отоманска територија, каде традиционално беа сместени и грчките училишта. Меѓу таквите центри беа Јанина, Смирна (Измир), Кидонис и по доцна во Истанбул . Исто така, постоеја и образовно воспитни центри на Пелопонез во кои се воспитуваа деца и други кадри, кои после се вработуваа ширум градовите со грчки училишта. Со ваквата преродба дојдоа и сите други општествени и интелектуални промени, кои ја водеа земјата во Револуција.

1821 – ВРЕМЕТО НА РЕВОЛУЦИЈАТА

После 7 години од завршетокот на Револуцијата, претседателот на државата, Јоанис Каподистријас, беше запрашан од европските влади за бројот на турското становништво на Пелопонез. Каподистријас им даде две броики и тоа во 1821 година 42,000 лица и после завршетокот на војната, ниту еден

турски граѓанин. Во оваа вистина денес Грција неможи или несака да верува, зошто таму имаше и премногу турско население, а сега да ги снеса сите без трага. Тие живејат на секаде по грчката територија во мали заедници како земјоделци, занаетчи, трговци, вработени во државните институции. . . . Нивните семејства не знаеле за некоја друга земја во која би се преселиле, а сепак за кусо време им се изгубила секоја трага. Што се случило со една таква голема бројка на луѓе? После 1821 година за само неколку недели беа сите убиени без разлика на пол или возраст. Нив, 42,000 Турци. Мажи, жени, деца, стари и млади, сите заедно нестанаа од лицето на земјата. Без суд, без докажување на виновност И никој за тоа не беше земен на одговорност.

Масовното убивање за сигурно беше дел од Револуцијата, што од оваа временска дистанца го доживуваме како уште еден мит околу грчката воинственост и “храброст”. Како уште еден мит од 1821 та година. “Но, имаше исти такви убиства и од страната на Турците”, велат некои, како да бараат некоја сатисфакција за злосторниците и нивните нечесни дела.

За овие настани околу училиштата кружат безбројни легенди, со цел да се разјаснат страшните злосторства над невиното турско становништво. Но не е тоа така лесно да се објасни, а да при тоа не останат длабоки траги во душите, особено кај децата. Како може некој да му појасни на детето дека татко му, дедо му или некој негов близок роднина немилосрдно убивал Турци? Да колел невини деца заедно со неговите родители и потоа ги фрлал во градските бунари? Како може да им се појасни дека многу предмети кои се денес во нивните домови покрадени од домовите на тие невини луѓе кои ги нема веќе меѓу живите за да ја кажат вистината за својата прерана смрт? Ако сето ова им го кажеш, би биле запрепастени, па можеби и ви одговориле со прашање; – ” Па зарем ние сме по арни, дедо, од нив? Која е разликата меѓу нив и нас? Каде е нашата морална супериорност?”

Островот Чиос со право постана вистински пример на грозоморно место кое проголта иљадници невини луѓе. Постана грозоморно место на турската трагедија, за време на грчката

Револуција. И ако има и многу други места каде се извршени масакри над невини турски граѓани од разни регуларни и паравоени формации, сепак, Чиос остана лендмарк по злосторствата и најпознато стратиште на светот.

Насилствата во тие времиња беа вообичаени настани. Не беше ништо чудно да се влезе во некое место и да се потаманат луѓето како да не се луѓе. Крволочноста на грчките банди немаше граници. Владееше правото на ножот и куршумот. Насилството беше средство да се преживее или да се владее со послабиот. Многу добронамерни денес се прашуваат; – Вистина ли е дека се случило некое проклетство во Триполикас? Да, навистина масакри се случија во Триполикас, но зарем и Турците не правеа зулуми и масакри во многу земји од својата империја? Но за чест на вистината, од сите масовни истребувања на ненаоружаното турско население, а спрема постоејќите документи, најлошо поминаа жителите на Триполикас. Кога Грците го освоија градот, во него живееја над 35,000 Турци. Од нив никој не остана жив.

Разорувањата и штетите кои уследиле од воените дејствија, се рефлектираа во потполност во песната за слободата од Дионисиос Соломос. Неговата поезија, 40 години подоцна, беше користена за национална химна на грчката држава. Од целата негова поезија, околу 158 творби, многумина знаат само по некоја строфа. “Ако прочитам повеќе од две строфи,” вели еден од грчките учесници во овој документарец, “ќе откријам дека нашата национална химна не е само химна за слободата, туку сведоштво за зулумите над недоволното население. Ево како е тоа прикажано графички од што се гледа грозомората на настаните: “Погледај како очајните раце го кинат животот. Ги расфрлуваат носете, рацете и мртвите глави на убиените. Сабји и синџири измешани со сивине мозоци исфрлени по земјана. Напукнати черепи и делови од внатрешнината на абдоменот... Се’ во еден неопислив ужас. Оф, оф! Што е доста, доста е.”

“Долго ќе траат и ќе се споменуваат овие злосторства. Нашата национална химна содржи се’ друго, а најмалку зборови за слободата. Таа ги содржи ужасите и насилствата на

Револуцијата. Верувам дека Соломос не е толку наивен од колку се мисли да е. Читајќи ги строфите за слободата на нашата национална химна се стекнува уверување, во поетски смисол, дека таа е реалистична вистина за тоа време на нашата Револуција. Нашата Револуција од 1821 та година, како и секоја револуција, е крвава приказна. Таа сведочи за протерувања, реваншизам, епидемии, глад, убивања, грабежи, насилни преселувања и робства. И Грците и Турците настојуваат овие настани да ги стават зад себе и да ги забораваат. Ако можат. Новата власт треба да се организира и да профункционира врз урнатините на Револуцијата, а да би се постигло тоа, дел од минатото би требало да се избриши. А како? Со идеолошкиот патриотизам втемелен врз баварскиот модел, а потоа него да се замени со “славното” наследство од античка Грција. Арно, ама стварноста е извонредно тешка да се менува преку ноќ. Во Атина, но и на секде по Грција, се гледаат спомени од изминатите времиња издробени на стотини парчиња кои би требало да се прespoјат во едно цело. Сите историски траги стари со стотици години веќе одамна ги нема. Интензивно се бришат секакви врски со Отоманската империја и на се’ што новата грчка држава ја потсетува на тие времиња. Сета оваа работа би требала да доведе до потполна чистота и непрекината врска со одамна нестанатата античка грчка култура.”

Овие накани на новокомпонованата држава можат да се сметаат како накани на луѓе кои го загубиле компасот и здравиот разум, или како смешни и не сериозни, но најповеќе како надвор од цивилизациските норми во однесувањето со историската наука. Впрочем, и другите нови држави прават исти грешки, некои повеќе а некои помалку, со цел да негираат делови од своето минато и да креираат по поволна сегашност и иднина пред очите на својот народ и пред намеѓународната заедница. Велат некои историчари и други луѓе од науката, дури на другата страна пак противниците на таквиот пристап кон историјата се фаќаат за глава од недоверба да ли е тоа можно. “Ваквото директно поврзување со најстарата античка култура, придонесува препород, без прекин на историските токови.” Велат првите, тапкајќи се по своите рамена како чудотворци.

Лажниот пат по кои тргна новата грчка држава започна со доаѓањето на баварските владари. Доаѓајќи во нашава земја, тие затекнаа дисфункционално општество во секој поглед. Насекаде сиромаштија и очај, во застрашувачки размери. Нивното разочарување беше големо, кога не најдоа народ со хеленски дух во кои тие беа вљубени, туку улични питачи, кои зборуваат Арватски (Албански), на место старо грчки. “Како може да биди Хелен некој така сиромашен и очаен уличен питач во Атина, кои зборува Арватски (Албански)?” Изјавиле хеленовљубените при доаѓањето во Грција. Тука нема никаква поврзаност ниту логичност меѓу овие факти на теренот и оние, во кои ние верувавме при нашето доаѓање. После ваквата фактичка состојба, разочарани се вратија во Баварија и рекле: ” Таму долу, во Грција, ние неможиме да направиме ама баш ништо. Никој неможе да ја спаси таа земја. Овие денешни Грци, со оние од античкиот свет, немаат ама ништо заедничко, што ги поврзува.”

Дури грчкото кралство покушава да стани на носе, баварскиот историчар Фолмераер (Fallmerayer) излезе со своја теорија насочена против поборниците на цврстите врски со античка Грција, како непрекинатата нишка.

Која беше неговата цел? Своите домашни вљубеници во Хеленизмот да ги “врзи за столбот на срамот“, заради нивните налудничави идеи.

Фолмераер тврди дека сегашните Грци, како раса, немаат никаква врска со старите Грци. Се разбира, неговите тврдења и теории направија голема паника во кралството не само затоа што тој не ги прифаќа нивните желби да ја преточат лагата во вистина, туку затоа што ги саботирал промоциите на поволните легенди на монархистичкиот режим и народот во државата.

Фолмераер бил огорчен со експлозијата на хеленистичките љубители и обожаватели во Баварска, па се одлучил на уште по смел чекор напред ; – со цврсти докази да ги разувери, дека сите тврдења на актуелната власт во грчкото кралство за непрекинатите врски на денешните Грци со античките, се само фикција и потполно лажни.

Овај познат германски историчар е набрзо прогласен за најголем непријател на Грците затоа, што отишол и многу подалеку од она што го очекувале неговите противници од круговите на власта во Грција, но особено во Баварија. Тој ги изнел на светлото на денот сите докази од времето на римското владеење со античка Грција па се' до доаѓањето на Славјаните на балканските простори во шестото, завршувајќи со преселувањето на Албанците од северот, во 14 то столетие.

И така, спрема Фолмераера, врските кои би ги поврзувале сегашните Грци со оние од античките времиња се измислени, лажни и затоа не постојат, зошто се прекинати не само еднаш, туку три пати. Со тоа, Фолмераер ги отфрлува сите врски кои би ги поврзувале денешните Грци со античките како лажни и не постоечки, а континуитетот на Хеленизмот како нација, за фикција.

Ете така, овај познат германски историчар и чувар на историските вистини, си го заслужил пиететот: – “најголем непријател на Грција.”

Во ваквата констелација на силите спротивставени едни спрам други, доаѓаат на грчката сцена две познати имиња на грчката историја: византилогот и фолклористот Спиридон Забели и историчарот Константин Папаригопулос.

Спрема нивните пишувања, континуитетот на Хеленизмот во Грција бил воспоставен уште во времето од пред 1850 ттите години. Тие тврдат, дека немало прекини на континуитетот во историјата. “Но можно е да се случувале нестабилни и стабилни временски периоди кои нашиот колега од Баварија, историчарот Фолмераер, ги нарекува прекини или пукотини во континуитетот, кои заправо се поврзници.”

Затоа, спрема пишувањата на Папариголопулос и Забели, “нацијата е обновена и континуитетот е воспоставен, но неслагањата на историчарите остануваат и понатака, само не како идеолошки или историски, туку политички, со кои државата би требало да се по забави што побргу. Таа треба од

мултиетничко општество да креира единствена обединета грчка Нација.”

Тука тие мислеле првенствено на Албанците како најмногубројно малцинство, кое било многу заслужно во борбите за независност. Инаку, кога сме кај Албанците, тие се народ поделен на две групи; – На православни и муслимани, или како некој ги нарекуваат ТУРКОАЛБАНЦИ. Најважните водачи во борбите за независност на Грција од 1821 година биле од редовите на православните Албанци, кои се истакнале со големи способности и храброст, особено оние од острвата Хидрати, Острива и Спетсес, како и Сулиотите во борбите на копно. Не е на одмет да се спомени и фактот, дека луѓето од тие времиња биле доста образовани и способни за интелектуална работа. Така, Марко Боцари составил говорен грчко- албански речник. Многу интересен речник. Тој добро ги познавал двата јазика, грчкиот и албанскиот, што го осмелиле да се впушти во ваква една јазична авантура. Јас би рекол и дека Боцари го познавал и турскиот јазик покрај овие двата, но слободно би можел да речам дека се служел и со Колокотронис.

Историчарот Папариголопулос во фалењето на Албанците и нивните компатибилни и прикладни особини за интеграција во новото грчко општество, малку претерал, зошто ги зел за пример само православните, а ги запоставил муслиманите, со што ги покажал и своите неприфатливи верски склоности, како научник.

Папариголопулос во понатамошната “научна” расправа уште повеќе скршнал од патот на науката и се впуштил во матните води на расизмот и не толеранцијата, што го прави уште по неверодостоен и во полемиката со историчарот Фолмераер.

Расправајќи за квалитетите на двата народа, грчкиот и албанскиот, те и за идеалната комбинација при komponирањето на новата грчка нација, тој рекол дека Грците биле интелектуално, културно и цивилизациски по напредни, а пак со Албанците, грчката раса добива виталност, снага и единство. Единството на овие квалитети, дури и денес ги потврдуваат “завидните квалитети” на грчката “модерна” и “демократска”

држава. Во овој контекст е вредно да се спомене и фактот, дека Албанците, интегрирани во грчкото општество, се чувствуваат поголеми Грци и од самите Грци, што зборува нешто само за себе. Тие ја потврдуваат тезата на германскиот историчар, Фолмерајер, за потполно исчезнатите врски на денешните Грци со оние, од пред многу столетија.

ЈАЗИКОТ И ИДЕНТИТЕТОТ 1821

Јазикот и идентитетот се тесно поврзани. Без јазикот нема идентитет, но и идентитет без јазик не го бидува за ништо. Затоа, борбата за јазикот е постојана и приоритетна. Како и во секоја нација, така и во грчката, јазикот изигра видна улога. Тој беше застапен прво во православието и трговијата а попосле, со организацијата на образовниот систем, одигра голема улога во обединувањето на расцепканите друштвени заедници во една нација. Со јазикот се ствара и заедничка култура, преку која се идентификува и нацијата. Исто така, јазикот придонесе и во просветеноста на револуционерните водачи, кои на крајот ја извојуваа и слободата и независноста. Ова го разбра и првиот председател на новата држава Јоанис Каподистријас уште за време на првата година од херојската војна кога, настојувајќи да ги постави темелите на државата, отвори универзитет и други училишта, кои изиграа важна улога во развојот на разурнатата Грција во тие времиња. Јазикот и образованието се едини елементи кои имаат моќ да ја обединат општествената заедница и створат Нација. Можи слободно да се рече, дека образованието беше почеток на силата на грчката држава. Грчките училишта беа вистинските победници.

Што го идентификува националното единство на едно општество? Секако неговата култура! А што би требало да ја идентификува културата како таква? Се разбира јазикот. Кога е сега и тоа постигнато, вратите на прогресот се ширум отворен. Сите кои учествуваат на било кои начин во образовниот систем, се Грци. Исто како Изократовиот концепт, кој е отворен, националистички концепт од 19 столетие, различен од оној од 20 столетие. Дури онај концепт од 19 столетие му одговарал на биолошкиот континуитет спрема Фолмерајеровата теорија, овај широко е отворен и убав. Типичен пример на таа убавина е и

прифаќањето на машкиот фустан, кој се носел на Балканот, и тоа само кај Албанците. (А што е со македонскиот фустан? Тој не постој кај Македонците зошто не се интегрирани во новата грчка нација? С.Г.)

И председателската гарда денес носи фустани и опинци со женски пуфки како дел од униформата базирана врз, како рековме погоре, на обичаите кај Албанците.

Во продолжение на разговорите и одење кон крајот на настаните со кои се покушава да се внесе нов и по цивилизиран дух во лажната грчка историја, учесниците од грчката страна продолжија со помирлив и по флексибилен јазик.

“Ние во оваа проблематика гледаме одвнатре да најдеме податоци кои дозволуваат флексибилност за компромиси. Сметаме дека е потребна флексибилност кај секоја нација, како би изнашла погодни начини за прилагодба во новиве околности. И можеби во тоа се крие и нашата совест која превладува денес во Грција, поминувајќи низ многу промени и прилагодби на својот пат низ времето. Нашето прилагодување постигна висок степен. Дури и Ромејте дозволија така и официјално да се викаат. И тоа не само децата на Грци и нивните потомци, туку и денешни Грци.” (А што е со Македонците? С. Г.)

