

*Who are the Modern
Greeks?*



A Novel

By
Risto Stefov

Who are the Modern Greeks?

A Novel

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 © 2012 by Risto Stefov

e-book edition

Index

| | |
|---|-----|
| Index | 3 |
| Part 1 - Introduction | 4 |
| Part 2 – Who are the Modern Greeks? | 9 |
| Part 3 - Where did modern Greeks come from? | 13 |
| Part 4 - Why Greece and not Arvanitovlachia? | 19 |
| Part 5 - Why did the Europeans need a Greece? | 24 |
| Part 6 – On the way to Hellenism | 29 |
| Part 7 - Twenty Authors can't all be wrong! | 34 |
| Part 8 - Connecting the Past with the Present | 40 |
| Part 9 – Language Religion and Identity | 46 |
| Part 10 - Why expose the Greek Fraud? | 50 |
| Part 11 - The curse of Hellenism | 56 |
| Part 12 – Is there a Misunderstanding? | 60 |
| Part 13 – What is Greece up to? | 64 |
| Part 14 – My personal Opinion | 68 |
| Part 15 – More questions | 73 |
| Part 16 – On to Macedonia | 78 |
| Part 17 – Education | 84 |
| Part 18 – Assimilation | 91 |
| Part 19 - Fifty authors can't still all be wrong! | 97 |
| Part 20 – The Macedonian Party? | 107 |
| Part 21 – Baiting the Trap | 113 |
| Part 22 – The Greek Macedonians | 117 |
| Part 23 – The Need for Intelligence Gathering | 122 |
| Part 24 - The Walls are closing in | 126 |
| Part 25 – Reacting to Rumours | 131 |
| Part 26 – The Unconvinced | 138 |
| Part 27 – Time to Stand Up | 145 |
| Part 28 – Twenty-five more authors | 149 |
| Part 29 – My fascination with Greeks? | 156 |
| Part 30 – Who writes my books? | 162 |
| Part 31 – Ilinden 1903 | 167 |
| Part 32 – Conclusion | 176 |

Part 1 - Introduction

Dear Macedonians, one way to defend ourselves from the Greek onslaught and gain back our identity and dignity is to fight back to the level to which the Greeks have reduced us; that is to attack their identity as they have attacked ours. We need prove nothing to them except to expose them as the artificial identity they truly are and to uncover their design to wipe us out in order to usurp our Macedonian heritage.

There are some who say the 1903 Macedonian Ilinden Uprising was one of the greatest Rebellions Europe has witnessed since the French Revolution (Giorgio Nurigiani, "Macedonia Yesterday and Today") yet there are others today who adamantly claim that Macedonians don't exist.

If we are to take these people seriously we not only need to examine their claims but we need to understand their motives for making such claims.

Modern Greeks, who in 1912, 1913 acquired Macedonian territories by conquest and imperial means, claim not only that Macedonians don't exist but that Macedonia is Greek for historic reasons.

For modern Greeks to make such claims they will need to provide evidence to (1) prove that Macedonia does not belong to the people that were living on it before Greece annexed it in 1913 and (2) prove that the modern Greeks are indeed the rightful heirs of Macedonian lands.

The purpose of this book is to examine the legitimacy of the Modern Greek claim that "Macedonia is Greek". To do that we will need to examine (1) who are the modern Greeks and (2) why is their claim, as they put it, "the only valid claim?"

When Greeks say that "Macedonia is Greek" do they mean all of geographic and historic Macedonia or just the part that was annexed by Greece in 1913?

If they mean only the part of Macedonia that was annexed by Greece then we need to examine how Greece acquired it. There is plenty of historic evidence to highlight how Greece acquired Macedonian territories between Macedonia's invasion in 1912 and the conclusion of the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest. Evidence shows that the Macedonian lands acquired by Greece were acquired by war and arbitrary means which has nothing to do with historic claims.

If however all of geographic and historic Macedonia is claimed to be Greek then Modern Greeks will have to show additional proof as to (1) why they did not register their claims during the signing of the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest and (2) why they willingly allowed Serbia and Bulgaria to take 49% of Macedonian territories.

The reality is that 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 in 1912 arbitrary borders were set up more or less where the invading foreign armies stopped their advance.

Serbia was looking to gain access to the Adriatic Sea but Austria-Hungary and Italy prevented that by proposing the creation of Albania. This loss of territory on the Serbian side led to renewed conflict in the region sparking the second Balkan War involving Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania.

As a result of this, 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.

Professor Dr. Vanche Stojchev uncovered various inconsistencies and anomalies in the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest 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 even be valid.

"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.

However, before Modern Greeks can answer questions like "Why is Macedonia Greek?" they will need to answer the ultimate question and that is "What makes their claim legitimate?" On what basis can Modern Greeks say that Macedonia belongs to them instead of to the people who were already living there before Greece annexed it?

Here Modern Greeks will need to prove their inheritance rights above and beyond those of the indigenous people already living in Macedonia. But in order to have such legitimate rights, that is above the rights of the indigenous people, Modern Greeks will have to show that they possess a continuous Greek lineage that extends beyond that of the indigenous people living in Macedonia.

To prove that this "continuous" Greek lineage exists, we will need to examine historic evidence prior to and leading up to the creation of the Modern Greek state. In other words we need to know more about the

Modern Greeks and their existence before the Greek state was created in 1829.

Modern Greeks have already registered their claims about Macedonia and the Macedonians. Their claims can basically be summarized as follows;

1. According to official Greece; Macedonians do not exist.
2. According to official Greece; Macedonia, particularly the Republic of Macedonia, is occupied by Slavs who came to Macedonia during the 6th century AD.
3. According to official Greece; the Modern Macedonian ethnicity is a modern creation, created by Tito.
4. Although they have not specified which part(s) of Macedonia, according to official Greece; Macedonia is Greek and has always been Greek.

If we analyze these claims then, based on Greek logic alone, we can conclude that the people living in Macedonia are Slavs who came to Macedonia during the 6th century AD. So in effect the Modern Macedonians, or “Slavs” as the Greeks like to call them, according to Greek claims, have been living on Macedonian lands for say 1,500 years?

Now based on the above, Modern Greeks will have to show that they have legitimate claims to Macedonian lands that extend more than 1,500 years. That means that Modern Greeks will have to prove that their ancestors owned Macedonian lands prior to the 6th century AD. Naturally if they want to be taken seriously, modern Greeks will need to prove that they are the rightful heirs of those lands. I will be more than willing to accept continuity of the nation’s culture, traditions and language. In other words, did the Greeks of the 19th century prior to the creation of the Modern Greek state share a similar culture, similar traditions and a similar language with the Greeks of 1,500 years ago?

Let us begin by looking at the culture, tradition and language of the Modern Greeks of the 19th century.

Sir Charles Eliot in his book “Turkey in Europe” on page 267 says: “It would be amazing if the people who are now called Greeks are of the physical types as what are styled Ancient Greeks, which generally means the inhabitants of Athens and Sparta. The Greeks have spread around the Aegean and Black Seas, and come into contact with the inhabitants of the littoral. The Macedonian Empire must have had a large non-Hellenic substratum. Constantinople and all Continental Greece were for centuries ruled by Romans, and during many subsequent centuries invaded and colonized by Slavs. The Crusades and Latin conquests brought a large influx of western Europeans, commonly called Franks; and in later times, extensive Albanian settlements were made in Greek districts. Clearly the Modern Greek must be of very mixed blood.”

Again Sir Charles Eliot in his book “Turkey in Europe” on page 299 says: “It must be confessed that, though the Greeks showed more energy

than any other Christian race, those who now remain in Turkey (except the islanders) are not remarkable for physical vigour or military capacity. This, is no doubt, partly due to the fact that the people who revolted against Mahmud were largely Hellenized Vlachs and Albanians, who, under the modern system would, not be regarded as Greeks. Nowadays the robust agricultural population is rarely Hellenic in its sympathies, for, as already mentioned, there are comparatively few parts where it is really Greek.”

So, what is Sir Charles Eliot trying to tell us about the Modern Greek towards the creation of the Modern Greek state?

For starters he is telling us that the so-called “Greek” of the 19th century had very few to none of the traits of the ancient Greeks from 1,500 years ago. He is also telling us that the 19th century so-called Greeks were not really Greeks at all but Hellenized Albanians and Vlachs. In other words, they were Albanians and Vlachs made to feel like they were Greeks.

Lucy M. J. Garnett in her book “Greece of the Hellenes” published in 1914 on page 31 says: “The height standard for the Greek army is nominally 5 feet 1 inch the average Hellene by no means being a tall man. Nor is this standard rigidly adhered to, for a recruit is not rejected on the score of height, if certified physically fit in other respects. Some of the hardest soldiers are recruits among the Albanians and pastoral Koutso-Vlachs of Thessaly who form an important contingent.”

Lucy M. J. Garnett in her book “Greece of the Hellenes” published in 1914 on page 33 speaking about the dress of the Greek Royal Guard says: “His feet are shod with Albanian red leather shoes the upturned, pointed toes of which are finished with woolen turfs.”

Lucy M. J. Garnett in her book “Greece of the Hellenes” published in 1914 on page 33 and 34 also says: “All Greek soldiers are required to be able to read and write, and if a conscript on joining has not already acquired those rudiments of education, he is put to school. Notwithstanding the educational efforts of the Government as many as 30 percent proved fifteen years ago or so to be completely illiterate, which not more than 25 percent had advanced beyond the ‘three R’s’. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that these conscripts include both Albanians from the settlements in Attica and other parts of the Kingdom and pastoral Koutso-Vlachs, all of whom habitually speak their own dialects, and learn Greek only as a foreign tongue.”

So what is Lucy M. J. Garnett telling us about the Greeks of the 19th century?

Here again Lucy M. J. Garnett is giving us evidence that the so-called Greeks of the 19th century were not really Greeks but Albanians and Vlachs. In other words, the immediate ancestors of today’s Greeks were not really Greeks at all!

My aim in this book is to show that Modern Greeks are not only NOT entitled to the Macedonian heritage, but they should not even be entitled to

be called Greeks. Underneath the highly polished “Modern Greek veneer” hides an artificially created nation constructed from the bones and ashes of the Macedonian, Albanian, Vlach and Turkish cultures that once flourished on those lands.

Part 2 – Who are the Modern Greeks?

According to official Greece, Macedonia, particularly the Republic of Macedonia, is occupied by Slavs who came to Macedonia during the 6th century AD. Neither justified nor proven, this claim is used by Greece to negate the Macedonian identity and deny the Macedonian people their human rights. By this Greece is in violation of international norms and standards particularly in regards to the freedom of Macedonians to self identify.

If the Macedonians are “Slavs” as Greeks claim then what are the Greeks, particularly in view that they both existed side by side as neighbours without borders for over 2,000 years?

How will the Modern Greek identity stack up to the Modern Macedonian identity if placed side by side?

Before answering the above questions however let’s examine “Who are the Modern Greeks?”

Edward Blaquiére Esq. author of the book “The Greek Revolution; Its Origin and Progress” on page 21 says: “Among the numerous islands of the Aegean, arise several barren rocks, some of which are however gifted by nature with small and commodious heavens. Of this number are Hydra Spezzia and Ipsara, the two first close to the Eastern shore of the Peloponnesus, and the later not far from Scio, on the Asiatic coast. Tyranny and Want had driven some families, whose origin like that of nearly all the peasants, who inhabited proper Greece, was Albanian, to take refuge on the desolate crags, where they built villages, and sought a precarious existence by fishing.”

What is Edward Blaquiére trying to tell us in regards to the origins of the Modern Greeks, “whose origin like that of nearly all the peasants, who inhabited proper Greece, was Albanian”. By the words of Edward Blaquiére nearly all the peasants inhabiting “proper” Greece were Albanian!

William St. Clair author of the book “That Greece Might Still Be Free” on page 9 says: “The Roman Catholic Greeks, who lived in the islands which had been under Venetian or Genoese rule, regarded themselves as a separate community. The Albanians of Hydra and Spetsae, many of whom could not even speak Greek, regarded themselves as Greek because their allegiance was to the Orthodox Church.”

William St. Clair says “The Albanians of Hydra and Spetsae regarded themselves as Greek” which implies that the Modern Greeks living in Hydra and Spetsae have Albanian origins.

Constantinos Pappariopolous in “History of the Hellenic Nation” on page 73 says: “The concept of the ‘Hellenic’ state as elaborated in Western Europe presupposed that this was to be the heir of the Ancient Greek (Hellenic) world. Since it occupied the same territory and this territory has been liberated after the uprising of the Christian populations claiming to be

their descendants, it should -it was assumed- share the same culture and the same language as its ancient ancestors. Indeed, the newly born 'Hellenic' state originally based its legitimacy on this heritage. However, it had to undertake a difficult struggle to convince European public opinion of the validity of its claims. Moreover, the German historian Jacob Philip Fallmerayer argued that the ancient Greeks had been annihilated during the Slavic invasions of the Greek lands and the creation of new settlements in the seventh century AD. By this account the so called Neo-Hellenes were nothing more than a mixture of Slavic and Albanian populations."

Here again we have references that the Modern Greek or Neo-Hellenic population living in the region where the Peloponnesus is today was once a mixture of Slavs and Albanians.

Ironically and despite the 20th century adjustments of borders, Modern Greeks today do not hesitate to call their northern neighbours "Slavs" but adamantly reject Jacob Philip Fallmerayer's arguments which imply that they too are the descendants of Slavs.

In the book "The Vlachs: The History of a Balkan People", on pages 124 and 125, T. J. Winifrith says: "There are two other difficulties involved in the Turkish period. In tracing the movements of merchandise and men in the Balkan peninsula it is extremely difficult to differentiate the various races involved. Western travelers knew little, Turkish authorities cared less. Even the polyglot Vlachs themselves neither knew nor cared a great deal and until the rise of national consciousness at the end of the eighteenth century were probably happy with the label of Greek which was good enough for outside observers."

In the book "The Vlachs: The History of a Balkan People", on page 139, T. J. Winifrith says: "One of Greece's first and best Prime Ministers was John Kolettis, a Vlach who dressed like a Turk and had been court physician to Ali Pasha."

Speaking about 19th century migrations in the Balkans, in the book "The Vlachs: The History of a Balkan People", on pages 119 and 120, T. J. Winifrith says: "Elsewhere there is a further source of confusion with massive immigration of Albanians into Greece."

In telling the story of the Vlachs, T. J. Winifrith gives us important clues as to the true identity of Modern Greeks. In the days when Modern Greece was molded into a nation Vlachs, a Latin speaking people, and Albanians were the primary sources of raw materials for the "making" of the Modern Greeks.

In the "Popular Science Monthly" edited by J. McKeen Cattell, published in 1915 on pages 41 and 42 we read: "Most of the old Greek race has been swept away, and the country is now inhabited by persons of Slavonic descent. Indeed there is a strong ground for the statement that there was more of the heroic blood of Hellas in the Turkish army of Edhem Pasha than in the soldiers of King George."

In the “Popular Science Monthly” edited by J. McKeen Cattell, published in 1915 on page 42 we also read: “The Modern Greek has been called a ‘Byzantine Slav.’ King George himself and Constantine his son are only aliens placed on the Grecian throne to suit the convenience of outer powers, being in fact descendants of tribes which to the ancient Greeks were merely Barbarians.”

Here we are told by Popular Science Monthly that not only have the ancient so-called Greeks disappeared and been replaced by persons of Slavonic descent but that even the rulers of Modern Greece are aliens.

In the “Encyclopedia Britannica” published in 1910 on page 465 in the History of Greece section we read: “In 1715 the Ottomans with a large disciplined army set themselves to recover the Morea [later renamed the Peloponnesus], the Venetians were left without support from the Greeks. The peninsula was rapidly recaptured and by the Peace of Passarowitz (1718) again became a Turkish dependency. The gaps left about this time in the Greek population were largely made up by an immigration from Albania.”

I have been told by several Greeks to “read the encyclopedia” and educate myself on the true history of Greece. So following their advice I looked up the 1910 version of Encyclopedia Britannica and lo and behold it corroborates the story that the early 19th century Modern Greek population is Albanian. It also tells us that old Greece, more commonly known as Morea, a Slav word for “ocean”, was occupied by the Venetians.

In “Greece of the Hellenes” by Lucy M. J. Garnett on page 32 we read: “The Athenian women are neither beautiful nor well made; they have neither the physiognomy of French women, nor the full beauty of the Roman dames, nor the pale white delicacy of the Turkish women—one sees nothing in the town but ugly creatures with broad noses, flat feet and ill-formed waists. It is because Athens, twenty five years ago, was only an Albanian village. The Albanians formed and still form, almost the whole of the population of Attica; and within three leagues of the capital, villages are to be found where Greek is hardly understood. Athens has been rapidly peopled with men of all kinds and nations; that explains the ugliness of the Athenian type.”

Here Lucy M. J. Garnett comes out with it and spares us no details. Athens, at Modern Greece’s humble beginning, the seat of Modern and Ancient Greek-Dom, the pinnacle of Greek pride and glory in the 19th century was nothing more than an “Albanian village”.

Albanians, Vlachs, Slavs? Where are the so-called Greeks, descendants of the ancient Greeks, inheritors of the ancient Greek and Macedonian heritage?

We don’t need to look too far or scratch too deep from the surface to find irregularities with the Greek identity. Even with the scant evidence presented from only half a dozen sources we can see that the Modern Greek identity is not what it seems. So, how dare they [Modern Greeks]

challenge our Macedonian identity when their [Modern Greek] identity is artificial at best?

Dear Macedonians, pay no attention to Modern Greek allegations because Modern Greeks are NOT really who they say they are. Modern Greeks are NOT the descendents of the so-called Ancient Greeks as they portray themselves to be. The so-called Ancient Greeks may have been who the world was told they were, which is yet to be proven, but they disappeared a long time ago. I can tell you with much certainty that the Modern Greeks are NOT their descendants. The Modern Greeks are nothing more than imposters and usurpers of the Ancient City State heritage. The only thing they have in common with the ancients is that they happened to live on the same lands.

Dear Macedonians do not “negotiate” our sacred biblical name, our symbols and our Macedonian historical heritage with these usurpers and charlatans.

We would not have to resort to this had Greece done the right thing and recognized the Macedonian people as Macedonians and provided them their human rights as prescribed by International Law. But No, we have to do this the hard way by dredging up the ugly Greek past! It’s never too late however for Greece to do the right thing!

Part 3 - Where did modern Greeks come from?

In chapter 2 of this book we established that prior to and during the creation of the Greek state in the early 1800's the majority of the population living on Greek lands was predominantly of Albanian, Vlach and Slav origin, which leads to the question "Where from and when did these Albanians, Vlachs and Slavs come to Greece and what happened to the indigenous population living on those lands?"

Modern Greeks claim that they are the descendents of the so-called Ancient Greeks. Is this fact or fiction?

We will begin the investigation with the "Popular Science Monthly" edited by J. McKeen Cattell, published in 1915. The Popular Science Monthly on page 41 reads: "Once Greece led the world in intellectual pursuits, in art, in poetry, in philosophy. A large and vital part of European culture is rooted directly in the language and thought of Athens. The most beautiful edifice in the world was the Peace Palace of the Parthenon, erected by Pericles, to celebrate the end of Greece's suicidal wars. This endured 2,187 years to be wrecked at last (1687) in Turkish hands by the Christian bombs of the Venetian Republic.

But the glory of Greece had passed away long before the fall of the Parthenon. Its cause was the one cause of all such downfalls – the extinction of strong men by war. At the best, the civilization of Greece was built on slavery, one freeman to ten slaves. And when the freemen were destroyed, the slaves an original Mediterranean stock, overspread the territory of Hellas along with the Bulgarians, Albanians and Vlachs, barbarians crowding down from the north."

So, what is the writer of the Popular Science Monthly from 1915 trying to tell us here? For one he or she is telling us that at the best of times; that would mean during the classics, Greece was predominantly populated by slaves and when the City States fell to the Romans the so-called ancient Greeks were numbering one freeman to ten slaves. So even before the turn of the new millennium the classical Greeks had vanished and were replaced by the slaves they once employed. Furthermore, the author is telling us that the glory of the so-called Ancient Greeks had passed away, died long before the Venetians occupied Greece in 1687. So where is the cultural and ancestral connection between the ancients and the moderns? Does it really exist?

Again looking at page 42 of the "Popular Science Monthly" we read: "It is maintained that the Modern Greeks are in the main the descendants of the population that inhabited Greece in the earlier of Byzantine rule. Owing to the operations of various causes, historical, social and economic, that population was composed of many heterogeneous elements and represented in very limited degree the race which repulsed the Persians and built the Parthenon. The internecine conflicts in the Greek community, wars with foreign powers, and the deadly struggles of factions in the

various cities had to a large extent obliterated the old race of free citizens by the beginning of the Roman period. The extermination of the Plateans by the Spartans and of the Melians by the Athenians during the Peloponnesian wars, the proscription of the Athenian citizens after the war, the massacre of the Corcyrean oligarchs by the democratic party, the slaughter of the Thebans by Alexander and of the Corinthians by Mummius are among the more familiar instances of the catastrophe which overtook the civil element in the Greek cities. The void can only have been filled from the ranks of the metics and resident aliens and of the descendants of the far more numerous slave population. In the classic period four-fifths of the population of Attica were slaves; of the remainder half were metics. In AD 100 only three thousand arm-bearing men were in Greece. (James Bouchier)”

James Bouchier here reaffirms the fact that the so-called Ancient Greeks disappeared a long time ago and the void was filled by the numerous slaves they employed which at the time consisted of 80% of the total population.

Looking further down on page 42 of the “Popular Science Monthly” we read: “The constant little struggles of the Greeks among themselves made no great showing as to numbers compared to other wars, but they wiped out the most valuable people, the best blood the most promising heredity on earth. This cost the world more than the killing of millions of barbarians. In two centuries there were born under the shadow of the Parthenon more men of genius than the Roman Empire had in its whole existence. Yet this empire included all the civilized world, even Greece herself. (La Pouge)”

La Pouge here confirms what many others believed; the so-called Ancient Greeks were wiped out a long time ago.

At the bottom of page 42 of the “Popular Science Monthly” we read: “The downfall of Greece, like that of Rome, has been ascribed by Schultz to the crossing of the Greeks by the barbaric races which flocked into Hellas from every side. These resident aliens, or metics, steadily increased in numbers as the free Greeks disappeared. Selected slaves or helots were then made free in order to furnish fighting men, and again as these fell their places were taken by immigrants.”

Here again Schultz validates the fact that the so-called Ancient Greeks disappeared a long time ago and were replaced by aliens, slaves and immigrants. But who were these immigrants and where did they come from?

To get some answers to these questions we will examine the book “Customs and Lore of Modern Greece” by Rennell Rodd published in 1892. Rennell Rodd on page 17 writes: “Those who adopted the creed of their conquerors, in order to escape from these indignities, as did a large portion of the inhabitants of Euboea, and subsequently of Crete lost their national character, and, becoming Mussulman, practically ceased to be

Greek; indeed, from the time of the Ottoman conquest the question of nationality is largely merged in the opposition of creeds. Sultan Mohammed II appears to have foreseen a safeguard against future insurrection in draining the resources of the country, and literally exhausting its population; and he re-peopled the vanquished Constantinople by transferring to the city the wealthiest inhabitants of the lands he subsequently reduced. Slavery awaited the Venetian subjects of Modon and Nauplia when they fell into his hands in 1463, and a similar fate befell a number of the natives of Euboea in 1470. The Ionian were called upon to yield their quota to the re-population of Constantinople, and a number of slaves were drawn from Rhodes in 1480. In the last year of the 15th century and the opening of the 16th, when the Morea was again the battle-field of Turk and Venetian, the occupants of the plains of Argos and of portions of Attica were practically exterminated, and Albanian colonists began to re-occupy the ruined lands. In the following century the Ottoman admiral, Barbarossa, carried off the female inhabitants of Aegina into slavery, and massacred the males, leaving the island entirely depopulated until it was re-colonized by Albanians. He reduced the majority of the Aegean islands to subjection, expelled the Italian nobles and said to have carried off 30,000 Greeks into slavery.”

So what is Rennell Rodd telling us about the Modern Greeks and their true origins? Well, for one, he confirms what others are saying, that is, the original Greeks that inhabited the Greek islands and the mainland of Greece proper vanished a long time ago. Some converted to Islam and the rest were taken into slavery. He is also telling us that the vacant lands left behind were settled and colonized by Albanians.

It is interesting to note here that most of the Greek nobility was taken to Constantinople and no doubt Islamized to maintain loyalty. If that were the case and we have no reason to doubt it, then the question that begs to be asked is “Who is more Greek, the descendants of the Modern Turks of Constantinople or the Modern Greeks of Greece proper?” It makes one wonder!

According to Rennell Rodd however, one thing is certain and that is that there is very little that connects the Modern Greeks with the Ancient so-called Greeks and plenty of evidence that connects the Modern Greeks with the Albanians!

Let us see what else Rennell Rodd has to say. On pages 18 and 19 of his book “Customs and Lore of Modern Greece” published in 1892, Rennell Rodd goes on to say: “Meanwhile, the deserted lands were gradually occupied by Christian Albanians moving south before the wave of Turkish advance. Their earlier immigrants are lost in the silence of time, but the first recorded mention of their appearance in Peloponnesus occurs in the middle of the 14th century, when Manuel Kantacuzen brought Albanian mercenaries to Mistra, and later established colonies in the peninsula. Again, at the close of the 14th century in the reign of [Byzantine

Emperor] John Paleologus, some 10,000 of them crossed the Isthmus, and in later days of the despots of the Morea they are found serving as mercenaries in their armies. The immigration continued through the 15th century, after the final reduction of Albania by the Turks. They occupied the greater part of Boetia, Attica and Megaris, portion of the Corinthian territory, of Argolis and Achaia, as well as small districts of in Phocis, Elis, and Archadia...”

Here again we find evidence of Albanians occupying deserted Greek lands as early as the 14th century. Even the Byzantine Emperors had a hand in re-colonizing Greece with Albanians. Then later during the Ottoman invasion of Albania we have even more Albanians invading and occupying Greek territories.

In view of what we have read so far, we can see a clear pattern developing which indicates without a doubt that as the so-called Ancient Greeks disappeared from Greek lands, they were replaced by predominantly Albanian immigrants who no doubt are the ancestors of today's modern Greeks.

I use the reference “so-called Ancient Greeks” because as we earlier learned from “Popular Science Monthly” edited by J. McKean Cattell, published in 1915, the Greek population that survived the Roman invasions and occupation were predominantly the Slaves of the Ancient Greeks. So when we make reference to the so-called Ancient Greeks in the 14th century AD, we are talking about the descendents of the Slaves who served the Ancient Greeks. So you see the so-called Greek lineage was already watered down even before the Slav, Vlach and Albanian migrations into Greek lands.

Speaking of Vlachs and Slavs, let us see what T. J. Winnifrith has to say? On page 119 in his book “The Vlachs The History of a Balkan People”, T. J. Winnifrith writes: “In the area where Vlachs as opposed to Romanians now live there is no shortage of reference to Vlachs after the breakdown of Byzantine authority. Choniates describing the Bulgarian revolt mentions a Vlach Chrysos setting up an independent principality in near Strumitsa and calls Thessaly ‘Great Vlachia’. [Byzantine Emperor] Andronicus I in an edict 1184 refers confusingly to Bulgars, Cumans and Vlachs in the Meglen with the Vlachs receiving preferential treatment. In 1221 the Bishop of Naupaktos, John Apokaukos, refers to the injuries suffered by Simeon Sgouropoulos and his daughter at the hands of Avriolines Constantinos, a colonist of the Romans, whom people today call the Vlachs. This piece of evidence would seem to indicate a Vlach presence in Aetolia, especially as Constantinos with his Latin sounding first name (a corruption of Aurelian) had plenty of his race to support him. This evidence is sighted in an article by P. Nasturel which is a useful summary of Medieval Vlach history from the Romanian point of view. It is interesting that we have a definite indication that the Vlachs were seen as the descendants of the Romans, although it is just possible that Vlachs

on the sea coast of Greece might be Dalmatian-speakers. Nasturel rather weakens his case by mentioning the people who call themselves Romans, cited by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who are certainly Dalmatians and by drawing attention to the reference in about 1165 by the priest of Dioclea to Morlachs, black Latins, who used to call themselves Romans. This may be a reference to Dalmatians, although the etymology of Morlachs, from Mavrovlachoi shows a greater contact with Greece than most Dalmatians would have had, and we must not forget the fondness of Modern Vlachs for black clothes.”

On pages 120 and 121 in his book “The Vlachs The History of a Balkan People”, T. J. Winnifrith also writes: “As in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when there was much Albanian activity at a time the Ottoman Empire was losing its authority, so in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the breakdown of Byzantine authority lead to movements by both Vlachs and Albanians into Greece. These movements parallel earlier waves of invasions by Slavs on the breakdown of East Roman authority in the seventh century and by Dorians or north-western Greeks in the twelfth century B.C. after the collapse of the Mycenaean civilization. The details of all four movements of populations are obscure. There was bound to be much intermingling between races. Some Byzantine verses at the end of the fourteenth century describe Momicila a Bulgaralbanotovlachos, and slightly later we hear of one Boncoes a Serbalbanitovulgarovlachos. Modern polyglot Vlachs had polyglot ancestors.

Throughout the fourteenth century Vlachs are hard to distinguish from Albanians. The first mention of the Albanian language is not until 1285. According to John Kantakouzenos some people who lived in no town but inaccessible places in the mountains of Thessaly submitted in 1334 to the [Byzantine] Emperor Andronicus III. They were Albanians with no King, called after their tribal chiefs, Malakasaii, Bouii and Masaritae. But these were probably Vlachs; there were in Pouqueville’s time Vlachs in the Pindus who called themselves Bovi, and there is still a village called Malakasi. Elsewhere we hear of the Albanian leader Peter Leosas, leading Malakasii of his own race, and this would seem to suggest two kinds of Malakasii. The name may derive from the coastal plain of Malekastir, a word of Latin origin, in central Albania. The theory that the Bouii came from the nearby highland pasture of the Bevaei is more conjectural. Together with the Albanians the Vlachs penetrated to central and Southern Greece. We hear of Vlachs in Attica, Kephallenia and Crete, although in these instances and in the place names with Vlach elements which can be found as far south as the Peloponnesus there maybe confusions between Vlachs or shepherds and Albanians.”

Even though there is much too much detail for my purpose, I decided to include T. J. Winnifrith’s above two quotes for those who maybe interested in further pursuing this study. T. J. Winnifrith does however

answer the question “Where from and when did these Albanians, Vlachs and Slavs come to Greece?” to a comfortable degree to reach another conclusion and that is not only are the Modern Greeks not the descendants of the Ancient Greeks but their origins can be traced in the Albanian and Vlach immigrants who were not even from Greece proper. So how does that make them the descendants of the Ancient Greeks? It does not!

After reading T. J. Winnifrith’s quotes above I am beginning to understand why Greeks throughout the Ottoman period right up to the time when Greece was created, correctly referred to themselves as “Romaioi” (Romans). Being partially the descendants of the Vlachs who in turn are the descendants of the Romans, naturally made them feel like Romans, thus their name “Romaioi”. This understood, then why did the Modern Greeks opt for being called “Greeks” and “Hellenes” and tied themselves to the Ancient Greek Heritage when they are not Greeks at all? A subject for my next chapter!

Part 4 - Why Greece and not Arvanitovlachia?

“This unique nation-state [Greece] would represent the ultimate achievement of the Hellenic ideal and, as such, would lead all Europe to the highest levels of culture yet known.” (Michael Herzfeld)

In chapters 2 and 3 of this book we established that prior to and during the creation of the Greek state in the early 1800's the majority of the population living on Greek lands was predominantly immigrant, mostly of Albanian, Vlach and Slav origins, which had settled in Greece to fill the void created by the disappearance of the so-called ancient Greeks. This leads us to the question “Why was this region not called ‘Arvanitovlachia’ which would have correctly represented the land’s demography? Why Greece, a Latin name, and not Arvanitovlachia an appropriate name to represent the two distinct ethnic identities which lived on those lands at that time?”

Although a difficult question to answer, in view of the Modern Greeks who have for the last 200 years tried to bury all evidence of their true past, the best response would be to say that ‘the people living in Greece at the time of their independence were not given a choice to self identify’. When Greece was first created in the early 1800's the population was neither asked nor involved in any kind of self-identification. Unlike the Macedonian people who in 1991 participated in a free referendum which enabled them to self identify and gain independence, the people of Greece were not given that choice! In essence the decision to call the newly created state “Greece” solely rested with foreigners and academics who, instead of calling the new state by its true representative demographic, opted for calling it “Greece” so that they could connect it with a world and culture that had died more than 2,000 years before.

In this chapter we are going to discover the reasons why Greece was named Greece and not Arvanitovlachia or some other name that would have appropriately connected the land with the current people.

We so readily use the word “Ancient Greece” and “Ancient Greeks” to refer to a place and a people in the classical period (about 600 BC to 300 BC) without realizing that the terms “Greece” and “Greeks” are of Latin origin which probably came into use sometime after the 1st century BC and were popularized during the 19th century.

The reason I mention this is because today Greece, without any justification, objects to the Macedonian peoples’ use of the name Macedonia to refer to their country on the grounds that the name “Macedonia”, for historic reasons, belongs to the Greeks. To which Greeks does the name “Macedonia” belong? Is it to the so-called Ancient Greeks whose very name is not only of non-Greek origin but given to those people by the Latins after they disappeared from the face of this earth? Or does the name “Macedonia” belong to the Arvanitovlachs, the immigrants who over the centuries came to live on those lands? Or does the name

“Macedonia” belong to the modern imposters who go by the name of “Greeks”?

Why Greece and not Arvanitovlachia? To find the answers to this questions we will first look at segments of William St. Clair’s book, “That Greece Might Still Be Free” which appeared in my series of articles called “William St. Clair on 19th century Greece and the Modern Greeks”, at: <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/82531> and <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/82785>)

According to St. Clair “To be Greek was to be a drunkard, a lecher, and, especially, a cheat.”

But later by the seventeenth century, as more information was uncovered about a people who once lived on those lands, a new picture began to emerge. In time Europeans, without ever having been to Greece, came to believe that the Ancient and Modern Greeks were one and the same. As more information came out, especially after Lord Byron visited Greece in 1809 and 1810, and, on his return, published the first two cantos of Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage, the legend of a place called “Ancient Greece” and a people called “Ancient Greeks” began to grow and spread like wildfire. Besides experiencing Greece for himself, Byron had also read and drew on the many travel books in the works of dozens of earlier writers in prose and in verse which helped him compose some of his best work described as best-sellers. At least twelve editions of his poem were printed between 1812 and 1821 and it was translated into several European languages.

Byron’s work prompted more travelers to visit “Greece” but very few were equipped to make more than superficial observations. That, however, did not stop them from making generalizations and expanding the myth surrounding these so-called “Greeks”. As the idea of a “Greece” and “Greeks” grew it was romanticized by more and more writers. Many without ever having visited “Greece” shamelessly drew on the work of others and raised this mythical “Greece” into legendary status.

By 1770 the legend became so real that the few writers who questioned it were dismissed as cranks.

Again according to St. Clair, “With the advent of Byron, literary philhellenism became a widespread European movement. Hosts of imitators copied his rhetorical verses, and travelers who visited Greece after the appearance of Childe Harold in 1812 were even more enthusiastic than their predecessors.

By the time of the Greek Revolution in 1821 the educated public in Europe had been deeply immersed in three attractive ideas;

1. that Ancient Greece had been a paradise inhabited by supermen;
2. that the Modern Greeks were the true descendants of the Ancient Greeks; and
3. that a war against the Turks could somehow ‘regenerate’ the Modern Greeks and restore the former glories.”

So even before the so-called “Modern Greeks” had a chance to discover who they truly were and to decide what to call themselves and their little country, the outside world had made that decision for them. They were going to be called “Greeks”, the embodiment of the “Ancient Greeks” and their little country was going to be called “Greece”.

Not everyone however believed in these ideas but in Western Europe where philhellenism flourished the deed was done. But as St. Clair tells us, “The responsibility for turning philhellenism into a political programme belongs to the Greeks themselves.

The impetus came from the Greeks overseas.”

By late eighteenth century colonies of people who came from the region that later became known as “Greece” and settled in Europe had become largely integrated into Western European culture. It was these people who naturally embraced the literary tradition of philhellenism and later built on it.

As Michael Herzfeld in his book “Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the making of Modern Greece” on pages 4 and 5 tells us: “By the nineteenth century, Classical scholars had come to pride themselves on a remarkable degree of academic perfectionism, but their views were clearly as much a matter of intellectual fashion as ever. A frankly critical American observer of nineteenth-century European scholarship decried not only the English scholars' ‘limp Grecism,’ as evidenced in the excessively ‘scented, wholesale sweetness of the modern aesthetic school in England,’ but also the Germans' use of Greek' ‘as a stalking-horse for Teutonic psychology’ and their grave concern with minutiae. Scholars of the two nations resembled each other, he thought, ‘in but a single trait—the conviction that they understand Greece’ (Chapman 1915: 12-13). Nor was this acid commentator entirely free of any such conviction about himself, to judge from the tone of these remarks. And so, presumably, it will go on. New truths will yield to still newer truths about the same basic idea, the vision of Classical Greece—the source, in a commonly held view, of the very practice of historical writing itself. Such changes in perception are of interest here for two reasons. First, they show that through all the divergent interpretations there runs a common theme: the idea of Hellas as the cultural exemplar of Europe. And, second, these same contrasts mark the progressive enhancement of that exemplar's authority, not its dissolution (as we might expect) in the bickering of the ages. Whatever Greece is or was, the idea of Greece—like any symbol—could carry a wide range of possible meanings, and so it survived triumphantly. Similarly, the concept of European culture, so stable at the level of mere generality, has undergone many transformations through the centuries. ‘Europe,’ like ‘Hellas,’ was a generalized ideal, a symbol of cultural superiority which could and did survive innumerable changes in the moral and political order. It was to this European ideal, moreover, that

Hellas was considered ancestral. Such is the malleable material of which ideologies are made.”

What the Europeans saw in Greece they saw in themselves and as David Holden 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.” Whatever Greece is or was, the idea of Greece—like any symbol—could carry a wide range of possible meanings, ‘Europe,’ like ‘Hellas,’ was a generalized ideal, a symbol of cultural superiority. Europe needed a genuine noble European past, a source for its enlightenment and it found it in a mythical Greece, a Greece of its own creation.

On page 5 of his book Michael Herzfeld goes on to say: “It is as an ideological phenomenon that we shall treat the twin concepts of Hellas and Europe here. They provided the motivating rationale for one of the most explosive political adventures of the nineteenth century, an adventure which claimed thousands of lives and brought many more under the control of a nation-state that had never before existed as a sovereign entity. This adventure was the Greek struggle for independence of 1821 to 1833. Its eventual success was by no means certain in the early stages. The Great Powers were reluctant to commit themselves to the Greek cause until, forced by public opinion at home, by the Greeks' own successes, and by the fear of each other's intentions, they began to take a more active part in bringing the Greek State into existence. That the Greeks did eventually prevail, despite the enormous Turkish armies with which they had to contend as well as their destructive internal squabbles, is some measure of the evocative power of the name of Hellas among their European supporters. To be a European was, in ideological terms, to be a Hellene. Yet the Hellas which European intellectuals wished to reconstitute on Greek soil was very different from the Greek culture which they actually encountered there, despite all the western-educated Greek intellectuals' efforts to bridge the gap.”

If I interpret Herzfeld correctly, not only did Europeans invent and mold the concept of a “Greece” and “Hellenism” but by their instigation of the so-called “Greek Struggle for Independence”, with assistance from the Great Powers, they created a country where one never existed before! Yes you read it right! The Europeans instigated the so-called “Greek Struggle for Independence” in order to bring back the mythical “Ancient Greeks”! Further, they helped create a country based on a myth and shaped the character of its population on a culture that had died more than 2,000 years ago. And all this at the expense of the real, living and vibrant cultures that lived and coexisted on those lands for centuries. This reminds me of what the Greeks did in Macedonia nine decades later when they invaded, occupied, annexed Macedonia, destroyed its living and vibrant culture and turned the Macedonian people into mythical Greeks!

Why Greece and not Arvanitovlachia? Because the Europeans, aliens to the so-called Greek lands, took it upon themselves to reshape the new country and its people into something artificial to suit their own desires. Which begs the question “Why did the Europeans need a Greece and how did the birth of Greece shape Europe?” a subject for my next chapter.

Why give “Greece” a Latin name? The obvious answer is because the “concept” of a Greece was invented by the Modern Latins even before the “country” Greece came into existence. Since the Latins invented Greece it was appropriate that they give it a Latin name?

Part 5 - Why did the Europeans need a Greece?

In the first four chapters of this book we established that the people living in the southern region of today's Greece in the early 19th century were predominantly Albanian, Vlach and Slav immigrants who had settled there over the centuries to replace the population void created by the disappearance of the so-called "Ancient Greeks". Given the fact that this new population was predominantly not Greek, 18th century authorities decided to label it Greek anyway in an effort to connect it with a culture that once existed on those lands a long time ago. In this part we will explain why there was such a need to create a Greece and how it benefited Europe.

It is not my intention here to delve into the various details or the rationale involved in creating a Greece so I will present the reader with only a general overview to show why 18th and 19th century Europeans needed a Greece and how they proceeded in creating one.

The reader must keep in mind that when 18th and 19th century authorities were contemplating the creation of Modern Greece and writing its history there were several overriding criteria that needed to be addressed. These were:

1. The belief that God created the world and that the world was no more than 5,000 years old.
2. The human race had descended from Noah's Ark which was believed to have landed in the Caucasus after the great flood.
3. History began at the point when the world was created by God. No history was acceptable before that.
4. The history of a nation had to be based more or less on a "national myth" designed to support the "nation", its people and particularly its rulers.

5. The writing of a nation's history was usually sponsored by those in authority who during the 18th century were predominantly monarchs.

So, as one can see, the history of a nation or of the world for that matter had to be written to fit the above criteria as well as to suit the desires and approvals of its sponsors.

In order to understand why Europeans chose "Ancient Greece" after which to model their own culture, we need to examine Europe's late 18th and early 19th century political, cultural and economic situation.

The first and foremost reason for Europeans choosing "Ancient Greece" as their model to build on is because Ancient Greece was part of Europe. It was important for Europeans to show that the most "enlightened" civilization in the world originated in Europe.

Europeans at the time were involved in all sorts of ventures including the occupation and colonization of various regions of Africa, Asia, Australia and America. They were also involved in enslaving people from Africa and Asia in order to obtain free labour for building their cities and

transportation routes, operating their farms, serving as domestics, etc. All these “doings” had to be justified as “moral” and appropriate not only to the world but also to the European masses which supported the political systems and those in power.

One way to justify them was to show examples of other civilizations doing exactly that; that it was okay to take other peoples’ lands and enslave them for the benefit of this new European civilization. In order to convince the world, particularly their own people, the Europeans needed a practicing example which they found in the “Ancient Greeks”.

Europeans also needed precedence to show that they were not the first to condone imperialism and slavery and at the same time maintain the image that they were civilized. It was one thing to say that a “Greek” civilization existed 2,500 years ago in a savage world full of Barbarians however it would have been more convincing if such a civilization existed today, in this world.

As mentioned in a previous chapter, certain Europeans, later referred to as Philhellenes, convinced that such a civilization could be re-created, decided to instigate an uprising against the Ottoman Empire. Believing that if the Greeks of today could be freed from the Ottoman yoke they would be politically and culturally capable of quickly progressing to the level of the so-called “Civilized Ancient Greeks” of some 2,500 years ago.

Be it by chance or by design, once the Western European Public found out about the merits of this so-called “Ancient Greek Civilization” it began to look up to it and accept it not only as a source of enlightenment but as a guiding light for Europe’s future.

As it happened, the first step in re-creating this old civilization was to popularize it abroad among intellectuals and academics, especially in Britain and France.

With the publication of the Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage and Lord Byron’s work, the British and French audience was quick to catch on and became very open to the idea of “bringing back the Ancient Greeks”.

Once popularized, a movement started forming giving the “idea of re-creating Ancient Greece” life and impetus and later moral, financial and military support. The movement caught on much easier and faster in Western European countries than it did inside the Ottoman Occupied Greek Regions but with persistence from the Great Powers and British gold, Hellenism was reborn.

Once the European public was in support of such a venture, it was time to convince the people living on the lands where once the so-called “Ancient Greeks” lived. Unfortunately, convincing the “locals” became a harder task than convincing the European public but in the long run persistence paid off and today we have pure Greeks, descendants of the Ancient Greeks.

The primary reasons why Europe wanted a Greece can be summarized as follows;

1. Europeans needed to justify the use of slavery as a moral deed for the greater good of a superior and moral Modern European civilization. Because of its intellectual capacity, the so-called “Ancient Greek Civilization” was considered both superior and moral which not only condoned slavery but practiced it. As I have shown in previous parts of this book, more than half of Ancient Athens was populated by slaves who served the ruling elite.

2. Europeans needed precedence to justify their acts of colonization and imperial land grabs and found it in the so-called Ancient Greeks, particularly in the imperial ventures of Ancient Athens.

3. Besides 1 and 2 above, Europeans needed a “model” on which to build their own civilization and to show that European “knowledge” and “culture” were genuinely European and not imported from any of the “other” lands from which slaves were imported. They found this “model” in Ancient Greece and took from it what they deemed appropriate and discarded the rest.

In other words, late 18th and early 19th century Europeans found in Ancient Greece a civilized people with a superior culture and intellect which at the same time practiced slavery, fought for booty and colonized other peoples’ lands; a behaviour worthy of emulation.

What is most interesting, little known and needs emphasis is the fact that the so-called “Greek Uprising of 1821” was not at all a “Greek Uprising” but an uprising instigated by non-Greek Europeans outside of Greece. Also, another little known fact is that this uprising was mostly financed by Great Britain and fought with the help of Western European volunteers.

The aim of this venture was not just to free the people from the Ottoman yoke but to turn them into something they were not. And thus the curse of Hellenism was born.

Hellenism may have been viewed as “something wonderful” by outsiders who yearned to see the “Ancient Greek Civilization” re-born but it was a nightmare for the people directly involved who were asked to give up their true identities for something alien, foreign and long dead; to which they never belonged. Ninety-two years later, the Macedonians of Greek occupied Macedonia were asked to do the same; become Hellenes, something foreign and alien. One-hundred and seventy years later we are re-living the curse of Hellenism as the Republic of Macedonia is attempting to assert its identity.

In the book “Entangled Identities Nations and Europe” edited by Atsuko Ichijo and Willfried Spohn on page 109 we read “It should be strongly emphasized, however, that this new image of classical Greece was constructed in Europe and was imported to the new born Greek state (Tsoukalas 2002). Modern ideas touched the general Greek population only marginally, if at all.”

After the Greek state was created for the first time in 1829 it was incapable of governing itself and was placed under foreign rule and a foreign administration. On page 110 of the book “Entangled Identities Nations and Europe” we read “Greece was governed by an imported young monarch, Prince Frederic Otto of Wittlesbach, the seventeen year old son of King Ludwig of Bavaria.”

“The three men regency council which in fact was to rule [Greece] was also Bavarian and protestant. What came to be called ‘the protecting powers’ exercised such an influence on the newly-born state that the first political parties were named appropriately ‘the English party’, ‘the French party’ and ‘the Russian party’. Supporters of these parties represented nascent class structures in Greek society but above all these parties represented corresponding foreign influences and interests.”

As we continue to read the book “Entangled Identities Nations and Europe” on page 111 we find “The political parties which existed, as we mentioned earlier, reflected the interests and the antagonisms of foreign powers.”

“In reality, however, this utopian, irredentist idea [which the Greeks developed on their own] served as a smoke screen for corruption and severe socio-economic problems faced by the government and as an excuse for the even greater blatant intervention of the Great Powers in Greek affairs. (Clogg 1979: 76-79)”

In the book “The Greek Phoenix” by Joseph Braddock on page 137 we read “Colonel Napier was seeing a lot of his celebrated guest, and paid him every attention, realizing that Byron, as a representative of the London Greek committee, might have considerable influence both in Greece and London in helping him obtain military command. So it was arranged that Napier should be given leave to go to London, furnished with a letter of introduction from Byron to the London Greek committee. He arrived in January 1824, carrying a letter written on the 10th of December 1823 in which Byron advised that a loan of 500,000 pounds should be raised to provide an army for Greece to be commanded by Napier. ‘Of his military character it was superfluous to speak; of his personal, I can say from my own knowledge’ Byron wrote ‘that it is excellent as his military -in short a better or a braver man is not easy to be found. He is our man to lead a regular force or to organize a national one for the Greeks. Ask the army; ask anybody! He is, besides, the personal friend of Mavrocordato, Colonel Stanhope and myself; and in such concord with all three that we should pull together, an indispensable as well as rare point, especially in Greece at present.’

Alas, the London committee was too preoccupied to welcome Napier’s services. At the moment they were busy devising acrimoniously the menu for their next public dinner, and were more interested in making plans for the cultural regeneration of Greece than in hearing about Napier’s military virtues.”

In the “Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece” edited by Nigel Wilson, which so many Modern Greeks encouraged me to read so that I can “educate” myself on page 345 we read “Hellenization denotes the spread of Hellenic culture in non-Greek ‘barbarian’ society and the process under which ‘barbarians’ accept, adopt, and incorporate Hellenic culture.” “The first modern appearance of the concept of Hellenism and Hellenization occurs in *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, G. Droysen’s great three volume work published between 1833 and 1843”

Hellenism, whatever purpose it was intended to serve should have died a long time ago along with Fascism, Nazism and slavery but unfortunately it has not. Instead, nurtured by the Powers that created it, it has flourished and swallowed and destroyed nations of people including part of my own; the Macedonians in Greek occupied Macedonia who to this day are struggling to get free.

What is this phenomenon called “Hellenism”? Whatever it is, it has different interpretations to different people but as Macedonians that have been touched by it, while refusing to yield to it, for us it has been a nightmare. Greece, after invading, occupying and annexing 51% of the Macedonian territories in 1912, 1913, in the name of Hellenism tortured, murdered and expelled all Macedonians who refused to become “Hellenes”. It then changed all peoples’ and place names to “Hellenize” them and make them Greek. If that was not enough, Greece then abolished the Macedonian language rendering it illegal to be spoken both in public and private, all this in the name of “Hellenism”. In other words, Hellenism for the Macedonians has been a relentless enemy whose aim has been to destroy what is real and replace it with something artificial which has no roots or a real past.

Part 6 – On the way to Hellenism

“In 1821, the Greeks rose in revolt against the rule of Turkey and declared themselves an independent nation. Their goal was far more ambitious than freedom alone, for they proclaimed the resurrection of an ancient vision in which liberty was but a single component. That vision was Hellas—the achievements of the ancient Greeks in knowledge, morality, and art, summed up in one evocative word. What was more, the new Greek revolutionaries went one step further than their forebears had ever managed to do: they proposed to embody their entire vision in a unified, independent polity. This unique nation-state would represent the ultimate achievement of the Hellenic ideal and, as such, would lead all Europe to the highest levels of culture yet known.” (Michael Herzfeld, “Ours Once More”, page 3)

What Herzfeld fails to mention above is that it was not the Greeks that rose in revolt against the rule of Turkey but rather the Philhellenes who instigated this so-called “rise” whose origin was anything but Greek. And who were these Greeks anyway?

In this chapter will provide the reader with further evidence to show that not only did the so-called “Greeks” not exist but the architects of “Hellenism” could not care less if they existed or not. Their aim was to bring back Hellenism at any cost because after all, as mentioned in a previous chapter, “Hellenization denotes the spread of Hellenic culture in non-Greek ‘barbarian’ society and the process under which ‘barbarians’ accept, adopt, and incorporate Hellenic culture.” (“Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece” edited by Nigel Wilson, page 345)

The Philhellenes neither thought nor cared what Hellenism could do to the living and vibrant cultures that existed on those lands. Like the Borg in the fictional Star Trek movie series, the Philhellenes wanted to create a race of “perfect” humans and model them in an image created of their own imagination. They did that not because they cared for the plight of the indigenous people whose cultures they destroyed but to achieve their own moral and political aims.

And how did the Modern Hellenes come to know of “Hellenism”? Was it passed on from generation to generation? Did they come to know it from their parents and grandparents? NO! It was taught to them by foreigners!

In the “Scottish Geographic Magazine” Volume XIII published in 1897 on page 370 we read “The Turks who came in at the time of conquest, and were mostly landowners, have almost entirely disappeared since the Turkish yoke was thrown off. The Vlachs, on the contrary, descendants of the Romanized people of the Balkan Peninsula, live in considerable numbers in the mountains of north and central Greece. The number of these people, called by G. Weigand Aromunes, is at most 50,000. Formerly, the Aromunes of whom there are 150,000 in the southwestern part of the Balkan Peninsula, were champions of the Greater

Greece policy, but since the Bulgarians have obtained their freedom, the Aromunes have also fostered a national feeling. In Greece however, the well to do classes are opposed to the movement, and here, too, the government has made great efforts to win over these people, which probably will be attended with success. Lastly, Gypsies must be mentioned, who are numerous all over the country. They are to a large extent Hellenized, and their numbers therefore cannot be exactly ascertained.”

In the book “Greek Pictures” by J. P. Mahaffy published in 1890, on pages 20 and 21 we read “...in the Middle Ages, these Albanian mountaineers have brought both war like spirit, bright costume and beauty of person, to refresh the Hellenic race. There are still, even in Attica, districts where Albanian is the common language; there are Albanian names famous in Greek annuals, especially in the great War of Independence (1821-1831), and among the sailors of Hydra, so famed for their commercial enterprise and their deeds of war, the chief families were Albanian in origin.”

Further down on page 21 we read “Before I return from the Albanian digression, I will say a word about the costume which has become the national dress of the Greeks. The most characteristic feature is the ‘fustanella’, a white petticoat which like the Scottish kilt, gives its name to the whole attire. Wearing the fustanella in Greece is like ‘wearing the kilt’ in Scotland. This petticoat is however, more troublesome and exacting than its Highland brother; and this is the reason that the king’s guard in Athens, who wear it as a uniform, look so straight and well drilled.”

In the book “History of the War of Independence in Greece”, by Thomas Keightley, Esq. on page 260 we read “Colocotronis was the son of the man, who, after giving the Turks most effectual aid against the Albanians after 1770, was put to death by them. Having with difficulty escaped from the murders of his father, he had served in the Greeks troops of the different powers who successively occupied the Seven Isles. He had frequently returned to Morea, and putting himself at the head of parties of Klefts, made the Turks tremble within the walls of Tripolitsa and purchased his departure with considerable sums of money. He had risen to the rank of Major in the Albanian regiment, in the pay of England when it was disbanded.”

We now turn to the “The Atlantic Monthly: A Magazine of Literature, Art and Politics” volume XLIX, January 1882, to page 31 where we read “I have received an invitation to spend a September Sunday at Poros, a little island in the Aegean Sea, lying to the south east, and about five hours distant by steamer from the port of Peraeus. It is one of a group made famous in the Greek revolution of 1821 by bravery of its Albanian settlers, in defense of a country which they never adopted for their own until this moment of danger came. Some two centuries ago, Albanian fugitives, who had fled from their northern home on account of the oppression of their

Turkish rulers, alighted like wild sea-birds on the rocky cliffs of Hydra, Speza and Poros. Here they built their nests high and secure above the reach of invasion, feeling themselves safe as long as they could keep control of the surrounding waters. Joined from time to time by small companies of their countrymen, they gradually increased in numbers, and formed themselves into a more stable community, with laws and habits of its own.”

Later on the same page we read “At the time of the revolution, these Albanian settlements had developed into a colony of rich and imperious merchants, who lived in their island homes with a rude, barbaric luxury.”

Further down the same page we read “Albanian Captains, Albanian ships, and Albanian gold became the strength of the Greek and the dread of the Turk. The successful close of the revolution found them as firmly allied with the Greek nationality as they had previously been alien to it, and there are now no names more honoured and beloved in Athens, no families more influential in its polite circles, than those of the Albanian leaders of 1821, the Tombazis, the Miaulis, the Coundouriotis.”

In “The New Monthly Magazine” edited by W. Harrison Ainsworth, Esq. Volume 88 on page 480 we read “It is a singular fact that the Vlachs call themselves, in their own patois, Romans. Their total number in the provinces of European Turkey is supposedly to exceed half a million; and, during the Greek revolution, they furnished at least ten thousand armed men, under Zongas. This leader was formerly the protopalicar, or lieutenant, of their famous chief Catz Antoni who was put to death in the most cruel manner by Ali Pasha, for numberless acts of brigandage.”

In the book “Race or Mongrel” by Alfred P. Schultz on page 90 we read “About this time the Avars came from Asia to Europe. Bajan-Chan, their leader, incited the Slavs to invade Greece in 578[AD]. They crossed the Danube, a hundred thousand men strong, invaded Greece, and extended their incursions as far south as the Peloponnesus. Manander states that Hellas was torn to pieces by the Slavs. A few years later Bajan Chan was at war with the Emperor and at his instigation other hordes of Slavs and Avars poured into Greece. Evagrius writes that in 578 and in 593 the Avars conquered all of Greece and devastated it with fire and sword. After these invasions the Slavs and Avars did not again leave Greece. They remained as the lords of the lands with Huns and Bulgarians. When peaceful conditions were again established, a great number of the inhabitants were Slavs, who retained their customs, religion and language for a long time. Cities, villages, brooks, mountains now have Slavic names. Marathon is Vrana; Salamis, Kiluri; Platea, Kochla; Olympia, Miraka; Delphi, Kastri; and other places are named Goritza, Vostiza, Kaminitza, Pirmatsha, Chlumutzi, Slavitz. Names similar to these are found in Gelicia, Poland, and other Slavic countries. Hellenic they are not.”

Avars, Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs, Gypsies? Where are the Greeks?

On page 91 of the same book we read “In 1204, Venice, having a German-Frankish army at her command declared war on the Eastern Empire and took Constantinople. A Frankish army landed at Patras (Morea), and many of the knights received latifundia in the Peloponnesus and subsequently remained in Greece. In the 14th century the Albanians invaded Greece, and settled there. The influx of Albanians continued for a considerable time. In 1407, we are told, Theodore Paleologus settled ten thousand Albanians with their wives and children, in the Peloponnesus. Mazari, writing in 1446, states that the Greeks of this time were not a race but a debris of other races.”