Во оваа прилика вредно е да ги споменеме зборовите на поетот Гиоргос Сефарис изречени за време на доделувањето му Нобелова награда во Штокхолм во декември 1963 та година, кои гласат: “Јас не сакам да речам дека ние имаме иста крв со старите Грци, зошто мразам расистички теории. Ние живеиме на истата земја со нив и ги гледаме истите планини, кои завршуваат во истото море.”

“Од 1821 та година измина скоро едно и пол столетие. Две балкански војни и две светски војни од како ние, спрема зборовите на поетот Сефарис, го обновивме нашиот грчки идентитет на интернационално рамниште со современа дефиниција и ако има нешто со што треба да се гордееме, е следното: – Местото каде живеиме, нашата историја, можноста

да одлучуваме за својата судбина толку, колку што можиме. И на крајот, ова не беше можно без 1821 та година и нашата Револуција, без борба, без идеи за нашата иднина и без нашите легенди. Како ја користиме слободата, зависи од нас. Но, мора да е од полза за нашиот патриотизам, за љубовта према местото во кое живееме, со почит спрема пролеаната крв на праведен или неправеден начин, и пред се', за препородот на нашата татковина, денешна, модерна Грција.”

НАШЕ ВИДУВАЊЕ

Смелоста на учесниците во оваа научна дебата да ја изнесат вистината за темелите на денешната грчка држава заслужува внимание и поштовање, но прикаската ќе биде целосна и уште по веродостојна, ако и денешните грчки политичари ја прифатат горчливата вистина и им пружат рака на Македонците во знак на помирба и уште поширока добрососедска соработка.

Вистината излегува на видело и нема зошто да се преговара за нашето име. Македонија не била никогаш дел од Грција и нашата историја е само наша, како што нивната е само нивна.

Нашите политичари и научниците на Македонија имаат прилика да ја одбранат честа и достоинството на македонскиот народ од неправдите и понижувањата што сме ги преживеале од вистинските арамии на Историјата, само ако знаат како. Шансата им е дадена. Треба предизвикот да се прифати, зошто нечесната совест на непријателот му ја јади душата и моли за прочка.

Ваш Сотир Гроздановски
13 октомври 2015
Brooklyn, New York, USA

Discussion with Ilias Petropoulos regarding Macedonian and Greek Issues

Ilias Petropoulos is a Greek poet and writer who in 1975 left Greece and went to live in Paris. Discontent with the way he was treated in Greece because of what he thought and wrote he fled to France to pursue what he loves the most, his writing. Petropoulos said he was fed up with the pretentiousness, intolerance, racism and chauvinism that goes on in that country and decided it was time to abandon it.

Ilias Petropoulos is one of those rare Greeks who has taken interest in studying the “real” aspects of Balkan culture particularly those of old Salonika (Solun) in Greek occupied Macedonia. As a Greek himself he understands the neo-Greek mentality and what it does to people in modern Greece, particularly to the Macedonians.

Petropoulos accepted to do this interview, conducted by Liljana Kotevska on March 14, 1992, because he felt it was time that he spoke up and let people know how he felt about his experiences in Greece.

Q. Mr. Petropoulos, why are you exiled?

My answer would be for freedom. The freedom to write without being afraid. The freedom to publish my works without fear of persecution. I have been jailed several times in the past. I always wanted to leave Greece so that I can write. I managed to do that in 1975 and since then I have never returned.

My writing is about ideas that are not appreciated by the so-called “intellectuals” in that country. In fact they hate what I write so I am forced to work without a bibliography which means I have to strictly rely on my own memory which is like a vault full of data.

Q. You have written a beautiful nostalgic essay about Solun with a picture of the 1912 Greek occupation of that city. What do you remember about that?

My father was a civil servant in the Greek government and as part of his service he was obligated to serve at various places in Greece. During the 1930's he was ordered to go to Northern Greece and serve in Solun. At that time Solun was still a large and multinational city dominated by Jews. I remember Solun was a multi-ethnic city with a mottle of different people with their various languages. Solun was not a ghetto but a city of ethnic communities organized in different neighbourhoods each with its own Church, Mosque, or Synagogue and each supporting a different profession or skill. You had your Jews, Greeks, Albanians, Macedonians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Serbians, Vlachs, Grekophones, Turkophones, Karamans (Orthodox Turkophones from Asia Minor), Doimi (Islamized Jews) and Franko-Levantists.

Q. I understand that after Macedonia's division Solun, the Balkan Metropolis you speak of, was transformed into a provincial city. What can you tell us about that?

Yes you are right. From that moment on Solun lost its place of being rich and famous and fell into misery. Before the Balkan Wars and before the First World War, Solun was a grand city with its harbours full of foreign ships from all over Europe. When Solun was taken over by the Greeks it not only lost its multi-ethnic character, it lost its luster and appeal and there was no longer reason for foreign ships to remain there. Then after more than 40,000 Jews left, Solun was dealt another death blow completely losing its place as a great city.

Q. Obviously you were negatively influenced by your experience in Greece and you feel a need to write and expose its chauvinism. What can you tell us about that?

The Greek racism and chauvinism we are witnessing today is mainly due to the educational indoctrination or the kind of education we have all received in Greek schools. From youth children are taught to be paranoid and confrontational towards their neighbours and towards the Balkan reality. Racism in Greece comes in various

forms and wears many different masks. I believe the best remedy for eliminating this sort of behaviour is to expose people to the truth and recognize all people for who they truly are. This reminds me of the time I sent a letter to Melina Merkouri, then Greek Minister of Culture, to let her know that a certain group of archeologists were planning to remove Bogomil graves from the territory of Macedonia to prove that Slavs never set foot in this Greek territory. I saw this with my own eyes and even took photographs which I later sent to Athens and Paris. Unfortunately, the Minister never answered my letter nor did she make any comment to the articles I wrote about that, which only proves that she not only knew about it, she was part of the conspiracy to cover up the existence of Slav graves in Macedonia. And by doing that did she really prove that Slavs never laid a foot in this “holy land of Greece”?

Q. One of Greece’s most tragic periods is the Greek Civil War. What do you remember about that?

About that! In 1990 I published a book entitled “Corpses, corpses, corpses” in which I covered the German occupation of 1941 to 1944 and the Greek Civil War of 1946 to 1949. Even though the democratic movement in that period [during the Greek Civil War] was bathed in blood the real Greek tragedy came later during the Karamanlis dictatorship of 1955 to 1963. This is the period during which the democratic people of Greece were truly smothered. If you ask an outsider even if they are Europeans they will say the worst period in Greece was the Greek Civil War or the dictatorship of the Colonels but the truth is the Karamanlis era was the worst. If I can describe him in any way I would say he is the murderer of Greek culture.

Q. Mr. Petropoulos, are you familiar with the story of the 28,000 refugee children which were exiled during the Greek Civil War and since then have been displaced all over the world?

I am well aware of their story but not all the children are Macedonian, some are from other parts of Greece. What is more frightening than that story is the story of the children caught by the Greek Monarcho-Fascists. Did you know that the Monarcho-Fascists had orders to take by force, kidnap children from the groups

that were leaving? These children, under the protection of Queen Frederica, were all sent to isolated schools which existed everywhere in Greece from Solun to Rhodes. These schools were like jails and children taught there were destined to become the new Praetorian Guard or the janissary in Greece's service.

Q. How was the defeat of the Democratic Army of Greece and General Markos treated in Greece?

This is a very intricate question whose answer can fill an entire book. In hindsight we know that Stalin abandoned the Partisans in Greece and left them to meet their own fate. Tito too gave up on them when he broke off his relations with the Democratic Army of Greece. We also know that Tito allowed the Monarcho-Fascists to enter Yugoslavia in 1949 to cut off the Partisans from retreating. As for Markos, I believe he was a good person and did his job during the occupation and during the Greek Civil War but failed to stop the political failures and subsequent liquidations.

Q. Mr. Petropoulos what can you tell us about the military dictatorships in Greece?

The so-called "Colonel Dictatorship", I can tell you, was tragic but more comical than dangerous. It is well known that there have always been tortures committed in Greece. In fact no matter what regime was in power, it committed torture but none more than the Karamanlis regime. The Karamanlis regime was particularly brutal by its specific targeting of the leftists. When Papadopoulos, the leader of the dictatorship took over, he began to torture everyone, even those on the right. The Greek bourgeoisie was caught by surprise by this one because Greece had now regressed and had re-introduced the old classic method of torture only to use it against itself. How ironic? You can't trust anything or anyone in Greece.

Q. There is an ongoing dispute between an Orthodox Cleric and a number of Greek artists like Kazantzakis, Angelopoulos and his latest film, etc. What can you tell us about that?

There are certain Metropolitans, voyeurs of a neo-Orthodox movement, who are trying to scare Angelopoulos and others like

Freda Ljana, Kazantzakis, etc., people involved in cinema. As for Kazantzakis himself, he is not really in serious trouble because he never was a revolutionary and he wears a ten meter cross on his chest. But in Rondis's and Laskaratos's case they are in real trouble that is why those two were in jail. Rondis is a good artist and may be one of the most important and most captivating of Greek writers.

Q. Going back to Solun. Nowadays we witness one massive manifestation of Greek chauvinism in Solun against the international recognition of the Republic of Macedonia. What can you tell us about that?

The massive meeting of the "people" as was presented by Greek authorities was organized and supported by all the political parties in Greece. This was a dangerous chauvinist manifestation. As I recall there was word that the residents of Solun were claiming they did not know who these "Slavo-Macedonians" were. Perhaps they were pretending they didn't know because according to official Greece "Macedonians don't exist". If they don't exist then how can there be a name for a people that don't exist. And if they don't exist how could the residents of Solun know about them? This is what the "sold-out" professors from the University in Solun were saying. These are the same "sold-out" professors who have been trying their best to prove "the Greek-ness of Macedonia". And if I may add, these are the same "sold-out" professors who can't even prove their own Greek-ness.

Take a look at Karamanlis for example. His mother is a Slavic speaker and his father is a Turkish speaker. How about Manolis Andronikos? How Greek is he? This is not an exception; this applies to every Modern Greek. Every Greek has his own non-Greek story. That is why "Greeks" like these have an inferiority complex and need to boast about their Greek-ness, need to play the "super patriot card" and hold lectures on patriotism.

Q. As I recall Kostantinos Karamanlis, in the beginning of this year, wrote a letter to his European partners calling their attention to the Macedonian question. Will the Europeans give him their attention?

Karamanlis is of no significance in Europe. Europe is currently passing through a phase, a transformation of shedding its wool and this is complicating things in the Balkans. Greece has no strategy in its national politics and is nervously reacting to the changing situation. This nervousness is manifesting itself in bad politics and horrible diplomacy. Instead of acting rationally Greece is reacting irrationally to the new situation causing disharmony in the region. Whatever war Greece was fighting, it has lost it. Today Turkey is rising in dominance in the region between the Balkans, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. Turkey will become a great power and fast.

Q. In the publication entitled “Minorities in Greece” published in Athens some time ago there is a mention that the “Slavo-Macedonians” are the third largest group of people. What do you know about that?

Unfortunately Greek politicians are unwilling to accept reality and are consumed by their destructive tactics of playing the nationalist or racist card. The Greek government was well versed with the term “Macedonia the country” from many international communications but now the instant that country became a reality Greece found a need to negate its existence. The Greek government is as blind to the existence of the country Macedonia as it is blind to a lot of internal problems to which it remarks with expressions like “we may not be far from the day when the Christians will ask for the independence of Crete”.

Q. What do you think of Macedonia? What does Macedonia mean to you?

The Kurds before Xenophone’s epoch moved between Armenia and Mesopotamia but did not succeed in securing a country of their own but the Macedonians did. The neo-Greeks think they are the descendents of the Ancient Greeks and of the Byzantines and by that they believe they have exclusive right to the name “Macedonia”. These are the same people who insisted that Istanbul be called Constantinople. I think my Greek compatriots have many more bitter pills to swallow.

Interview Liljana Kotevska, March 14, 1992, Epoha, pages 34-36
Translation and editing, Risto Stefov

Greece's invasion and occupation of Macedonia – The First Balkan War

By the turn of the 19th century the new Balkan nations Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria were flexing their economic and military muscles. Alliances like the Serbian-Bulgarian league against Greek-Ottoman collusion or the Greek-Romanian league against Bulgarian aims at Macedonia came and went. In world events on the surface it seemed that everything was normal but deep inside a rift was developing.

The rift became apparent when Russian-Austrian relations began to seriously cool. Dividing lines were drawn as Russia began to warm up to Britain and France while Austria began to warm up to Germany. Italy remained neutral for a while and took a few shots at the Ottomans but was prohibited (by the other powers) from attacking the centers of Ottoman power. (It was through these campaigns that Italy occupied the Dodecanese). Even though Italy was restrained from further campaigns, it weakened the Ottomans enough for the three new Balkan States to consider campaigns of their own. Italy's actions were also a sign of things to come and created an atmosphere of urgency for the new Balkan states to expedite their own plans for territorial annexation.

Everyone wanted a piece of Macedonia but no one dared stick out his neck to get it. The three wolves of the Balkans (Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria), with Russian help, realized that each alone could not accomplish what the three could do together. They swallowed their pride, put their differences aside and by the end of 1911 they started negotiations on how to annex Macedonian territories.

As a way of preventing Austrian aspirations in the Balkans, Russia invited the idea of a Serbian-Bulgarian league. Russia hoped that, jointly, Serbia and Bulgaria would be able to withstand Austrian advances in Macedonia without its involvement. After getting them to agree to talk, Serbia and Bulgaria listed their terms but could not reach an agreement. Autonomy for Macedonia was one major issue of contention upon which they could not agree. While Sofia supported the idea of autonomy Belgrade opposed it. Finally, for the sake of expediting the negotiations, all parties agreed that the

“autonomy question” would be left separate and dealt with after the annexation of Macedonia.

Russia made it clear to both parties that they couldn't invade Macedonia without its permission and only if the Ottomans became a threat to the Christian population. In the meantime Serbia was encouraged to take steps to annex Albania and Kosovo. A draft Serbian-Bulgarian agreement was reached and signed on March 13th, 1912. Included in the agreement was a crude delineation of prospective boundaries and suggestions that the final boundaries might be settled by force of arms. The Russians also insisted that Tsar Nikolas II would arbitrate any disputes regarding the exact territorial limits.

Even before the Serbian-Bulgarian agreement was finalized, Greece was already having discussions with Bulgaria about negotiating a Greek-Bulgarian agreement. The Greek-Bulgarian negotiations, like the Serbian-Bulgarian negotiations, were conducted in secret known only to the Greek King, Prime Minister Venizelos and their negotiator “The Times” correspondent J. D. Bourchier, an old friend of Venizelos. Like the Serbs, the Greeks had always opposed the idea of Macedonian autonomy but the Bulgarians were unwilling to proceed until Greece agreed to the autonomy. The Greek-Bulgarian treaty was signed on May 30th, 1912. Both parties promised not to attack one another and to come to each other's defense should the Ottomans attack them.

The “Balkan League of Nations” was spawned in June 1912. Shortly afterwards the Ottomans were given a signed ultimatum bearing the League's signature, which in short read, “deliver the promised reforms in Macedonia or prepare to be invaded”.

There was much intrigue, agreements, counter-agreements and secret deals between the Balkan League of Nations (Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia) but from the outset each state was determined to exploit any situation that developed, purely for its own gain. “The Balkan League of Nations in fact was simply a device for synchronizing a military effort upon the part of the four powers (Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro) which had come to realize that the simplest way to settle the Ottoman question, before it

was too late and while circumstances were favourable, was to attack the Ottomans simultaneously and present the European powers with a *fait accompli*.” (Page 440, Dakin, *The Greek Struggle in Macedonia 1897-1913*) All that remained now was to provoke the Ottomans into committing an offence against the Christian population and the invasion would become a reality.