Then on page 351 of the same book we read “That environment is of little importance to the development of a race is clearly demonstrated by the fact that when Hellenes lived in Greece, Greece was great. Since their mongrelization, Greece has produced nothing.”

Here I have given the reader evidence from half a dozen writers and authors who have published their work more than a century ago, writers and authors who lived much closer to the time when Greece became a country for the first time, to the time when Hellenism was invented and unleashed on the people of the Balkans.

Who are the Modern Greeks? A fair and reasonable question indeed! A question that needs to be asked! Modern Greeks have placed the Macedonians in a precarious position regarding the Macedonian ethnic identity. Modern Greeks have systematically and relentlessly denied the Macedonian ethnic identity robbing both the Modern and Ancient Macedonians of their heritage. If that is fair then let us equally be fair in answering the question “Who are the Modern Greeks?”

The best answer I can give you at this moment is that they are NOT who they say they are! I have been accused on several occasions of being a “liar” when it comes to answering such questions so I will use Mazari’s words;

“Mazari, writing in 1446, states that the Greeks of this time were not a race but a debris of other races.”

If the Greeks of 1446 were a debris of other races, then what are the Modern Greeks of today? 98% pure Greeks and 2% Muslim Greeks? I think not!

The question that then begs to be asked is “What right do these imposters and charlatans have to meddle in Macedonian affairs and to question the Macedonian identity when their own identity is fabricated, false and fake?”

To be fair then the world too should deny the Modern Greeks the right to self identify because after all, unlike the Macedonians, the Modern Greeks are NOT really who they claim to be!

And now I leave you with this. “Is Hellenization a term that reflects the reality of an ancient society, or a term and concept created by modern scholars in the course of their study? Is it a tool, useful shorthand or a

phantom? According to G. Bowersock ‘Hellenization is... a modern idea reflecting modern forms of cultural domination’.” (“Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece”, edited by Nigel Wilson, page 345.)

Part 7 - Twenty Authors can't all be wrong!

Amazingly after all that has been said about the artificial identity of the Modern Greeks, there are still Greeks out there who accuse me of “lying” for pointing out the obvious. There are still Greeks out there who insist that all these authors from whom I take quotes for my chapters are “simply crackpots” who have something against Greece or perhaps are jealous of the “glorious Greek heritage”, as I am often accused of being!

In this chapter I will present the reader with testimonies from twenty different authors, all westerners and all in a mission to HELP the Modern Greeks justify their artificiality who in telling their story have inadvertently confessed to the Modern Greek falsehood.

If you think telling the truth is wrong and an awful thing to do when exposing your Greek falsehood then perhaps you can explain to me how you justify denying the Macedonians their identity generation after generation. Macedonians have been denied their ethnic identity, culture, language and heritage by Greeks since Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria acquired Macedonian lands by war in 1912, 1913. For my accusers, which is more wrong, to live a lie and deny others their true heritage or to tell the truth about you?

There is no denying that the Modern Greek nation is an artificial creation created by Western Philhellenes from the Slav, Vlach and Albanian immigrants who over the centuries came to live on those lands after the so-called “Ancient Greeks” disappeared.

To put an end to the notion that this is somehow a conspiracy to “rob” the Modern Greek nation of its heritage, in this chapter I will present quotes from twenty different authors who basically say that; Modern Greeks are NOT the descendants of the so-called “Ancient Greeks” of 2,500 years ago but rather the descendants of the more recently arrived Slav, Vlach and Albanian immigrants.

(1) Now let us start with Edward Blaquiére, Esq. in his book “The Greek Revolution; its Origin and Progress”, on page 21 we read “Tyranny and want had driven some families, whose origin, like that of nearly all the peasants, who inhabit proper Greece, was Albanian, to take refuge on these desolate crags [the islands Hydra, Spezzia and Ipsara], where they built villages, and sought a precarious existence by fishing.”

(2) In the book “Greece and the Balkans Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment” edited by Dimitris Tziouvas on page 5 we read “In southern Albania many Orthodox Albanians and Vlachs were Hellenized during the 18th and 19th centuries.” On page 6 we read “It should be stressed, however, that the Greeks as an ethnic community during this period included many Grecophone or Hellenized Vlachs, Serbs, or Orthodox Albanians.” And on page 75 we read “For Kodrikas, and many others, it was language that determined who was a ‘Greek’ for it constituted the ‘national existence’ of the nation. But for the

Phanariot Theodoros Negris, Serbs and Bulgarians were as true Greeks as any other Christian”.

(3) In J. P. Mahaffy’s book “Greek Pictures” on pages 20 and 21 we read “In the middle ages, these Albanian mountaineers have brought both war like spirit, bright costume, and beauty of person, to refresh the Hellenic race. There are still, even in Attica, districts where Albanian is the common language; there are Albanian names famous in Greek annals, especially in the great War of Independence (1821-31), and even among the sailors of Hydra, so famed for their commercial enterprise and their deeds of war, the chief families were Albanian in origin.”

(4) Surprisingly even Nicholas G. L. Hammond the greatest Philhellene historian and author has admitted that the Modern Greeks are not what they seem. Nicholas G. L. Hammond in his book “Migrations and Invasions in Greece and Adjacent Areas” on page 57 writes “It was during this period [1206 to 1260] that the flow of immigrants from the western area began. It became a flood in the fourteenth century. They went as mercenaries, raiders and migrants. The great majority of them were speakers of Albanian, but others joined the movement. Whatever their language they were described by the Greek and Latin writers as ‘Albanoi’ or ‘Albanitai’ or ‘Albanenses’ and the reason of this collective term can only be that they entered the Byzantine world through the district which the Byzantines knew as ‘Albanon’. Thus the Vlach speaking Malakasii who invaded Thessaly in 1334 were described as ‘Albanoi’ by Cantacuzenus 1.474 no less than the evidently Albanian-speaking ‘Albanensium gens’ which raided Thessaly in 1325.

The southern movement of the tribes was on a very large scale. It was also rapid because towns and cities were bypassed (Dyrrachium for instance being captured c. 1368). It had two main effects. It took possession of Epirus Nova, the area inland of the coastal strip from Dyrrachium to Valona; and it sent streams of migrants into most parts of the Greek peninsula and some of the Aegean islands”.

On page 59 of Hammond’s book we read “But the Albanian raids continued and Acarnea was laid to waste. In 1341 the Emperor attacked the offending Albanians ‘around Pogoniane and Libisda’ (Lidisda), i.e. in the central part of northern Epirus; and then in 1355 he campaigned from Thessaly as far as the Aetolia and Arcanania and was killed in action (Cantacuzenus 3.319). These campaigns did not stop the flood. Albanians were serving as mercenaries in the Peloponnesus c. 1350, and they and their families were given land there to cultivate.

Other bands of Albanians and Vlachs invaded the Catalan principality of Boetia and Attica, and a great many Albanians settled there as peasant-farmers in 1368 and later years.

The penetration of the Greek mainland which we have described occurred during the hundreds or more years after 1325.”

Then on page 61 we read “Once in possession of northwestern Greece, the Albanians opened the way for other immigrants. Offshoots of Vlachs and Albanians entered Boetia, Attica and Euboea...”

(5) Keith R. Legg’s book “Politics in Modern Greece” on page 48 we read “As early as the 18th century, these areas were described as ‘hotbeds of chronic insurgency’. There were few Muslims here; the inhabitants, largely of Albanian stock, were only imperfectly assimilated into the Greek nation...”

Then on page 86 we read “At the time of independence, the range of local dialects was significant; a substantial portion of the population spoke Albanian”.

(6) In the “International Encyclopedia a Compendium of Human Knowledge” edited by Richard Gleason Greene on page 201 we read “Overrun by the Vandals and Goths it [Morea, today’s Peloponnesus] became a prey, in the second half of the 8th c. to bands of Slavic invaders, who found it wasted by war and pestilence. Gradually however these barbarians were subdued and Grecianized by the Byzantine emperors. Nevertheless, the numerous names of places, rivers, etc, in the More of Slavic origin prove how firmly they had rooted themselves, and that the Moreotes are anything but pure Greeks.”

(7) In the book “Races of Europe a Sociological Study” by William Z. Ripley Ph.D., published in 1910 on page 408 we read “Since the Christian era, as we have said, a successive downpour from the north into Greece has ensued. In the 6th century came the Avars and Slavs, bringing death and disaster. A more potent and lasting influence upon the country was probably produced by the slower and more peaceful infiltration of the Slavs into Thessaly and Epirus from the end of the seventh century onward. A result of this is that Slavic names to-day occur all over the Peloponnesus in the open country where settlements were readily to be made. The most important immigration of all is that of the Albanians, who, from the 13th century until the advent of the Turks, incessantly overrun the land.”

(8) In the book “Greece in the 20th Century” edited by Theodore A. Kouloumbis on page 24 we read “Primary school children were taught, in the 1880’s, that ‘Greeks [are] our kinsmen, of common descent, speaking the language we speak and professing the religion we profess’, but this definition, it seems, was reserved for small children who could not possibly understand the intricate arguments of their parents on the question of Greek identity. What was essentially to understand at a tender age was that Modern Greeks descended from the Ancient Greeks. Grown up children, however, must have been no less confused than adults on the criteria for defining modern Greek identity. Did the Greeks constitute a race apart from the Albanians, the Slavs and the Vlachs? Yes and no. High school students were told that the ‘other races’, i.e. the Slavs, the

Albanians and the Vlachs, 'having being Hellenized with the years in terms of mores and customs, are now being assimilated into the Greeks'.

(9) In Alfred P. Schultz's book "Race or Mongrel" on page 92 we read "From the foregoing it is evident that but very little Hellenic blood is left in Greece, and that little is so thoroughly vitiated that its disappearance is but a question of time. No race inhabits Greece. The 'Greeks' are descendants of races so different that their crossing can never produce anything else than human mongrels. Their ancestors were Greeks, Hellenized Asiatics and Byzantine Greeks (i.e. Hamitic-Semitic-Greek-Egyptian-Negroid mongrels), Slavs, Sicilians, Spaniards, Huns, Bulgarians, Walloons, Franks and Albanians."

(10) In the book "Sailing from Byzantium" by Colin Wells on page 183 we read "This revival also allowed the Byzantines to decolonize the Greek mainland. The success of that effort would prove crucial to the survival of Greek culture in future centuries, after the other lands had fallen away. Having overrun nearly all of the Greek mainland, the cities, and the islands, by the tenth century the Slavs in Greece had been converted to Orthodox Christianity and thoroughly Hellenized. Today the only evidence of the Slav's arrival is the presence of Slavic place names, some five-hundred or so of them, scattered charmingly throughout the Greek countryside."

(11) In Alexandra Halkias's book "The Empty Cradle of Democracy" on page 59 we read "Through the end of the revolution in 1830, Greeks, including most of the 19th century nationalists, seemed to have had a vague but firm sense of continuity from ancient to modern Greece, though this was not articulated in racial terms, but on a basis of a common language, history and consciousness. In effect, at this time, who ever called themselves a Greek was a Greek. It is because of this that many Greek-speaking Albanians, Slavs, Rumanians and Vlachs were easily assimilated and indeed became important players in Greek patriotism at the time (Dakin 1972, 8)."

(12) In the book "Turkey in Europe" by Sir Charles Eliot on page 267 we read "Constantinople and all of continental Greece were for centuries ruled and occupied by the Romans, and during many subsequent centuries invaded and colonized by Slavs. The crusades and the Latin conquest brought a large influx of western Europeans, commonly called Franks; and, in later times, extensive Albanian settlements were made in Greek districts. Clearly, the modern Greek must be of very mixed blood."

(13) In the book "History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century" by G. P. Gooch on pages 490 and 491 we read "General interest was first aroused by a controversy as to the racial derivation of the modern Greeks. The war of independence had won the sympathy of Europe; and it was a rude shock both to Greece and to her champions when Fallmerayer announced that her inhabitants were virtually Slavs. The race of Hellenes, he declares in his 'History of Morea' was rooted out and Athens was

unoccupied from the sixth to the tenth century. Only its literature and a few ruins survived to tell that the Greek people have ever existed. What the Slavs had begun the Albanians have completed. Scholars had been so busy with the Ancient Greeks that they had never inquired as to what happened to them. Leake had discovered a great number of Slavonic place names but he had drawn no conclusions. 'I now lay the foundation of a new view of Greek history and of the whole peninsula'. He recalls the invasions of the Huns, the Bulgars and the Slavs, and the second volume shows the Morea flooded by Albanian colonists and finally conquered by the Turks."

(14) In the "Phrenological Journal and Magazine of Moral Science for the Year 1843" Vol. XVI on page 246 we read "Next to them in this respect are the modern Greeks, who, for the most part, are of Sclavonian origin, and, where they are not purely Sclavonian, are a cross-breed in which the Sclavonian enters very largely."

(15) In Rennell Rodd's book "The Customs and Lore of Modern Greece" on page 17 we read "In the last year of the 15th century and the opening of the 16th, when the Morea was again the battle-field of Turks and Venetians, the occupants of the plains of Argos and of portions of Attica were practically exterminated, and Albanian colonists began to re-occupy the ruined lands."

(16) In the book "In Greek Waters a Story of the Grecian War of Independence (1821-1827)" by G. A. Henty published in 1893 on page 40 we read "With them [the modern Greeks] 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 who the descendants of the veritable Greeks of old are in a great minority. The majority are of Albanian and Suliot blood, races which even the Romans found untamable."

(17) In the "Popular Science Monthly" Volume LXXV, July to December 1919, edited by J. Mckeen Cattell on page 591 we read "The modern Greeks are largely of Slavic origin. They are not the descendants of the ancient Greeks. That noble race greatly mixed with barbarian blood during the middle ages, was completely destroyed in the course of the frequent uprisings against Turkish rule. Slavic immigrants gradually peopled the country."

(18) In William St. Clair's book "That Greece Might Still be Free" on page 91 we read "The Albanians, some of whom were Christian and some Muslim, were torn by this dilemma, and when the need for decision became inescapable, they divided by religion and not by race. The Roman Catholic Greeks, who lived in the islands which had been under Venetian or Genoese rule, regarded themselves as a separate community. The Albanians of Hydra and Spetsae, many of whom could not even speak Greek, regarded themselves as Greek because their allegiance was to the Orthodox Church."

(19) In the 1910 “The Encyclopedia Britannica”, eleventh edition, on page 465 we read “...in 1725 the Ottomans with a large and well disciplined army set themselves to recover the Morea, the Venetians were left without support from the Greeks. The peninsula was rapidly recaptured and by the peace of Passarowits (1718) again became a Turkish dependency. The gaps left about this time by the Greek population were largely made up by an immigration from Albania.”

(20) In the book “Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe (1770-1945)”, Volume II, edited by Balasz Trencsenyi and Michal Kopecek, on page 141 we read “It is funny but also sad, to see a social gathering of different Greeks, but is to say Chiots, Cretans, Albanians, Byzantines, Orientals, Ionian islanders and others, where upon the one mixes in Turkish words, the other Italian ones, the other Albanian ones, and in the same gathering, while they are all Greek, they cannot understand each other without the use of a translation or an explanation of each word as it is uttered, with the gathering thus turning into a Babel.”

For those who are still not convinced that the Modern Greek identity is an artificial creation, please continue to read this book.

Part 8 - Connecting the Past with the Present

When the crazy idea of creating “Hellenes” out of the Modern Barbarian ethnic groups, who during the late 18th and early 19th centuries were living on the same lands as the people from the Ancient City States of 2,500 years ago, was starting to take root a history had to be written for them. This would be no ordinary history but a history that would extend their lineage connecting their modern existence with that of their ancient.

But didn't I tell you all along that the Modern Greeks are not at all connected with the ancient ones? Didn't I tell you that the Modern Greeks are not Greeks at all but Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs and an assortment other smaller ethnic groups? Yes I did! How then can a group of Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs be connected to a people that ceased to exist more than 2,000 years ago? All I can say at this point is that “it's by Magic”!

In this chapter we will explore the magic processes used by the Philhellenes to transform mere barbarians of the Slav, Albanian and Vlach kind into sophisticated Modern Greeks, perfect replicas of the Ancient Greeks, as envisioned by their Philhellene creators.

If I can refer to Lord Byron as the “Father of Modern Greece” because of his involvement in the creation of the “Modern Greek” then I would have to refer to Johann Gustav Droysen as the “wizard of Modern Greek History” for his magical performance in making the connection between the Modern Greeks and the “Ancient” ones.

Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884) was a German historian and a member of the Frankfurt Parliament. (Page 597, “The Columbia Encyclopedia” 3rd Edition, 1963)

In “The Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece”, edited by Nigel Wilson, on page 345 we read “The first modern appearance of the concept of Hellenism and Hellenization occurs in *Geschichte des Hellenismus* G. Droysen's great three volume work published between 1833 and 1843. He viewed the Hellenistic period as the time in which, in the territories conquered by Alexander the Great, Greek and Near Eastern cultures were intertwined to create the cultural background from which Christianity emerged.”

The great Philhellene masterminds, it appears, were not too concerned about the Ancient to Modern Greek connection when they were concocting the idea of creating Greeks from Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs because they probably did not believe that the concept would catch on, but once it did, that job fell upon Johann Gustav Droysen to connect them to a fabled but glorious past.

“In his first edition of [his book *History of Hellenism*] 1883 Droysen set out to bridge the gap between classical Greece and the coming of Christianity, and he found his link in what he called the Hellenistic age. ‘My enthusiasm’, he wrote ‘is for Caesar, not Cato, for Alexander, not Demosthenes’, small wonder that such a man living in the Germany of

Bismarck should conceive a devotion to the rising state of Prussia, with its manifest destiny to unite the Fatherland; and Droysen's second edition, published in 1877, under the spell of Prussian success, laid special stress on the forces making for panhellenism and the unity of Greece – above all Isocrates and the kings of Macedon.

It was Droysen who really raised the national issue in Greek history.” (Page 235, “The Problem of Greek Nationality”, F.W. Walbank)

Droysen, it appears, had quickly discovered that the Ancient so-called Greeks had disappeared from the face of the earth and he could not make a connection so he decided to borrow or perhaps steal from the Macedonians. Even though the Macedonians ethnically had nothing to do with the Ancient City States, Droysen made it his mission to make the connection, making it appear as if they did. Instead of appropriately calling the Period subsequent to Alexander the Great's time “the Macedonistic Period”, he opted for calling it “Hellenistic”, which in effect robbed the Macedonian people of their heritage and handed it to the artificial newly created Greeks.

Further down in “The Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece”, edited by Nigel Wilson, on page 345 we read “The creation in the 19th and 20th centuries of modern European Empires in regions once dominated by Hellenistic kingdoms was a further spur to reassessing the Hellenistic period. Those developments encouraged scholars to see Alexander and his Macedonian successors as precursors of contemporary events. In parallel, scholarship was adding new evidence to Droysen's view of Hellenistic civilization as a mixed culture which, although Greek in character, had been enriched by the incorporation of features derived from ancient Near Eastern cultures.”

In Peter Green's book “Alexander of Macedon 356-323 B.C. a Historical Biography” on pages 482 and 483 we read “Committed liberalism, however, was not a universal feature of nineteenth-century scholarship. European history moved in various channels, some more authoritarian than others: as usual, Alexander's reputation varied according to context. One milestone in Alexander studies was the publication of Johann Gustav Droysen's still immensely influential biography, *Alexander der Grosse* (1833). It has often been said, with justice, that this is the first work of modern historical scholarship on Alexander: Droysen was, undoubtedly, the first student to employ serious critical methods in evaluating our sources, and the result was a fundamental study. Once again, however, Droysen's own position largely dictated the view he took of his subject. Far from being a liberal, he was an ardent advocate of the reunification of Germany under strong Prussian leadership and after 1848 served for a while as a member of the Prussian parliament.

Thus we have a biographer of Alexander imbued with a belief in monarchy and a passionate devotion to Prussian nationalism: how the one aspect of his career influenced the other is, unfortunately, all too predictable. For the

aspirations of independent small Greek states (as for their German counterparts) he had little but impatient contempt. In his view it is Philip of Macedon who emerges as the true leader of Greece, the man destined to unify the country and set it upon its historical mission; while Alexander carried the process one step farther by spreading the blessings of Greek culture throughout the known (and large tracts of the unknown) world. Plutarch's early essay on Alexander had made much the same point, contrasting the untutored savage who had not benefited from the king's civilizing attentions with those happy lesser breeds who had, the result of their encounter being that blend of Greek and oriental culture which Droysen, perhaps rather misleadingly, christened Hellenism.

As one contemporary scholar says, 'Droysen's conceptions were propounded so forcefully that they have conditioned virtually all subsequent scholarship on the subject.' Whatever their views on the nature of his achievement, most subsequent biographers tended to see Alexander as, in some guise or other, the great world-mover. This view held up surprisingly well until after the Second World War. The late nineteenth century, after all, saw the apogee of the British Empire, and scholars who got misty-eyed over Kipling in their spare time were not liable to argue with Droysen's view of Alexander. But this was also the heyday of the English gentleman, and much of that fascinating if often legendary figure's characteristics also now began to figure in their portraits – Alexander's becoming lack of interest in sex, his chivalrous conduct to women, his supposed ideals and aspirations towards the wider and mistier glories of imperialism.”

Droysen again sets the stage for Macedonians not only to be viewed as “Greeks” but as “Greek unifiers” missing the point altogether that Philip II of Macedonia subjugated the City States after defeating their armies in Charonea in 383 BC. But some people just see what they want to see completely ignoring reality!

In the book “The Body Impolitic” by Michael Herzfeld on page 9 we read “Here is the ultimate Greek tragedy: that of a country forced to treat everything familiar at the time of the nation-state’s foundation as ‘foreign’ while importing a culture largely invented – or at least redesigned – by German classicists of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. For many decades, and almost without interruption, Greeks were forced to put aside music, art and language that were deemed too tainted by the ‘oriental’ influences of the Ottoman, Arab, Slavic and Albanian culture; to forget the partially Albanian roots of modern Athens and its environs; to use in elite-controlled contexts such as schools, the media and the law courts an artificial language syntactically modeled to a surprising extent on French and German but claimed as a revival of a ‘pure’ ancient Greek that supposedly had been preserved in these quintessentially Western languages; and to contemplate the architecture of Bavarian neoclassicists

as more genuinely Greek than the homes and churches that had been their cultural settings for many centuries.”

Then on page 6 of the same book we read “The Greeks’ marginal status in the ‘Western Civilization’ of which they are supposedly founders, and yet in important respects also the victims, rudely batters their everyday lives at every turn: internationally embarrassed by their successive governments scandals and acutely aware of their dependency on the European Union of which Greece is a member state enjoying nominally full equality with the others, they find themselves derided for an obsession with whether or not they are ‘really European’ that is itself the product of a ‘crypto-colonial’ set of aesthetic and ethical norms.”

On page 7 of Michael Herzfeld’s book “The Body Impolitic” we read “Greece is a country created and lauded by the West for virtues that were to a great extent invented in the West: the glories of classical culture, intensely studied and formulated in such universities as Gottingen and Oxford during the enlightenment, were imported during the romantic era in Greece, now under a western imposed Bavarian monarchy and Bureaucracy. In Athens, a partially Albanian small town dragged into modernity by being made the national capital, the florescence of neoclassical architecture signed the reconstruction of the present as a living past, but the local architecture (and especially those aspects of it that seemed to recall the Ottoman period) was demolished as quickly as possible. Domestic spaces nonetheless retained non classical interiors often with distinct Turkish-sounding names for the various features, in contrast to the classical names of the exterior ornament. In language, above all, ordinary speech was increasingly condemned as both decadent and foreign, a medley of Turkish and Slavic influence, and was replaced for legal and educational purposes by the newly created puristic language. Music, art and folklore – everything was reclassicised in a formula created in Germany, Britain and France.”

Further down on page 7 and at the top of page 8 of the same book we read “Greek independence was thus highly conditional. The bourgeoisie that emerged out of this situation was beholden to the west; the religious imitated the rationalism of the West; and the academic establishment, especially during periods of military rule, faithfully reproduced the self demeaning ideology of Greece the European ancestors as prime instrument of its own – highly conditioned – status and power.”

I find it unnecessary to add any more information; the above few quotes quite remarkably define not only the fabrication processes but also the character imposed on the south Balkan people to create this fantastic entity called Modern Greece. These few quotes go a long way in describing what went on in the fabrication of this purely artificial nation called Greece and in the falsification of its history ; and if I may add at the expense, among others, of the Macedonian people.

Now a few words about the other creator of Greece; Lord Byron

“It is worth while to ask, for instance, how many of those who are moved by the poetry of Lord Byron has contrasted it with his opinion of the modern Greeks, when now and then he descends to sober prose? It is somewhat curious to notice the actual origin of Lord Byron’s expedition, and the opinion he really formed in the course of it. Dr. Millingen as his physician and constant companion, speaks with an authority on this point to which no one else perhaps can make an equal claim, and this is the account he gives; - Breaking asunder the shackles which checked their immorality, the late revolution has given the amplest scope to the exhibition of their real character, and it stands to reason that it must have placed in more glaring light the melancholy picture of their utter worthlessness. Even under the wisest government, the regeneration of a nation can be the difficult work of time, and certainly none can be less easily improvable than this.

According to the same authority, Lord Byron, when asked why he fought for Greece, gave the following reason: - Heartily weary of the monotonous life I had lead in Italy for several years, sickened with pleasure, more tired of scribbling than the public if perhaps of reading my lucubrations, I felt the urgent necessity of giving a completely new direction to the course of my ideas, and the active, dangerous, yet glorious scenes of the military career struck my fancy and became congenial to my taste. I came to Genoa, but far from mediating to join the Greeks, I was on the eve of sailing to Spain, when informed of the overthrow of the liberals, I perceived it was too late to join R. Wilson, and then it was the unmanageable delirium of my military fever that I altered my intentions and resolved on steering to Greece. After all, should this new mode of existence fail to afford me the satisfaction I anticipate, it will at least present me with the means of making a dashing exist from the scene of this world where the part I was acting had grown excessively dull.” (Pages 929 and 930, “The Nineteenth Century a Monthly Review”, edited by James Knowles, July-December, 1870)

And now I leave you with this;

“In order for Greece to be delivered her independence from the Ottomans by the great powers of the enlightened West, Greece had to prove not only that she could become a modern nation but, somehow, that Greece, under the oriental patina of the Ottoman subject, was always already the primal modern entity. Or alternatively, Greece could have followed Ludwig von Maurer’s advice, who, in 1836 said that ‘all the Greeks have to do in order to be what they used to be is mimic the Germans.’ (in Tsiomis 1985b: 144). And the Greek intellectuals understood only too well that in order for them to be considered to be European they first had to prove that they were as ‘Greek’ as the rest of the Europeans.” (Page 28, “Fragments of Death Fables of Identity an Athenian Anthropography” by Neni Panourgia).

Part 9 – Language Religion and Identity

By now everyone who has read the previous chapters in this book should be aware of the history of how the so-called Greek nation was created. But what we have not discussed so far is the criteria used in identifying who was Greek and who wasn't given that the Modern Greek nation was created from Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs.

Putting the question another way, in the early 19th century when the Greek state was being created for the first time ever, how did one recognize a Greek from a non Greek given that the majority of ethnic groups living in the land who became Greek were predominantly Albanian, Slav, or Vlach?

In James Knowles's monthly review "The Nineteenth Century and After" volume LXXXVI, July – December 1919 on page 645 we read "But who are the Greeks? At least five-sixths of them, if not more, are Christian Albanians of the Orthodox faith, Albanians in sentiment and in language, who because they acknowledge the Patriarch of Constantinople are declared to be Greek in point of 'national consciousness'.

In point of fact, the greater number of the Christian Albanians, whether Orthodox or Catholic, are thoroughly Albanian in sentiment as well as in race and language, and have nothing whatsoever in common with Greeks except allegiance to a Church which styles itself Oecumenical or universal, not national or Greek."

In this author's estimation, an Albanian whose allegiance was to the Orthodox religion was considered to be Greek.

In the book "Greece in the Twentieth Century" edited by Theodore A. Couloumbis on page 25 we read "Greeks are those who speak Turkish but profess the Christian religion of their ancestors."

In the book "The Empty Cradle of Democracy" by Alexandra Halkias on page 59 we read "Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the average inhabitant of Greece called himself of herself Roman (Romios), and the (Greek) language Romeika."

"...though this was not articulated in racial terms but on the basis of a common language, history and consciousness. In effect, at this time, whoever called themselves a Greek was a Greek. It is because of this that many Greek-speaking Albanians, Slavs, Romanians and Vlachs were easily assimilated and became important players in Greek patriotism at the time. (Dakin 1972, 8)"

"To some extent – the consciousness of the modern Greek of his classical ancestry is a product of Western scholarship."

Here Alexandra Halkias tells us that before Greece became a country in the early 19th century some of its people called themselves Romios meaning Romans and the language Romeika. But no sooner had Greece been created by its Philhellene patrons than Romios and Romaika became

Greek and all those who spoke Romaika, irrespective of their ethnic origins be it Slav, Albanian or Vlach, became instant Greeks.

In the book “Greece and the Balkans” edited by Dimitris Tsiiovas on page 43 we read “. . . common phenomenon in Balkan history: the ‘ethnicization’ of religious, social or occupational groups. Very often, such groups were denoted by the names of ethnic communities and they used these names to denote themselves as well. As we saw ‘Greek’ (Romaïos) could mean ‘Orthodox Christian’ but also ‘city dweller’ and well to do ‘citizen’ in particular. In the same way ‘Turk’ often means ‘Muslim’. Bulgarian was used to denote ‘villager’, with or without pejorative connotation. ‘Vlach’ could mean ‘shepherd’ or ‘nomad’ in General.”

In the book “Politics in Modern Greece” by Keith R. Legg on page 86 we read “The term ‘Greek’ differentiates the language spoken by inhabitants of modern Greece from the languages of the surrounding countries; but there is disagreement on what the Greek language was, is, and should be. At the time of independence, the range in local dialects was significant; a substantial portion of the population spoke Albanian.”

In the book “Political Science Quarterly” edited by The Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Twenty-Third volume, published in 1908 on page 307 we read “There was little interest as to the nationality of the rayahs while Turkish rule was strong. They were nearly all Christians of the Byzantine kind, those in Europe at least, and were hence regarded as one people, for oriental theocracy cannot conceive of nationality apart from religion. They themselves knew the differences in their origins and in such traditions as they had; some were Slavs, some Vlachs and some Albanians. . .”

“But they felt more deeply than they thought; the hardships of their common lot and the common worship of their church gave them a stronger sense of unity than disunity; they were all non-Muslims, all rayahs and in a sense all Greeks.”

Here the authors do not hesitate to equate “Greek” with “Orthodox Christian” as was truly the case back in the 19th century, a formula that the Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians would later use to make Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians out of the Macedonians.

“When we read that the Roumanians are Latins; that the Bulgarians and Servians are Slav, according to the opinion of this and that writer, or that they are Greeks, as Greece contends, we get the common coin of diplomatic exchange; but it is spurious and counterfeit if passed as historical truth.” (Page 307, “Political Science Quarterly” edited by The Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Twenty-Third volume, published in 1908).

In the book “Romaic Grammar” by E. A. Sofocles, A. M. published in 1842 on page iii of the preface we read “Romaic, or, as it is often called, MODERN GREEK is the language spoken by the modern Greeks.”

Then on page iv in the same book we read “The revolution of 1821 has restored the ancient appellation ‘Ellines’ but as it is used chiefly by the inhabitants of Bavarian Greece, who perhaps do not constitute more than one-fourth of the Greek nation, it may safely be said that the mass of the people still call themselves Romeii and their language Romaiki.”

In James Knowles’s monthly review “The Nineteenth Century” Vol. VI, July-December 1870, on pages 948 and 949 we read “The Orthodox Church, it is true, has striven more successfully to make Christian Greeks than to make Greeks Christians; but to assert that a Greek Christian is a Hellene it is as reasonable as to call all Roman Catholics Italian; and to claim a Slav or Albanian as a Hellene because he speaks Greek, is much the same as calling an educated Russian French, or an Irishman English, because they prefer French or English to their own less developed languages.”

In William St. Clair’s book “That Greece Might Still be Free” on page 8 we read “In the eyes of the majority of Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, it was primarily their religion that distinguished them from the Turks, Arabs, Armenians, Jews and others who made up the population of the Empire. All their feelings of being a community centered on the Orthodox Church with its Patriarch at Constantinople, and they felt themselves as alien to the Roman Catholic Greeks who inhabited some of the islands as to the Muslims. Their tradition lead back to the great days when a Greek-speaking Roman Emperor sat on the throne of a Christian Empire at Constantinople and the Orthodox Church and the Patriarchate had an unbroken succession which had been little affected by the Turkish conquest. The Greek language which they spoke was known as ‘Romaik’ from the time when they had been citizens of the Eastern Roman Empire. They called their children after the saints of the Orthodox Church, Georgios, Dimitrios, Spyridon.

Most Greeks of the Ottoman Empire had no comprehension of that complex of ideas relating to territorial boundaries and cultural and linguistic uniformity which makes up the European concept of a nation state.”

Then on page 9 of St. Clair’s book we read “The Albanians of Hydra and Spetsae, many of whom could not even speak Greek, regarded themselves as Greek because their allegiance was to the Orthodox Church.”

And finally on page 22 of St. Clair’s book “That Greece Might Still be Free” we read “In Greece itself the Greeks still thought of themselves as the Christian inhabitants of a Muslim Empire, not as the descendent of the Hellenes. The veneer of philhellenism in Greece was very thin indeed. The Greek leaders in Greece itself who joined the conspiracy were content to adopt the propaganda of their expatriates, but they knew that their power over their people depended on something else entirely. A policy of establishing a European nation-state based in ideas about ancient Hellas

formulated in Western Europe was far from their minds. Their aim was much simpler. They wanted to get rid of the Turks and take their place as rulers of the country. But they had no wish to set up European political institutions, to assume Western or ancient clothes, or to speak ancient Greek. They did not want to be ‘regenerated’ at all. They were content with the primitive semi-barbarous Eastern way of life they had always known.”

It is a shame indeed that so many living and vibrant cultures had to be destroyed to make room for “Hellenism”, something dead and artificial.

In Michel Herzfeld’s book “The Body Impolitic” on page 7 we read “In language, above all, ordinary speech was increasingly condemned as both decadent and foreign, a medley of Turkish and Slavic influences, and was replaced for legal and educational purposes by the newly created puristic language. Music, art and folklore – everything was reclassified in a formula created in Germany, Britain and France.”

Again, so many wonderful and vibrant mother languages destroyed to make room for an ancient 2,000 year old dead language artificially resurrected and engineered for the artificially created Hellenic identity which bears no resemblance to the real identities that it replaced which existed on those lands before they were destroyed just in the same way the Greeks are attempting to destroy the Macedonian language spoken north of Mount Olympus.

And now I will leave you with this;

In Bayard Taylor’s book “Travels in Greece and Russia” published in 1872 on pages 261 and 262 we read “The fact is, a few deeds of splendid heroism have thrown a deceitful halo over the darker features of the Greek War of Independence, and most of those who bend in reverence to the name of Marko Pozzaris do not know that his uncle Nothi stole supplies from his own troops to sell to the Turks – that, which Canaris and Miaulis were brave and incorruptible, Colocotroni filled his purse and made cowards of his men, - that, while Karaiskai was honorable, others broke the most solemn vows of their religion and murdered the captives they were sworn to spare. One can only say that the Greeks are what the Turks made them – that we should not expect to find in slaves the virtues of freedom; but treachery and perjury were never the characteristics of the Moslem. It is the corrupt leaven of the Lower Empire which still ferments in the veins of this mixed race. I have already said, and I will repeat it, that not one-fifth of the present population can with justice be called Greeks. The remainder are Slavonians, Albanians and Turks, with a slight infusion of Venetian blood.”

Part 10 - Why expose the Greek Fraud?

Many Greeks, it seems, are not happy with the material I turn out in these chapters and have bitterly complained. It is not that they believe what I have written nor do they believe anything anyone has written outside of their trusted state sponsored Greek educational system. Their problem is that they can't understand why I do this! And by "this" I mean writing about their true identities which, for some reason, seems to offend them.

The largest numbers of e-mails, outside of the profane and downright vulgar ones, I receive from Greeks on a daily basis, show a trend of puzzlement; "why, they want to know, do I do this?" Well, I will tell you.

Millions of Macedonians have been denied their ethnic identity by no one else except Greek governments, Greeks and Bulgarians. This has been going on relentlessly for over a century. For over thirty years I have tried to reason with Greeks and explain to them how we feel about being treated this way but in spite of all my effort I have not been able to make any progress. All I received back was more ridicule and the standard Greek government sponsored responses such as "you are a Slav", "there is no such thing as a Macedonian", "Macedonia is Greek", "Tito created the Macedonian identity", etc., etc., etc. I have to be honest, I don't much like what the Greeks are doing, especially considering where they stand regarding their own identity, so after thirty years of pleading I have decided to fight back in a familiar manner that every Greek would understand; deny their identity as they are denying mine.

There is however, if I may point out, a big difference between the Macedonian ethnic identity and that of the Greeks. While Macedonians are people who are true to themselves and have accepted their ethnic identity as was passed on to them by their ancestors, the Modern Greeks have accepted an artificially constructed identity which is a product of the 19th century Western Philhellenic imagination.

Macedonians have put up with a lot from the Greeks in the last hundred years and it's time we start fighting back. Greece, with its partners Serbia and Bulgaria, invaded occupied, partitioned and annexed Macedonia, a land that did not belong to them. They each then tried to forcibly and against their will turn Macedonians into Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians respectively. Those Macedonians who resisted were persecuted to no end. Some were exiled, some were tortured and many were outright killed. Greece, in its new found megalomaniac glory, wanted to turn Macedonians into Hellenes which is not only alien to Macedonians but downright artificial, a creation of the imagination.

In their zeal to expand the curse of Hellenism into Macedonia, the Greeks did some very nasty and unforgettable things to the Macedonians, of which I am sure they are not proud. Among the nastiest things they did is torture, murder and exile many Macedonians because they refused to

become Hellenes. They then introduced policies to change all Macedonian place names and people's names to Greek sounding ones to prove to everyone how "Greek" Macedonia was. They even changed the engravings on church icons and gravestones to remove all traces of Macedonia and to make the past look like it was always Greek. On top of that the Greeks introduced laws to prohibit Macedonians from speaking their mother language in order to erase another unique and dear thing belonging to the Macedonians. Need I say more?

Now that Serbia abandoned its share of divided Macedonia and the Macedonian people managed to scrape a little country together that they can call their own, the Greeks wasted no time in exporting their Hellenism and harassing them too. It seems if you are a Macedonian there is no safe place to hide from the curse of Hellenism.

After all the things Greeks have done to the Macedonians how can anyone be surprised if the Macedonians started fighting back? Who are these Greeks anyway and what right do they have to abuse the Macedonians and get away with it? How can a fabricated nation of people who are not who they say they are have such rights? In fact, how can a people like the Modern-Greeks even be allowed to have a country?

The only reason Modern Greeks have gotten away with what they have done (and are still doing to this day) is because the Macedonian people have been passive. Macedonians who have been abused over the last century have accepted their abuse as "an act of fate" because there was no one willing to help them. Macedonians however are human beings with rights and it's a matter of time before they discover they have those rights and start fighting back and exposing the racist Greek attitude which has ruled over them for more than a century. If I am any example, Macedonians will no longer tolerate the Greek abuse and will fight for their place in this world and get back what was taken from them, including their identity and dignity.

For many years Greeks have abused, tortured, exiled and murdered Macedonians and not a single perpetrator has yet to be punished. Naturally all Macedonians have lost faith in Greece and in Greek justice. Greece has shown no interest in coming to terms with the Macedonians and reconciling the past wrongs it has perpetrated against them. Is there any wonder why its abused loyal citizens drift through life like zombies?

If I may add, Greece is perhaps the only country in Europe where racism, Nazism and Fascism are still alive and well. Racism, Nazism and Fascism were destroyed during the Second World War but not in Greece. Racism, Nazism and Fascism are not only tolerated they have been allowed to flourish in Greece. Greece is still ruled by the same dynasties which served Metaxas, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, people with no respect for human rights, people who still believe in Hellenism and in the creation of a superior race. The USA among others has also supported these Greek dictatorial regimes on many occasions since World War II and

if not directly, then indirectly is responsible for the fate of the Macedonian people in Greece. No wonder the US State Department in its “Country Reports on Human Rights Practices” downplays the plight of the Macedonian minority in Greece!

Speaking of Metaxas, in the book “The Metaxas Myth Dictatorship and Propaganda in Greece” by Merina Petrakis on page 126 we read “The word Hellenism is a symbol and this symbol is the central point around which the civilization of all the nations on earth will be constructed.”

To the Greeks who place blind faith in their trusted government which has been telling them they are “Hellenes”, “descendants from the Ancient Hellenes” please take heed; even Metaxas did not believe “Hellenism” was an ethnic entity; he believed “Hellenism” was a symbol, an idea! One cannot build an ethnic nation from a symbol or from an idea!

“The target of Metaxas’ theater propaganda was the transformation of the masses in such a way that they could become worthy citizens of a ‘regenerating Greece’ and participate in the creation of the ‘Third Greek Civilization’. The ‘regeneration of Greece’ formed one of the basic objectives of the new regime and was launched by Metaxas on 10 August 1936 on his radio speech, and was repeated and analyzed in Thessaloniki on 6 September 1936: ‘We were forced to impose a dictatorship (...) in order to be able to accomplish our supreme goal which is one and only one: the ‘regeneration of Greece’: a regeneration which is not only economic but social. Greece cannot exist socially if its society consists of unhappy and miserable people. The Greek people have reached such a point of degradation and indifference that they have endangered the fate of the nation and the country (...) Thus I repeat: Regeneration from a national point of view: because you cannot exist but as Greeks; as Greeks who believe in the power of Hellenism and through it you can develop and create your own civilization.” (“The Metaxas Myth Dictatorship and Propaganda in Greece” by Merina Petrakis, pages 126 and 127).

Further down on page 127 in the same book we read “Metaxas envisaged a new state based on the revival of Hellenismos (Hellenism-Greek National Identity), and the supreme Greek ideals. These ideals and Hellenism had been squashed after the Great War and the Asia Minor catastrophe, together with the Megaly Idea (the Supreme Idea) of a Greater Greece, which was the standard-bearer of Hellenism. In Metaxas’ view, no person, especially a young person, could live without national identity because he would become disoriented and confused.”

Further on, on page 127 we read “The existing educational system, instead of offering them a cultural education based on national ideals, introduced new theories to instruct and enlighten young people on general matters. This was, according to Metaxas, a fatal mistake: education in Greece should serve no other purpose than to educate Greeks and directed them towards the great national ideals. Spiritually, people could only exist as Greeks, Turks, French, English, Germans and others. Therefore, Greek

youth should realize that they could exist and act only through their nationality: Hellenism, Metaxas claimed in the 'historical' articles exchanged between him and his political rival Venizelos, (the charismatic propagandist for 'Greater Greece'), through Kathimerini in 1934-1935 had no boundaries, and the Megali Idea was dead only in its territorial form. By and large, Greek Civilization and Greek Culture had no boundaries either. Thus, it was imperative that Greek National Culture, the Hellenic Culture, should be reconstructed and reinstated, in such a way, that it could spread beyond the geographical frontiers of Greece. This was the essence of Hellenism and the Megali Idea and it became the dream of the 'Fourth of August State'. On 2 October 1936 when Metaxas set out the main objectives and policies of his government the 'regeneration of Greece' formed the central theme. 'Greece has but one way out' he strongly emphasized 'to march ahead determined to achieve her regeneration; this regeneration would be a long and difficult task; but we are determined to accomplish this task completely and thoroughly. This objective needed the mobilization of every section of Greek society.'

Allow me to remind the reader that by "regeneration" Metaxas meant the total destruction of the real ethnic identities which seemed to "creep back up" in Greek society. The re-emergence of real ethnic identities Metaxas calls "degradation and indifference". In other words regeneration according to Metaxas means the re-introduction of "Hellenism" in a more potent form.

Then at the bottom page 127 Metaxas goes on to say "The route that must be taken by our Organization, an organization which bears a successful title which signifies your goals, are open to discussion and further meanings. I am sure that you will work very hard so that your ideals will be very successfully conveyed to the whole of Greece in such a way that a special class of people, who think alike are totally devoted to the state, will emerge and form the governing class of our society."

On page 128 we read "The above extract suggests that the regime was determined to use every possible means to ensure the 'regeneration of Greece' and the creation of the 'Third Greek Civilization'. In his speech to EON in Ioannina on 13 June 1937, Metaxas analyzed this concept and set out the conditions for its materialization: 'You must be prepared for what is coming because you will live to see the creation of the Third Greek Civilization which is the Modern Greek Civilization. The first civilization was the ancient civilization. That civilization was great in spirit but lacking in religious faith and is gone forever. Along came the second Greek civilization (Byzantine) which did not accomplish great spiritual things but had a deep religious faith. Now it's your turn to combine the best elements of both these civilizations and with your deep Christian faith (...) and the inspirations drawn from the great accomplishments of your ancestors you must create the Third Greek Civilization.'

The ‘Third Greek Civilization’ demanded a return to national values as they were epitomized by the Metaxas regime. These values would, according to Nicoloudis urge the ‘thirsty’ Greek people ‘to return to their eternal springs where they would accomplish their spiritual elevation and national regeneration and create a new supreme civilization: The Third Greek Civilization’.”

And finally on page 131 we read “Thus, the Greek foreign policy under Metaxas, at least in the beginning, came under German influence.”

Besides sounding utterly mad like a script for a fiction b-rated movie, Metaxas’ approach in theory may sound progressive. There is nothing wrong with a people returning to its roots, but to what roots was Metaxas proposing to return? To the Slav, Albanian, or Vlach roots from which his Modern Greek people descended? Of course not! He was proposing to return to his mythical roots of the Philhellene creation, the ones that never existed before. Still one might say that there is nothing wrong with that, unless the one was a Macedonian who lived through and witnessed the Metaxas madness.

Outside of Macedonians being exiled in the hundreds of thousands to the hot and dry island concentration camps purely for being born Macedonians, outside of having their language banned by law not to be spoken in private or in public, and, outside of having been forced to accept foreign names and a foreign imposed alien identity, Macedonians don’t have much to complain about Metaxas’s accomplishments.

But the worst thing about Metaxas is his policies which he instituted in the late 1930’s regarding the treatment of ethnic minorities in Greece; policies which exist and are still enforced to this day. Another prevalent issue in today’s Greece is Metaxas’ racist attitudes which have survived and been practiced not only in education and in government institutions but in the psyche of the Greek people who for years have been brainwashed and sold on the glory of Hellenism which, if they care to find out, is synonymous with racism, Nazism and Fascism.

Ladies and gentlemen, the legendary Dr. Frankenstein is alive and well, and for the past century or so, has been working for the Greek government in aid of Hellenism.

For those who still ask “why I do this?” let’s say I have my reasons. Besides the countless Macedonian lives lost in the fight against Hellenism, the countless people exiled, split apart from their families, had their properties and homes confiscated, and, besides those who were converted into ardent Hellenes, there are also those Macedonians who still feel insecure about their culture and identity thanks to the Greek need to propagate Hellenism. I have decided to speak to those people and tell them that they have no reason to feel insecure and ashamed of who they are and have no need to question their history and ethnic identity just because the Greeks told them to. I want these people to look into the true face of Hellas

and the Hellenes and see them truly for what they are; a fake nation full of frauds unworthy of attention and undeserving of admiration.

Part 11 - The curse of Hellenism

Hellenism is not a religion, it is not an ethnic entity and is not even a national identity; it is an idea, an idea designed to mold an entire country into believing and behaving the way Modern 19th century Europeans wanted. Hellenism began in a small part of Modern Greece, in fact to be more precise the Philhellenes created that small part of Modern Greece because they needed a cultural basis to model their idea after. The Modern Europeans found what they needed in a society that lived in that very small region of Modern Greece 2,400 years ago.

Once upon a time during the late 18th and early 19th century there were some Western Europeans who considered themselves “forward looking” and believed they could improve the world if only they could teach it how to behave in a manner to their liking. To do that they needed a model which they found in the people of 2,400 years ago who lived in the southern part of today’s Modern Greece. The ideas and actions of these Western Europeans came to be known as “Hellenism” and they themselves became known as “Philhellenes” or friends of the Hellenes. The people that accepted the ideals of Hellenism thus became known as the “Hellenes”.

Modern Greece was not named “Greece” by accident and neither was Ancient “Greece”. We all know that there is not a single ancient map showing “Greece” because there was no “Greece” back then. The names “Greece”, “Greeks”, “Ancient Greece” and “Ancient Greeks” came into use and prominence in the late 18th, early 19th centuries. One of the reasons for giving “Greece” a Latin name is because the Philhellenes needed “Greece” to have a Western name in order to be part of the Western World. Another reason for coming up with this name was to, for the first time ever, group together all the ancient worlds including the City States, Achaea, Thessaly, Epirus and Greek occupied Macedonia under one “Western sounding” name, “Greece”.

Modern Hellenism was expected to begin in the southern part of Modern Greece with the toppling of the Ottoman Empire and from there expand outwards. Not everyone however bought into the idea of Hellenism, not if it had to be at the expense of traditional values.

The idea was that in order to be a Hellene one had to not only embrace the ideals of Hellenism but had to forsake ones own culture, traditions, language and even religion. To many people Hellenism was synonymous with paganism. It is funny nowadays to hear Greek Orthodox Priests bursting with pride about being such great Hellenes unknowingly or intentionally forsaking Christianity, the very same faith they have sworn to serve. But that is not all; a Hellene is obligated to keep his or her real identity a secret not only from society but also from its offspring. The children must not know the truth, which would ensure that they would remain good Hellenes!

Surprisingly Hellenism was embraced by many people but not as many as expected. People with strong traditional values and long family roots refused to give up that which they held dear and near to their hearts. Many fought against Hellenism and many more even lost their lives. The ones who embraced Hellenism were either ignorant of their own history or wanted more out of life than what it had to offer even if it meant trading their real history, language and ethnic identity for it.

The new Hellenic identity required the Hellene to have a Hellenic name so every non-Greek personal and family name had to be changed to sound Greek. Unfortunately, as is with people receiving alias names in witness protection programs, real identities cease to exist. And since the new identities have no history, phantom histories have to be fabricated and lies propagated in order for the individuals to fit in. The “changed” individuals then have to be instilled with pride to not only convince their neighbours of who they are but eventually to convince themselves and their children. This is why today, after 200 years of Hellenization we have so many Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs and even Christian Turks from Asia Minor bursting with pride about being “pure Greeks, direct descendants from the Ancient Greeks”.

I hope now you understand why the “real” history of these people cannot be allowed to surface. If it does it will shatter the illusion of Hellenism and not only expose the perpetrated Philhellene conspiracy but will also alienate its willing and unwitting participants who now number in the tens of millions. If the conspiracy to create Hellenism is exposed then every Greek will have no choice but to question his or her “Greek” identity; are they Slav, Albanian, Vlach or some other unheard of ethnicity from Asia Minor, the Caucasus or somewhere else? The Republic of Macedonia’s coming into existence has threatened to expose this Hellenic conspiracy which explains why so many paranoid Greeks negate its existence and act so suspiciously.

For many, including the vast majority of Macedonians, who valued their culture, language and traditions, the fight against Hellenism has become a relentless and never ending struggle. For them Hellenism is a curse.

Following are excerpts from the book “Blood Lines form Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism”, by Vamik Volkan.

On pages 121 and 122 we read “Greece’s movement to build a national identity, however, contained a unique element not shared by others: external support and even pressure, for a specific kind of new identity. The British, French and Russians demanded that the modern Greek identity be Hellenic and respond to the Europeans’ nostalgia for the restoration of a pre-Christian Hellenic civilization that has been in eclipse for some two thousand years. Europeans confidently expected to see the characteristic of Homer in post liberation Greeks, in spite of the ebb and flow of history over such a great span of time. The neoclassicism that rose in seventeenth

– and eighteenth-century Europe as an aesthetic and philosophical idea was to be physically embodied in modern-day Greece. The idealistic and hopeful attitudes of neoclassicism that would later be imposed on the Greeks was succinctly expressed in 1822 when American President James Monroe declared: ‘The mention of Greece fills the mind with the utmost exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible’.

In reality, however, just before the Greek war of independence, most Greeks still referred to themselves as Romans. Vlachavas, the priest rebel leader who rose against the Ottomans, declared, ‘A Romneos I was born, a Romneos I will die’.

Some Europeans and the few Americans who came to help Greece start a new nation-state, were disappointed even indignant, to discover among Greece’s peasants there were no warrior-heroes like Achilles or Ajax, no statesmen like Pericles, no philosophers like Socrates or Plato and no poets of the caliber of Aeschylus or Sophocles. There was, in fact, little likeness between nineteenth century Greeks and the idealized Greeks from ancient history that had such hold on the imagination of European liberators.”

Further down on page 122 we read “The folklore scholar Michael Herzfeld has identified three major obstacles to the project of re-Hellenizing Greece. First, the people in the new nation-state found it difficult to accept that they should resemble the long-lost inhabitants of their land; most of the common people had no idea what they were supposed to be. Second, they could not be “Hellenic”, in the old pagan sense of the word, since they strongly adhered to the Christian faith in their Orthodox church. Finally, it was hard to be Hellenic while using a Romaic language mixed with Turkish, Arabic and Persian origin.”

Even further down on page 122 we read “Hellenism was embraced, but under the three obstacles listed above, under a special way. It was made ‘intimately personal’, identified as a mystical sensibility that could not be understood by even Western supporters. George Evlambios in 1843 declared that foreigners should not attempt the impossible by trying to fathom the mysteries of Greekness. It was ironic that the Hellenism thesis, although initially externally directed, would in practice ultimately lead Greeks to differentiate themselves from the very others who had helped to define them. Absorbing Hellenism made modern Greeks proud of their uniqueness.”

At this point I usually make my commentary about the Modern Greek hypocritical stance against the Macedonian ethnic identity and how while ignoring the fact that there is no real Greek identity, only a manufactured one, Greeks continue to be an obstacle to Macedonia’s entry into the world. But instead of making my own commentary, this time I will use quotes from the book “The Emerging Strategic Environment Challenges of the twenty-first century” edited by Williamson Murray.

On page 17 of this book we read “Considering, for example, the contemporary notions promulgated by the Ministry of Education in Athens regarding Macedonia. Greek textbooks portray Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great as exemplars of Greek civilization and their kingdom as thoroughly Hellenized. Therefore, according to this logic, the modern inhabitants of Macedonia are a product of an unbroken cultural influence stretching back to the Greece of the fourth century BC. As a result, the present Slav-inhabited Republic of Macedonia supposedly has no right to its name nor to use the sixteen-pointed Star of Vergina, the symbol of the ancient Kingdom of Macedonia, as its national emblem. Left out of this fairy tale is the absence of any proof that the ancient Macedonians spoke Greek or formed part of Greek culture.

Furthermore the undisputed fact that Philip and Alexander admired Greek culture and that Greek was spoken at their court hardly made their subjects Greek, any more than the fact that the court of Catherine the Great and Alexander I spoke French made the Russian serfs of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century part of French culture. Ignored, too, is the influence of successive waves of invasions that smashed into the Balkans between the fourth and fourteenth centuries AD.”

Then on page 18 we read “What was left of ancient Greek culture in medieval Macedonia after one thousand years of rapine, enslavement and slaughter at the hands of outsiders? Today the Greek government insists that its country has no minorities. But a traveler to Greek Macedonia or Thrace will discover that many (perhaps 250,000 or more) Albanians, Slavs, and Muslims - what precisely to call them is completely a matter of opinion – live near the Greek border with Albania, Macedonia, Bulgaria and European Turkey. All that these contradictions really prove is that after two centuries of independence, Greek nationalists remain insecure and self-doubting behind their boastful and touchy facades.”

And now a word to my critics;

When I first started writing these chapters, Greeks accused me of “making up stories” and of “telling lies”, demanding to see proof and quotes from reliable sources. Now that I have produced quotes, many, many quotes from over thirty different reliable and unbiased authors, who by the way all support the Greek side while telling “your” story, you accuse me of using “other peoples’ words” and of “not having a mind of my own”. Please make up your minds!!!

Please, instead of putting blame on me for telling you the truth, admit to yourselves that you are a fake nation with a manufactured identity and instead of trying so hard to prove that “Macedonians don’t exist” try harder and prove that “Greeks do exist”.

For those who are still not convinced that the Modern Greek identity is an artificial creation, please continue to read this series of articles.

Part 12 – Is there a Misunderstanding?

No matter what I do these days there seems to be a misunderstanding between what I say in my articles and what is understood by most Greeks.

Once again I will repeat myself. For various reasons, which every Greek should understand, successive Greek governments and the majority of Greek people who elect those governments have been denying the Macedonians their ethnic identity. This has been going on since 1878 when it became obvious that Macedonian lands were available for the taking. One of the excuses Greek governments and many Greeks use to deny the Macedonians their identity is their empty claim that “Macedonians do not exist”. So then who were these people living on those lands which Greece acquired by war in 1912, 1913? Depending on which Greek you ask, you get a variety of answers which range from; they are “Slavs”, “Bulgarians”, “Serbians”, “Skopjans”, “Slavo-Skopjans”, etc., etc.; but NEVER Macedonians.

Greeks have been denying the Macedonians their ethnic identity for over a century not because there are no Macedonians but because they, the Greeks in 1912, 1913 usurped 51% of Macedonia’s lands and stole the Macedonian heritage and they don’t want to be exposed and identified as the lying and thieving culprits that they are. The excuse Greeks use to justify this, without an ounce of proof of course, is that “Macedonia is Greek”. And how is Macedonia Greek? They say because the Ancient Macedonians were Greek. Are we missing something here?