Using proven techniques of terrorism to prepare the battleground, Bulgarian sponsored brigands masquerading as Macedonian revolutionaries conducted many raids inside Macedonia murdering, raping and plundering villages in hopes that the real Macedonian revolutionary bands would be blamed. When the Ottomans investigated the disturbances, both Patriarchist (Greek supported) and Exarchist (Bulgarian supported) authorities corroborated their stories and pinned these murderous acts on the Macedonians. As expected the Ottomans responded swiftly and dealt with the situation using violence in the usual manner. Their actions however were welcome news to the League’s spies who immediately dispatched communiqués to the European press. There was an outcry that the Ottomans were committing atrocities against the Christian population in Macedonia and something had to be done. It was now up to the Great Powers to decide the course of action.

Along with documents of Ottoman atrocities, the foreign press also received well-camouflaged Balkan League propaganda. The League had commenced extensive propaganda campaigns against the Ottomans, detailing every Ottoman committed act for European consumption. A war was imminent but, according to the League’s propaganda, it was a necessary war to “liberate” the enslaved Christians from Ottoman oppression. The League, through extensive media campaigns, called on all Christians in Macedonia to join the League and oust the oppressive Ottomans. But some Macedonians were not convinced those calls were genuine. Here is what Yane Sandanski had to say; “We ought to work on the awakening of the consciousness of the Macedonian masses that they are an independent nation...because those who seek to ‘liberate them’... will actually be coming to enslave them...” (Page 134, Radin, *IMRO and the Macedonian Question*)

As mentioned earlier, the Western Powers had not exhausted the full potential of the Ottoman markets and were unwilling to let the Ottoman regime in Macedonia collapse. At the same time Britain, France, Italy and Russia were greatly concerned about the aggressive attitudes of Germany outside of the Balkans. More importantly, they were concerned that the Ottoman regime was leaning towards an Ottoman-German alliance.

When Russia proposed the idea of a “Balkan League of Nations” it was welcome news for Britain, France and Italy. The League was viewed as an anti-German front, a way of ejecting the Ottoman regime from Europe and at the same time, safeguarding (British, French and Italian) interests and expansionary ambitions. The not so obvious Russian motive for sponsoring the League was to guarantee its own influence in the Balkans perhaps through Serbia or Bulgaria or both.

On October 18th, 1912 Montenegro declared war on the Ottomans with the League following suit. The battles that ensued were fought almost entirely on Macedonian soil, once again causing the Macedonians to suffer from someone else’s war.

Russia, the architect of the Balkan League, was against a war in 1912 and so were France and Britain. A war at this point might throw off the delicate diplomatic balance and escalate into a “world war”. Russia feared that the half-millennium old Ottoman Empire might not be as easy a target as the League had estimated. Britain and France feared a backlash from Germany and Austria now that the Ottomans were warming up to them as a prospective ally. To stop the League’s aggressive actions, both Britain and France threatened them with economic sanctions but that was not enough to suppress the appetites of the three hungry Balkan wolves.

The League’s plan was to surround the Ottoman army in Macedonia and force it out to Constantinople, the Ottoman capital. To everyone’s surprise, however, the League won a crushing and unexpected victory in just six weeks. Five Ottoman divisions were surrounded and defeated in two battles, in Bitola and Kumanovo. With the exception of Sandanski and a force of 400 Macedonians who fought back and liberated Melnik and Nevrokop, the League

received no opposition from the Macedonians. In fact, the enthusiasm created by the “liberators” not only helped the League fight harder but also encouraged thousands of Macedonians to enlist in the League’s armies. “A Macedonian Militia force of 14,000 fought under the Bulgarian command in the East. The ‘Volunteer regiment’, directed by the Macedonian revolutionary veterans, consisted of a thousand Macedonians, Turks and Albanians. In the Serbian and Greek armies, Macedonian detachments such as the ‘National Guard’ and the ‘Holy Band’ were given the task of encircling the Ottomans to fight their retreat.” (Page 143, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question) Even Chakalarov, the protector of the Lerin and Kostur regions, joined the fight to help the League get rid of the Ottomans. The League’s victories and intense propaganda were so convincing that the entire Macedonian population welcomed the so called “liberators” with open arms.

The moment the three wolves evicted the Ottoman army from Macedonia, they quickly worked out a partitioning strategy along the following lines:

- Serbia was to receive the northwestern portion of Macedonia, which included Skopje, Bitola, south to west of Lerin, east to Gevgelija and west to the Albanian Mountains.
- Bulgaria was to receive all of Thrace, west to Gevgelija, south to the Aegean Sea and east from Solun.
- Greece was to receive north to Lerin, west to the Albanian Mountains, all of Epirus and east to Solun.

“To ensure their hegemony and quell any dissent, the occupying forces set up the apparatus of government and, by legislative decrees, extended their own constitutions to these new bodies, from which Macedonians were absent. Indeed, in many provincial centres, such as Gevgelija, a double or triple condominium was established, much to the detriment of the Macedonian citizens.” (Page 143, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question)

In view of the Macedonian contribution to the League’s success in evicting the Ottomans, on December 12th, 1912 Sandanski called for

Macedonian autonomy. The League's occupying armies, however, refused to budge and initiated a violent assimilation program. The Macedonian fighters, who fought side by side with the League's armies, found themselves policed by a joint League command ensuring that no resistance or independent action would arise. The League also pursued Sandanski and his men. Sandanski resisted and stayed active in the Pirin Region until his assassination in 1915 by Bulgarian agents.

The changing conditions inside Macedonia forced the Macedonian Revolutionary leadership to seek refuge in foreign cities away from home. Some of the more prominent leaders moved to St. Petersburg and joined the Macedonian community living there. This small group of Macedonians consistently lobbied for Macedonian Statehood and, in the war's aftermath, acted as a government in exile. The most outspoken advocate of the Macedonian leaders was Dimitar Chupovski who published the "Macedonian Voice" and continuously protested to the Great Powers against Macedonia's partition. In June 1913 he wrote; "The division of Macedonia among the brother nations is the most unjust act in the history of these nations – it is trampling on the rights of man..." (Page 145, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question) In total eleven issues of "Macedonian Voice" were published and distributed all over Europe.

"A great terror reigns in Macedonia now. The 'freedom' of the allies has no frontiers, no-one from Macedonia has the right to travel outside, to protest or complain before the European states. Whoever disturbs this order is either killed or imprisoned. The allies surround Macedonia with a Chinese Wall..." (Page 145, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question)

The Macedonian people must not stand idly by and accept the unworthy fate of being divided so that others may profit from it. "In the name of the Macedonian people, we demand that Macedonia remain a single, indivisible, independent Balkan state within its geographical, ethnographic, historical, economic and cultural frontiers...Macedonia represents a unified body both from the historical and natural viewpoints, and cannot voluntarily end its many centuries of existence by agreeing to be broken up...Can we

allow a people to be, at one and the same time, Bulgarian, Serb and Greek? Is it not simpler to assume that the nationality attributed to us is dictated by the big power politics of the interested parties who wish to take over Macedonia?" (Page 145, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question)

By November it was becoming apparent that the Ottomans were running out of options. On November 12th, 1912 they called on the Great Powers to bring about an armistice. To deal with the situation a peace conference was scheduled for December 16th, 1912, to take place in London. Having some time to adjust to the new situation, the Great Powers, for the first time, opted from the usual "status quo" recommendations and considered making concessions to the victors. Austria, however, was not too happy at the prospect of a "large Serbia" let alone allowing Serbia access to the Adriatic Sea. Austria was eyeing the Adriatic region as a prospective sphere of influence for itself. Being unable to make concessions by itself, however, Austria did the next best thing and agreed with Britain about the idea of "creating" a new State, Albania. Another reason why Austria did not want Serbia to have access to the Adriatic Sea was because a Serbian port might become a Russian port.

This attempt to deny Serbia access to the Adriatic Sea not only left Serbia landlocked but also upset Russia, causing it to break relations with Austria. Italy too was affected by this diplomatic power play, pushing it to improve its relations with Austria. This, as it turned out, was the crucial historic moment which gave birth to the "Triple Alliance" (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy) and the "Triple Entente" (Britain, France and Russia), a division that would have future consequences.

As a result of this sudden change of events, Austria began to amass troops along the Serbian border. At the same time, fearing German intervention, Russia ordered a halt to Bulgarian and Serbian advances towards Constantinople, the Ottoman capital. To fully curb Serbian and Russian expansionism: France, Britain and Italy voted to grant the newly created Albanian State full independence. This saved Albania from being partitioned by the Greeks and Serbians and made it a Great Power protectorate, which Albanians enjoy to this day.

I want to emphasize that by 1912 it was well known that a Macedonian Nation with a Macedonian consciousness existed and demonstrated its desire for independence. These actions were well documented and familiar to the Great Powers, yet even after pleading their case, the Macedonians were NOT ALLOWED to attend the London Peace Conference of December 16th, 1912. Numerous petitions made by the Macedonian revolutionary leadership affiliates from St. Petersburg were all ignored. Also Chupovski's memo to the British delegation was not tabled. Here is what Chupovski (in part) had to say; "In the name of natural law, of history, of practical expediency, for the Macedonian people, we ask that Macedonia's right to self-determination be admitted, and that Macedonia be constituted within its ethnic, geographical and cultural borders as a self-governing state with a government responsible to a national assembly." (Page 147, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question)

The London Conference adjourned on August 11th, 1913, officially declaring an end to the First Balkan War. In spite of all the wheeling and dealing that went on during the conference, the resolutions left all parties dissatisfied. Serbia was dissatisfied with losing the Albanian territory. Serbia appealed to Bulgaria to grant it access to the Aegean Sea via Solun and the Vardar valley, but its appeals fell on deaf ears. Greece also was not happy with Bulgaria's invasion and annexation of the Dardanelles. To balance its share, Greece wanted Serres, Drama and Kavala as compensation. That too fell on deaf ears. Bulgaria too, frustrated with not achieving its "San Stefano Dream", was bitter about Russia deserting it during the London Conference negotiations.

Seeing that Bulgaria was not going to budge and the fact that neither Greece nor Serbia alone could take on Bulgaria, should a conflict arise, Greece and Serbia concluded a secret pact of their own to jointly act against Bulgaria. In short, the objective was to take territory from Bulgaria west of the Vardar River, divide it and have a common frontier.

After stumbling upon this Greek-Serbian pact, despite Russian attempts to appease it by offering it Solun, Bulgaria remained bitter

and in a moment of weakness was lured away by Austria. By going over to Austria, Bulgaria in effect broke off all relations with the Balkan League. Russia, disappointed with the Bulgarian shift in loyalty, made it clear that Bulgaria could no longer expect any help from Russia.

Modern Greeks today believe Macedonian was liberated in 1912!

Source:

Stefou, Chris. History of the Macedonian People from Ancient times to the Present. Toronto: Risto Stefov Publications, 2005.

Macedonian was never a part of the Hellenic city-states

By J.S.G. Gandeto

One of the steps in the Scientific Method of Investigation is the publication of your obtained results so that others may independently, by repeating the same experiment derive to the same conclusion, and verify whether it is true or not what you have stated that you have accomplished with your hypothesis. When many independent laboratories-through their scientific research-arrive to same conclusions as yours, then, the hypothesis that you have proposed becomes accepted and your findings acknowledged.

I have said before, and I stand by my assertions, that Macedonia was never a part of any ancient Greek city-state, nor were the ancient Macedonians ever considered, by the ancient Greeks or by themselves, to be Greek. Macedonia was never a member of any Hellenic League. Macedonia was not a member of the Greek Amphictyonic League.

These leagues were reserved for Hellenes only. The boundary between Macedonia and Greece was the river Peneus and mount Olympus; to the south were the Greek tribes and to the north was Macedonia.

I challenge all of you, including Professor Stephan Miller and his like-minded historians, to prove me wrong. When you loudly proclaim "Macedonia was always Greek", I dare you to find one shred of evidence and bring it forward. Find other like-minded authors from antiquity who will agree with your own assertion. Please, show the evidence and discredit my person in front of this sophisticated readership. I will state the following once more: Anyone who claims that ancient Macedonia was a Greek land and that ancient Macedonians were Greeks or that Macedonians are stealing Greek heritage, is nothing less and nothing more than a corrupt, deceitful fabricator of history whose scientific thinking is based on personal beliefs and mythology. Facts are not derived

through beliefs and mythology. Scientific knowledge does not rest on feelings, nor is it supported by bed-time stories and la-la-byes. Science needs concrete proofs, and that is what you do not have.

I stand on the shoulders of others;

I stand convinced that (1) you will be unable to prove Strabo, Scylax, Dichaerchus, Scymnus, and Dionysius wrong. These biographers have stated that Greece commences at the Ambracian Gulf, and terminates at the river Peneus.

I am convinced that (2) you will be unable to prove Aeschines, Theopompus and Pausanias wrong, for not including Macedonia on their list of the Amphictyonic people of Greece.

I stand convinced that (3) you will have no answer as to why Thucydides found no room for Macedonia on his list of states on either side of the warring parties in the Peloponnesian War; Macedonia is found neither on the Athenian, nor on the Lacedaemonian side.

These are hard facts that cannot be dismissed with lame excuses and manipulation of text. One cannot disregard evidence of this magnitude and bring forward a pitiful assertion like 'Macedonians spread Hellenic culture in the East', instead. You cannot substitute and equate the words of a king (Philip V) "My ancestors Philip II and Alexander the Great conquered Greece", with "but Macedonians had same names as Greeks" nonsense. You can saturate the media with slogans and cry "thieves" as long as you want but you will not be able to subvert and change the evidence left from the ancient authors. Fact is that you have bought some professors to put their shoulder on your "Greek" wheel, but fact is also that you are stuck in the mud of lies up to you knees and cannot move.

The following piece of evidence reaffirms my position and demonstrates, once again, that truth cannot be suppressed for long.

As one of the powers which had guaranteed the independence of the Greek Kingdom in 1828, Great Britain held the position that the Greek claims to extension of their territories were greater (as of

1880) than the boundaries which the Greek city-states held in antiquity. This position was brought forward by Major J.C. Ardagh, (later became Sir Major-General). He was part of the British delegation that was attached to the Special Embassy during the Congress at Berlin on June 3rd, 1878. He was also appointed as her Majesty's Commissioner for the delineation of the frontier of Bulgaria (September 7th, 1878); and was employed during the conference at Constantinople in 1881. Sir J.C. Ardagh was born on August 9, 1840, and died on September 30th, 1907.

Before the Conference at Constantinople, Major Ardagh communicated with the British Foreign Office on the issue of the new Greek frontier with his "Memorandum on the Ancient Boundaries of Greece", which was received at the Foreign Office on February 24th, 1881. The information which Major Ardagh presented in his memorandum (quoting sources from antiquity) reaffirms claims made by Macedonians today that, Macedonia was never part of any Greek (Hellenic) state during ancient times. If ancient Greek sources did not see Macedonia as part of the "Ancient Greek World", how can the modern Greek state see Macedonia and its people as Greek?

What Major Ardagh's memorandum does raise is questions not only to the issue of the true Greek frontier, but also to the true identity of the people of Macedonia. Since 1913, the end of the Second Balkan War when Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia and Montenegro divided up Macedonia amongst themselves, Greece has been claiming that Macedonia was always Greek. Major Ardagh discredits this claims by quoting ancient Greeks themselves and shows that not only was Macedonia not Greek or part of ancient Greece and neither was Epirus or Thessaly.

Doc. 41 Memorandum
on the Ancient Boundaries of Greece
By Major J.C. Ardagh, C.B., R.E.
(Received at the Foreign Office, February 24th, 1881)

The Ancient Boundaries of Greece

As the claims of the Greeks to an extension of territories are in some degree based upon the limits of the ancient Greece, I conceived that an examination of the early Greek geographers would throw some light upon them, and I have been able to procure, and annex extracts from them in Greek with translations.

Strabo, Scylax, Dichaerchus, Scymnus, and Dionysius all concur in making Greece commence at the Ambracian Gulf, and terminate at the river Peneus.