Even if the ancient Macedonians were related to the ancient people living south of Olympus, and they themselves say they were not, it is neither here nor there because the modern Greeks have nothing to do with either the so-called ancient Greeks or with the ancient Macedonians. In fact as I have shown numerous times the only people the Modern Greeks are related to are the Slav, Albanian and Vlach immigrants who descended upon the territory of modern Greece during the 11th to the 14th centuries. Again as I have shown in these chapters, Modern Greece and the Modern Greeks are a 19th century creation, a fabrication of the Philhellene imagination. How many times must that be said to be understood?

Up until the late 1980’s the rules were that one had to be born a Greek to be a Greek. It was my understanding that a Greek could not be made, he or she had to be born Greek. In fact Greece, in 1982 by Ministerial Decree number 106841, announced the passage of Law no. 400/76, providing that; “Free to return to Greece are all Greeks by genus, who during the Greek Civil War of 1946-1949 and because of it have fled abroad as political refugees, in spite that the Greek citizenship has been taken away from them.”

Similarly Law no. 1540 was subsequently introduced making provision for the return of confiscated properties to political emigrants, read political refugees. The wording used in the legislation was again unjustly

circumspect. It defines political emigrants for whom the law shall have application limited to those who are “Greeks by genus”.

The term ‘Greek by genus’ is a term used by Greek authorities for all those who identify themselves as being ethnic Greek. Hence ethnic Macedonians who are also political refugees and have had their Greek citizenship rescinded and/or properties confiscated are excluded from enjoying the rights granted under these laws, therefore severely questioning the very standing of the laws based on grounds of equity and fairness. Moreover, the construction of the wording as relating to these laws is not benign, it has the clear intent to discriminate against all those who belong to the category of people classified as political refugees and who are not “Greeks by genus”. Given that ethnic Macedonians predominantly make up this category of people, it is indisputable that they have been the ones targeted by this exclusivist definition and the ones to have suffered the most.

What exactly then is “Greek by genus”? Does it mean Greek by birth or Greek by blood born from Greek parents? Yes it does according to the way it has been applied in laws! How then can a Greek with Slavic, Albanian, or Vlach ancestry be a “Greek by genus” and not someone who was born in Greece, is a Greek citizen but feels Macedonian?

My friends the “Greek jig is up”! “There is no such thing as a Greek” because according to Greek law a Greek has to be born from a Greek. But how can a Greek be born from a Greek when “there is no such thing as a Greek” in the first place?

But as I say this I get comments from Greeks like the following;

“Ethnicity is not based on genetic make-up. In no country is one required to take a genetic test before he is accepted as a citizen. Even Hitler did not require any such tests. For Risto Stefov, however, and some of his colleagues, the fact that Greeks cannot prove a genetic identity to someone (not defined thus impossible anyway) who was Greek, means Greeks are not Greeks. Therefore the Greek word Macedonia and the Greek administrative district of Macedonia (in Greece) with its Greek history are up for the taking. The only merit of such an extreme form of racism is that it does not openly ask for the extermination of Greeks as it mercifully makes Greeks non-existent by an act of free will. Nevertheless, through this invention, part of Greece, Greek property (in the administrative district of Macedonia) as well as Greek heritage and history may be appropriated just the same.

Unfortunately for Risto Stefov and his friends, ethnicity is not decided by a set of genes and besides we know nothing about how genetically homogeneous the original Greeks (whoever Stefov thinks these might have been) were. This racial, or even racist, attitude towards the definition of ethnicity, ignores thousands of years of linguistic and cultural continuity and the self-definition at all times of Greeks as Greeks. Stefov conveniently also ignores the geographic continuity, for Greeks never

lived just around Athens and Sparta by their own accounts and the accounts of others.” (Tymphaios, March 06, 2009)

So, what is Mr. Tymphaios telling us? Is he telling us that “anyone who feels like a Greek can be Greek”? What about someone who is and feels Macedonian can they be Macedonian? For over 100 years Greeks have been saying NO!

No matter how you slice it Mr. Tymphaios, this type of “Greek logic” is very difficult to swallow.

All I want from you Greeks is to apply the same logic to the Macedonians as you apply to yourselves! If a Slav, Albanian and Vlach can be “a Greek” because, if I understand Tymphaios correctly, he or she “feels like a Greek” then why a Macedonian, born of Macedonians, who lived in Macedonia for many generations, cannot be a Macedonian? You can’t have it both ways!

Mr. Tymphaios goes on to say “The nationalistic principles of the nineteenth century, in which an ethnicity was genetically unchangeable through time, is a fossil of pre-scientific thinking. Thanks to Darwin and the scientific revolution he brought about, we know a little bit more now than people knew in the 19th century. Humans, like other species, are not static. The ancient Greeks had no special properties all of which disappeared with them when Demosthenes, or Alexander [for your information Mr. Tymphaios, Alexander was not Greek, he was Macedonian] or someone or other died. Linguistic, historic and cultural continuity is what determines the survival of an ethnicity not a unique ‘blood’ or an exclusive set of genes. Like species, so human ‘ethnicities’ evolve over time. Risto Stefov’s quest is a constant search for a genetic contamination from Albanians or some other ‘impure’ ethnicity, so that like a creationist he may say: aha, Greeks as known today were never created by God, or Greeks of the ancient times have no connection to today’s Greeks because they did not call themselves Romioi, presumably did not mix with Albanians, etc. So therefore they were a different ‘race’. He cuts a lonely figure in such a quest, because this kind of thinking is more and more recognized as belonging to those racist theories promoted by the fascistic states of mid-20th century. Stefov’s ethnic principle is like that of Creationism in the sense of lines that are not evolving but can only stay or disappear. Today this is a thought rarely entertained even by ordinary laymen.”

But what Tymphaios fails to understand, or is hypocritical about it, is that the exact same thing he speaks of and accuses me of doing is practiced by Greece today! Mr. Tymphaios, principles which apply to the Greeks as you stated above equally apply to the Macedonians! I can and have accused you of doing the same thing you are accusing me of, except that Greece and Greeks are the ones who deny the Macedonians their ethnic identity and not the other way around? All I am doing is pointing out what others, whose research you might appreciate, are saying about you. So

again I will ask the question “why can’t a Macedonian, who calls him or herself Macedonian, born from Macedonians and feels like a Macedonian, according to Greeks, cannot be a Macedonian”? Mr. Tymphaios and the rest of you Greeks who deny the Macedonians their ethnic identity, I anxiously await your answer.

Frankly Mr. Tymphaios, I couldn’t care less what you Greeks call yourselves and who you think you are and who you think you have descended from. What I don’t like about you is your lack of fairness when it comes to treating those different from you and your disregard for the rights of the Macedonian people both inside Greece and in the Republic of Macedonia.

First, you, and by you I mean Greece and the Greeks, invaded, occupied and annexed our country Macedonia without our consent, which I call theft, then you tormented, killed, assimilated and evicted us from our homes in the name of Hellenism. You then changed our personal names, toponyms and hydronyms and made them Greek sounding so that you could show the world how Greek Macedonia is. You then banned our mother tongue and made us speak your alien Hellenic language which we detest. You openly practice racism by publicly denying Macedonians their most basic human rights and you dare call me a racist for defending myself? Where is the fairness in that?

Perhaps Mr. Tymphaios you should learn a bit more about the real Greece before you leap to accusing others for things your country and your countrymen practice every day.

And now I will leave you with this;

“It is, after all, through the same neo-Classical elite ideology that today rejects Bernal’s arguments out of hand that Greeks were taught to reject everything familiar in their vernacular culture as ‘foreign’ to the Classical Hellenism invented by the eighteenth-century German scholars who had sired both the ‘autochthonous’ theory of Greek ethno-genesis and, in the lineage of ‘Aryan’ linguists, the so called racial science of the Nazis. This is also the ideology that today made it necessary to specify whether one means modern Greeks, as I have just done, because the West has made Classical antiquity the only acceptable touchstone of their cultural worth. The example of modern Greece provides a useful key to historicizing those who Eric Wolf has ironically dubbed ‘the people without history’ (Wolf 1982). For the modern Greeks – a people arguable plagued by an excess of history, but for a kind invented for them by more powerful others – face a real life dilemma...” (“Anthropology, Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society” by Michael Herzfeld, page 67)

Part 13 – What is Greece up to?

So for Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs who want to be Greeks they can be Greeks because they feel like being Greeks but for Macedonians who are Macedonians and want to remain Macedonian, according to twisted Greek logic, they cannot be Macedonians! Why is that, why the double standard and what are the Greeks up to?

Well to put it bluntly, it is very simple. Greece has stolen Macedonian lands and has expropriated the entire Macedonian heritage. It doesn't want anyone to know about it or have to give back what it stole from them. So instead of dealing with its issues Greece is making all kinds of childish accusations to avoid them. One of its most childish accusations is its claim that "Macedonians don't exist".

First and foremost everyone must understand that it is not up to Greece to decide whether Macedonians exist or not; it is up to the Macedonians and the Macedonian people decided a long time ago that they do exist and have spilled blood to establish themselves in this world. YES there are Macedonians and YES they exist all over the world and inside Greece and Bulgaria. Most of the world, except for Greece and Bulgaria and their European Union supporters who shall remain nameless, has accepted the fact that Macedonians exist and have no problem with it.

It is well known to historians and to most laymen that Macedonia was a "nation state" and even an empire with historic roots which proves its existence, whereas Greece was NEVER a nation state that is not until 1829 when the Philhellenes artificially created it. Greece has no proof of its existence as a nation state prior to that. In fact there is not a single ancient map that shows the words "Greek" or "Greece" to ever have existed.

If you have been reading these articles by now you should also know that "there is no such thing as a Greek" in a natural or ethnic sense. The Modern Greek nation was created by the 19th century Western European Philhellenes and rests on the bones of the Slav, Albanian and Vlach cultures which were sacrificed to artificially create Greece. Macedonians on the other hand are a genuine people who do have their own unique culture and recognize, acknowledge and respect their true roots.

Besides stealing Macedonian lands and expropriating the Macedonian heritage, the Greeks have also committed many atrocities against the Macedonian people of which I am sure they are not proud and of which they don't want the world to know. These include burning Macedonian villages, killing innocent civilians, exiling families, exiling children, confiscating properties, imprisoning and torturing tens of thousands and downright murdering thousands of Macedonians. These are recent and well documented historic events that can easily be proven and cannot be denied.

On top of that Greece has also changed peoples' personal and family names, changed all Macedonian place names and prohibited Macedonians

from speaking their Macedonian language and from identifying as Macedonians. In fact Greece went even further and erased everything that was Macedonian including Macedonian inscriptions on public buildings, church icons and gravestones. Why did Greece do all this? Obviously it had a reason!

The reason Greece did all this is because it is hiding a deep dark secret, a secret it doesn't want the world to know. So to avoid revealing this secret, Greeks will do anything to keep Macedonians distracted and away from these issues.

But as long as Macedonians pay attention to the Greeks, the Greeks will continue to engage them in their lies and rhetoric which will keep them busy and away from finding the truth. Greeks love nothing better than to engage people in nonsensical issues like the "name dispute" to keep them from finding out what truly matters to Greece, the "Macedonian lands".

Greeks couldn't care less what the world thinks of the "crazy debates" that go on between Macedonians and Greeks as long as they are distracting and not about what matters to Greece most, the "Macedonian lands".

Greece would rather have the entire world believing that all Balkan people are crazy with nothing better to argue about than ancient names and who was who 2,000 years ago. And as long as the world thinks we are all crazy the Greeks will enjoy living in the warmth and luxury of our Macedonian homes while we freeze out in the cold. As long as we engage the Greeks in nonsensical issues and the world thinks we are crazy the Greeks will continue to pillage and rape our Macedonia, our inheritance from our fathers and grandfathers. And while the Greeks enjoy the comfort of our homes and lands we will roam the Diaspora as political and economic refugees.

You want the truth about Greece? This is the truth about Greece and our predicament with it! Macedonian homes and lands today are occupied by former Albanians, Vlachs and Asia Minor Turks who today call themselves Macedonians, themselves victims of Hellenism, while the real Macedonians are roaming the world living in foreign lands. And why is this? Because Greece wants to hold onto Macedonian lands at any cost, lands that do not belong to Greece, lands that Greece acquired by war in 1912, 1913 and against the wishes of the real Macedonian people.

Why is Greece making childish claims that "Macedonians don't exist"? Why is Greece continually inventing new lies? So that it could lay claim to Macedonia, so that it could say that Macedonia belongs to Greece. So that it could forever steal our inheritance from us!

In order for Greece to "lay claim" to Macedonian lands, it must remove all other claimants who may have similar claims or who may challenge its claim. The only people who have legitimate claims to Macedonia and the Macedonian heritage are the Macedonian people themselves. So by denying the existence of the Macedonian identity

Greece is in effect removing the Macedonian people from this equation. So, according to Greek logic, if Greeks continue to believe Macedonians do not exist they cannot challenge Greece's claim to Macedonia: plain and simple.

In order to "lay claim" to the Macedonian lands and heritage Greece requires proof of ownership. So far however there were no reasons for Greece to show proof of ownership because there were no challengers to its claims. But with the appearance of the Republic of Macedonia, Greece is becoming increasingly insecure and feels that sooner or later those challengers are bound to surface. So to delay or divert those challenges Greece has invented a number of nonsensical issues such as "the name dispute" and the various vetoing threats to keep the Macedonian people busy and away from the main issue; challenging Greece's hegemony over Macedonia, a land and heritage that does not belong to Greece, a land and heritage that belongs to the Macedonian people. And there ladies and gentlemen lies the crux of the entire problem.

Now for those who think they know Greece! (This includes most Greeks and many foreigners)

No one knows Greece's attitude towards the Macedonians better than the Macedonians themselves who have lived in Greece. No one knows Greece better than the Macedonians who have experienced Greek justice first hand. Being Macedonian from Greece and having lived in Greece we qualify, more than anyone, to judge for ourselves what Greece is and why Greece is behaving the way it is. We have a good idea of what it is like to be abused by Greece and Greeks and I can assure you our story is not a pretty one. We know exactly what the Greeks are capable of, what they will do and how far they will go to hold onto Macedonia. And as Macedonians from Greece we know that there is but one real issue to focus on and that is the lands the Greeks have stolen from the Macedonians; everything else is trivial.

Everything that Greece has done to this day was done to safeguard its hold on the Macedonians lands. By what it has done to this day is proof that Greece will stop nothing short of exterminating the entire Macedonian nation in order to safeguard its hold on Macedonian lands and to hide the atrocities it has committed against the Macedonian people.

The so-called "name dispute", veto threats, history lessons, etc., etc., that Greece continues to invent are nothing more than smoke and mirrors to hide the only tangible item Greece values "the Macedonian lands".

"The recent furor over the publication of a relatively mild historical and ethnographic account of the progressive Hellenization of the Greek province of Macedonia (Karakasidou 1997) exhibits both the nervousness of the Greek establishment and the persistence of stereotypes of Greeks as irrational, hysterical Balkan lunatics among supposedly sober commentators in the West. It also demonstrates the neuralgia that anthropology can induce in those who are committed to unitary myths of

national origin...” (“Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society, Anthropology” by Michael Herzfeld, page 68).

Are Greeks who know their own true identities and who are well aware of how they acquired Macedonian lands nervous? You bet they are! More nervous than ever since the Republic of Macedonia came into existence and the Macedonian people started to take matters into their own hands.

Greece was launched in early 19th century like a sailing ship without a rudder. What happened to it was not entirely its own fault. But since then Greece had all the time in the world and plenty of opportunities to build a rudder and change direction. But as of yet it hasn't! Instead of joining the post World War II democratic nations and embracing democracy, Greece has chosen to remain static; a racist bigot nation which refuses to submit to the truth and reality of its own situation.

Part 14 – My personal Opinion

Recently one of my readers wrote to me asking for my personal opinion of what I think is Greece's dispute with the Macedonian people. More precisely as a Macedonian from Greece what do I think is the core issue that troubles Greece with regards to the Macedonians?

Let me start by saying that, in my opinion, there is one core issue that troubles Greece and that is the Macedonian lands. Greece in 1912, 1913 occupied 51% of Macedonia's territory and since then has turned it into Greek lands at the cost and exclusion of their real owners, the Macedonian people.

Irrespective of what one calls them and how they identify themselves, I see the Macedonians as the indigenous people that have lived in Macedonia for millennia. Macedonians have no collective memory of ever arriving in these lands or having lived anywhere else except in Macedonia. So naturally I support the fact that those lands belong to the Macedonians.

On the other hand the Greeks in 1912, 1913 invaded, occupied and annexed Macedonia, which never belonged to them and makes their annexation illegal under international law.

But worse than that, after annexing Macedonian lands the Greeks were not satisfied with having the Macedonians living on them so they implemented assimilation policies to turn Macedonians into Greeks. Naturally many Macedonians resisted and over the years were punished by Greece. Many were tortured, exiled, jailed and even murdered.

It is difficult for people to believe that Greece would want to assimilate alien ethnic groups and turn them into Greeks. What would be their motive?

There is plenty of evidence that suggests that the Greeks did this to expand their manufactured Hellenic Empire and bring back the glory of the mythical Hellas of ancient times, a type of Hellas that never existed before. Given that Modern Greeks themselves are a manufactured entity and having nothing to do with the so-called Ancient Greeks, these modern charlatans felt it was their duty to convert every Macedonian into a Greek, even if it meant doing it against their will. The Greeks did this in order to create a false idea that Macedonia somehow was once part of Greece and that the Macedonian lands, heritage and people belonged to Greece.

Today however we know that the Macedonians are a unique ethnic entity entirely different from the Greeks and that the Modern Greeks are in reality the descendants of the Slav, Albanian and Vlach immigrants who came to Greece during the 11th to the 14th centuries AD.

So through its assimilation policies Greece turned the 51% of Macedonia it occupied into a type of Borg-hive (like in the fictional Star Trek movie series) where people were not allowed to have real names, speak a real language, or express themselves in their own familiar culture.

Real things like personal names, place names, mother language and familiar writing were forbidden from being used and were replaced with alien names, an alien language and an alien writing system all in the name of Hellenism and all for the glory of modern artificial Hellas.

The Macedonian peoples' lives in Greece are full of tragedy. Not only was one occupier (the Ottomans) replaced with another (the Greeks) in 1912, but many Macedonians lost their lands and all of them lost their identity, language, culture and continuity. But their tragedy doesn't end there.

Outside of the Macedonians who were forced out of their homes and lands and outside of the ones who submitted to Hellenism because of fear or for personal gains, there are also the majority of Macedonians who felt oppressed with no opportunity to improve their lives and political situation. These Macedonians are left in limbo waiting for an opportunity to bounce back. Unfortunately the Greeks know this and have made sure such an opportunity never presents itself. That is why consecutive Greek governments since 1912 have made it their mission to suppress and torment the Macedonian people so that such opportunities are avoided at all cost.

Besides losing their lands, freedom and identity and being treated like second class citizens in their own lands, the Macedonians in Greece who feel Macedonian, even without publicly expressing it, have been unjustly persecuted. Greece continues to this day to close the border to Macedonians and to confiscate Macedonian lands. Greek authorities look away when Macedonians are harmed and Greek courts often side with the perpetrators in such cases. Putting it more bluntly, Greece not only discourages people from expressing their ethnic sentiments but will legally prosecute those who do.

Given the current situation and Greece's attitude towards the Macedonians what can be done to help bring positive change?

A valid question indeed, a question I have struggled with for many years but to this day I have found no answer. Since Macedonia's occupation in 1912 Greece has maintained a singular policy; exterminate the Macedonian people and permanently annex their lands and heritage. This policy has not changed since it was implemented in 1912 which leaves the Macedonian people with little room to maneuver. In fact the only options left for the Macedonians in Greece are to disappear all together or fight back for their survival! In my opinion there is but one option for the Macedonians and that is to "liberate Macedonia from the Greeks"!

To do that, however, Macedonians must first stop responding to Greek engagements in nonsensical issues and start focusing their effort in highlighting the truth about their status in Greece. Macedonians must let the world know what Greece has done and is still doing to them. All Macedonians originating from Greek occupied Macedonia who care about

their inheritance, who care about their family's lands, properties and homes which their fathers, grandfathers and great grandfathers poured sweat and spilled blood to build and protect, must stand up and demand their human rights from Greece. Failing that, they must then demand that the Greeks leave Macedonia.

It doesn't matter what the world thinks and what the Greeks will do; Macedonians have a duty to express their own feeling, their own desires and their own needs. By any definition, the 51% of Macedonia that was occupied by Greece in 1912 is still occupied by Greece to this day. Greece had all the time in the world and plenty of opportunity to voluntarily stop its persecution of the Macedonians and award them their human rights as prescribed by International law. Unfortunately Greece to this day has ignored every call from every International institution to voluntarily comply.

Perhaps what the Macedonians need to do, to give Greece a wakeup call, is amass in every major city in the world and hold human rights demonstrations with huge placards held high with slogans like "Macedonia is Macedonian", "Greeks get out of Macedonia" and "Greece stop the ethnic cleansing of Macedonians". It's about time the Greeks are given reciprocal treatment by challenging their identity as they have challenged ours for the last one-hundred years. It's time we raise placards with slogans like, "There is no such thing as a Greek", "a Modern Greek is nothing but a Slav, an Albanian and a Vlach", "Hellenism is Barbarism" and "I am a Macedonian from Greece and I exist".

Greece has proven it will not yield on human rights on its own unless it is extremely pressured from the outside. Greece has a long record of abuse against all people who are not committed to Hellenism and fear they are a threat to its integrity. Greece feels that if it recognizes any of its ethnic groups living on its soil it will have to justify to them the violence and criminal conduct it perpetrated against them over the years. In other words, what Metaxas and others like him did to the Macedonian people in pursuit of Hellenism, will no longer be viewed as an act of "glory for Hellas" but a criminal act of "cultural genocide" against an innocent population.

If the Greek government recognizes a single minority it will have to explain to the people why in the past it committed cultural genocide against that minority. It will also have to punish all those involved in perpetrating the "cultural genocide". And how can it do that when everyone in the entire Greek government today is a devout Hellene who believes in the glory of Hellas and that no "minorities" exist in Greece? How can it do that when Greeks who today hold high positions in Greek society are the pillars of Hellenism and claim to be the descendants of Plato and Pericles? What are the chances of the Greek government ever doing that?

Greece will not become a democratic state and will not allow its ethnicities to self declare until racism and intolerance are completely

eradicated in that country. Greece cannot and will not free itself from its prejudices until it deals with its past and corrects the injustices perpetrated against its innocent population. There can be no closure for any of the ethnic groups living in Greece until Greece gives up its Hellenism and its imperial plans for glory and the pursuit of its expansionist Megali Idea, an Idea that today lays dormant.

Given that Greece will not yield on its own, what can be done to improve the Macedonian situation in Greece?

First and foremost we need to fight for our human rights as a people protected by international law. As people we have certain rights that need to be exploited. We can't continue to dismiss what Greece is doing to us thinking of it as "an act of fate" when in fact it's "an act of crime".

Second we need to learn to voice our concerns and no longer be silent and put up with abuse. After all the harm Greece has done to us, how much more harm can it do? Keeping silent only prolongs our agony and allows Greece to further rob us of our lands, heritage and dignity. The Greeks today live warm and comfortable lives in our homes, the very same homes our Macedonian ancestors slaved to build and died to protect. And while the Greeks live comfortably consuming "our inheritance" we roam the Diaspora.

It is time to speak up and tell Greece to recognize us and accept us for who we are, Macedonians, or to speak up and tell the Greeks to "get the hell out of our Macedonia"!

"The relationship between the Modern Greeks and the Macedonians is a relationship marked by bloodshed, murder, unimaginable atrocities that have yet to be accounted for - and it all started with An Invasion in 1912 that broke every international law, and treaty of its time. This is what needs to be addressed - if the Macedonians raise this one point, it will be a massive blow to Modern Greece, and significantly Europe too, which has unofficially sanctioned Greece's state sponsored genocide of the Macedonians. If the Macedonians, anywhere in the world, can get this point (and only this point), there is hope some wrongs of the past, might be addressed." Paul from www.maknews.com/forum

And now I leave you with this:

Thanks to one of my readers for bringing it to my attention;

Please click on this link; <http://www.youtube.com/ristostefov>

As much as I don't like what this person is doing, especially the "impersonating" part, I welcome the initiative which proves that I am getting my message across. This imposter while accusing me of "falsification" has failed to notice the irony in his message which hypocritically, is also an act of falsification!

Thank you again for reminding me why I do this (fighting for the rights of all Macedonians) and for confirming that I am on the right track. By impersonating me and by your rude comments you not only have belittled yourself but you have inadvertently validated everything I have

said about your behaviour and the way your kind treats the Macedonian people. Congratulations, whoever you are, in your depraved ways you have done your racist country proud!

“There cannot be an Athenian alive today who can trace a direct line of descent from classical times to the present without leaving Athens. Because of numerous and protracted foreign occupations, true Athenians were a relatively small minority even in the age of Pericles. In a later period the city was suffering with severe depopulation and was re-stocked with Albanians! At the time of Greek independence in 1834, Athens was a miserable village with a population of only 6000. So, in this sense, there cannot be any true Athenians of classical breeding.” (Insight Guides, Athens, Greece Series, page 42)

Part 15 – More questions

As much as I don't want to turn this series into a "Dear Risto" column, a couple of you have asked some very important, worthwhile and valid questions that I would like to answer.

1. As Macedonians should we be abandoning our "Slavic" culture in favour of the Ancient Macedonian one?

2. What is your personal, and not a dictionary quote, definition of a Hellene? In your opinion who and what is a Hellene?

I will begin answering the first question by saying that the Macedonians of today are a product of all that has happened in Macedonia. We are the descendents of all the people who set foot on those lands and therefore are the inheritors of everything that was left for us. Since man set foot on Macedonian soil our culture has been evolving, growing and adding to our being; culminating in what it is today.

We are Macedonians because we have lived in Macedonia for many generations and have experienced what is Macedonian and that which we have experienced has made us into who and what we are, Macedonians. If we seek the truth about who we are then we have no choice but to accept and embrace everything that makes us who we are. We are Macedonians, one of the deepest rooted people in the world and inheritors of everything that was Macedonian since before history was recorded.

In an ethnic sense we are Macedonians but linguistically we speak a Slavic language, a language that today is described as belonging to the family of Slavic languages. Ethnically we are not Slavs, we can't all be Slavs from the Balkans to Siberia. We are Slavic speakers who over the years have evolved into a unique entity which can only be described as Macedonian. We have, however, contributed immensely to what we today call "Slav culture" more than any other ethnic nation in the Slavic speaking world. We know for a fact that Slav culture, particularly the written form of the language, was spread from Macedonia by the Solun brothers Kiril and Metodi and that is undeniably part of our Macedonian heritage.

Are the modern Macedonians the descendants of the ancient Macedonians?

My answer to that question is why stop with the ancient Macedonians? Why not go even further back and ask "are we the descendants of all the people that occupied Macedonian lands since the melt of the last ice age"? We cannot say with certainty that we are and neither can we say that we are not. All we can say is that Macedonia, the land and all that has taken place on it over the ages has made us into who we are today, Macedonians. One thing we need to refrain from is allowing others, particularly our enemies to define us.

Our neighbours to the south, the Greeks, have made the mistake of defining themselves as the "descendants of the ancient Greeks" ignoring

many years of evolution, population movements, invasions, conquests and so on. The Greeks followed the “Western European” blueprint for nation building and falsely linked themselves to the ancients and only the ancients, leaving a wide gap in their culture. However they only did this to make political gains and take advantage of their neighbours, particularly the Macedonians. In fact most of Western Europe has used mythical historiography to build its modern nations. Macedonia does not need to resort to myths because Macedonians have historically existed since pre-history.

If there is the question of who the Modern Macedonians are then there must also be a question of “who the Ancient Macedonians were”.

As far as we know the Ancient Macedonians began as a small tribal nation somewhere in today’s Kostur Region sometime in the 9th century BC. They only occupied today’s geographical Macedonia in the 4th century BC after Philip II became king. From what we know, Philip II defeated the various tribal kingdoms in the vicinity of today’s geographic Macedonia and incorporated the people and their lands into his Macedonian kingdom. These tribes were not all Macedonian before Philip conquered them. So what were they?

From what we know from history, Ancient Macedonia, before it became a nation state, was the land of the Pelasgians, Illyrians, Thracians, Phrygians, Paeonians and others. Hardly anything is known about these great ancient and prehistoric tribes except that they were very numerous “like leaves in a forest”. So what happened to these people? Naturally modern mainstream history would have us believe that they all disappeared, but did they? Or could these people be the ancestors of today’s modern Slav speakers?

There are some well educated and prominent scientists today who believe that large groups of people who moved into the Balkans and Europe after the last ice age are still living there to this day. Could one of those large groups be the modern day Slav speakers? There are some who believe they are! How else does one explain the Slav language being spoken over such a large expanse and by so many different people in Eastern Europe?

Now if we put two and two together we come to the realization that there is a high probability that today’s Slav speaking Eastern Europeans are the descendents of any or all of the prehistoric Illyrians, Thracians, Phrygians, Dardanians, etc.; the very same groups of people mainstream history claims have disappeared.

If the people incorporated in Ancient Macedonia by Philip II indeed came from these same tribes, and we know they did, then they too must have been the ancestors of the modern day Slav speakers. This raises the possibility that the Ancient Macedonians may also have been “Slav speakers”. We know that the most prominent Ancient Macedonians including Alexander the Great were bilingual and we have many historic

examples to prove it. We also know Alexander's Macedonian soldiers spoke an "unknown" language unique to the Macedonians. The only thing, as of yet, is that we don't know if that language was Slavic. But with time, that problem too will be solved.

So, without knowing all the facts, why would we opt for "accepting" the Ancient Macedonian heritage while rejecting our "Slav" culture when there is a possibility that one is a progression of the other?

If I had to guess, I would guess that the "Slav culture" of the 9th century AD is the revival of the Ancient Macedonian Culture of the 4th century BC but with a Christian twist.

And now to answer the second question, "my definition" of what is a Hellene?

I believe I answered this question before but I guess not to the satisfaction of at least one reader. A Hellene is a 19th century mythological being that encompasses all the desired qualities that the 19th century Western European culture craved.

Trying to define what a Hellene is is like trying to define who Santa Claus is. The word "Santa Claus" conjures up an image of a white bearded man dressed up in a red suit who gives away presents; an image of happiness. But is Santa Claus real? It depends who you ask? Most children will say that he is! But does Santa Clause exist? Yes he does, you can find him in practically every mall around Christmas time.

A Hellene is like Santa Claus in many ways. Conditioned over the years many people believe he or she exists. Any ordinary person properly dressed in red and white attire can unmistakably be Santa Claus, similarly any person who speaks and feels Greek can qualify to be a Hellene. The story of the Hellene is something like the story of Santa Claus. They both started somewhere back in Ancient times and borrowed something from this culture and something from that. The case of Santa Claus, evolved into what we know today as "the white bearded man in the red suit, living in the North Pole, making toys for little girls and boys and delivering them to all the children in the world on Christmas Eve on his sled pulled by his flying reindeer". The case of the Hellene also evolved in a similar fashion borrowing from the ancients what was attractive then mixing it with Christianity and what was desirable we then have "a Hellene who is a Christian Orthodox, speaks a bastardized ancient Language and claims to be a descendent of a race of people that died 2,000 years ago".

Will the "Santa Claus" of modern times survive the scrutiny of science if so examined? Will we find that he is real, exists and flies a sled pulled by reindeer? No! We believe in Santa Claus because he is a powerful symbol of our traditional values which today is exploited and utilized by merchants to sell their wares and make money. Similarly Hellenism (for some) is a symbol of a "perfect culture". It does not really exist and will not survive scientific scrutiny but is tolerated by people because it benefits a certain and powerful segment of our society.

Like ordinary people who put on cheap red suits and fake white beards, pretending to be Santa Claus in order to sell merchandise, ordinary people who speak Greek can also be Hellenes in order to improve their social status in society.

Does a Hellene exist? Does Santa Claus exist? It all depends on who you ask! Is a Hellene real? Is Santa Claus real? No, because they both exist only in the imagination of those who believe in them!

“To be a Modern "Hellene" one must be a liar. One has to lie about their ethnic heritage. One has to lie about their mother tongue. And one has to lie about their history. And so it goes, a Hellene is a person who is faking their ethnicity, mother tongue and history.” (Maknews from www.maknews.com)

“The British, French and Russians demanded that the modern Greek identity be Hellenic and respond to the Europeans’ nostalgia...” (“Blood Lines from Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism”, by Vamik Volkan, page 121)

“Thus, the recourse to the new image of Hellas (both as cultural construct and as social system) began immediately upon the brief rule of governor Kapodistrias and became efficiently implemented with the takeover of the Bavarian monarchy and its explicit desire for centralization and Hellenization. In fact, the cultural image of Greece was put into production with much greater urgency than was a political-economic infrastructure, despite the obvious importance of the latter in a newly constructed state.” (“Dream Nation Enlightenment, Colonization and the institution of Modern Greece”, Stathis Gourgouris, page 87)

“It should be strongly emphasized, however, that this image of classical Greece was constructed in Europe and was imported to the newborn Greek state (Tsoukalas, 2002).” (“Entangled Identities Nations and Europe”, edited by Atsuko Ichijo and Willfried Spohn, page 109)

“The adjective ‘Hellenistic’ not, significantly, existing in any Greek original – was first coined in its French form ‘hellenistiques’ by J.B. Bossuet, in 1681 as a term for the Greek of the Septuagint, the ‘Hellenized’ version of the old Testament.” (“The Hellenic Age a Short History”, Peter Green, page xvi introduction)

And now I leave you with this;

“And thus, I call upon the western intellectuals in general and the western philhellenes in particular to separate their personal sentimental attachments to Greek history, to do the only honorary thing left and treat Macedonia and Macedonian history as a separate and comprehensive study that it is, and that it certainly deserves to be. The conflicting statements left strewn in the literature in the past hundred or so years—are the result of biased and subjective influences—and have not only caused political discourse and confusion, but bring about contradictions, fuel tensions and cause unnecessary hateful speculations.

For instance, when some nineteenth century unsuspecting authors

depict events in antiquity and describe the ancient Macedonians as Greeks, it was done not because the evidence left from the ancient biographers would support such an act but because the western media and the western academia in particular, would allow dissemination of historically inaccurate information. Such supposedly "harmless" omissions—read desirable proliferation of myths—would seep easily into the readers' consciousness for whom the built up historiography of the artificially created Greek nation, lay in tandem with the envisioned fundamental grand scheme of things in the regional geography designed for Balkans.

It is morally wrong, ethically inadmissible and scientifically incorrect to lump the ancient Macedonians under Greek umbrella, simply, because today's Greece—the creation of the western powers—enjoys sentimental support of many western intellectuals. Truth does not need lobbyists. Truth is not a tradable commodity and cannot be conditionally used and selectively applied. Appropriation of Macedonian history is not an acceptable act; portraying ancient Macedonians as Greeks is an outright fabrication.” (Gandeto - <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/97381>)

Part 16 – On to Macedonia

Modern Greeks, who were educated through the Greek educational system, seem to think that Macedonians did not exist prior to the 1940's. In fact some are so sure that they are willing to stake their own reputation on it, so they say.

One Greek, who claimed to be a Professor of History, not long ago wrote and told me that there is absolutely no evidence to support the existence of Macedonians prior to Tito's "alleged" creation of Macedonia. In fact, he said that he was so sure that Macedonians did not exist he was willing to accept everything I said at face value if I could only show him a single piece of evidence that proved Macedonians existed before 1940.

Believing he was sincere, I had no reason to doubt him, I took up his challenge and put together a document which can be found at this link; <http://www.oshchima.com/Historical%20Documents/hdoc1.pdf>

After reviewing the document the good professor was kind enough to write back to me but it wasn't what I expected. The only thing he wrote was "Macedonia is Greek"! Nothing else! I never heard from him again.

I used to believe that Greeks were sincere in their quest for the truth but experience has taught me differently. I used to believe if one laid the facts on the table all arguments could be resolved through reasoning and logic but unfortunately I was wrong! As I have found out over the years, Modern Greeks, at least the ones I have dealt with, are not interested in finding "the truth" unless the truth serves their purpose. The only thing these Greeks are interested in, as I have found, is covering up all evidence that might challenge their claims on Macedonia and expose their lies. Facts, evidence, or logic do not matter and no Greek can be convinced of the truth unless it serves his or her purpose or supports his or her claims on Macedonia. Therefore it would be a waste of time to try and prove anything to a Greek who is convinced that his or her truth is the only truth.

If I were to classify the Greeks into categories I would classify them into three types. The first type which includes the vast majority of Greeks is the silent type which steers away from "anomalies" or information that is not explained by their indoctrination. These Greeks have found that curiosity can be painful, as Anastasia Karakasidou discovered when she wrote her book "Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood".

The second type of Greek is a patriotic and devoted type who believes that everything the Greek government tells him or her, particularly about Macedonia, is true. This Greek is taught to believe the indigenous Macedonians, the ones who lived in Macedonia for many generations, the ones whose lands Greece stole, are his or her enemies. They are convinced that these Macedonians are preoccupied with "stealing" their Macedonia from them and therefore should not be trusted and should be punished at every opportunity.

The third and most dangerous type of Greek is the one who knows the truth but is entrusted with protecting Greek interests at any cost. This is the Greek that seeks out evidence in order to destroy it.

So the next time a Greek asks you to produce evidence that proves Macedonians exist remember that by providing this evidence you are helping him or her to cover it up.

The problem these Greeks have is not only with evidence but with the people who are bent on digging it up. Remember Karakasidou's case? The Greeks threatened to "blow up" the publishing house in London if it published her book. Greeks often use this kind of "intimidation" to prevent what they deem "damaging" information from coming out. But more often than not, they publish "their own" versions of "the facts" to create confusion and bury the truth. For example Greeks, for years, maintained that Macedonians did not exist. But when stories started surfacing that Macedonians do indeed exist, they invented the idea that these people were not really "ethnic Macedonians" but "geographic Macedonians". In other words they are called "Macedonians" not because they are ethnic Macedonians but because they are "Greeks" who just happened to live in Macedonia!

Until a couple of decades ago, according to these Greeks, Macedonians did not exist; today, according to the same Greeks, we have all kinds of Macedonians. In fact the Greek Prime Minister himself just announced to the Greek Parliament that he too is a "Macedonian"! This is how Greek logic works. If you can't outright eradicate "the information" then you bury it in a huge tangle of lies. Greeks are experts at this!

Fortunately Macedonians and even foreigners are slowly coming on to these "Greek tricks" and the Greek lies are gradually being exposed.

Today there is an overwhelming amount of evidence uncovered all over the world not just from books but also from newspapers and journals. Greeks however are trying very hard to bury it by side tracking the reader with personal attacks on the messenger instead of dealing with the message. In place of responding to the questions posed, Greeks tend to attack the credibility of the messenger calling him or her "anti-Greek" having an "axe to grind" or not possessing "the right credentials" to be an authority. It seems that when facts are presented that contradict the "Greek view", Greeks tend to dismiss them by accusing the presenter of not having the "right credentials".

Recently old newspaper stories from the late 1800's and early 1900's have also been surfacing from various library archives. These newspapers, it appears, have been carrying all sorts of stories from the Balkan conflicts, including many from the Macedonian 1903 Uprising against the Ottoman Empire. These stories exist and are real and can be found in the archives of practically every major library in the world. Some of these documents are now being digitized and will soon be available online everywhere on the internet. Here are some examples;

<http://www.maknews.com/forum/archive/here-are-som-articles-from-the-new-york-times-t5689.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/forum/archive/newspaper-articles-about-the-macedonians-in-the-1800-s-t5734.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/forum/general-discussions/reference-list-1-newspaper-articles-t14740.html>

<http://www.macedoniantruth.org/forum/showthread.php?t=1139>

These stories talk about Macedonians fighting for their freedom, Macedonians who according to the Greeks did not exist prior to the 1940's. With stories like these coming out no one in the world is going to believe the Greeks and their false claims. No one is going to believe that the references "Macedonian" and "Macedonians" are "geographic" and not "ethnic". Who in the world, except Greeks, uses "geographic" references when referring to people's "ethnic" or "national" identities?

"Since the declaration of the Republic of Macedonia the Greek government has asserted that it has exclusive copyright to the use of the Star of Vergina. But it has been argued that since modern day Greeks are not descended from the ancient Greeks: 'The Star of Vergina is not a Greek symbol, except in the sense that it happens to have been found in the territory of the present-day Greek state. The modern day Greeks appropriate ancient Greek cultural symbols because they happen to live in more or less the same part of the world as the ancient Greeks did'" ("Experimenting with Democracy Regime Change in the Balkans", Edited by Geoffrey Pridham and Tom Gallagher, page 271)

"It is widely recognized that national symbols are often a modern creation which do not reflect the reality of the circumstances they purport to represent. Tradition can be invented. Modern Greece, for example, is a relatively new creation and bears little resemblance to the ancient Greece which is the source of much of its symbolism." ("Experimenting with Democracy Regime Change in the Balkans", Edited by Geoffrey Pridham and Tom Gallagher, page 271)

So let us dispense with the niceties and tell it the way it is. Greeks who know the truth know very well that Macedonians have as much right to the Macedonian heritage as Greeks do to the Greek heritage. Even though the Modern Greeks are not the descendents of the so-called ancient Greeks they consciously laid claim to the ancient Greek heritage. Why are they then protesting against the Macedonians laying claim to the Macedonian heritage, even though the Macedonians have been living in Macedonia a lot longer than the Modern Greeks have lived in Greece? Looking at the problem another way, why is the world not challenging these imposters for

usurping the Greek heritage? If Macedonians have no right to the Macedonian heritage then surely the Modern Greeks have no right to the Greek heritage?

We know that the Greeks acquired Greece and Greek occupied Macedonia under false pretences so why are we not putting all this on the table and making it part of the so-called “name negotiations” with Greece?

“And, once again, we came to this often visited intersection; there are some very progressive Greeks who do not subscribe to this middle-age Greek thinking and who see the people in the Balkans living in peace and harmony—these are the true Greeks and then, there are newly created Greeks, those whose heritage has been wiped out and replaced with the newly “morphed” ethnicity “Greek-Macedonian”. Since they—in this Greek created problem—stand to lose the most, they are the “true” Greek soldiers in the forefront fighting the battle. I am sure they wouldn’t dare dig deeper into their past because they will inevitably find “skeletons” which have another story to tell: their grandfathers did not even speak Greek nor did they share in these “megali” Greek dream. What they dreamed the most and with a heavy heart longed for, were their abandoned homes, forsaken culture and their way of life in their Asia Minor communities.

Sooner than later all these Greek lies and fabrications will run their course and Europe will have no choice but to put an end to this Greek farce.” (Gandeto, <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/98213>

“Those who espouse extreme nationalist positions, claiming (as they invoke Alexander, Philip, and Aristotle) that the name of Macedonia is exclusively Greek and that there is no such thing as a Macedonian minority, are reacting to the exigencies of a perhaps genuine dangerous local situation in which their country faces potentially hostile neighbours on several fronts; but they are also resuscitating the very logic that has always compromised their supposed independence to begin with – the logic according to which all the country’s modern claims must be evaluated by the yardstick of ancient history.” (Michael Herzfeld, “Anthropology - Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society”, pages 67 and 68).

“It is a myth that the population exchange ensured an uncontested and harmonious national homogeneity or that the refugees became integrated into Greek society in an unproblematic way. The criterion used for the population exchange was that of religion, in line with the tradition of the millet system. In many instances the refugees could hardly speak Greek and many had been reluctant to leave their lands and home where they had lived for generations.

Although the refugees from Asia Minor are collectively referred to as a single group, in fact they came from various cultural, linguistic, social and regional backgrounds.” (“Mediating the Nation - News, Audiences and the Politics of Identity” by Mirca Madianou, page 31)

And now I leave you with this;

THIS MACEDONIAN SUN

[The National flag]

By Spero Thompson

Patriots rose and fell in the Ilinden uprising
Turks holocaust villages, hope flees the land
Greeks, Serbs, and Bulgars drive out the Ottomans
Partitioning of Macedonia, their Balkan war prize demand

Europe's power struggles bring a darkness of night
Ilinden, Balkan, World wars; repeatedly Macedonia is overrun
Sunrise overcomes night, announcing a new day
In 1991 history records the rising of the Macedonian Sun

Macedonia's twentieth century featured bloodshed and hope
Began in bloodshed, ending in independence, hope realized
A standard is raised to represent and identify themselves
By symbol and colour, their nationhood is visualized

For so long a people oppressed and suppressed
Now masters of their own house and land
A century of, sultanate, monarchy, communism then autonomy
Today under their own flag they stand

The Macedonian Sun, a boldly emblazoned flag
On a field of red, a golden risen sun
The sun signifies a new day of self-rule
Red, for a history written in blood, a memorandum

A banner derived from their ancient heraldic emblem
Eyes see... 'we are a people' its proclamation
Proud emigrant sons and daughters see it fly
World acknowledged, flag of their mother nation

Historically, countries play leading or supportive roles
Now Macedonia is cast in a modern part
Ally to all who pursue peace and democracy
The Macedonian Sun, their pledge of national heart

Reader, listener, understand the meaning of this flag
With both prospect and retrospect you will see
The sun looks ahead, to a new era begun

Red, looks back on blood, sacrificed for country

This century, as nations strive, ideology against ideology
Fly in honour and freedom, oh Macedonian Sun
Until all flags are lowered, required no more
When His kingdom come, Gods will be done

Part 17 – Education

Greek lobbyists and the Greek propaganda machine have been busy for the last couple of centuries ensuring that the “Greek point of view” is not only promoted but enforced everywhere in the world, particularly in the English speaking world. As a result today we have a world which believes Macedonians do not exist and everything that is Macedonian is Greek.

As unbelievable and bizarre as this may sound, it is true. It all starts in school where children are taught to believe that Macedonians are Greek and as these children grow up and some become teachers, they in turn teach new children to believe that Macedonians are Greek and the cycle of lies continues. How do I know this? I have encountered it myself personally but that is not what compelled me to write about it. Just recently I received an angry e-mail from Pete Kondoff who you may know from the Canadian-Macedonian Historical Society in Toronto, Canada. He is one of its founders. Pete was angry because of what happened to his grandson at university.

The problem began when the grandson’s professor asked the students for some background information in order for her to become better acquainted with them. When Mr. Kondoff’s grandson was asked for his ethnic background he replied, “Macedonian” to which his professor retorted, “Then you must be Greek!”

Why would a professor at a prominent Canadian university think a Macedonian is “Greek”?

Mr. Kondoff’s grandson is a 4th generation Canadian. The Kondoff family has been living in North America since the very early 1900’s, even before Macedonia was invaded and occupied in 1912 and partitioned in 1913 by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria. So technically the Kondoff family has absolutely nothing to do with Greece. As a young man, Pete’s father immigrated to the United States while Macedonia was still occupied by the Ottoman Empire.

To be corrected by his professor, who in fact went against his own beliefs, was not only a surprise but a shock to Pete’s grandson. What do you say to your professor who just made a huge mistake? I am sure this is a dilemma many Macedonians face not only in school but at their jobs and even at parties and outings. It is frustrating and sometimes worrisome. Do you argue with people and face ridicule because they “perceived you are ignorant of your own identity” or “do you accept what they say” and keep quiet and suffer desolation and humiliation in silence?

Pete Kondoff and his wife Mary have been active participants in the Macedonian community all over North America since their youth. They have fought for the rights of Macedonians all their lives and Pete, being an educator himself, was very angry about the incident. How could a professor at a Canadian university not know about the Macedonians? Worse, how could a Canadian professor use “Greek propaganda” against a

Macedonian, perhaps even without knowing it? Why and how often does it happen? These are some of the questions which plague Mr. Kondoff?

Now some of you may think “So what’s the big deal?” mistakes are made, it was a simple mistake what is the harm in that?

Well, calling a Macedonian “Greek” is like calling a black person “a slave” or a North American indigenous person “a savage”. It is very degrading and hurtful and congers up unpleasant memories from painful past experiences. So why would a professor who would NEVER call a black person “a slave” or an indigenous person “a savage” call a Macedonian “Greek”? This thought has haunted Mr. Kondoff from the day he found out.

Since the incident Pete Kondoff has been vigorously campaigning to inform the various universities and educators of this problem. Mr. Kondoff believes the problem is not with the educators themselves but with the educational system. For years information about the Macedonians has been compiled through Greece and the Greeks have been skewing it to fit their own agenda. With the advent of the “Classics” departments, Modern Greeks have been very influential in Western universities and have been responsible for compiling the history of the Balkans, particularly ancient history. Without any opposition from the Macedonians, Greeks have been revising history, naturally to their advantage, and unfortunately to the detriment of the Macedonians. The Greeks over the years have carefully positioned their “specific views” of who the Macedonians are as part of their history which Mr. Kondoff believes is intentionally done and designed to mislead the world about the Macedonians.

It is one thing to harmlessly “exaggerate” a little to suit your agenda but yet another to use “exaggerations” in order to wipe out an entire culture and to rob it of its lands and heritage.

If it is true that “the law is blind to ignorance” then “unknowingly spreading false information that contributes to the demise of a culture” would constitute “breaking the law”. Just because people don’t know they are telling lies does not mean they are not causing harm! Mr. Kondoff strongly believes that the educators themselves are victims of this “Greek propaganda” which has been taught in our schools for over a century. Mr. Kondoff strongly believes that our educators are ethical people who would NOT voluntarily spread anyone’s harmful propaganda if they knew that it was propaganda. The question here is how do we inform our educators that some of what they are teaching our children may in fact be someone’s propaganda?

No educator would call a Macedonian “Greek” if they knew the kind of atrocities the Greeks have committed against the Macedonians. No educator would ever call a Macedonian “Greek” if they knew the Greeks used and still use force to assimilate Macedonians for the purpose of eradicating the Macedonian culture and usurping the Macedonians heritage.

What intelligent and civilized person, who has devoted his or her life to teaching and to making our world a better place, would agree to promote Greek racist propaganda designed to rob Macedonians of their land, name, language and heritage if they knew that it was indeed propaganda? Most educators are dedicated to preserving cultures, not destroying them.

Therefore it is imperative that we all understand that today's Macedonians are the survivors of a brutal Greek cultural war waged against the Macedonians since 1912 and not just inside Greece but worldwide, a war that has cost Macedonians their lives, personal freedom, language and dignity. These Macedonians are survivors of "cultural genocide" and not only deserve recognition but also respect for their suffering.

It is indeed WRONG to call a Macedonian "Greek" as much as it is wrong to call a black person a slave. If you believe Greeks have done wrong to the Macedonians then please stop calling them "Greek". They have their own identity, call them Macedonian! Please stop the abuse.

Mr. Kondoff believes that the educational system must take responsibility for its own actions first by identifying and removing what is deemed "politically motivated propaganda" from their curriculums. If the universities care for the rights of all people then why not let their educators teach "the Macedonian experience". If there are differences in opinion between Macedonians and Greeks then tell both sides of the story. It's about time Macedonians are given an opportunity to tell their own side of the story.

It is also about time that the world learns of another side of Greece and what it has done to (1) secure its own place in the world and (2) its use of its "place" as leverage to usurp Macedonia's history. But our subject here today is not about "the history" itself but about how Greece has distorted history to deny the Macedonian people their identity, culture and basic human rights.

By calling a Macedonian "Greek" you in effect unwittingly insult all Macedonians and deny them their most basic human right, the right to exist as Macedonians. A Macedonian knows he or she is not "Greek" and if you deny them the right to be Macedonian then what do you expect them to be? Is it not enough that Macedonians suffered for a century under Greek oppression? Do we really need western university professors calling them "Greek"? When is the abuse going to end?

I want to make it perfectly clear that we don't blame the educators for teaching what they teach but at the same time we cannot just sit idly and witness our human rights being trampled. That is why we appeal to every reader to do their part and make sure their local school boards and universities are well aware of this problem. Macedonians are not "Greeks" and object to being called "Greek" because by calling them "Greek" you not only abuse and insult them but you unwittingly trample on their human

rights. Macedonians have the right to call themselves Macedonian not only because they are Macedonian but because they have that right under international law.

As much as we like to allow our professors the freedom to teach whatever they deem appropriate we also have the responsibility to protect the rights of those who are mistakenly misrepresented. It is our duty to also make sure “past wrongs” are corrected. Therefore we appeal to every educational institution to re-examine their policies regarding Macedonia and the Macedonians.

We are well aware of the so-called “Greek contribution” to Western European culture but as Macedonians we too have our own experience with Greece and so far it has not been pleasant!

“The Europeanisation of Mass Education and the Re-Writing of History

A second area where EU officials have sought to invent Europe as a category of thought is in the education sector. This is summed up most vividly in the notion of ‘introducing the European dimension’ into national school curricula, textbooks, and university syllabuses. Central to the process of constructing any new political order is the mobilization of history and memory. As Anderson (1983), Gellner (1983) and Hobsbawm (1990) remind us, mass education – together with conscription, taxation and state violence – were the foremost technologies for inculcating nationalist consciousness among the peoples of the emergent nation states. For this reason, EU officials now emphasize the importance of re-writing history from a European perspective to challenge the nationalist bias of traditional ways of teaching and learning (Brugmans 1987). But what does history look like from this ‘European perspective’?

Typically, EU historiography – like Seton-Watson’s view of European culture – represents the last 3,000 years of European history as a kind of moral success story: a gradual coming together in the shape of the European community and its institutions. According to this conception, European history is an evolutionary process that starts with ‘prehistory’ (where the key stages include Homo Erectus, megalithic civilization, the Neolithic revolutions and the bronze Age), before advancing to the age of classical antiquity. The result is that European identity is portrayed as the end product of a progressive ascent through history – albeit a highly selective history – from ancient Greece and Rome, to the spread of Christianity, the scientific revolution, the Age of Reason, the Enlightenment and the triumph of liberal democracy. These key episodes thus become palimpsests for an essential European cultural community: a ‘core Europe’ whose common bonds lie in its shared heritage, moral ascendancy and cultural continuity.

The EU’s choice of ‘ERASMUS’ and ‘SOCRATES’ as acronyms for its two major educational exchange programmes is a minor example of this. Another is the targeting of the Acropolis and Mount Athos as the two

largest EU-funded projects within its 'Conservation of Europe's Archaeological Heritage' initiative.

French historians seem to have made a particularly noticeable contribution to the EU's attempts to re-write history. For example, in one recent EU-sponsored history textbook Henri Brugman's (former rector of the Collège d'Europe) has an essay entitled: 'Europe : a common civilization, a destiny, a vocation' (Brugmans 1987:11). In the same volume, George Pflimlin (1987:9) describes the last 3,000 years of European history as 'le miracle européen'. Similarly the historian Hélène Ahrweiler argues that there does indeed exist 'an essential Europe': "All peoples (Valéry says 'races') and all lands which were in turn Romanized, Christianized and subjected – at least mentally – to Greek discipline, are thoroughly European... Everywhere where the names of Caesar, Caius, Trajan, and Virgil, everywhere where the names of Aristotle, Plato and Euclid have simultaneously held meaning and authority, that is Europe" (Ahrweiler 1999:32).

The idea that European cultural unity is founded upon a shared ancient civilization is attractive to the architects of political integration and clearly informs much of their campaigning work. The problem with such a notion, however, is that it reifies an outdated idea of cultures as fixed, unitary and bounded wholes that is both sociologically outmoded and politically dangerous. As Pieterse (1951:5) states, 'what is being recycled as "European culture" is nineteenth century elite imperial myth formation'. EU officials and image-makers, however, continue to draw on 'classical' images in their quest to identify the essential elements of European culture, and show little sensitivity towards post-colonial criticisms of Western orientalism.

Typically, EU officials justify their attempts to promote the re-writing of history books to reflect the 'European perspective' on the grounds that this is necessary to combat the hegemony of nationalist ideology, which they regard as the primary obstacle to European union. The result, however, is that nationalist ideology is simply substituted for a new ideology of 'Europeanism'. For example, writing in a recent EU 'information' booklet Pascal Fontaine (Monet's former chef de cabinet and Director of the Commission's Information Office in Paris) charts the progress of the 'European ideal':

"...in the nineteenth century, it was an inspiration for poets and romantics, only to be distorted by conquerors seeking to justify their lust for power. It did not come to full expression in practical form, however, until a handful of courageous, visionary statesmen determined to put a stop to the loss of life that seemed to be the inevitable outcome of conflicts between nation-states" (Fontaine 1991:5).

The true saviours of Europe are thus not the leaders of the Resistance or the Allies, but Monnet, Spaaks, Schuman, De Gaspari and Adenauer: these 'visionary statesmen' have become the symbolic guardians and

ancestors of the 'European ideal'. But if Europe symbolizes peace and prosperity, the nation state is construed as an agent of conflict and war. To complete this heroic myth of itself, the EU has also produced a series of films and videos for distribution to schools, colleges and local authorities. These include 'Jean Monnet, Father of Europe', 'A European journey' (a jingoistic potted history of the various stages achievements and future of European integration); 'The Tree of Europe' ([a]n original feature which will make all Europeans aware of the common roots of their past'); and 'After Twenty Centuries', which surveys 2,000 years of European history and features Europeans' 'shared experiences at political, intellectual and cultural level' (European Commission 1991:1-5).

Jean Baptiste Duroselle's (1990) volume, *Europe, A History of Its Peoples*, represents an even more ambitious attempt to re-configure history. This 416 page magnum opus – part textbook, part manifesto – reflects the historiography implicit in EC discourses on culture. Chapter one opens with the image of rape of the Greek Goddess 'Europa', and proceeds to discuss the geographical complexity and uniqueness of the continent (sic) of Europe. Chapter three describes the Celts and Teutons as the first Indo-Europeans. Chapter four proceeds under the heading 'Classical Antiquity: Greek Wisdom, Roman Grandeur'. Chapter five ('the First Four Centuries AD in the West') is devoted exclusively to the expansion of Christianity. Chapter seven is a lengthy discussion of whether Charlemagne's empire marks the 'beginnings of Europe'. Chapter eight ('Europe Under Siege') opens with a vivid image of banner-waving Saracens on horseback - 'European civilization' thus being equated unequivocally with Christendom defending itself against the resurgent forces of Islam. The book continues in a similar vein until Chapter seventeen (*The Road to European Disaster*) which deals with nationalism. Chapter eighteen ('Europe Destroys Itself') which covers the period of 1914-1945, and finally chapter nineteen, 'Europe's Recovery and Resurgent Hopes', which focuses on the 'makers of Europe' and the 'building of Europe in the face of Gaullism'. The net result is that European history is presented as the story of reason and unity triumphing over disunity and nationalism – the apotheosis of the Enlightenment project, or what Wolf (1992:5) calls 'history as a genealogy of progress'. It is invariably a selective, sanitized and typically heroic re-reading of the past, one that systematically excludes or ignores the less noble aspects of European modernity such as the history of slavery, anti-Semitism, colonialism or imperial conquest. The author's conclusion that Europe's history has been marked by a 'general if halting growth in compassion, humanity and equality' (Duroselle 1990:413), simply confirms this interpretation. History, it seems, is as much about 'forgetting' as it is about remembering and interpreting past events."