The catalogue of the ships in the Iliad, the various lists of the Amphictyonic tribes, the states engaged in the Peloponnesian war, the travels of Anacharsis I the description of Greece by Pausanias, and the natural history of Pliny - all give proof of the same fact, by positive or negative evidence; nor have I found anywhere a suggestion that Epirus was Greek, except that Dodona, the great oracle, though situated amid barbarians, was a Greek institution, and the legend that the Molossian Kings were of the house of Aeacidae. When Epirus first became powerful, 280 B.C., Greece had long been under the complete ascendancy of the Macedonians, and after the fall of the Empire at the battle of Pydna, 168 B.C., it became a Roman province in 148 B.C. The establishment of Greek independence in 1832 was exactly 2,000 years after the battle of Pydna.

Strabo:

1. The tribes extending beyond the Ambracian Gulf to the eastward, and contiguous with the Peloponnesus, are Greek.
2. The tribes from the Strymon to the Pontic passes and Haemus are all Thracian, except on the coast which is inhabited by Greeks.
3. On the right of the entrance (of the Ambracian Gulf) dwell the Acarnanians, a Greek tribe. On the left is Nicopolis and the Kassopaeans, an Epirote tribe.
4. The Peneus divides Lower and Maritime Macedonia from Thessaly and Magnesia, and Haliacmon Upper Macedonia.

5. But the Peneus bounds Macedonia towards the north, and Thessaly towards the south.

Scylax: Periplus:--

1. From Ambracia Greece is continuous (along the coast) as far as the river Peneus.

2. Up to this point (the country of the Magnesians) Greece is continuous from Ambracia.

Dicaearchus:

1. I therefore draw the limits of Hellas at the country of the Magnesians, i.e., to the Vale of Tempe.

Scymnus:

1. Above Tempe towards Olympus is the region of the Macedonians. (The writer describes the Thesprotians, Chaonians, Molossians and the inhabitants of the interior of Epirus, as barbarian. 430-460.)

2. Greece is continuous from Ambracia to the Peneus.

Homer:

In the catalogue of the ships in the second book of the Iliad, Acarnania, Aetolia and Thessaly are the most northern districts mentioned. The others are Boetia, Phocis, Locris, Euboea, Athens, Salamis, Argos, Mycinae, Laconia, Messenia, Arcadia, Crete, Rhodes, and Isles.

The Amphictyonic people. The names are given by Aeschines, Theopompus and Pausanias:

Aeschines:

Thessalians, Boeotians, Dorians, Perrhaebians, Magnetes, Locrians, Aetians, Phthiotas, Maleans, Phocians.

Theopompus:

Ionians, Dorians, Perrhaebians, Magnetes, Achaeans, Maleans, Dolopes, Aeneans, Delphians, Phocians, Phthiotas.

Pausanias:

Ionians, Diopes, Thessalians, Magnetes, Maleans, Phthiotas, Dorians,

Of these, none belong to Epirus; indeed there are neither Aetolians nor Acarnanians.

Thermopylae:

The next catalogue which throws light on the subject is that of forces under the command of Leonidas at Thermopylae. They are enumerated by Herodotus, Pausanias, and Deodorus as follows:

Peloponnesians, Thespians, Thebans, Phocians, and Locrians (or Milesians).

Forming in fact, something less than the present limits of Greece.

Thucydides:

In book II of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides gives a catalogue of the states ranged on either side as follows:

With the Lacedaemonians:

All the Peloponnesians except the Argives and Achaeans, the Megareans, Locrians, Boeotians, Phocians, Ambraciots, Leucadians, and Anactoreans

With the Athenians:

Chians, Lesbians, Plataeans, Messenians of Neopactus, most of the Acarnanians, the Corcyraeans, Zacynthians, with certain islands and colonies.

Anacharsis:

Travels in Greece, 357 B.C. There are 14 other nations in Epirus.

Pausanias does not even mention Epirus

Pliny:

Natural History, book IV: He places mount Olympus in Thessaly, but does not precisely define the boundary of Macedonia, which he describes as extending to the Adriatic.

With this illustration by Ardagh, the Greek cries of "Macedonia is Greece" is shown once again to be nothing more than a fabrication; the ancient boundaries of Greece do not coincide with the modern Greek borders. These ancient frontiers of Greece are the basis which the present Greek state is using for the claims on Macedonia.

This is certainly another piece of evidence that reaffirms the inadmissibility of the Greeks' claims that "Macedonia was always Greek". Time and again, this blatant lie is being exposed for what it really represents - a flagrant and shamelessly executed subversion of historical truth - heist of unparallel historical proportions never before seen in the history of mankind. What is so arrogantly flaunted as Greek heritage is nothing but a stolen property from the Macedonians. Between these rampant Greek lies and deceptions and the silence of the European academicians, who, certainly, know the truth, runs the menacing current of the biased and the hypocritical attitude of Europe itself. Human rights are at issues in Greece and Europe stands silent.

By not timely addressing these, obviously gross, violations of its own constitution, Europe undermines its own reputation. By not attending to these flames of hatred and racism exhibited by the Greek government, Europe diminishes its own stature and weakens its own institutions. Europe must find courage to tell Greece, simply,

to "grow up" as our former us Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger in the interview for the Macedonian Television, pointed out.

In the words of the former German ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia Hans Lothar Schteppan, "Greece's strong objection to the name was laid on a foundation of lies".

A memorable encounter:

Spartan response to Alexander's request for a meeting of the Hellenic League at Corinth:

"The tradition of their country, they informed the king, did not allow them to serve under a foreign leader." (So much to Macedonia's pretensions to Hellenism - writes Peter Green. (Alexander of Macedon 356 -323 B.C. A Historical Biography p. 121)

The Greek President is Albanian!

“I can’t believe how much Greeks have changed in the last two or three decades. In the 1980’s I used to go shopping at various boutiques in Greece where signs were readily displayed; ‘we speak Macedonian’, ‘we speak Albanian’, etc. I recall meeting a Greek lady of Albanian descent who proudly spoke Albanian and was always happy to show off her knowledge of the Albanian language. In fact she was hired for the job because she spoke Albanian. Greek merchants in those days did everything to attract customers. Today, unfortunately, they say there are no Albanians or Macedonians living in their country. Unbelievable!” These were the words of my Albanian language interpreter, whom I hired to translate for me at my meeting with Albanian publicist, historian and researcher Arben Ljalja.

“Yes, things in Greece today have changed a lot but for the worse especially for the Albanians, Macedonians and Turks but Pandora’s Box for the minorities has been opened. I think Europe is tired of Greece’s politics, especially of the non recognition of ethnic minorities. The question is when will Greece come to terms with its past and start paying for the damages it has caused owing to its unproductive and negative politics”, says Ljalja, who himself is as an economic immigrant and has lived in Greece for eleven years. Ljalja has first hand experience of what it is to be an Albanian living in Greece.

Albanians living in Greece have witnessed various forms of repression and scandals involving the Greek police. Only last year two Albanian immigrants were physically beaten by several policemen. We know about it because it became public knowledge only after a video, made through a cell phone, was released. Ironically the video was made by the same policemen who did the beating.

In its latest report the European Committee for Torture has placed Greece at the bottom of its ranking for abusing minorities and

immigrants. Similar reports on Greece are published by various international organizations for human rights including Amnesty International and the Human Rights Watch.

Fifteen years in a row, the American State Department in its own yearly Publication on human rights has written about Greece's violations of human rights with regard to its Macedonian, Albanian and Turkish minorities and their non-recognition.

THE ALBANIAN LANGUAGE ALMOST BECAME OFFICIAL IN GREECE

It is estimated that about 3.5 million Albanians live in Greece today (35% of the total Greek population) and like the Macedonian and Turkish minorities; they are not recognized by the Greek state. Let us not forget that there are also thousands of Albanian migrant workers who work in Northern Greece at seasonal jobs and contribute to the Greek economy. Unfortunately Greece only recognizes Muslims without specifying their ethnic background be it Turkish, Albanian, or other.

According to Ljalja's research however, the number of Albanians living in today's Greek territory is much larger than currently estimated because during the period from 1856 to 1858 two thirds of the population (66%) living in Greece was Albanian. The Albanians even had their own representatives in the Greek parliament. It was during this period that the Greek Parliament openly debated the issue of making the Albanian language a second official language of the Greek state. But that did not happen.

The first Albanian publication in Greece "Voice of Albania" appeared in 1890. It was published by Anastas Kulorioti in the Albanian language but was quickly shut down by the Greek state and Kulorioti was immediately jailed. Anastas Kulorioti died from poisoning in a Greek prison.

Immediately after the Ambassadorial conference in London in 1913, even though the Chemerija (Chamurija) region was populated by an Albanian majority, it was given to Greece anyway. Greek authorities conducted massive population expulsions not only of Turks but also

of Albanians and Macedonians. As a result, according to estimates compiled by Albanian organizations and historians, there were around 260,000 Albanians exiled from Greece in the subsequent 64 years. The 1923 Lausanne agreement which recognized that there was a sizable Albanian minority living in Greece and called on the Greek state to provide basic human rights, such as education and religious rights, did not help at all.

Then in the period from 1913 to 1948, in place of the exiled Macedonians, Albanians and Turks, Greek authorities deposited more than 1.5 million colonist settlers from Asia Minor, Pontus and other regions because they supposedly were the descendents of Alexander the Great.

TWENTY-SEVEN GREEK PRIME MINISTERS HAVE ALBANIAN DESCENT

Things in the Balkans are very much mixed-up and so intertwined that it is normal to assume that people are very much mixed. The Balkans is the place where one can find all kinds of people in a single region which is also the subject for Ljalja's latest thesis. According to Ljalja's findings, 27 out of the 57 former Greek Prime Ministers are of Albanian descent.

Former Greek Foreign Affairs Minister Theodoros Pangalos, a Greek government representative, on occasion openly spoke about his Albanian background

Speaking of Albanians occupying high positions in the Greek government, Ljalja's investigation has revealed that even the Greek President, Karolos Papuljas is of Albanian descent. According to Ljalja, Papuljas is a Cham (from Chamurija), born in the village Voshtina, one kilometer away from today's Greek-Albanian border. His ancestors were Muslims with the last name Sulejmani. About 120 years ago Papuljas's ancestors converted to Christianity and changed their name. Ljalja supports this assertion with evidence which he received from a well-known Albanian actor who studied with Papuljas and with whom the Greek President maintains contact to this day.

Source:

Petre Dimitrov, Forum, December 12, 2008
Translated and edited by Risto Stefov

About the Greek Language

By Risto Stefov

rstefov@hotmail.com

March 21, 2010

There is much to say about the so-called “Greek language” about its inception some 3,000 years ago and about its evolution to what is supposedly spoken in Greece today. But is the language spoken in Greece today a “Greek language”, whatever that may mean, or a mix of various languages that modern Greeks speak today?

There are a couple of reasons why I am bringing this up at this time. One is to remind the Greeks that although they call their language “Greek”, implying that it is the language of the so-called “ancient Greeks”, it is not. The second reason is that two can play this game. Greeks tell me that there is no such thing as a Macedonian language and what I call Macedonian is no more than a mix of “Serbian, Bulgarian, Greek and Albanian with some other foreign words added to it here and there”. While these same Greeks claim that there is no such thing as a “Macedonian language”, they boast that they speak the language of the ancient Greeks.

Well let’s put this theory to a test shall we?

First and foremost, the language that modern Greeks speak today is not their mother tongue. When Modern Greece became a country for the first time in 1829, the majority of the so-called first Greeks spoke Arvanitika (Albanian), Vlahika (Vlach), Turkika (Turkish), Slavika (Slav), etc. The so-called “Greek language” they speak they had to learn in school.

So once again, the so-called “Greek language” that Modern Greeks speak today was a language they learned in school. Now in contrast to the Greek language, the Macedonian language, call it what you like, is a natural language that Macedonians learned from their mothers.

Macedonian is a banned language in Greece so the Macedonians could not have learned it in school, the only place they could have learned it is from their mothers and relatives. Ever since Greece illegally acquired Macedonian territories in 1913, Macedonians had no access to Serbia or Bulgaria so how could Macedonian be a Serbian or Bulgarian language?

Now if we go far back in time you will discover that the Macedonian people spoke this language even before there was ever a Serbia or Bulgaria. In fact it was the Bulgarians, a Turkic tribe which spoke a Mongolian language, that adopted the Macedonian language and not the other way around.

If the Modern Greek language is the same language as the ancients spoke then why did the modern Greeks have a need to “purify” it, a process which eventually failed?

Modern Greek is not at all the same as the so-called “ancient Greek” which the Athenians spoke some 2,500 years ago. In fact Modern Greek is yet another “Balkan language” full of colloquialisms and foreign words which the Greek state borrowed from the Byzantine Church and from other foreign languages, including Turkish. Most Modern Greeks don’t know this and know even less about the history of their own language. That is why they claim ‘it is all Greek’.

Here are some examples of ancient Greek, Modern Greek, (English);

Ipos, alogo (horse)
Hygor, nero (water)
Onos, gaiduri (donkey)
Oikos, spiti (house)
Odos, dromos (road)
Ihthis, psari (fish)
Oinos, krasi (wine)
Ofthalmos, mati (eye)
Ega, Gida (goat)
Erifi, Katsiki (kid, baby goat)
Ois, provaton (sheep)
Yshoiros, gourouni (pig)

Kyon, skylos (dog)
Mys, pondiki (mouse)
Ornitha, kota (hen)
Oon, avgo (egg)
Artos, psomi (bread)
Ris, miti (nose)
Naus, plion (ship)

By just this small sample of examples it should be obvious to everyone that “ancient Greek” and “Modern Greek” are not only NOT the same language but they are not even similar! That is precisely the reason why Greek authorities tried to “purify” their language! And yes there are “ancient words” in the Modern Greek language such as “odos” for example but they only exist because of the language purification initiatives Greek purists undertook since 1776 which were finally abandoned in 1974 by the Greek government.

Another reason for bringing up the inconsistencies in the so-called “Greek language” is because I was asked to do it by one of my readers who wanted to see more evidence of what I am talking about, but not from Macedonian sources because it might be dismissed as “Skopjan propaganda” by our Greek adversaries. So without further ado here is evidence on the formation of the Greek language as composed by non-Macedonian authors;

1. “The beginning of the modern Greek language controversy can be precisely dated to 1776, when Voulgaris, in the preface of his logic, argued that in order to study philosophy it was necessary to know ancient Greek adding that the ‘worthless little books that profess to vulgar language should be hissed off the stage’. By ‘vulgar language’ he meant any variety of modern Greek as opposed to the ancient language.” (“Language and National Identity in Greece 1766 - 1976”, by Peter Mackridge, page 83)

Now who was this Voulgaris character? Here is what Peter Mackridge has to say: “Kitromilides describes Voulgaris as the ‘Patriarch of the Greek enlightenment’ and the first recognized leader of the enlightenment in south-east Europe.

Voulgaris studied at Padua and went on to teach for twenty years in Yannina, Kozani, the Athronite Academy and Constantinople.” (“Language and National Identity in Greece 1766 - 1976”, by Peter Mackridge, page 84)

“Voulgaris introduced himself to the Russian empress in 1771 by referring to himself as ‘Slaviano-Bulgarian’ by origin, Greek by birth, Russian by inclination. (13) It is clear that his aim was to ingratiate himself with the empress by asserting that he too, like the majority of her subjects, was of Slav origin; it is not certain how seriously he took this himself, but his surname does imply Bulgarian origin.

(13) Quoted from an unpublished manuscript by Batalden (1982: 22), who points out the irony that Catherine was not Russian but German by birth. I am grateful to Elka Bakalova for informing me that ‘Slaviano-Bulgarian’ refers to the Slav Bulgarians as distinct from the Turkic proto-Bulgars.” (“Language and National Identity in Greece 1766 - 1976”, by Peter Mackridge, page 85)

2. “Folk culture, for Koraes, was less a source of proof that the people actively yearned to recover their ancient virtues than evidence of their potential (and need) for extensive reeducation. His own experience, in which a series of lucky chances made it possible for him to acquire some learning at an early age (Clogg 1976: 121-124), may well have influenced his thinking here: the Hellenic virtues could be acquired, given only native diligence and aptitude. That one had to turn to Western Europe in this endeavor was simply a matter of historical circumstance, of the fact that Europe had been the repository of Greek learning during the centuries of Ottoman rule – a time when the Greeks themselves had acquired a shamefully Turkish patina which now had to be scraped away.