Source:

“Europe Cultural Construction and Reality”, edited by Peter Niedermuller & Bjarne Skolund, pages 59 to 61

After reading the above, does anyone still think there is room in Western Europe for Macedonia? After what is said and done, do Macedonians really think they are welcome in the European Union?

Part 18 – Assimilation

It is difficult to convince Macedonians that Greeks exist when most “Greeks” they know are in reality assimilated Macedonians, some their own relatives. There are hundreds of thousands of Macedonians today who will testify that they have family members who identify as “Greeks”. I too have extended family members who identify as “Greeks”. But how can they be “Greeks”, a supposedly unique ethnic group different than mine, when I know for a fact we share common great-grandparents whom I know were Macedonians?

The so-called “Greeks” who today live in Greek occupied Macedonia are either assimilated Macedonians, like my extended relatives, or other assimilated, imported ethnic groups such as Vlachs, Albanians, Christian Turks, Russians, etc. The Greek government officially does not recognize any of the “ethnic groups” living anywhere in Greek occupied Macedonia, which has been a Greek practice since 1912 when Greece along with its partners Serbia and Bulgaria invaded, occupied and divided Macedonia.

So in spite of Greek attempts to portray “Greek” as a “unique ethnicity” with roots extending back to ancient times, the word “Greek” is nothing more than an “umbrella” word that defines a criteria and a method by which various ethnic groups are assimilated and made into “Greeks”. “Greek” is not an ethnic term and to be “Greek” by choice one only needs to abandon their true “ethnicity”, name and language and accept a Greek name, the Greek language and subscribe to the “Hellenic club” of being a descendant of the ancient Greeks.

In this chapter we will examine the Greek assimilatory policies and practices put in place in Macedonia since the 1850’s in order to better understand how the “Greek identity” in Macedonia has been artificially created.

What most Macedonians of the late 19th and early 20th century did not know is that the “Greeks” they encountered since the 1850’s were not “Greeks” at all but assimilated Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs and other ethnic groups. Assimilation of ethnicities into the “Greek” fold did not just begin with the Macedonians; it was well practiced much earlier in the Peloponnesus, Epirus and Thessaly with the Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs living there.

As we have shown in previous chapters, “Hellenization” was invented in Western Europe by the Philhellenes and then first put into practice in the early 1800’s in the region of Greece today known as the Peloponnesus. The aim at the time was to drive out the Ottomans, establish a “Greek” state and resurrect the so-called “Greek civilization” which existed in that region some 2,500 years ago. What the Philhellenes failed to understand or did not care at all is that the people living in that region at the time were not the descendents of the ancients but the descendents of Slav, Albanian

and Vlach immigrants who had migrated into that region two millennia after the ancients disappeared.

The Philhellene aim was to “enlighten” these immigrants and teach them to believe that they were the descendants of the ancients and by instilling in them the language and mannerisms of the ancients, make them their descendants. Surprisingly the process worked as many Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs bought into the idea and began to behave as if they truly were the descendants of the ancients.

To make these people forget who they were and give them new identities, Greek authorities, with the help of their Philhellene patrons, introduced a new language, an ancient dead language, and renamed all people and place names to Greek sounding ones. To make them sound authentic and “survivors of time” wherever possible modern names were replaced with ancient ones.

We know from old maps and documents that most of the villages and other place names in the Peloponnesus before the Greek state was created were of Slavic origin but by the end of the 19th century they were all changed to Greek sounding ones, a practice Greece later used in Macedonia during the 1920’s and 1930’s.

By the time Greece occupied Macedonia in 1912 the people and place names in the Peloponnesus, Thessaly and Epirus were already changed.

Assimilation and the process of Hellenization in Macedonia began in the early 1850’s with the introduction of the Greek Patriarchate Church. The process was accelerated in the late 1870’s after Macedonia was liberated from the Ottoman Empire by Russia and given back to the Ottomans by the Western Powers. When Greece realized that the Macedonian question was not settled and it knew it had a chance to grab Macedonian territories, it accelerated its policy of “Hellenizing Macedonians” through the introduction of more Patriarchate churches and Greek schools. Bulgaria did the same through the introduction of the Bulgarian Exarchate church and Bulgarian schools.

Then when Macedonia was invaded occupied and partitioned during the 1912 and 1913 Balkan Wars, all three occupying states (Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria) began a process of forced assimilation. The first step that Greece took was to expel all Muslims from its Macedonian occupied territories. The second step was to expel all those who refused to abandon the Exarchate church in favour of the Patriarchate. The Greek army was given free reign to do whatever it wanted and as a result many Macedonians were killed, raped, tortured, robbed and many villages were burned and hundreds of thousands were left homeless.

The following links provide more information on the Greek atrocities committed against the Macedonian civilian population in 1913.

<http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov61.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov64.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov67.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov72.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov76.html>

<http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov80.html>

Unfortunately none of the people who committed these crimes have been punished and no justice for the Macedonian people has ever been served.

After the end of the 1st World War and after Greece established itself in Macedonia, it began a policy of renaming people and places. All peoples' surnames and given names were changed as well as the names of cities, villages, lakes, rivers, mountains, etc. Macedonian personal names were replaced with Greek sounding ones and registered in peoples' personal identification cards.

Even though Greece established Greek schools in Macedonia, most of the adult population did not speak Greek and were forced to take night classes to learn the Greek language. Then when the dictator Metaxas took power in Greece, the Macedonian language was banned by law and anyone speaking Macedonian was given a hefty fine. Repeat offenders were jailed, beaten and even forced to drink castor oil. Plain clothes policemen roamed the streets and market places and hid in people's yards listening under windows. These policemen were paid a commission for each person they fined so there was plenty of incentive for them to be vigilant.

In order to eradicate everything Macedonian, the Greek government also initiated policies to erase all Macedonian writing in churches, church icons, tombstones, signs and writing in public buildings. All books, bibles and remnants from the Exarchate church or from previous periods were collected and burned, regardless of their value.

Then in the 1950's entire Macedonian villages were forced to take an oath in public that they would never speak their Macedonian mother tongue and to pledge loyalty to Greece and to the Greek King.

To ensure that everything Macedonian was forgotten and to expedite the assimilation process of Hellenizing the Macedonians, the Greek state encouraged its administrators to take Macedonian wives and make sure the children were brought up as Greeks. But when that too was not succeeding the Greek state introduced day-care centers and kindergartens for very young children to ensure the Macedonian children learned the Greek language.

Greece says there are no Macedonians in Greece but fails to explain why there are so many day-care centers and kindergartens for Macedonian children. In the last decade or so there has been an increase in the number of kindergartens and day-care centers opened for pre-school children in cities and villages where Macedonians live in larger numbers. For example in the city Kalamata in the Peloponnesus there are only two day-care centers for 60,000 residents. In Athens there are only ten where as in Lerin (Florina), Voden (Edesa), Kostur (Kastoria) and other places in

“Northern Greece” there are 48 day-care centers and new ones are constantly being opened. The reason for having so many pre-schools is because many three year old Macedonian children do not speak the Greek language and that is because at home they speak mainly Macedonian.

The idea for sending these very young children to school at such an early age is a well concocted plan by the Greek government which always looks for ways to assimilate the Macedonians. By separating the children from their families at a very young age, the Greek government hopes that they will never have the chance to learn the Macedonian language which is a constant reminder that they are not Greeks.

Members of the Macedonian minority in Greece say that the nationalistic politics of Greece are deeply entrenched in the Greek educational system. Greeks do not recognize the existence of minorities and will not allow minorities to speak or to be educated in their own language even though, according to all European conventions, they have a right to do so.

Besides the assimilatory policies carried out through education and various other incentives in Greece there is also a dark side to this assimilation; the use of terror. Macedonians have always been discouraged from speaking their Macedonian language and for feeling Macedonian. Tactics used to discourage Macedonians from expressing their ethnic Macedonian sentiments included fines, imprisonment, beatings, torture and even death. Children have often been given the strap, made to drink castor oil and scolded in public for uttering Macedonian words or for wearing Macedonian clothing.

The Greek state has made it abundantly clear that there is no room for Macedonians in “Northern Greece”, the native homeland of the Macedonian people. By calling that part of Macedonia, annexed by Greece in 1913, “Greek occupied Macedonia” we as Macedonians are expressing our sentiments of exactly how we feel as citizens of Greece. Being prohibited by Greece from expressing our Macedonian sentiments in our own homeland is equivalent to being occupied and it is only fitting that we refer to our homeland as “Greek occupied Macedonia”.

Besides forcing people to become “Greeks” against their will, there is the downside to being “Greek” and that is people are cut off from their past. Being “Greek” means that one can no longer be Macedonian, speak the Macedonian language, enjoy the Macedonian culture or have a history prior to becoming a “Greek”. This means that any Macedonian who accepts to be “Greek” must also accept to “forget their past”. Being given a “new Greek name” means loss of continuity with ones own past and having to accept a fabricated past.

Greek history in Macedonia begins with the invasion and occupation of Macedonia. All those Macedonians who accepted to become Greeks voluntarily had to also accept that their history began the moment their names were changed and any Greek history prior to that had to be

fabricated. Similarly, all villages whose names were changed by the Greek administration have no history associated with their new name and their history too had to be fabricated.

“The concept of a ‘Hellenic’ state as elaborated in Western Europe presupposes that this was to be the heir to the ancient Greek (Hellenic) world.

Thus, as Greek intellectuals soon realized the phoenix myth proved too weak to support a national ideology. For ‘Hellenism’ as a cultural discourse corresponded to the ‘revival’ of ancient Greece, which resulted in the inevitable rejection of all the in-between periods. The forgotten periods were now treated as ‘empty pages’ to be filled in. The silence was attributed to the religious prejudices of the Catholic West against Orthodox Byzantium an argument which in turn nurtured the Orthodox anti-Western trends. There was an obvious need for a narrative to replace the one coming from abroad. It was time for ‘real’ Greek history to be written”. (“Discourse of Collective identity in Central and South-East Europe (1779-1945)”, Edited by Balaz Trencsenyi and Michael Kopesec, page 73).

“The common Greek language in the last quarter of the twentieth century was neither a restored version of the tongue of the popular heroes of the Greek revolution, nor the demotic of the Diaspora intellectuals. It was passed through the filter of the Katharevousa, just as national ideology passed through the filter of the ‘Hellenization’ process. In the Greek language through the sixteen to the eighteenth centuries the word ‘Hellenic’ meant the language of ancient Greece. In Greek today, the word ‘Hellenic’ means modern Greece and one needs to add the adjective ‘ancient’ to refer to the language of the classical era. In the academic programs in the English speaking world, though, ‘Greek’ refers to the Classical-language programs. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, modern Greece was ‘Hellenized’ and ‘Hellenism’ acquired a modern Greek version.” (“Hellenisms Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity” edited by Katerina Zacharia, page 229)

“The tourist who travels today in Greece recognizes in the regions visited the names of places encountered in ancient Greek literature, mythology and history. But the visitor does not know that this map of ancient Greece has been constantly redesigned over the last 170 years, that is, since the beginning of the Greek state.” (“Hellenisms Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity” edited by Katerina Zacharia, page 230)

“The modification of the place names began just after the constitution of the Greek state in the early 1830’s, and went hand in hand with the reorganization of the administration of the country and its divisions into prefectures, municipalities and parishes. The people attempting the renaming of spaces were conscious of the ideological importance of this action.

The renaming of space was not achieved in a single attempt but was a long process that went on for decades. It took place each time a new region was integrated into the Greek state. This was the integration of Thessaly (1881), of Macedonia (1913), and of Thrace (1920). Every time they carried out a reform of the local administration – until as recently as 1998; when many municipalities and communities were reunited with the so-called Kapodistrian plan ‘new’ Greek classical names, previously unknown to the local inhabitants, made their appearance.

Which were the toponyms that had to disappear? According to the Greek authorities, they were the toponyms that were ‘foreign or did not sound good’, in other words those that were in ‘bad Greek’.” (“Hellenisms Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity” edited by Katerina Zacharia, pages 230 and 231)

“The middle of the nineteenth century was the stage of a conflict between the Greek intelligentsia and Fallmerayer, who maintained that, in the middle ages, Greece was inhabited by Slavs and Albanian peoples. As a consequence, Greek intellectuals were prompt to erase all the Slavic and Albanian names which could support the rival arguments. In 1909 the government-appointed commission on toponyms reported that one village in three in Greece (that is, 30% of the total) should have its name changed (of the 5,096 Greek villages 1,500 were considered as ‘speaking a barbaric language’).” (“Hellenisms Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity” edited by Katerina Zacharia, pages 231 and 232)

“After the Balkan wars (1912-1913), new reasons were added to the previous ones: Names ought be changed so as not to ‘give rise to damaging ethnological implications to the Greek nation, of a sort which could be used against us by our enemies’. The new enemy was the revisionism of the northern borders acquired after the Balkan wars, through the use of minority issues.” (“Hellenisms Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity” edited by Katerina Zacharia, page 232)

Part 19 - Fifty authors can't still all be wrong!

There are some staunch Modern Greeks out there that still don't get it! Being told that you are a "Greek" or pretending to be a Greek does not really make you a Greek, at least not the kind of Greek you think you are!

We have shown over and over again that "anyone" can become a Greek by accepting the "Greek indoctrination" and that is to learn to speak the Greek language, feel Greek and "pretend" to be a descendent of the so-called "Ancient Greeks". You can learn to speak Greek and feel Greek as much as you want but you can't "pretend" to be something you are not! People should not "pretend" to be something they are not if they want to be taken seriously! Acting like you are the descendents of the so-called "Ancient Greeks", speaking their language and feeling like them does not make you the descendants of the Ancient Greeks! It would be to your advantage to not only learn "the truth" about yourselves but to either embrace it or accept to reject it. Modern Greeks are the descendents of the Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs that immigrated to Greece during the 11th to the 14th centuries AD and all other people that subsequently settled in that region ever since.

The ancient Greeks that you think of and speak of so fondly died off even before Rome conquered Achaea (Greece proper) about two centuries before Christ. When the Romans walked into Athens they found a population made up mostly of slaves. These slaves became the new citizens of Achaea after they were freed by Rome. Unfortunately they too perished over time and that is precisely why Byzantine Emperors and later Ottoman Sultans had to repopulate Achaea first with Slav immigrants and later with Albanians and Vlachs.

Therefore the true ancestors of the Modern Greeks are the Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs and all others that landed in Greece since the disappearance of the so-called ancient Greeks.

Here is evidence from fifty different authors that proves my point that Modern Greeks today are NOT the descendents of the "Ancient Greeks" and are the descendents of the Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs.

1. "The [Greek] claim to southern Albania rests entirely on the assumption that the majority of the population is Greek. The Greeks are stated to number 120,000 and Albanians 80,000. But who are the 'Greeks'? At least five sixths of them, if not more are Christian Albanians of the Orthodox faith, Albanians in sentiment and language, who because they acknowledge the Patriarch of Constantinople are declared to be Greek in point of 'national consciousness'." ("The Nineteenth Century and After XIX-XX a Monthly Review", founded by James Knowles, Vol. LXXXVI, July-December 1919, page 645.)

2. "Did the Greeks constitute a race apart from the Albanians the Slavs and the Vlachs? Yes and no. High school students were told that the 'other races', i.e. the Slavs the Albanians and the Vlachs 'having been Hellenized

with the years in terms of mores and customs, are now being assimilated into the Greeks’.” (“Greece in the 20th Century”, Editors Theodore A. Couloumbis, Theodore Kariotis, Fotini Bellou, page 24.)

3. “The Turkish village which formally clustered around the base of the Acropolis [old Athens] has not disappeared: it forms a whole quarter of the town.

An immense majority of the population in this quarter is composed of Albanians.” (“Greece and the Greeks of the Present Day”, by Edmund About, page 160.)

4. “Through the end of the revolution in 1830, Greeks, including most of the nineteenth-century nationalists, seemed to have had a vague but firm sense of continuity from ancient to modern Greece, though this was not articulated in racial terms but on the basis of a common language, history and consciousness. In effect at this time, whoever called themselves a Greek was a Greek. It is because of this that many Greek-speaking Albanians, Slavs, Rumanians and Vlachs were easily assimilated and indeed became important players in Greek patriotism at the time.” (“The Empty Cradle of Democracy”, by Alexandra Halkias, page 59.)

5. “The first Greek who had a plan for insurrection and for a liberated Greece was Rhigas of Valestino.

Rhigas was the author of poems, revolutionary proclamations and a constitution...

In this document he spoke of a sovereign people of the proposed state as including ‘without distinction of religion and language – Greeks, Albanians, Vlachs, Armenians, Turks and every other race’.

It seems that in their minds the distinction between ‘Greek’ and ‘Orthodox’ was still blurred.” (“Appleton’s Annual Cyclopedia and register of important events 1901”, Third Series Volume VI, page 113.)

6. “There cannot be an Athenian alive today who can trace a direct line of descent from classical times to the present day without leaving Athens. Because of numerous and protracted foreign occupations, true Athenians were a relatively small minority even in the Age of Pericles. In a later period, the city was suffering from severe depopulation and was re-stocked with Albanians. At the time of Greek independence in 1834, Athens was a miserable village with a population of only 6,000.” (“Insight Guides Athens Greece Series”, page 42.)

7. “It is one of a group made famous in the Greek revolution of 1821 by the bravery of its Albanian settlers, in defense of a country which they had never adopted for their own till this moment of danger came. They brought to it moreover, the hoarded wealth of many years. Albanian captains, Albanian ships and Albanian gold became the strength of the Greek and the dread of the Turk. The successful close of the revolution found them as firmly allied with the Greek nationality as they have been previously alien to it, and there are now no names more honoured and beloved in Athens, no families more influential in its polite circles, than

those of the Albanian leaders in the war of 1821, the Tombazis, the Miaulis the Condouriotis.” (“The Atlantic Monthly: A magazine of literature, science, art and politics Vol. XLIX, January 1882, page 31.)

8. “Among the numerous islands of the Egian, arise several barren rocks, some of which are however gifted by nature with small and commodious heavens. Of this number are Hydra, Spezzia and Ipsara, the first two close to the Eastern shore of the Peloponnesus, and the latter not far from Scio, on the Asiatic coast. Tyranny and Want had driven some families, whose origin, like that of nearly all the peasants, who inhabited proper Greece, was Albanian, to take refuge on these desolate crags, where they built villages and sought a precarious existence by fishing.” (“The Greek Revolution; in origin and progress”, by Edward Blaquiére Esq., page 21.)

9. “In reality however, just before the Greek war of independence, most Greeks still referred to themselves as ‘Romans. Vlachavas, the priest rebel leader who rose against the Ottomans, declared, ‘A Romneos I was born a Romneos I will die.’” (“Bloodlines from the Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism”, by Vamik Volkan, page 121..

10. “Constantinople and all continental Greece were for centuries ruled and occupied by the Romans, and during many subsequent centuries invaded and colonized by Slavs. The Crusades and the Latin conquest brought a large influx of western Europeans, commonly called Franks, and, in later times, extensive Albanian settlements were made in Greek districts. Clearly, the modern Greek must be of very mixed blood.” (“Turkey in Europe” by Sir Charles Elliot, page 267.)

11. “But it has been argued that since the modern day Greeks are not the descendents of the ancient Greeks: ‘The Star of Vergina is not a Greek symbol, except in the sense that it happens to have been found in the territory of the present-day Greek state...’” (“Experimenting with Democracy Regime change in the Balkans”, edited by Geoffrey Pridham and Tom Gallagher, page 271.)

12. “Contemporary historians state the Emperor Basilius also was a Slavonian; many cities bearing Slavonian appellations still exist in Greece, as, for instance, Platza, Stratza, Lutzana,...” (“The Foreign Quarterly Review Vol. XXVI”, published in October M. DCCC. XL., 1841, page 73.)

13. “By the fourteenth century Orthodox Christian Arvanites had made their way into the Greek thema of the Byzantine Empire, which largely comprised the land that now constitutes Greece. They first came to Attica as early as 1383...They did not complete their immigration until 1759, when Sultan Murat III offered them land in Athens...Thus the Arvanites were already inhabiting Athens when the city became the capital of Greece in 1834.” (“Fragments of Death Fables of Identity An Athenian Anthropography” by Nani Panourgia, page 27.)

14. "I have already said, and I will repeat it, that not one-fifth of the present population can with justice be called Greeks. The remainder are Slavonians, Albanians and Turks, with a slight infusion of Venetian blood." ("Travels in Greece and Russia", by Bayard Taylor, 1872, page 262.)

15. "It should be stressed, however, that the Greeks as an ethnic community during this period [1840's] included many Grecophone or Hellenized Vlachs, Serbs or Orthodox Albanians." ("Greece and the Balkans Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment", edited by Dimitris Tziouvas, page 6.)

16. "All Greek soldiers are required to be able to read and write, and if a conscript on joining has not acquired those rudiments of education, he is put to school. Notwithstanding, the educational efforts of the government, as many as 30 percent proven fifteen years or so ago to be completely illiterate, while not more than 25 per cent had advanced beyond the 'three R's'. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that these conscripts included both Albanians from the settlements in Attica and other parts of the Kingdom and pastoral Koutso-Vlachs, all of whom habitually speak their own dialects and learn Greek only as a foreign tongue." ("Greece of the Hellenes", by Lucy M. J. Garnett, 1914, pages 33 and 34.)

17. "I could speak Turkish, and the Macedonian dialect, besides my own Greek tongue, and as a curious boy in the holidays I had been here and there, wishing to know more of the world round me and the people who lived in other villages than mine. Being neither Turkish nor Greek, we called them Bulgarian, but their language is not Bulgarian, but the Macedonian dialect, and I found lovable people among them, honest, hospitable and kind." ("When I was a Boy in Greece" by George Demetrios, pages 131 and 132.)

18. "The migration of the Albanians is the best attested and in many ways the most instructive of migrations into Greece....

We had difficulty staying because they were rather suspicious of us, but we stayed with a man who talked Greek as his main language, although he talked to his wife in Albanian...

The ancestors of these people probably came to the Epidaurus in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, but they were still talking Albanian as their mother tongue in 1930....

Albanian was the language they talked among themselves, but they could also talk Greek. This was their second language although they lived in Greece....

The one in Epirus which was still Albanian in its customs and its language had probably been there since about 1400...

A group of 10,000 Albanians with their families and their flocks appeared there, and asked if they could be admitted to the Peloponnesus. They were accepted by Theodore, who was the principle ruler of the

Peloponnesus...” (“Greece Old and New”, by Nicholas Hammond, edited by Tom Winnifrith and Penelope Murray, Pages 39 to 44.)

19. “...so, in the Middle Ages, these Albanian mountaineers have brought both war like spirit, bright costume, and beauty of person, to refresh the Hellenic race. There are still, even in Attica, districts where Albanian is the common language; there are Albanian names famous in Greek annals, especially in the great war of independence (1821-1831) and even among the sailors of Hydra, so famed for their commercial enterprise and their deeds of war, the chief families were Albanian in origin.” (“Greek Pictures drawn with pen and pencil” by J. P. Mahaffy, M.A. D.D., 1890, pages 20 and 21.)

20. “Groups of men in stately Albanian costume, with their grand walk and graceful air, stalk up and down with eastern impassibility, price an article, call for a ‘fotia’ (brazier of coals for lighting cigarettes) , at the cafés, or converse in the strange patois of Greece about the last conclusion of the ‘vouli’ or house of delegates.” (“Greek Vignettes a sail in the Greek Seas, Summer of 1877”, by James Albert Herrison, page 148.)

21. “In the 1770’s a fiery Orthodox preacher, the monk Kosmas of Aetolia, tried to stem the tide of mass conversions to Islam in the Northern Greek lands by founding Greek schools in a score of villages in Thessaly, Epirus and Macedonia, where the language had long been abandoned for Albanian, Vlach or Slav, and obliged peasants to speak only Greek.” (“Greece the Modern Sequel from 1821 to the Present”, by John S. Koliopoulos and Thanos M. Veremis, page 159.)

22. “...following the alleged discovery of Slavic buildings by the German excavator at Olympia. The claims were answered by Paparrigopoulos himself, by reinstating his 1843 position that there was indeed a Slavic presence in the Peloponnesus in the Middle Ages, but that the Greeks need not worry because the Slavs were culturally absorbed...” (“The Nation and its Ruins”, by Yannis Hamilakis, page 115.)

23. “In 1358 the Albanians overran Epirus, Acarnania and Anatolia and established two principalities under their leaders... Naupactas fell into their control in 1378...”

Other Albanians and Vlachs invaded the Catalan principality of Boeotia and Attica, and a great many Albanians settled there as peasant-farmers in 1368 and later....

The penetration of the Greek mainland which we have described occurred during the hundred or more years after 1325.” (“Migrations and Invasions in Greece and Adjacent Areas”, by Nicholas G. L. Hammond, page 59.)

24. “When arriving by airplane at Athens, one lands at the new airport at Spata. Spata is a town situated in the Messogia region that bears and Arvanite name that means ‘axe’ or ‘sword’ (in Greek ‘spaps’, spaya from which derives the Albanian Spata). The term ‘Arvanite’ is the medieval equivalent of ‘Albanian’. It is retained today for the descendants of the

Albanian tribes that migrated to the Greek lands during the period covering two centuries, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth.” (“Hellenism Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity”, edited by Katerina Zacharia, page 230.)

25. “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 descendents of the veritable Greeks of old are in great minority. The majority are of Albanian and Suliot blood, races which even the Romans found untamable.” (“In Greek Waters: a story of the Grecian War of Independence (1821-1827), by G. A. Henty, 1893, page 40.)

26. “Where are we to look for the descendents of the Greeks of old? Travelers tell us that, as late as the sixteenth century, Athens was but a castle with a small village; and that Sparta, divided by two tribes of the Slavi, the Ezeriti and the Milingi, had not only lost her ancient name, but it was impossible to recognize the site in which she had stood of old.” (“History of the Island of Corfu” by Henry Jervis-White Jervis ESQ., page 250.)

27. “General interest was first aroused by a controversy as to the racial derivation of modern Greeks. The war of Independence had won the sympathy of Europe; and it was a rude shock both to Greece and to her champions when Fallmerayer announced that her inhabitants were virtually Slavs. The race of the Hellenes he declared in his ‘History of the Morea’ was routed out, and Athens was unoccupied from the sixth to the tenth century. Only its literature and a few ruins survived to tell that the Greek people had ever existed. What the Slavs had began the Albanians completed.” (“History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century”, by G. P. Gooch, 1918, page 491.)

28. “There were few Muslims here; the inhabitants largely of Albanian stock, were only imperfectly assimilated into the Greek nation...”

(“Politics in Modern Greece”, by Keith R. Legg, page 48.)

“The term ‘Greek’ differentiates the language spoken by inhabitants of modern Greece from the languages of the surrounding countries; but there is disagreement on what the Greek language was, is, or should be. At the time of independence, the range of local dialects was significant; substantial portions of the population spoke Albanian.” (“Politics in Modern Greece”, by Keith R. Legg, page 86.)

29. “...followed by violence, recourse was had to arms, and the two elder brothers united against Vely, the offspring of a slave; who being forced to expatriate himself, embraced the perilous profession of those Albanian knights errant, more commonly known by the appellation of kleftes or brigands.” (“The Life of Ali Pasha of Jannina, 1823, page 26.)

30. “There is the case of Karamanlides, a predominantly Turkish-speaking Christian Orthodox people, who were forced to go to Greece although they did not necessarily identify ‘ethnically’ with the Greeks. At

the time of the exchange they numbered as many as 400,000.” (“Mediating the Nation News, Audiences and the Politics of Identity”, Mirca Madianou, page 31.)

31. “Morea... as Fallmerayer traces it back to the Slavic word ‘more’, the sea which nearly encircles the Morea. The Morea forms the most southern part of the Kingdom of Greece and is divided into the monarchies of Argolis, Corinth, Lakonis, Messenia, Archadia, Achaea and Elis. Overrun by the Goths and Vandals, it became prey, in the second half of the 8th c. to bands of Slavic invaders who found it wasted by war and pestilence.” (“International Cyclopaedia a Compendium of Human Knowledge”, American Editor-in-Chief Richard Gleason Green, 1890, page 204.)

32. “This point is made in almost all publications on Albanian nationalism (e.g. Skendi 1967 and 1980). In the nineteenth century, the Greek historian Constantinos Paparrigopoulos considered the Albanians a ‘race’ that could be acculturated into Hellenism. His viewpoint was greatly influenced by the considerable Albanian contribution to the Greek war of independence (1821-1828).” (“Nationalism Globalization and Orthodoxy” by Victor Roudometof, page 156.)