Koraes is today remembered most of all for his leading role in the development of katharevousa, the neo-Classical (or purified) form of the modern Greek language which, somewhat ironically in the light of his revolutionary principles, has become closely associated with the political Right and the foreign interests which it represents (Sotiropoulos 1977).

Katharevousa was always something of a cultural appeal to the West for recognition, an attempt to demonstrate that the ordinary Greeks of today could speak a tongue which was undeniably their own yet no less clearly Hellenic. Such purism naturally demanded that all words of obviously Turkish origin be eliminated. A recent commentator's description of this deorientalization of the language as "beneficial" (Babiniotis 1979: 4) shows how successful Koraes was in establishing a moral standard by which all subsequent linguistic developments could be evaluated. Ideological criteria of culture, if they are to be judged successful, must in some measure become self-fulfilling prophecies.

The development of katharevousa was part of Koraes' wider, educative view of Hellenic regeneration. Culture, rather than physical descent, still seems to have been the main component of Greekness in his day. Educated people throughout the Balkans called themselves Hellenes; in the Romanian princess Dora d'Istria, we shall later meet one of the latest and most flamboyant embodiments of this conceit. It seems, moreover, that language was sometimes thought virtually sufficient to make people forget that they had ever been anything but Greek – in 1802, there appeared a quadrilingual dictionary published by the priest Daniel of Moskhopolis, exhorting "all who now do speak an alien tongue rejoice, prepare to make you Greek " (quoted in Clogg 1973: 20). This attitude was to change significantly later on, after the establishment of the new Greek State, when greater emphasis came to be laid on an essentially retroactive claim to descent from the ancient Greeks." ("Ours Once More Folklore, Ideology, and the making of Modern Greece", by Michael Herzfeld, pages 17 and 18)

3. "Wealthy Greeks, who for the most part had acquired their fortunes abroad, shared to the full the local patriotism so characteristic of the Greeks. This prompted them to provide the funds for schools, libraries and scholarships in their local communities. There was also a more practical motive, for the development of a Greek commercial empire created an increasing demand for numerate and literate Greeks with knowledge of foreign languages.

Schools of a kind had existed throughout the period of Ottoman rule, although with rare exceptions, such as the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople, they had concentrated on imparting a basic knowledge of reading and writing to their pupils. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, however, a number of more advanced academies were either founded or revived. Besides the Princely Academies of Jassy and Bucharest, important schools were founded on the island of Chios, in Smyrna (The Evangelical School, 1733, and Philological Gymnasium, 1808) and Ayvalik. In these more advanced schools there was a heavy emphasis on the Greek classics, together with an attempt to inculcate the rudiments of mathematics and the natural sciences. Many of the teachers had studied at the universities of western Europe, particularly in Italy, and many of their graduates were also to study abroad, thanks to the subventions of the merchants.

Books in Greek for a Greek readership had been printed, in substantial quantities, mainly in Venice, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the eighteenth century, however, the production of books for a Greek audience increased dramatically. During the first twenty-five years of the century just over a hundred such books were printed. During the last twenty-five years well over 700 were published, while some 1300 titles were published during the first two decades of the nineteenth century. They were generally small editions, though they did sometimes run to several thousand copies. A more significant indicator of the intellectual climate in Greece, perhaps, than this dramatic increase in the numbers of such books published was the change in their content. Whereas at the beginning of the eighteenth century these books were overwhelmingly religious in character, by the years before 1821 their content had become increasingly secular. Numerous translations were published of the works of Western scientists and philosophers, including Locke, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Beccaria and Rousseau. Some Greeks such as Evgenios Voulgaris themselves published learned philosophical treatises, making use of works of philosophers such as Kant. But in essence the 'Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment' was derivative rather than original, its protagonists seeking above all to make the achievements of Western philosophers and scientists known to their fellow countrymen. The works of the

Western Enlightenment also began to circulate in the Greek lands in their original languages, often remarkably soon after publication. The most significant aspect of this increasing secularization of Greek culture was the rediscovery by the Greeks of a sense of their own past, a realization that they were the heirs to a glorious heritage that was universally admired by the educated classes of western Europe. During earlier centuries there had been a limited awareness of the ancient world but the nascent Greek intelligentsia embraced the study of Greece's classical past with an intensity approaching fervour during the fifty years or so before the outbreak of the Greek revolt. New emphasis was given in the schools and academies to the study of ancient Greek, new editions of the classics were published and Greeks saw in the wars between the Greeks and the Persians analogies with their present situation. Some Greeks began to baptize their children with the names of ancient worthies rather than the saints of the Orthodox Church. This rediscovery of the past engendered in the Greek intelligentsia a new self-confidence, aptly epitomized by Benjamin of Lesbos' claim in 1820 'that neither the Greeks of old nor the Greeks of today are subject to the laws of nature'.

An unfortunate outcome of this obsession with Greece's classical heritage was the increasingly bitter dispute that developed over the Greek language. Some argued that if the Greeks were truly to become worthy of their great heritage then they should reverse the natural development of the language and restore it to its pristine Attic purity, purging it of its Turkish, Slav and Italian accretions. Others argued that the spoken or demotic language should be made the basis of the written language. Still others advocated an intermediate position, arguing for the 'purification' of the demotic without going to the extremes of the archaizers. The 'language question' was by no means resolved at the time and has continued to bedevil Greece's cultural development right up until modern times. It must be emphasized that the intellectual ferment that characterized the Greek world in the seventy years or so before the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence was largely confined to a small, predominantly Western-educated intelligentsia, many, perhaps most, members of which actually lived outside the Ottoman Empire. It largely passed over the heads of the great mass of the Greek people, who were mostly illiterate and who remained steeped in a thought

world that was essentially Byzantine. The prophecies, folk songs, tales of Alexander the Great and popular romances such as the Erotokritos remained the staples of popular culture. The obsession with Greece's classical past was not widely shared. When someone compared the prowess of a klephtic leader to that of Achilles, the former asked 'Who is this Achilles? Did the musket of Achilles kill many?' Moreover the intellectual revival was for the most part resolutely opposed by the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church, which regarded the new emphasis on philosophy, the natural sciences and the culture of the ancient world as likely to lead to moral degeneration and indifference in matters divine. To counter what it regarded as the flood of atheistic and seditious literature circulating among the Greek populations of the empire a printing press was set up in Constantinople by the patriarchate in 1798, where uplifting and improving books were published under strict censorship. If the mass of the Greek population was largely indifferent to its enthusiasms, and the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church actively opposed to them, nonetheless the new intelligentsia did serve a useful function in articulating the aspirations of the Greek national movement.” (“A Short History of Modern Greece”, by Richard Clogg, Second Edition, pages 36 to 39)

4. “Greece has been characterized until recently by a fundamental diglossia between the spoken language everyday (the demotic) and a constructed language (katharevousa), which pretended to harken back to the classical idiom but was actually closer to Byzantine Greek, and which was inaugurated as the official language of the state in the 1830s and remained legally so until 1974. (“Dream Nation”, by Stathis Gourgouris, page 89)

But, despite all attempts by the purists to “purify” their artificially imposed Greek language, in the end their attempts failed and today we still have a language that contains words from the past, from an entirely alien era, and Turkish and other foreign words picked up along the way. So like their modern “fake” Greek identity it is only fair and deserving that the Greeks have a “fake” and bastardized language to be proud of and to call their own.

Greece does not hesitate to call the Macedonian language “non-existent” and a mix of Serbian and Bulgarian but have they ever

looked at their own language? I don't think so, because if they did then they would be less critical of other peoples' languages.

Modern Greece according to David Holden

David Holden, at the time his book “Greece Without Columns the making of the Modern Greeks” was published in 1972, was a chief foreign correspondent of the London Sunday Times. His career as a journalist has included long experience in the Arab world which qualifies him to assess Eastern strains in Greek life and attitudes without Western preconceptions.

Holden spent enough time in Greece to discover that, as he put it, “a great screen of mutual misunderstanding seems to hang between Greece and the western world” which he thought to explain why modern Greece is the way it is. He says he is a friend of the Greeks but he is not a “Philhellene” because to him, as he puts it, “philhellenism is a love affair with a dream which envisions ‘Greece’ and the ‘Greeks’ not as an actual place or real people but as a symbol of some imagined perfection” which he himself had never experienced.

Holden’s knowledge of Greece stems from two decades of watching, studying and visiting Greece. The result is a provocative and at times astonishing revelation, to say the least, which is sure to be controversial as well as illuminating. As per Holden’s own words, his book is “not at all about the Greece which countless volumes have been put before us and which the tourist advertisements nowadays continue to sell to us as a land of marvelous temples and antique memories of perfection.” The Greece Holden knows is the real Greece without any illusions.

Let us now see what Holden has to say on the question of “What is Modern Greece and who are the Modern Greeks?”

“Further back still, beyond the War of Independence when the modern nation-state of Greece came into being for the first time, the whole concept of Greece as a geographical entity begins to blur before our eyes, so many and various were its shapes and meanings.” (p 22)

What do you suppose Holden means? He means Greece before its independence was a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural region. He also means that a Greek state never existed before 1821.

“But if geography can offer us no stable idea of Greece, what can? Not race, certainly; for whatever the Greeks may once have been, when Homer and Agamemnon lived and cloud-gathering Zeus leaped from his Cretan birthplace upon the ancient world, they can hardly have had much blood-relationship with the Greeks of the peninsula we know today. Serbs and Bulgars, Romans, Franks and Venetians, Turks, Albanians, Germans and Italians in one invasion after another have made the modern Greeks a decidedly mongrel race.” (p 23)

Here he says that a Greek cannot be determined by his Greek ethnic identity because the type of Greek defined after 1821 never existed before. The modern Greek is a product of all the people that walked over or settled on those lands over the centuries including the Albanians, Vlachs, Turks and Macedonians.

“Not politics either; for in spite of the tenacious western legend about Greece as the birthplace and natural home of democracy, the political record of the Greek is one of singular instability and confusion in which, throughout history, the poles of anarchy and despotism have played roughly equal parts, and a decently modulated freedom has very rarely appeared.” (p 23)

Greece may boast that it is the cradle of democracy but in reality it has practiced everything but democracy! Even though Greece is a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural state, there is no room for diversity or for minorities. Greece is an expert in “cultural genocide” and in suppression of diversity. Even today Greece refuses to recognize the remnants of those people which it suppressed and which fought tooth and nail to preserve its true identity.

“Not religion; for while Byzantium was Christian, ancient Hellas was pagan; and although the Eastern Orthodox Church has closely associated with the Greeks for the last sixteen centuries it has never been their exclusive possession.” (p 23)

The only reason modern Greeks claim that the Orthodox Church is a “Greek possession” is because the Constantinople Patriarchate used the International Koine language which Greece today claims as its own.

“Not even language will quite do, for although it brings us a good deal nearer than the others to some overall coherence in the forms of Greek identity, it has also been a source of much Greek division in modern times. ...the official language of the state, called Katharevousa, or ‘pure’, is an artificially imposed adaptation of the classical tongue...” (p 23)

The Katharevousa was the Greek official language of the Greek state from 1901 until I believe 1975 when it was abandoned by the Papandreou regime in favour of the colloquial language known as the Dimotiki resembling the Koine.

“When Greece was reborn in 1832 in the form of a modern nation-state there was, in consequence, a fundamental ambiguity about her entire national character. The Greek nation-state was a product of western political intervention-‘the fatal idea’ as Arnold Toynbee once called it, of exclusive nationalism impinging upon the multi-national traditions of the eastern world.” (p 28)

When Greece became a state for the first time in 1829 the vast majority of people living on its territory were Albanians, Turks, Vlachs, Macedonians, Roma and a variety of other ethnic minorities. There never was a state called “Greece” before 1821.

“By extension, therefore, at any rate in theory, it [Greece] was a child of the renaissance and of western rationalism, some of whose inspiration was derived from classical Greece; and its western sponsors naturally saw the moment of its creation as a rebirth of ‘true’ or classical Greek-ness in the land to which that heritage rightfully belonged. But the Greeks themselves had few such thoughts. They had known no renaissance; and the thread of their classical past had long been woven into the oriental web of Byzantium. Their recovery of political independence was to most of

them far more a matter of restoring the power of the Greek Christian empire than of rebuilding ancient Hellas.” (p 29)

Before the Greek state was created by the Great Powers the people living in that region did not see themselves as the kind of Greeks they became afterwards. That Greece was not familiar to them. The vast majority of the people involved from 1821 when the uprising against the Ottomans began to the time Greece became a state for the first time in 1829 saw themselves as Christians fighting to restore the Byzantine state.

“Officially, Greeks call their modern state Hellas, after the classical world of 2,000 years ago, and by the same token they are officially known as Hellenes, which implies descent from their illustrious classical forefathers. But at the same time, colloquially, they call themselves Romios, derived from Rum, or Rome, and signifying that they are citizens of the eastern Roman Empire whose capital was Constantinople-in short, that they are really the children of Byzantine ‘Greece’, on the other hand, is derived from the Latin Graecia, the province of the western Roman Empire which stretched south of Mount Olympus through the peninsula of Attica and the Peloponnesus. Its International use to describe the sovereign state that currently occupies that territory is merely a reflection of the fact that ‘Greece’ in this modern sense is literally a western invention.” (p 29)

I believe the above quote is self explanatory.

“Thus, in Greece today, we have the fragmented and purely local traditions of the classical city states compressed together with the wide-ranging and multi-national pattern of the eastern Roman Empire into the mould of a modern nation-state which has nothing structurally in common with either and whose only internationally recognized name is equally foreign to both.” (p 29)

In other words, Modern Greeks received their classical ancient heritage through education and not through continuity; it being passed on from generation to generation. And by accepting this artificial heritage, Greeks have rejecting their real one, leaving them in a cultural limbo.

“The reality of Greece today, indeed, is that she is an immature, insecure and poor nation with an unmanageable and bitterly divided legacy of historical glory. Socially and economically she remains largely under-developed, but historically she is, so to speak, over-developed and unable, therefore, to treat herself, or to be treated by others, on her preset merits. So national pride becomes a substitute for performance and every step forward has to be taken with a confused and confusing backward glance.” (p 36)

If you want to learn more about “another side of Greece” I highly recommend you read David Holden’s book “Greece Without Columns”.

In spite of Greece’s artificiality today one can call him or herself a “proud Greek” with a 4,000 year old heritage and with roots extending back to the classical Greeks of 2,000 years ago but a real and genuine Macedonian accord to Greek logic cannot call him or herself a Macedonian because again according to modern Greek logic “Macedonia is Greek” and “there is no such thing as a Macedonia”!

Source:

Holden, David. Greece Without Columns: The Making of Modern Greeks. London: Faber, 1972.

G. A. Henty on 19th century Greece and the Modern Greeks

Modern Greeks for the last century or so have been spreading untruths about themselves and now generations later have forgotten who they really are.

This article is another means of letting the Greeks know who they are. And for those who ask, “Why am I doing this?” I am doing this because nowadays Greeks have forgotten who they are and where they come from and have become so brazen that they dare to attack others like the Macedonians, Albanians and Turks and question their identity without giving it a second thought as to their own and the damage they are doing.

When people deny other peoples’ ethnic identity they deny their right to exist and as such those people have no choice but to fight back. But unlike the Greeks who fight back with half-truths and untruths Macedonians have the truth on their side.

What follows are excerpts from G. A. Henty’s book “In the Greek Waters: A Story of the Grecian War of Independence (1821-1827)” who speaks the truth about 19th century Greece and the Modern Greeks.

On page 40 Henty said:

“Greece will rise one of these days,” Mr. Beveridge went on, “and when she does she will astonish Europe. The old spirit still lives among the descendants of Leonidas and Milatiades.”

“I should be sorry to be one of the Turks who fell into their hands,” William Martyn said gravely as he thought of the many instances in his own experiences of the murders of sailors on leave ashore.

“It is probable that there will be sad scenes of bloodshed,” Mr. Beveridge agreed; “that is only to be expected when you have a race of men of a naturally impetuous and passionate character enslaved by a people alien in race and in religion. Yes, I fear it will be so at the commencement, but that will be all altered when they become disciplined soldiers. Do you not think so?” he asked, as the sailor remained silent.

“I have great doubts whether they will ever submit to discipline,” he said bluntly. “Their idea of fighting for centuries has been simply to shoot down an enemy from behind the shelter of rocks. I would as life undertake to discipline an army of Malays, who, in a good many respects, especially in the handiness with which they use their knives, are a good deal like the Greeks.”

“There is one broad distinction,” Mr. Beveridge said: “the Malays have no past, the Greeks have never lost the remembrance of their ancient glory. They have a high standard to act up to; they reverence the names of the great men of old as if they had died but yesterday. With them it would be a resurrection, accomplished, no doubt, after vast pains and many troubles, the more so since the Greeks are a composite people among whom the descendants of the veritable Greek of old are in a great minority. The majority are of Albanian and Suliote blood, races which even the Romans found untamable. When the struggle begins I fear that this section of the race will display the savagery of their nature; but the fighting over, the intellectual portion will, I doubt not, regain their proper ascendancy, and Greece will become the Greece of old.”

William Martyn was wise enough not to pursue the subject.

On pages 139 and 140 Henty said:

“Brutes!” Martyn exclaimed with great emphasis. “How these fellows can be descendants of the Greeks beats me altogether.”

“The old Greeks were pretty cruel,” Horace, who had just joined them, said. “They used to slaughter their captives wholesale, and mercy wasn’t among their virtues. Besides, my father says that except in the Morea very few indeed are descendants of the Greeks;

the rest are Bulgarian or Albanian, neither of whom are Greeks of old would have recognized as kinsmen.”

“It is case of distance lending enhancements to the view,” Miller laughed; “our illusions are gone.”

“Never mind, we must make the best of them, Miller; they are not Greeks, but at any rate they are all that is left of the Greeks. Their actions show that their Christianity is a sham, but at the same time they are an intelligent race capable of someday becoming a great people again, and they are struggling to throw off the yoke of a race intellectually their inferiors and incapable of progress in any sort of way. That is what my father said to me as we were walking up and down the deck this morning. That is the light I mean to look at it in the future. It is a capable people struggling with an incapable one, and if they are savage and vindictive and debased it is the faults not of themselves but of those who have so long been their masters.”

“Good,” Martyn said; “that is the most satisfactory view of the thing, and we will stick to it and shut our years as much as possible in future against all stories to the Greeks’ disadvantage.”

In spite of Greece’s artificiality today one can proudly call him or herself a “Hellene” with a 4,000 year old heritage, with roots extending back to the classical Greeks of 2,500 years ago but a real and genuine Macedonian cannot call him or herself Macedonian because according to modern Greek logic “Macedonia is Greek” and “there is no such thing as a Macedonian”!

Source:

Henty, G.A. *In the Greek Waters: A Story of the Grecian War of Independence (1821-1827)*. London: Blackie and Son, 1893

After two centuries of living a myth Greece now faces reality

By Risto Stefov
rstefov@hotmail.com
January 24, 2010

The thing that amazes me most about Greeks is not the lies that come out of the mouths of so many, but the honesty that comes out of a few. I have always imagined that all Greeks knew the truth and by that I mean that they know how their recent ancestors became Greek and that deep down they know they are not “real Greeks”. And by “real Greeks” I mean descendents from the so-called “ancient Greeks”. I thought every Modern Greek knew that before Greece became a country in the 19th century his or her ancestors were not Greek at all and that somewhere down the line they became “Greek” through assimilation, the same way many Macedonians became Greek. But I guess I was wrong!

When Greece was created for the first time in 1829 there were no “real Greeks”. The entire region was populated mostly by Albanians, Turks, Slavs, Vlachs, Latin and a long list of other ethnicities that existed in that region at the time. The vast majority of the people living in the tiny Greek state at the time of its liberation from the Ottomans were uneducated and unfamiliar with the concepts of nationality and ethnicity. As far as they were concerned they were all Christians which distinguished them from their Muslim overlords. After their liberation all Christians in the Greek state, regardless of their ethnicity, were told they were Greek. This continued as Greece expanded its territory over the years and acquired more and more people.

Some people accepted the idea that they were Greeks and moved on. Those who refused were exiled, jailed, tormented, or eventually forcibly assimilated. But in spite of pressure from the authorities, many continued to speak their language, practice their traditions and

not feel Greek. Some continue these practices to this day, particularly in the villages and isolated communities.

So it should be of no surprise that there are people in Modern Greece today who truly believe that they are “real Greeks”, descendents of the so-called ancient Greeks, because that is what the Greek authorities have been telling them all their lives through their early education. There should also be no surprise that there are people who don’t “feel Greek” living in Greece today because generation after generation they held onto and cherished their true identities, mostly in secret. Unfortunately this is turning out to be the skeleton in Greece’s closet.

Some Greeks however, from time to time, had a need to venture outside of Greece and, mostly by accident, discovered that there is more to Greece than they were led to believe. Some refused to believe what they found yet others found more than they bargained for.

With no restriction and censorship by the Greek state, Greeks living in the Diaspora are exposed to much more information about themselves and about their country than they would otherwise have access to inside Greece.

Most of this “new and never heard of before” information unfortunately comes from their own compatriots and even from their own relatives. This kind of information is not easy to accept because it collides with their belief system and, for some, undermines the entire foundation of their own identity. Given where it comes from, this kind of information is not easy to reject either.

It is very difficult for Greeks, who truly believe that all Greeks are descendents of the ancient Greeks and that Greece is ethnically a homogeneous nation, to accept that people who are born in Greece and speak the Greek language do not “feel Greek” and therefore are not Greeks. For them things like that just don’t add up. No wonder so many who “do not feel Greek” are so frequently labeled “traitors”.

Today's story is about a Greek who all his life believed that he was a "real Greek" until he took a trip to Canada to visit his relatives and ran into some Greek speaking Macedonians who, as he puts it, "pointed him in the right direction".

Here is what he had to say:

"When I came to Canada to visit my relatives, as a grown man I had a certain understanding what a Greek was. I expected to find Greeks like myself there. A Greek is a Greek. If a person was born in Greece, spoke Greek then they were Greek, end of story, nothing complicated to comprehend. Right? Then I ran into some people who were born in Greece, spoke Greek but said they were Macedonians. What Macedonians, I asked? You mean you are from the north part of Greece, from Macedonia? Right? 'No!' One of them said 'we are Macedonians from Greece'. And he was quite hostile about it.

I was blunt and told them point blank that I did not believe him: 'vre pedia mu den iparhi tetio prama!' (Boys there is no such thing!) But they began to make fun of me calling me ignorant and all sorts of names. Another said 'I was living in Greece but know nothing of Greece'. He said I should take a trip one of these days and explore my own country that I live in and see things for myself. He even dared to tell me to 'open my eyes'. How dare they call me ignorant and all those things! I was quite upset for a long time and made no mention of it to anyone until I returned to Greece. Unfortunately, I could not shake off the feeling, it kept wearing me down. The only way to shake it off, I thought, was to prove to myself that those guys were wrong. So I took that trip. I toured my country but I could not prove them wrong.

Well, that was then and this is now. It didn't take me too long to discover that indeed things in Greece were not what I expected. I decided to keep looking and whatever I found, I was man enough to handle. Well, some things I found could be explained but others things which I could have called 'anomalies' could not. I could have ignored them but then who was I fooling? Unfortunately, as much as I hate to admit, those guys in Canada proved to be right. I did live in this country I knew nothing about. When I stopped fighting with

myself I discovered that Greece is a multi-ethnic country like any other Balkan country, full of living cultures, ethnicities and languages. In the villages were I visited I heard people speak Arvanitika (Albanian), Vlahika (Vlach), Makedonika (Macedonian) and Turkika (Turkish). I asked people if anyone here spoke other languages, other than Greek. Most people said ‘we are all Greeks here’ but some admitted that other languages are indeed spoken. When I asked who spoke these languages I got no names just a feeling that people do speak other languages. When I asked ‘how did these language get here’ no one seemed know. Some said they didn’t speak them themselves but heard others speak them. When I asked for their opinion, most said, as far as they knew, these languages have been spoken here from a long time for as long as they can remember. Who knew that non-Greeks lived in Greece? I always thought we were all Greeks here, that’s what I was told, that’s what I believed, it’s not something one talks about every day. There were always the signs but I never paid attention to the signs. I knew from my history lessons that some of our revolutionaries spoke different languages but thought nothing of it. There was no need to ask because the idea that we were all Greeks was strong and unquestionable. But I never heard of Macedonians living in Northern Greece that’s for sure. Not in the ethnic sense as a people different from the rest of us. I always believed we were all Greeks and a Macedonian was a Greek who lived in Macedonia, you know, Northern Greece.

Once I found this out I began to look for information through the internet outside of Greece and discovered all sorts of information but mostly contradictory. Most websites I found ridiculed the idea that ‘minorities’ lived in Greece. Some websites even went as far as to claim that Macedonians and Turks lived in Greece and were harassed by the Greek authorities. I didn’t know what or who to believe. But then I made the mistake of asking an academic friend of mine who told me most of this stuff on the internet is propaganda invented by our enemies to discredit Greece’s good name. When I pushed my point and asked for an explanation as to why people speak the different languages spoken inside Greece he told me not to ask so many stupid questions and ‘questions such as those are best left unanswered’. So now I don’t know who or what to believe.”

My fiend, I am sure you will find the truth for yourself if you look hard enough. And as far as knowing who you are, it will take you some doing but I am sure you will answer that question too. Good luck in your search.

So, Greeks, after living your myth for two centuries what have you accomplished? You now have grown adult men and women at the crossroads of their lives looking for answers, looking to find out who and what they are. And what do they find? They find that you have lied to them all their lives!

Greeks, you got rid of your dissidents by exiling them to the Diaspora and your faithful citizens are now awakening only to discover that you have lied to them. What are you planning to do with them? Exile them? Harass them? Or write them off as traitors? How far are you willing to go to protect your myth? Are you going to sacrifice every soul that uncovers the truth? These people have done nothing wrong, just as thousands of Macedonians whom you have exiled had done nothing wrong. The only thing people like that are guilty of is being honest and wanting to know the truth.

Every country has a myth to explain its existence and that myth is tailored to include everyone (not exclude them) even those who seek the truth. What is wrong with telling people the truth and teaching the truth in school? This is a global world now and sooner or later people will learn the truth if not from your educational system then from someone else's. You can't go on propagating your myth by calling it "the truth" and then calling the truth "Skopjan or Turkish propaganda".

Greeks, if you as an authority believe what you preach that "there are no Macedonians and that Macedonia is Greek" then you should feel no threat from those who you believe do not exist. You are not the first; Greek governments all along have been saying Macedonians do not exist since they acquired Macedonian lands in 1913 but this problem seems to follow you everywhere and how do you explain it? By perpetuating the perpetual lie that Macedonians still don't exist. One hundred years are about to pass since you invaded, occupied and partitioned Macedonia with your partners Serbia and Bulgaria. How many more centuries must pass, how

many more people must you exile, silence and ruin before you accept the fact that the Macedonians will not go away.

So do us all a favour and put an end to the injustices. Recognize the minorities living in your country and let them be who they truly are or want to be.

Well ladies and gentlemen, welcome to my world! As much as I feel vindicated by the fact that more and more “real Greeks” are learning the truth about Greece, I feel sorry for them, not because they discovered the truth but because their innocence will put them in jeopardy of becoming the new victims of Greek justice. They are great patriots as long as they believe the lies and propaganda and propagate the “Greek myth” but as soon as they discover the truth that they are not “real Greeks” they become traitors! A warning to other Greeks who have discovered this secret, as long as you live in Greece don’t divulge it to anyone. Keep this information to yourself! It would do no one any good for you to become a target of hatred and abuse, especially in the country in which you were born, live and love!

When Greece was created for the first time in 1829 there were no “real Greeks”. The entire region was populated mostly by Albanians, Turks, Slavs, Vlachs, Latin and a long list of other ethnicities that existed in that region at that time. The vast majority of the people living in the tiny Greek state at the time of its liberation from the Ottomans were uneducated and unfamiliar with the concepts of nationality and ethnicity. As far as they were concerned they were all Christians which distinguished them from the Muslims, their overlords. After their liberation all Christians in the Greek state, regardless of their ethnicities, were told they were Greek. This continued as Greece expanded its territory and acquired more and more people.

How Macedonia became Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian

By Risto Stefov
rstefov@hotmail.com
April 4, 2010

War and the suffering in Macedonia did not end after the failed 1903 Ilinden Macedonian National Uprising. Shortly after the Uprising was suppressed Macedonia became the apple of discord between Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria and to some extent Romania.

Unable to free itself from the Ottoman yoke, Macedonia became ripe for the plucking and whoever was able to muster enough strength and resources to drive out the Ottomans would have it in their possession. At that time Macedonia's neighbours knew they could not possess Macedonia without the cooperation of the Macedonian people, so first they tried their luck at "convincing" the Macedonians that they were not "really" Macedonians but "Greeks", on account of them being Orthodox Christians. Or they were "Serbians" on account of them supposedly speaking an "Old Serbian" language. Or "Bulgarians" because they supposedly spoke a dialect of the "Bulgarian" language and of course "Romanians" because many were Vlachs and spoke a dialect of "Romanian".

Failing to convince the Macedonian people "that they were not Macedonians" by propaganda alone, the four then resorted to using violence through the application of illegal armed bands. However, in addition to serving their masters by doing their bidding and murdering those who refused their will, these bands, consisting mostly of thugs, also served themselves by robbing, raping, beating and murdering innocent civilians.

Now in addition to the dastardly deeds performed by the Ottoman army and the Bashibazuks (armed Muslim civilians), there were

Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian and Romanian armed bands roaming the Macedonian countryside preying on the Macedonian people.

The Ottoman authorities knew about them and so did the international peace keeping forces stationed in Macedonia but they did nothing to help the Macedonian population.

Unable to turn the general Macedonian population into Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, or Romanians to their satisfaction, by severe methods the four began to open more Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian and Romanian churches and schools in Macedonia, offering Macedonian children “free education” but not in the Macedonian language. Education was offered in the Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, or Romanian language respectively. Unfortunately, along with the so-called “free education” came a heavy dose of foreign propaganda. Along with their “free education” children and young adults were also offered a glamorous lifestyle, something their families in the village could not give them. Being “educated” and convinced that they would be more cultured and better off as Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, or Romanians these children were then sent back home to “convince” others and also turn them into Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians or Romanians.

Many of these “educated children”, as young adults, became the new teachers and priests in the Macedonian village churches and schools. In addition to preaching and teaching they also unwittingly helped Macedonia’s enemies get a foothold in Macedonia. Those young adults who found their way back to who they really were or switched loyalties usually ended up dead because their benefactors could not tolerate traitors; a tradition Greeks practice to this day.

Almost the entire Macedonian population during these times, particularly in the villages, was uneducated and could not read or write. So, many people relied on the village teacher or village priest to help them with administrative matters and filling out travel forms etc. And while they were doing a public service for their illiterate, fellow villagers these teachers and priests were doing their benefactors a favour by registering the Macedonians as Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, or Romanians with a Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, or Romanian sounding name depending on who was their

benefactor. That is why Macedonians who traveled abroad during the late 19th century and early 20th century, before Macedonia was partitioned, had Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian, or Romanian sounding names. These names which exist to this day can be found in the United States, Canada and other places outside of Macedonia where Macedonians immigrated during Ottoman times.

Macedonians were never Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, Romanians, or Albanians. They were simply made to look like that for “political” reasons which became obvious after Macedonia was illegally invaded, occupied, partitioned and annexed by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria in 1912 and 1913.

Looking at this another way, there are many Greeks, Serbians, Bulgarians, Romanians and Albanians today who not too long ago had Macedonian ancestors!

In all this there was one organization which cared for the Macedonian population and fought to correct the injustices perpetrated and that was the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (MRO). Unfortunately because the MRO was a great threat to Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian and Romanian ambitions in Macedonia its members were hunted down and killed. In addition to killing off its members, the various factions, particularly the Bulgarians, made attempts to infiltrate the MRO and pose as patriotic Macedonians. This caused much internal strife and mistrust, which is felt to this day in modern Macedonian organizations. I must also add that even though the 19th and 20th centuries are now in the past, Macedonia’s enemies have not ceased their attempts to infiltrate Macedonian organizations. So who can blame the Macedonians for being overly suspicious?

Greek political aims in Macedonia

Greek propaganda in Macedonia began in June 1903 when Greek military officers, Pavlos Melas and Georgios Tzontas, began to hire illegal armed bands and dispatch them in Macedonia to create havoc and spread “Greater” Greek propaganda. Immediately after the August 1903 Ilinden Uprising, the secretary of the Greek consulate in Bitola, Ion Dragoumis, established a secret Greek committee to

work towards the assimilation of the Macedonian people and the annexation of Macedonia to Greece. Around about the same time the Greek bishop of Kostur, Germanos Karavangelis, created an illegal armed band. In the beginning of March 1904 two Greek armed bands were created in Thessaly. Six new illegal armed Greek bands in total were created and dispatched to operate in Macedonia.

Then in the fall of 1904 the Hellenic - Macedonian committee was formed in Athens whose job was to finance the Macedonian campaign and spread Greek propaganda in Macedonia. Most of the manpower for these illegal armed bands was hired from newly annexed Crete and manned by Greek officers.

Of all the illegal armed bands that operated in Macedonia, the Greek bands most closely cooperated with the Ottoman army and in many instances carried out missions for the Ottomans.

The goals and objectives of the Greek armed bands operating in Macedonia were regulated by a Rulebook entitled “General Instructions for the Macedonian Bands”, especially created for this purpose by the Hellenic-Macedonian Committee. The Rulebook contained three main points: 1. destroy the MRO insurgency and replace it with a Greek one; 2. eliminate all those who worked against the Greek cause; 3. convince the entire Macedonian population to join the Greek Patriarchate.

Macedonian intellectuals and leaders responded to the “Greater” Greek propaganda with appeals to the Greek population not to support the illegal armed bands in Macedonia and to oppose Hellenism, their mutual usurper.

Supported by the Sultan himself, the illegal armed Greek bands escalated their persecution of the Macedonian insurgency and of prominent intellectuals. In the eyes of the Macedonian population the entire MRO was labeled “Bulgarophile”, a false claim which is spread to this day.

According to Richard Oppenheimer, an Austrian civilian agent sent to Macedonia on April 18, 1908 who dispatched information to Aloys Aehrenthal of the Austrian-Hungarian Minister of Foreign

Affairs, the Greek bands in Macedonia killed 531 and wounded 175 people in the period from March 14, 1906 to March 14, 1908. According to the same information, MRO insurgents fought 12 battles with the Greek bands in the period from October 26, 1904 to June 27, 1905 in Voden Region alone. From January to October 1905, MRO insurgents fought 22 battles with the illegal Greek armed bands that had infiltrated Macedonia and 3 battles with locally hired Greek bands. Most battles took place in the Kostur, Kajlari, Drama, Lerin, Bitola and other Regions of southern Macedonia.

Greek-Ottoman cooperation contributed immensely to the Greek campaign in Macedonia and as the Greek armed bands kept growing the number of Macedonian insurgents kept dwindling.

Serbian political aims in Macedonia

Serbian propaganda activities in Macedonia began before the 1903 Ilinden Uprising. In fact the foundations for Serbia's Macedonian campaigns were laid in 1902 when a dedicated Committee for carrying out propaganda activities in Macedonia was established in Belgrade. Illegal Serbian armed bands began to infiltrate Macedonia while the Ilinden Uprising was still going on. In 1904 the number of Serbian armed bands operating in Macedonia increased significantly, especially in Ovche Pole, Azot and Poreche.

The Serbian sponsored armed bands in Macedonia also operated according to a Rulebook which listed the Serbian goals and objectives in Macedonia. According to the Rulebook Serbia's main goal in its campaigns in Macedonia was to minimize MRO influence on the Macedonian population by eliminating its leaders and insurgents. While doing this the Serbian armed bands were to avoid contact and conflict with the Ottoman authorities, including the army and police. These goals and objectives were regulated by Articles 17, 18 and 32 of the Rulebook.

In order to achieve their goals the Serbian armed bands, like the Greek and Bulgarian ones, used terror tactics including robbing and torturing the Macedonian population. Almost every village had

agents and collaborators who supported the illegal armed bands by offering them intelligence information, food and sanctuary.

Many Macedonian intellectuals tried to persuade the Macedonians, who were recruited by these bands in various functions, not to offer the foreigners assistance and to stop fighting amongst themselves, but without much success. There were many letters written to that effect which clearly demonstrated that Macedonia's neighbours deliberately intensified fratricidal fighting and self-extermination in Macedonia. Their goal was to create conflict among the Macedonian people, invade and partition their country and destroy the essence of the Macedonian nation, as events proved true over time.

Bulgarian political aims in Macedonia

Immediately after the 1903 Ilinden Uprising was suppressed, Bulgaria officially refused to bear responsibility for the dire events created in Macedonia. But the Macedonian Question remained a part of Bulgarian foreign policy. Besides being supported by pro-Bulgarian factions within the Macedonian Liberation Movement, at the beginning of 1905, the Bulgarian government created a second political department within its own Ministry of Foreign Affairs with a single objective; to deal with the Macedonian Question. The long term goal of this department was to overcome all factors that hindered Bulgarian influence in Macedonia and work towards giving Macedonia autonomy as a Bulgarian protectorate. Other goals included waging war against all who got in the way including those promoting foreign propaganda in Macedonia. Bulgaria's first priority was to infiltrate the MRO, kill off its leaders, insurgents and supporters and replace them with Bulgarian agents. This was to be accomplished through the assistance of the Bulgarian Exarchate churches and schools in Macedonia, which were financed and politically supported by the Bulgarian state and its various governments of that time.

Greece does not hesitate to claim Macedonia as its own but shies away from explaining how Macedonia became "Greek".

How Macedonians were made into Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians?

Before answering the question “How were Macedonians made into Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians?” I would like to provide the reader with some general background on milestone events that lead up to Macedonia’s invasion and occupation in 1912 and partition in 1913 by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria.

GREAT POWER ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INFLUENCE IN THE BALKANS

Macedonia was liberated in the spring of 1878 and was given back to the Ottomans in the summer of the same year.

After waiting for a long period of time for something to happen, Russia took its chance and attacked the Ottoman Empire in 1877. The official cause of the attack was in response to complaints from the peasants in the Balkans who were claiming to be exploited to the point of starvation.

The Turkish armies were decimated and on March 3rd, 1878 Turkey was forced to sign a peace treaty with Russia. This treaty became known as the San Stefano Treaty.

One of the requirements of the treaty was that a large Bulgarian state be formed that included most of present day southern Bulgaria, all of Macedonia and other parts of the Balkans.

The peace treaty was unfortunately signed without the consent of the Western Power who convened in Berlin in June 1878 to decide what to do.

Russia’s real motive for the attack it would seem had to do more with self interests and less with the interest of the people it was

trying to protect, so Russia took the opportunity to realize a long held ambition in the Balkans, access to the Mediterranean Sea.

The western powers of the time which included Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy unfortunately did not agree with what Russia was doing for two main reasons;

1. Britain and France, particularly Britain, did not want Russia to gain access to Mediterranean waters.
2. Both Britain and France had made many investments and had companies operating in the Ottoman Empire and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire would have meant the loss of their investments.

The western powers, including Russia, convened in Berlin on June 13th, 1878 and by July 13 they had concluded, among other things, to allow Bulgaria to become an autonomous state and to give Macedonia back to the Turks.

So Macedonia was free for 132 days from March 3rd, 1878, when the San Stefano Treaty was signed, to July 13th, 1878 when the Congress of Berlin decided to give it back to the Ottomans.

The Macedonian people's high hopes were dashed when they were handed back to the Ottomans to be further abused and exploited. This not only fostered hatred and mistrust for the great powers but also made the people realize that they would have to depend on themselves to gain their freedom.

Outside of dashing the Macedonian peoples' hopes, the actions of the Berlin Congress placed doubt on Macedonia's future which opened the question, "What will happen to Macedonia when the Ottoman Empire collapses completely?"

ACTIONS AND INFLUENCE OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES IN MACEDONIA

One of the most frequently asked questions is "What were foreign Christian Churches doing in a predominantly Muslim State?"

On the surface it seemed that everyone was interested in the well-being of the Macedonian people, especially Macedonia's neighbours

Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, and they wanted to make sure the Christian Macedonian people's rights were observed.

The reason however for allowing only churches to exist in Macedonia as opposed to clubs, political and other organizations is because of Muslim law.

Being Muslims, the Ottomans would only recognize religion as the sole entity allowed to operate in Muslim lands.

The legal system was created around the Seriat which had its basis in Islam. The Koran and Hadith were the books from which the ideals and fundamental principles for the construction of the legal system were drawn. No law could be passed which in principle contradicted the Seriat. Only the supreme religious leader, the Sejh-ul-Islam, had the right to interpret and assess the legal norms and only from the point of view of Islamic law.

The Koran dictated Muslim conduct and behaviour, including punishment for crimes. In the Ottoman mind only religion and the word of God had sole authority over peoples' lives. Religion was the official government of the Ottoman State. Islam was the only recognized form of rule that suited Muslims but could not be directly applied to non-Muslims. So the next best thing was to allow other religions to rule over the non-Muslims. The obvious choice for Macedonia of course was the Eastern Christian or Orthodox religion, which was the foundation of the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Empire's predecessor.

On the insistence of the great powers, especially Russia, to give the Ottoman non-Muslim citizens more rights, the Phanariot Patriarch church under the authority of the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople was re-established in Macedonia in 1850, 73 years after it was abolished by the Sultan Mustafa III in 1767.

Unfortunately the language of the Patriarch church was Koine, which was foreign to the vast majority of people in the Balkans who spoke dialects of the Slav language and after much complaining, Russia who saw itself as the protector of the Christian Orthodox believers, pressured the Sultan (Ottoman Supreme Leader) to

establish the Exarchate Church in 1872 which catered to the Slav speakers of the Orthodox region.

But after the formation of the Bulgarian state in 1878, Bulgarians adopted the Exarchate Church as the church of the Bulgarian people.

Faced with the prospect of having no church of their own, the Macedonian people also made an attempt to establish a Macedonian church in 1891 but without success. On the recommendation of the Patriarch, the Sultan would not grant the Macedonians their wish to have their own church.

So, having no church of their own, the Macedonian believers in Christ had no choice but to attend the foreign churches for their prayer.

So: “What were foreign Christian Churches doing in a predominantly Muslim State?” The real reasons for establishing the foreign Patriarchate and Exarchate Churches in Macedonia, as it turned out, were to promote foreign nationalist propaganda.

INVOLVEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN ROYALS IN MACEDONIA’S DESTINY

Up until a few years ago, most of us were not aware of what was going on behind the diplomatic curtain in Europe especially when it involved royal families.

But thanks to Hans Lothar Schteppan the former German ambassador to Macedonia we get to peek behind the curtain.

Using information from the Ottoman period he discovered in the Austrian and German archives, Hans Lothar Schteppan wrote a book called “The Macedonian Knot” which is based on new facts that have emerged connecting the European Royals to Macedonia’s annexation by its neighbours.

Before I give you any details, allow me to tell you a bit about the relationship of the royals of that time:

The King of England, Edward 7 was married to Princess Alexandra of Denmark. Princess Alexandra of Denmark was King George I's sister and King George was the King of Greece.

Princess Dagmar of Denmark, who was also the sister of King George of Greece, was married to the son of the Russian Tsar.

King George's wife Queen Olga Konstantinovna was a cousin of the Russian Tsar Nicholas's father and sister-in-law to King Edward 7 from England.

So you can see that the royals who ruled the most powerful states were related to each other and also looked after each others interests.

The reason this is important to know is because of, according to Hans Lothar Schteppan, the measures taken to award Macedonian lands to the smaller kingdoms mainly to the kingdom of Greece.

Sometime after Macedonia was given back to the Ottomans in 1878 it had been decided at high diplomatic levels that Macedonia was to be partitioned and awarded to Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria under the condition that Macedonia be divided under national lines. How and when Macedonia was to be divided was at the time not determined. The key words here are "national lines".

Here is what Greek King George I said: "I do not know exactly what the conclusion was (in Reval on June 9, 1908) but a decision on Macedonia was reached." This statement was made after King George met with King Edward of England, Tsar Nicholas of Russia and his own wife regarding "the future of Macedonia".

So from what Hans Lothar Schteppan tells us, every time the royals had a meeting King George of Greece would be asking, "When can I get more land for my people?"

Here is a quote from Hans Lothar Schteppan: "Greek King George, it would appear, was strengthening his Dynastic relations for the purpose of territorial expansion into Macedonia. This became evident when, during every meeting with the Great Powers, King

George lost no opportunity to beg for more territory for his Greek Kingdom demonstrated through 250 Acts of the German Kingdom.”

Here is a quote from Hans Lothar Schteppan: “Back in the 18th century when the Russian–Ottoman wars were shaking up the Ottoman Empire, England had interests in securing a passage through the Mediterranean Sea to gain access to its Indian colony. On the other hand, Russia needed uninterrupted access from the Black to the Mediterranean Sea. To prevent Russia from gaining access to the Mediterranean Sea, England established the new Greek State on the land historically known as Achaea. A new King from the European Dynasties was installed and the young State became a Kingdom, established for the first time in 1832. The first King to be installed was Otto of Bavaria (1833-62). The next King to sit on the Greek Throne was Prince Wilhelm from Denmark known as George I, 1863-1913. He is responsible for all the Imperialistic gains Greece made during the Balkan Wars.

To justify why he wanted Macedonian lands for his Greek kingdom, King George I kept referring to the 2.5 million Greeks living in Macedonia who over the centuries referred to themselves as ‘Makedones’. These so-called Greeks who referred to themselves as Makedones, according to King George, in fact were a majority in Macedonia and he could not allow a small minority, referring to the Exarchates, to “usurp the name, national and cultural identity of some 2.5 million Greeks”.

When Kalnoki, the foreign minister of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, having listened to his incessant complaints about the Greek Church in Macedonia challenged the Greek King George I about where he got the figure of 2.5 million Greeks in Macedonia, King George had to admit that the number of Greeks in Macedonia was very small. (Austro– Hungarian records of 1886)

So having only a small number of Greeks in Macedonia, King George I would have found it difficult to free Macedonia. To increase his chances he would have to “make” Greeks out of the Macedonians but the only access he had to do that was to “Hellenize” them through the Patriarch Church.

Another less known fact presented by Hans Lothar Schteppan in his Book “Macedonian Knot” is that during the 1903 Macedonian Uprising, Macedonian Revolutionary Dimitar Berovski, one of the organizers of the Razlog Uprising of 1876, was not granted audience with the Russian Tsar. This sounds suspicious because it was well known that Russia was helping all Uprisings in Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and even Greece. Russia prided itself on being the self appointed protector of the Orthodox Christian, regardless of ethnicity.

Could Russia have been planning a different future for Macedonia? If Dimitar Berovski for example was a Bulgarian, as Bulgarian Propaganda likes to present him, why then was he not granted audience with the Russian Tsar? Bulgarian Revolutionaries were certainly always supported! One reason might be that supporting Macedonia would have interfered with Russian support for Bulgarian interests in Macedonia, and this would certainly have had future consequences for Russian Free Passage into the Black Sea.

There are also other aspects to this. The Imperialistic Dynastic Network of Greek King George I, also had interests in enlarging Greece’s territory. Thus Macedonia was left to fight on its own, not only against the Turks but also against the royal resistance. (Hans Lothar Schteppan)

Since most historians in this time period were overwhelmingly dependent on their monarchs for their subsistence, it becomes very questionable that they would ever question their benefactors. It is however, most logical to assume that they as subordinates, accepted such and co-operated in initiating the creation of a fictitious state with a fictitious history. Historians such as Droysan, promoted such, and are being accepted today as being factual when they are not. This quote was made by Pete Kondoff and confirmed by Hans Lothar Schteppan during an interview conducted by the MPO’s Macedonian Tribune on October 17, 2005.

Among other things here is what Hans Lothar Schteppan had to say: Yugoslav history is like Bulgarian history, Soviet history, East German history and Polish history. History based only on ideological specters. There is no truth, no facts, just intentions,

wishful thinking, ideas and ideology. If you prefer ideology, please do so and please don't listen to me or read my book. What you have been taught in school, I am very sorry to say that I would personally not believe. So, please, you may believe whatever you like, just let me quote my documents. These documents are actual reports from the German ambassadors from the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century from Constantinople, Sofia, Belgrade, Vienna, London, St. Petersburg, etc., and I believe them to be factual more than I can say about Yugoslav and Bulgarian interpretations of history. I am sorry to say that. Hans Lothar Schteppan

THE MACEDONIAN PEOPLE'S RISE TO POWER AND THEIR FAILURE TO ACHIEVE INDEPENDENCE AND CREATE A MACEDONIAN STATE

When the Macedonian people along with their lands were handed back to the Ottomans in 1878 to be further abused and exploited, the Macedonian leadership came to the realization that no one was going to help the Macedonians so they had to organize and carry out a national struggle on their own.

The 1878 Congress of Berlin also awakened the Muslim Rulers in the Balkans to the reality that their Empire came very close to being destroyed.

So now we have the dynamics of the Macedonian people gearing up to free themselves and the Ottomans trying harder to stop them.

To maintain their state's integrity the Ottomans had to raise taxes in order to pay the interest on the money they borrowed from the westerners and they also had to keep a close eye on potential insurrections and further loss of lands.

To prevent further uprisings and rebellions, the Turks stepped up espionage activities and searches for weapons in the villages. If by any chance weapons were found, the entire village was burned to the ground, even if the weapons belonged to thugs.

By the time taxes were paid a Macedonian family would be left with 25 to 40 percent of their meager annual earnings to live on.

To make ends meet Macedonian men were accustomed to taking on additional jobs within the Ottoman Empire or abroad to make enough to survive the winter. It has been said that after twenty-five years of achieving autonomy, Bulgaria was thriving economically thanks to the cheap labour provided by the Macedonian migrant workers.

The West, including the USA and Canada, were to some extent also beneficiaries of the cheap Macedonian labour. Unable to pay their bills, Macedonian men ventured further and further from Macedonia looking for work. The further they ventured the longer they took to return home sometimes spending more than a couple of years before returning.

It was never their intent to abandon their homeland, but as Macedonians found it more and more difficult to cope at home they began to settle in foreign lands like Bulgaria, Russia, Serbia and even the USA and Canada.

Be they in Bulgaria, Russia, the USA, Canada or Macedonia, the Macedonia people's preoccupation after 1878 was how to become free from the oppressive Ottomans.

The answer came to them on October 23rd, 1893 when a number of Macedonian intellectuals met in Solun and decided to form a Macedonian Revolutionary Organization with aims of destroying the Ottoman social system and seeking autonomy for Macedonia. Gotse Delchev was chosen to lead the revolution.

By 1896 the revolutionary movement was able to exert influence to a point where it acted like a state within a state, taking over administrative positions from the Ottomans, leading boycotts against Ottoman institutions and offering isolated villages protection from Greek and Bulgarian sponsored brigands.

Besides preparing for an imminent uprising, the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization was able to organize cheti to defend the villages from marauding bands, Ottoman soldiers and from Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian hired armed bands.

However, before the failed Ilinden uprising the Macedonian leadership hardly concerned itself with the armed foreign bands or with the Greek, Bulgarian or Serbian nationalistic propaganda.

Unfortunately as the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization became more and more successful at its job, Ottoman authorities began to clamp down on it.

On January 31st, 1903 the Ottomans declared the organization illegal and sought ways to destroy it. One of the ways was to step up weapons searches in the villages, another was to capture and imprison its leadership.

With villages being destroyed at a rapid rate and leaders being lost to the prisons, the Macedonians had to accelerate their plans to carry out this massive national insurrection they were planning.

Unfortunately the Macedonians were finding it difficult to acquire the weapons, ammunition and supplies they needed for an all out strike and for a prolonged struggle. Some, including Gotse Delchev, believed more time was needed.

Unfortunately with Dechev's death on May 4, 1903 and with most of the leadership still divided, a rash decision was made to carry out the uprising on August 2, 1903 during the Ilinden celebration.

According to newspaper reports from 1903, during the heat of the Ilinden Uprising, Russia and Austria–Hungary urgently warned Macedonia's neighbours, for the sake of peace, not to interfere in Macedonia. In other words, not to help the Macedonian people free themselves. (Hans Lothar Schteppan).

As we all know, the uprising did not go well and ended in tragedy. All the villages suspected of helping the rebels were destroyed and many people were killed and displaced.

In the aftermath people lost confidence in their ability to free themselves and for the first time began to look to their neighbours to save them.

ACTIONS OF MACEDONIA'S NEIGHBOURS IN MACEDONIA'S INVASION, OCCUPATION AND PARTITION

While the Macedonian people were preparing for an uprising, their neighbours had different plans.

The Macedonian people's loss of confidence in themselves coupled with the weakened defense of the villages, was a victory for Macedonia's neighbours who wasted no time in stepping up their nationalistic propaganda campaigns.

Another little known fact is that after the failed rebellion, the Greek factions in Macedonia allied themselves with the Ottomans and became their eyes and ears in the villages.

As long as they kept the rebels down, people like Karavangelis, the Greek Bishop of Kostur, were given authority to carry out armed attacks on the Macedonian people, such as the one in Zagorichani.

Villages that refused to bend to the will of Karavangelis were viciously attacked and destroyed sometimes with the help of the Ottoman army.

Unable to convince the Macedonian people to peacefully change their allegiance by declaring themselves to be Greeks, Serbians or Bulgarians, their neighbours use armed bands and terror tactics to force them.

It was well known that there were no Greek, Bulgarian, or Serbian ethnicities living in Macedonia but that didn't stop the new Balkan States from inventing them. The wheels of the protagonists were turning when they attempted to kill two birds with one stone by cleverly substituting "ethnicity" for "religious affiliation". By the end of the 19th century the Christian Millet of Ottoman Macedonia was already divided into two millets (the Greek Patriarchist Millet and the Bulgarian Exarchist Millet).

First, since there was no Macedonian Millet there was no "governing body" to represent a Macedonian religious

denomination. Second, since all Christians in Macedonia already belonged to one millet or another, it was easy to make “ethnicity” claims on behalf of “religious affiliation”.

In modern terms all Macedonians belonging to the Patriarchist fold were considered to be Greeks. Similarly all those Macedonians belonging to the Exarchist fold were considered to be Bulgarians.

By introducing Serbian churches and schools, Serbia later used similar tactics to claim the existence of a Serbian ethnicity inside Macedonia.

“Thus by the 1880s a vicious three-way struggle for Macedonia was under way. . . ., the antagonists sought control of Macedonia's cultural and spiritual life through domination of schools, churches the press, and communal organizations. They fought first with propaganda, political pressure, and enormous financial expenditures. Over time, however, and especially after Macedonia's Ilinden Uprising of 1903, they resorted to armed force. All three antagonists sought to terrorize the others and their followers and to win over the Macedonian, population, or rather terrorize it into submission. They aimed variously to annex the entire territory (Bulgaria's plan) or to partition it (Greece and Serbia's later hope).

The Ottoman administration tolerated and tacitly encouraged the competition, in total accord with the basic principle of its state divide and rule in order to survive. In such circumstances Macedonian national consciousness could hardly continue to awaken and grow. With strong pressure from every side -state authority and the other Balkan nationalisms -the young and weak Macedonian movement could barely function and lacked material means and institutional foundations. Even the new but impoverished middle class was vulnerable to the foreign propaganda. As well, the opposition was overwhelmingly strong. Consequently, Macedonian movements could operate only illegally an underground and, until the revolutionary organization emerged in the 1890s, in isolation from its population.

In this post-1870 situation, the ethnically homogeneous, Orthodox Slavic Macedonians experienced an artificial division into three

‘faiths’ attending variously a Bulgarian (Exarchist), Greek (Patriarchist), or Serbian church. And such church affiliation split them into Bulgarian, Greek, and Serbian "nations," or rather "parties." This situation of course, did not necessarily represent assimilation, the acquisition of a particular national consciousness. It only reflected Macedonia's peculiar political reality.

Most Macedonians attended religious services in a language they did not understand; as well, in the 1880s most were illiterate or semi-literate, and into the interwar years many Macedonians would remain so. The vast majority of students at foreign (propaganda) schools received only one to three years of elementary schooling - insufficient even to grasp Bulgarian and Serbian, let alone Greek. Macedonian dialects remained the language of home and everyday life for Macedonians, who continued to identify with them and with the rich folklore and the traditional ways of Macedonia.” (Andrew Rossos, “Macedonia and the Macedonians A History”, Studies of Nationalities, pages 88 & 89)

All Macedonians belonging to the Patriarchist church were given Greek or “Hellenized” names. Similarly, all Macedonians belonging to the Exarchist church were given Bulgarian names. That is why to this day people who fled Macedonia at that time have names ending in “s”, “ff”, or “ch”.

In many instances brothers, born of the same parents, were given different last names because they happened to go to different churches. Their choice of church had nothing to do with loyalty to one faction or the other, but rather with the church’s location relative to home.

Each brother attended the church nearest to his house as he had always done. The sad part was that now with every spoonful of religion came a dose of venomous propaganda. Brother was pitted against brother, one fighting for “Hellenism” and the other for “Bulgarism”.

At the beginning of the Ilinden rebellion most Macedonian villages belonged to the Exarchate Church. With increased Greek activities through Karavangelis and others like him, the tide was turning. The

Greek success was mainly due to the Ottoman-Greek alliance and the Ottoman militia's assistance.

Russia made it clear to all parties that they couldn't invade Macedonia without Russian permission and only if the Ottomans became a threat to the Christian population.

So plans to invade Macedonia were under way, now it was only a matter of time. Macedonia's three neighbours, after forming a series of alliances, on June 1912, with Russian help, formed the "Balkan League of Nations" in preparation of an invasion. The League of Nations in fact was simply a device for synchronizing a military effort against the Ottomans.

When Russia proposed the idea of a "Balkan League of Nations" it was welcome news for Britain, France and Italy. The League was viewed as an anti-German front, a way of ejecting the Ottoman regime from Europe and at the same time, safeguarding (British, French and Italian) interests and expansionary ambitions.

The not so obvious Russian motive for sponsoring the League was to guarantee its own influence in the Balkans perhaps through Serbia or Bulgaria or both.

On October 18th, 1912 Montenegro declared war on Turkey with the League following suit. The battles that ensued were fought almost entirely on Macedonian soil.

The League's plan was to surround the Turkish army in Macedonia and force it out to Constantinople. To everyone's surprise, however, the League won a crushing and unexpected victory in just six weeks.

With the exception of Sandanski and a force of 400 Macedonians who fought back and liberated Melnik and Nevrokop, the League received no opposition from the Macedonians.

In fact the enthusiasm created by the "liberators" not only helped the League fight harder but also encouraged thousands of Macedonians to enlist in the League's armies.

However, as soon as the league armies evicted the Ottomans, the Macedonian people found themselves not liberated but occupied.

“A great terror reigns in Macedonia now. The ‘freedom’ of the allies has no frontiers, no-one from Macedonia has the right to travel outside, to protest or complain before the European states. Whoever disturbs this order is either killed or imprisoned. The allies surround Macedonia with a Chinese Wall...” (Page 145, Radin, IMRO and the Macedonian Question)

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE TREATY OF BUCHAREST WAS DRAFTED

As mentioned earlier, there were no definite plans on how to divide Macedonia since Macedonia never belonged to any of its neighbours. There were no national dividing lines to speak of other than the Patriarchist or Exarchist affiliated villages which existed all over Macedonia. So after the first Balkan War ended, arbitrary borders were set up more or less where the armies stopped their advance.

Serbia was looking to gain access to the Adriatic Sea but Austria-Hungary and Italy saw to it that it didn't by proposing the creation of Albania.

This loss of territory on the Serbian side led to a renewed conflict in the region termed the second Balkan War in 1913 involving Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Rumania.

As a result of this conflict, the original borders proposed after the first Balkan War were shifted and Macedonia was once again arbitrarily partitioned.

According to military historian Dr. Vanche Stojchev, author of the book “Military History of Macedonia” while the Treaty of Bucharest was being drafted in 1913, the occupying armies were still fighting in Macedonia. Every time one side took a hill or a ridge from the others, its military commander telegraphed his counterpart in Bucharest who in turn asked the commission to modify the maps to include the new gains. Says Professor Dr. Vanche Stojchev

I have uncovered various inconsistencies and anomalies in this treaty which would be of interest and importance to the Macedonian people. For example not many people know that the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest was not ratified by Austro-Hungary. Austro-Hungary was the first Great Power in the Balkans. After the signing of the treaty both Russia and Austro-Hungary called for further revisions which were basically ignored. Russia only accepted the treaty because it was pressured by the other Great Powers which in reality means the treaty may not be valid. Says Professor Dr. Vanche Stojchev

The reason why Macedonian institutions are not yet affirming the idea that Macedonian roots extend from the ancient times to today is because everything that was taught in Macedonia up to now had to be politically correct. We were taught a politicized history which catered less to reality and more to political aspects on how history should be viewed. Says Professor Dr. Vanche Stojchev

HOW WERE MACEDONIANS MADE INTO GREEKS, SERBIANS AND BULGARIANS?

In order to prevent future problems, the Great Powers insisted that Macedonia be partitioned along ethnic lines which basically became the blueprint on how to divide Macedonia between Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria. Unfortunately the people of the Balkans under Ottoman rule had no concept of what “ethnicity” was. For many centuries they identified by their religion and language and not by ethnicity. By the 1890’s when nationalism had gripped Macedonia and the Macedonian people began to awaken to their ethnic and national consciousness, Macedonia was already promised to Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria. So rather than supporting the Macedonians in fostering growth in their Macedonian consciousness, the Great Powers allowed Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria through propaganda and armed intervention to suppress it. While Macedonians were busy struggling to free themselves from the Ottoman yoke, Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria were busy publishing demographic statistics of ethnicities in Macedonia to prove to the world how “Greek”, “Serbian”, or “Bulgarian” Macedonia was. These demographic statistics were based purely on “Church Affiliation” and not on ethnicity. In other words, the ethnic identity of a Macedonian was

based on which church he or she attended liturgy. Those attending liturgy in the Greek churches were counted as Greeks, those attending liturgy in the Serbian churches were counted as Serbians and those attending liturgy in the Bulgarian churches were counted as Bulgarians. To increase their numbers Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria each secretly employed armed thugs to scare people into changing churches. Priests affiliated with the opposing church were usually driven out or outright killed.

Unfortunately, even by using church affiliation as a substitute for ethnicity none of the three competitors could muster any regional support. The best they could do was maintain full or partial support at village level. In other words in a cluster of villages most villagers would be of mixed affiliation. Even if entire villages were affiliated with one church or another they would belong to a mixed cluster thus making it very difficult to divide them by any means.

After Macedonia was invaded and occupied by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria in 1912, all three states continued to refer to the Macedonians by their church affiliation calling them “Greek” if they went to the Greek church, “Serbian” if they went to the Serbian church and “Bulgarian” if they went to the Bulgarian church. But after each state consolidated its power over Macedonian territories, Macedonians belonging to the competitors’ churches were forced to change church affiliation or “get out”. Many were driven out and exiled.

This practice of identifying Macedonians by their church affiliation continued even outside of Macedonia. That is why we have western authors referring to Macedonians as Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians.

Modern Greeks today claim there are no Macedonians in the Greek province of Macedonia!