33. “Rhigas of Valentino...author of poems, revolutionary proclamations and a constitution...

In this document he spoke of a sovereign people of the proposed state as including ‘without distinction of religion and language – Greeks, Albanians, Vlachs, Armenians, Turks and every other race’.” (“Nations and States”, by Hugh Seton-Watson, page 113.)

34. “As of 2002 more than 98,000 foreign pupils were enrolled in Greek schools, accounting for almost 9 percent of the overall school population. As regards nationality, 72 percent are from Albania. Clearly, Albanians are not unknown to Greeks and the new relationships emerging from the contemporary migratory context can be seen as superimposing themselves into a pre-existing trans-Balkan context.” (“The New Albanian Migration”, edited by Russell King, Nicola Mai and Stephanie Schwandner-Sievers, page 155.)

35 “Next to them in this respect are the modern Greeks, who, for the most part, are of Slavonian origin, and, where they are not purely Slavonian, are a cross-breed in which Slavonian enters very largely.” (“The Phrenological Journal and Magazine of Moral Science for the year 1843”, Vol. XIV, page 246.)

36. “The modern Greeks are largely of Slavic origin. They are not the descendents of the ancient Greeks. That noble race, greatly mixed with barbarian blood during the middle ages, was almost completely destroyed in the course of the frequent uprisings against Turkish rule. Slavic immigrants gradually repopulated the country.” (“The Popular Science Monthly”, edited by J. McKeen Cattell”, Volume LXXV, July to December 1909, page 591.)

37. "There was little interest as to the nationality of the rayahs while Turkish rule was strong. They were nearly all Christians of the Byzantine type, those in Europe at least, and were hence regarded as one people, for oriental theocracy cannot conceive of nationality apart from religion. They themselves knew the differences in their origins and in such traditions as they had: some were Slavs, some Vlachs and some Albanians..." ("Political Science Quarterly" edited by the faculty of science of Columbia University, Volume twenty-third, 1908, page 307.)

38. "Since the Christian era, as we have said, a successive downpour of foreigners from the north into Greece has ensued. In the sixth century came the Avars and the Slavs, bringing death and disaster. A more potent and lasting influence upon the country was probably produced by the slower and more peaceful infiltration of the Slavs into Thessaly and Epirus from the end of the seventh century onward.

The most important immigration of all is probably that of the Albanians, who, from the thirteenth century until the advent of the Turks incessantly overran the land." ("The Races of Europe a Sociological Study", by William Z. Ripley PhD, 1910, page 408.)

39. "When the Macedonians became rulers of Greece, Athens had twenty-one thousand citizens, ten thousand resident aliens and four-hundred thousand slaves." ("Race or Mongrel", by Alfred P. Schultz, page 86.)

"The resident aliens were mainly Aryan-Hemitic-Semetic-Egyptian-Negroid mongrels." ("Race or Mongrel", by Alfred P. Schultz, page 87.) "In the course of time the Hellenic blood was corrupted to a still greater extent. In 146 BC the Romans conquered Greece...When Mummius took Corinth...All the men were killed, the women and children were sold into slavery. Later the Goths invaded Greece...laid waste the land, and expelled or exterminated the inhabitants." ("Race or Mongrel", by Alfred P. Schultz, pages 88 and 89.)

"The only difference between modern Greeks and the other Balkanacs lies in the fact that the environment of the modern Greeks is the environment of the Hellenes. The environment, however, has no power whatsoever to change the mongrel into a race, and the Greeks have not been changed by it." ("Race or Mongrel", by Alfred P. Schultz, page 93.)

40. "The ethnographic record certainly shows that Rhigas could have identified as both Vlach and Greek, and even preferred one over another in different circumstances. The Koutsovlach contribution to Greek independence is well attested." ("Modern Greece a Cultural Poetics", by Vangelis Calotychos, page 44.)

"He consequently never traveled to Greece to implement the second part of his plan. Like many Philhellenes and Diaspora figures Rhigas never did set foot in Greece, which was fitting for one whose image of the place bore many characteristics of a European discourse located and produced

outside of the Greek mainland.” (“Modern Greece a Cultural Poetics”, by Vangelis Calotychos, page 47.)

41. “In the last year of the 15th century, and the opening years of the 16th, when the Morea was again the battlefield of the Turks and Venetians, the occupants of the plain of Argos and portions of Attica were practically exterminated, and Albanian colonists began to reoccupy the lands.” (“The Customs and Lore of Modern Greece”, by Rennell Rodd, 1892, page 17.)

42. “Modern Greece is so flimsy and fragile, that it goes to pieces entirely when confronted with the roughest fragment of the old. But there is very little of it, and if you choose you may see exactly what the Greeks of the 5th century saw, and, the people of Athens are, of course, no more Athenian than I am.” (“In Byron’s Shadow Modern Greece in the English and American Imagination”, by David Roessel, page 163.)

43. “This revival also allowed the Byzantines to re-colonize the Greek mainland. The success of that effort would prove crucial to the survival of Greek culture in future centuries, after the other lands had fallen away. Having overrun nearly all the Greek mainland, the cities, and the islands by the tenth century the Slavs in Greece have been converted to Orthodox Christianity and thoroughly Hellenized.” (“Sailing from Byzantium How a Lost Empire Shaped the World”, by Colin Wells, page 184.)

44. “The Vlachs, on the contrary, descendents of the Romanized people of the Balkan peninsula, live in considerable numbers in the mountains of northern and central Greece.” (“The Scottish Geographical Magazine”, volume XIII, 1897, page 370.)

45. “Europe’s affinity with ancient Greece left the newborn nation of Greece in an awkward double bind. Identifying ancient Greece as the ‘childhood of Europe’ Winkelmann gave the patrimony of Greece to western Europe, leaving only more modern sights of heritage to the modern Greeks. Michael Herzfeld suggests that ‘the west supported the Greeks on their implicit assumption that the Greeks would reciprocally accept the role of living ancestors of European civilization’.” (“Possessors and Possessed”, by Wendy M. K. Shaw, page 66.)

46. “It is simply not plausible to suggest that the bulk of Greek speaking Roman citizens in the Middle Ages, let alone the former Turkish subjects of 19th century Greece, ‘lived like, ancient Greeks.’” (“Macedonia and Greece the Struggle to Define a New Balkan Nation”, by John Shea, page 95.)

47. “Not less remarkable than the small size of Hellas was the small size of the Hellenes themselves. But it is much more easy to trace the boundaries of the one upon the modern map than it is to trace the blood of the other in the bodies of the modern inhabitants.

We have no accurate record of the proportions of free citizens who alone constituted the true Hellenes, but they were at most a small minority among the large population of helots and slaves.” (“The Nineteenth

Century a Monthly Review”, edited by James Knowles, Vol. VI, July-December 1879, page 932.)

48. “The Albanians of Hydra and Spatsae, many of whom could not even speak Greek, regarded themselves as Greek because their allegiance was with the Orthodox Church.” (“That Greece Might Still be Free”, by William St. Clair, page 9.)

49. “Here is the ultimate Greek tragedy: that of a country forced to treat everything familiar at the time of the nation-state’s foundation as ‘foreign’ while importing a culture largely invented – or at least – redesigned by German classicists of the late eighteenth early nineteenth centuries. For many decades, and almost without interruption, Greeks were forced to put aside music, art and language that were deemed too tainted by the ‘oriental’ influences of Ottoman, Arab, Slavic and Albanian culture; to forget the partially Albanian roots of Athens and its environs...” (“The Body Impolitic” by Michael Herzfeld, page 9.)

50. “The philhellenes – the word means ‘the admirers of the Greeks’ – who began to lobby for Greek freedom were struck by the contrast between the idea of ancient Greek freedom and the servitude of the modern Greeks, who were usually assumed to be direct descendents of Pericles and company. Philhellenes generally moved at a distance from reality: they were concerned only with the myth of Athens and were capable of ignoring anything which tended to tarnish the glamour.” (“Athens from Ancient Ideal to Modern City”, by Robin Waterfield, page 296.)

Given that the Modern Greeks are NOT the descendents of any “ancient people” as they pretend to be, then how do they justify the invasion, occupation, partition and annexation of Macedonian territories? How do they justify telling the Macedonians what they can and can’t call themselves? Why are these imposters and charlatans still being taken seriously? But, as long as we pay attention to them and argue with them, they will continue to argue back and to “pretend” that they are the descendents of the so-called Ancient Greeks.

Part 20 – The Macedonian Party?

Forty years ago we were told that Macedonians simply did not exist; “there was no such thing as a Macedonian”. Thirty years ago we were told that a “Greek” cannot be made; he or she had to be born from Greeks to be Greek. Twenty years ago we were told that “Greek” is the most “solid” ethnic identity on this earth with 4,000 years of continuous and uninterrupted lineage. Now we are told that Macedonians do exist and there are 3,500,000 of them spread all over the world.

Well for people who believe they are pure Greeks, direct descendents from the ancient Greeks, even though they are not Greeks at all, anything is possible. For people who descended from Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs and still believe they are Greeks, descendants of the ancient Greeks, anything is possible. For people who believe that Alexander the Great, the same Alexander the Great who conquered and brutally suppressed their so-called “ancient Greek ancestors”, is their national hero, then anything is possible.

When I first read the story that a new political party was formed in Greece, calling itself the “Macedonian Party”, I thought “how wonderful”, for a split second. Then reality hit. How is it possible for Greece to have a political party that represents the non-existent Macedonian minority? I knew there had to be a catch. A political party is being formed that wants to elect members to the European Parliament in the June elections. The catch however is that this is NOT a “Macedonian Party” at all but rather a “fake” Macedonian party created by Greeks for the purpose of usurping the name “Macedonia”. This time the Greeks are using a different angle to approach the same old problem. They want to hold onto Macedonia and the Macedonian heritage the best way they know how; by lying and cheating.

As we know the Modern Greeks are not Greeks at all. We know they were created by the Philhellenes from the Slav, Albanian and Vlach immigrants who migrated to Greece during the 11th to the 14th century AD. We also know that the Greek people living in Greek occupied Macedonia today are not Greeks at all. Of the total people living in Greek occupied Macedonia the majority are not even Macedonians. Greece has been importing people into Macedonia since it invaded, occupied, partitioned and annexed Macedonian lands in 1912, 1913. Greece has imported Albanians and Vlachs from Albania, 1,100,000 Christian Turks from Asia Minor, the Caucasus, Russia, Armenia, etc. In fact Greece is importing people from all over the world today as we speak and is still calling them Greeks. So the Modern Greeks, being neither Macedonians nor Greeks, in essence have no “real” claim to Macedonia or to the Macedonian heritage so they have no choice but to resort to lying and cheating.

The new Greek Party founded by the so-called “World committee for the Protection of Macedonia” is another ploy to lay claim to the name

“Macedonia”, through the European Parliament. The Party’s aim is to block the Republic of Macedonia from entering the European Union with the name “Macedonia”.

“It is of great importance for Macedonian Hellenism to join the European Parliament with the name ‘Macedonia’, ‘Macedonian’, ‘Macedonians’, in order to guarantee that Macedonia belongs only to Greece, before Skopje has a chance to do this for itself. If the Greeks, who are the real Macedonians, enter the European Parliament with this name then the fake Macedonians will not be able to do so”, said Konstantinos Kalfa committee member of the “World committee for the Protection of Macedonia”, as quoted by Kanal 5.

(Note how the fake Greeks refer to the real Macedonians as fakes).

According to its founders, “the party will fight to protect the name, history and rights of the large Macedonian minority [of the Greek kind], estimated to number 3,500,000 and is spread all over the world”.

So if I understand this correctly, the non-existent Macedonian minority that Greece has denied ever existed, now exists, suddenly overnight. It exists somewhat as “Macedonian” but not really because the Greek types of Macedonians are really “ethnic Greeks” who happened to live in Macedonia. We know however that there is no such thing as “ethnic Greeks” because the Modern Greek identity is not real but a Philhellene artificial creation! So if ethnic Greeks don’t really exist then these Macedonians who supposedly are “ethnic Greeks” in reality don’t exist either. But wait a minute aren’t the Greeks now telling us that they do exist, and that there are 3.5 million of them all over the world? Confused? Perhaps now you can appreciate the expression “it’s all Greek to me”! In other words “it’s too complicated for us non-Greeks to understand!”

Forget what the Greeks are telling you and focus on what they are trying to do. This is not about “ethnicities”, “languages”, “cultures” or histories it’s about the expropriation of Macedonian lands and robbing the Macedonian people of their heritage. Lying and cheating is a “Greek specialty”, this is how they built their fake identity and artificial country. They have lied to the world from the day the Philhellenes brought them into their artificial existence. But no matter how hard they try to suppress the truth it will eventually resurface.

What I don’t understand however is why do they have to lie? Everyone knows they are lying; why not admit to the truth? Why not say that in this world “might is right” and as long as we they have the “might” we will do whatever we want. They suppress the Macedonian people because they can and will hold onto their lands as long as they can.

I don’t know why they have to lie about their fake identity either? They are Greeks because they want to be Greeks, it’s as simple as that. Better still why not admit that they are the descendants of Slav, Albanian and Vlach immigrants? What is wrong with that? We are all immigrants here in Canada, with the exception of the indigenous people we found here

when we colonized their lands, and we are not ashamed of it and no Canadian needs to lie about it.

We know Greece suffers from anxiety, we have known this for many years. The whole world knows that Greece and Greeks are artificially created entities and that they suffer from anxiety. The only cure for their anxiety is for them to accept the truth. No more lies and pretending will lead to no more anxiety! Anxiety makes Greeks panic and panic causes them to behave irrationally. Behaving irrationally towards their neighbours causes their neighbours to behave irrationally right back. The Republic of Macedonia is forced to behave this way because Greece behaves this way. Most of Europe, catering to Greece's anxiety, also behaves this way. How else do you explain the "name game"? Is it rational for one country to "demand" of another to change its name? Is it rational for European Union countries to demand the Republic of Macedonia change its name? No! Why then are they behaving this way if not because of Greece's anxiety?

The European Union it seems will accept fake countries like Greece but will not accept the Republic of Macedonia, that is until it changes its name and it too becomes a fake country. This makes one wonder if the European Union itself is a club for fakes. Again, I will ask the reader to look at the European Union for what it does and not for what it says. The EU has many rules and regulations that support minority and human rights in its member states but at the same time it allows its member states to practice racism and discrimination against their minorities. It seems that EU rules and regulations apply to "others" and not to its own members! All those human rights laws in its books and none of them can help the Macedonians in Greece or in Bulgaria.

If the European Union will allow racist organizations like the fake "Macedonian Party" in its Parliament whose only aim is to rob the Macedonian people of their lands and heritage, then what does that say about the European Union? Some people think that members of the European Parliament are ignorant of the Macedonian people's real issues with Greece and Bulgaria. Others say they are indifferent. If that were true then those who are ignorant should by now have learned something after 17 years of playing the "name game". And those who are indifferent should have remained indifferent. Why have European Union countries sided with Greece demanding that Macedonia change its name?

"Greece's movement to build a national identity, however, contained a unique element not shared by others: external support and even pressure, for a specific kind of new identity. The British, French and Russians demanded that the modern Greek identity be Hellenic and respond to the Europeans' nostalgia for the restoration of a pre-Christian Hellenic civilization that has been in eclipse for some two thousand years. Europeans confidently expected to see the characteristic of Homer in post liberation Greeks, in spite of the ebb and flow of history over such a great span of time. The neoclassicism that rose in seventeenth – and eighteenth-

century Europe as an aesthetic and philosophical idea was to be physically embodied in modern-day Greece. The idealistic and hopeful attitudes of neoclassicism that would later be imposed on the Greeks was succinctly expressed in 1822 when American President James Monroe declared: 'The mention of Greece fills the mind with the utmost exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible'. In reality, however, just before the Greek war of independence, most Greeks still referred to themselves as Romans. Vlachavas, the priest rebel leader who rose against the Ottomans, declared, 'A Romneos I was born, a Romneos I will die'.

Some Europeans and the few Americans who came to help Greece start a new nation-state, were disappointed even indignant, to discover among Greece's peasants there were no warrior-heroes like Achilles or Ajax, no statesmen like Pericles, no philosophers like Socrates or Plato and no poets of the caliber of Aeschylus or Sophocles. There was, in fact, little likeness between nineteenth century Greeks and the idealized Greeks from ancient history that had such hold on the imagination of European liberators." ("Blood Lines from Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism", by Vamik Volkan pages 121 and 122).

"In Eastern Europe since 1990, the treatment of minorities seems quite contrary to the recent development in Western Europe, which reversed the earlier positions in both parts of Europe. If there have been any results from the High Commissioner's mission in the three serious cases of the Russians (and other minorities) in the Baltic, the Roma and the Sinti throughout Europe, and the Macedonians in Greece, nothing substantial has so far emerged about them. The High Commissioner has been in existence since the beginning of 1993, and Max van der Stoep has been exclusively active in Eastern Europe throughout the period until retirement mid-2001 when the new Commissioner Ralf Ekeus took over. After the first period of four years there was an analysis of Van der Stoep's efforts; due to the OSCE's discrete policy, assuring effected states of 'absolute' confidentiality, the relevant information is still lacking. The age of secret diplomacy in minority matters is not over in Europe." ("Ethnicity Nationalism and Violence", by Christian P. Scherrer, page 253)

"Because of Greece's almost hysterical reaction, the state [Republic of Macedonia] was not admitted to the UN until the end of 1992 under the absurd appellation 'former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia'. The successive Greek governments allegedly took offense at the symbolism of the name (the Macedonia of Philip II, the native land of Alexander the Great) and at the flag (a sun with sixteen rays on a red background) although Macedonia had borne this name as a Yugoslavian Republic since 1948." ("Ethnicity Nationalism and Violence", by Christian P. Scherrer, page 283)

"The key premise in Humboldt's idea is that Hellenic civilization assumed a transcendental significance because it testified to a cultural and

linguistic purity. This claim was historically absurd and even antithetical to the paradigm of comparative linguistics, which was the core of philological inquiry.

In practical terms, however, the historical absurdity of declaring Hellenic civilization the expression of a culture uncontaminated by foreign elements can be explained by a simple fact that usually tends to be disregarded – namely, that Hellenic civilizations as we know it was in effect the invention of the ‘Science of Antiquity’ of Classics. As such, it could have been (and was) endowed with whatever signification the discipline found useful.

The invention of Hellenic civilization shows the profound power of philology as a method to cultural knowledge – indeed, as knowledge.” (“Dream Nation” by Stathis Gourgouris, pages 133 and 134)

“...for more than a century, Greek schoolbooks have stressed the unbroken continuity and diachronic and homogeneity of Greek civilization and culture, with the results that Greeks tend to believe without question in this construction of Romantic nationalist historiography. According to this ideology, what is labeled with the timeless and semantically vague abstract term ‘Hellenism’ – together with its language – is a healthy organism that for 4,000 years has either resisted or assimilated foreign influences; alteration is viewed as adulteration, while outside influences are viewed as threats.” (“Hellenisms Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity”, edited by Katerina Zacharia, page 303)

“According to the narrative of Philhellenism, after nearly two millennium of imperial rule – first under the Byzantines and then under the Ottomans – a newly defined Greek nation could reunite with its glorified ancient heritage and, lead by monarchs of German and Danish ancestry, revive the traditions that had inspired western Europe to greatness. Yet Hellenism had to be invented in Europe as the cornerstone of Western Civilization before it could be imported to Greece as a nationalist movement. A combination of the real and imagined culture of the ancient Greeks became, in various guises, a heritage to which all could lay claim. Hellenism became a pan-European endeavour that spanned the course of many centuries and found varied forms of expression in different countries.

...Germans came to conflate modern Germany with the ancient Greek world. By the end of the nineteenth century for example, the archeologist Ernst Curtius could justify large scale archeological expeditions to Greece by simply explaining that ‘Germany herself has inwardly appropriated Greek culture’.

Similarly, in England ancient Greece became a model for nineteenth century citizens.

It stood as proof of the superiority of the West over the barbaric East; as such it presented one more reason for the civilization of the East

through European colonization.” (“Possessors and Possessed” by Wendy M. K. Shaw, pages 62 to 64)

After reading the above perhaps the reader will come to appreciate why Europe is so fond of Greece.

Part 21 – Baiting the Trap

I am sure by now everyone has heard of Professor Miller's infamous letter to President Obama signed by more than 200 professors and academics. <http://macedonia-evidence.org/obama-letter.html#obamacosigners>

But what does it all mean? Does it take 200 professors to sign a letter with such bogus arguments that even a child can tear apart with its eyes closed? But then if you think about it, there maybe a hidden agenda behind the letter! Does it take 200 professors to legitimize, as the Greeks put it, the "well known facts"? If the "facts" are so well known why does one need ALL those professors to "back them up"? Isn't it "a bit" of overkill?

I know the arguments in the letter can be refuted so easily and I know there are far more capable and convincing "classical students" than Professor Miller so why not go the extra mile and attempt to produce an "iron clad" case before President Obama?

There is but one reason why the Greeks have written this "private" but "purposely leaked" letter to President Obama. I received the letter four days before Obama did, do you think it was by accident? No! I believe the letter was sent to simply attract our attention! A trap to lure the Macedonians away from pursuing their human rights and to focus their energies on what the Greeks want them to focus on; nonsensical issues where there is nothing at stake for Greece.

The so-called Greek "dispute" with Macedonia actually has nothing to do with ancient history, ancient names, flags, or symbols. Greece's "dispute" with Macedonia is a ruse to cover up human rights abuses perpetrated by Greece against the Macedonian people living inside Greece. The real issue Greece is trying to avoid has a lot to do with confiscated properties and revoked citizenships than with ancient history. The real issue is about Macedonians being exiled from their homeland for just being Macedonian and Macedonians not being able to speak their language freely and practice their customs and culture without persecution.

By writing this letter the Greeks are trying to divert Macedonian and world attention to non consequential and nonsensical issues like "ancient names of regions" and what they were called 2,500 years ago. Issues that nobody cares about and that have no consequences for Greece!

The fact that over 200 professors have signed the letter however, if they indeed have signed it, should be of concern to the institutions where these professors teach. Do parents and students approve of their professors meddling in the politics of foreign states?

It should be of greater concern to the professors as well; especially if they didn't sign the letter and their names have been forged by the Greeks and dragged through the mud!

Let me explain how Greece plays this game. Greece uses the ancient argument to justify its occupation of Macedonian territories and to claim

the Macedonian heritage as its own to the exclusion of the Macedonian people. By arguing that “Macedonians do not exist” Greece is excluding the Macedonian people from their heritage and creating conditions to continue to deny them their human rights. So by helping the Greeks lay claim to the ancient heritage these professors are wittingly or unwittingly aiding and abetting Greece in its quest to deny the Macedonian people their human rights. If this is intentionally done then parents and students do have serious concerns and the right to worry and be upset with these professors. It is important that each co-signing professor think about the implications of his or her signature on this letter and the damage it will do to Macedonian peoples and their human rights!

There is a rumour circulating that Professor Miller has recommended that Greece “invade and annex” the Republic of Macedonia. I am currently looking for a source on this but if it turns out to be true would these professors still support Miller in his quest?

Greece and its Philhellene patrons had over 200 years to re-write history and poison the world with their “awesome” and unbelievable lies. But why are they now resorting to using this fake “ancient history” to solve their modern problems?

When it comes to “modern issues” why are Greeks focusing on the history from 2,500 years ago to solve their current problems instead of focusing on more recent history, like the history of the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the formation of the modern Balkans states? Modern Balkan problems, issues, disputes and arguments today stem directly from events that took place in the last 200 years. Today’s problems in the Balkans are a direct result of the formation of the new Balkan states and the conditions under which they were created. So why doesn’t Greece want to talk about or hold debates on issues from this period? Why instead talk about what happened 2,500 years ago?

Since the ancient City States were conquered by the Macedonians 2,300 years ago, the people in the lower Balkans have been subjugated by many conquerors including the Romans, Byzantines and Ottomans and the people have lived without borders up until the creation of the Modern Balkan states in the 19th century. Without borders to stop invaders, whoever invaded Macedonia also invaded Greece; whoever settled in Macedonia also settled in Greece. Being in close proximity (neighbours with open borders) for 2,300 years has exposed both Macedonia and Greece to the same demographic conditions. What was there to prevent those who entered Macedonia from entering Greece? The logical answer would be “nothing”!

Wouldn’t one be able to find the same kind of people in Greece as one finds in Macedonia? The logical answer would be “certainly”!

So why should we believe the Greeks when they tell us that they are “pure Greeks”, descendents of the Ancient Greeks and that the Macedonians are “Slavs”?

If the Modern Greeks are the descendants of the ancient Greeks then the Modern Macedonians are the descendents of the Ancient Macedonians! Conversely, if the Modern Macedonians are “Slavs” then so are the Modern Greeks!

Before determining “who the ancients were and were not”, would it not be logical to ask the question “who are and who are not the moderns”?

Let us start with the Modern Greeks since they came into the 19th century scene first.

Who are the Modern Greeks?

Here is what Edmund About has to say in his book “Greece and the Greeks of the Present day”. On page 160 we read: “The Turkish village which formerly clustered around the base of the Acropolis had not disappeared: it forms a whole quarter of the town. There are narrow alleys, huts of the height of a man, yards in which chickens, children and pigs crawl pell-mell between a dunghill and a heap of fagots. An immense of the majority of the population of this quarter is composed of Albanians.”

Here is what Alexandra Halkias has to say in her book “The Empty Cradle of Democracy”. On page 59 we read: “Through the end of the revolution in 1830, Greeks, including most of the nineteenth century nationalists, seemed to have had a vague but firm sense of continuity from ancient to modern Greece, though this was not articulated in racial terms but on the basis of a common language, history, and consciousness. In effect, at this time, whoever called themselves a Greek was a Greek. It is because of this that many Greek-speaking Albanians, Slavs, Romanians, and Vlachs were easily assimilated and indeed became important players in Greek patriotism at the time.

Until the beginning of the 19th century, the average inhabitant of Greece called himself or herself a Roman (Romios), and the (Greek) language Romeika.

To some extent – the consciousness of the modern Greek of his classical ancestry is a product of Western Scholarship.”

Here is what Michael Herzfeld has to say in his book “Anthropology”. On page 67 we read: “The example of modern Greece provides a useful key to historicizing those who Eric Wolf has ironically dubbed ‘the people without history’ (Wolf 1982). For the modern Greeks - a people arguably plagued by an excess of history, but of a kind invented for them by more powerful others.”

Here is what Appleton had to say in his 1901 “Annual Encyclopedia” third series volume VI. On page 113 we read: “The first Greek who had a plan for insurrection and for a liberated Greece was Rhigas of Valestino, a Thessalian who served in high posts in Wallachia, spent some years in Vienna, and was handed over by the Austrians to the Turks in Trieste in 1798 as a revolutionary conspirator, and hanged in Belgrade. Rhigas was the author of poems, revolutionary proclamations and a constitution, closely modeled on the French constitution of 1793 and 1795. In this

document he spoke of the sovereign people of the proposed state as including ‘without distinction of religion or language – Greeks, Albanians, Vlachs, Armenians, Turks and every other race’.”

Here is what we read on page 42 of the “Insight Guides Athens Greece Series”. “Because of numerous and protracted foreign occupations, true Athenians were a relatively small minority even in the age of Pericles. In later periods, the city was suffering from severe depopulation and restocked with Albanians. At the time of Greek independence in 1834, Athens was a miserable village with a population of only 6,000.”

In the “Atlantic Monthly” of January 1882 volume XLIX we read: “It is one of a group made famous in the Greek revolution of 1821 by the bravery of its Albanian settlers, in defense of a country which they had never adopted for their own till this moment of danger came.”

On page 109 of the book “Entangled Identities” edited by Atsuko Ichijo and Willfried Spohn we read: “It should be strongly emphasized, however, this image of classical Greece was constructed in Europe and was imported to the newborn Greek state. (Tsoukalas 2002)”

After reading the above quotes, there is but one logical conclusion that can be reached and that is “the Modern Greeks are the direct descendants of the Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs” and have nothing to do with the so-called “ancient Greeks”.

Unfortunately Greeks don’t want to talk about their “recent history” because they don’t want it to be discovered that they are frauds and charlatans.

Let us not allow the Greeks to fool the world that their dispute with the Macedonian people is anything but a ruse to sidestep the real issue, the existence of the Macedonian minority in Greece. The so-called Greek dispute with Macedonia is not about “names” or “history”! How can it be when the Modern Greeks are neither Greeks nor Macedonians? Why would a people who are neither Greeks nor Macedonians care about “Macedonia’s name” or “Macedonia’s history”? The ONLY concern the so-called Modern Greeks have is “how to continue to hang on to Macedonian lands and to the Macedonian heritage” as long as they can.

Part 22 – The Greek Macedonians

Several days ago I received a phone call from a stranger who opened the conversation in Macedonian and later asked me if I spoke Greek. He introduced himself as a “Grkoman” and asked me if I had ever heard of him. I said no to both questions.

This person, who asked to remain anonymous, said he was sick and tired of the Greeks denying the existence of Macedonians and wanted to have a meeting with me to tell me his side of the story so that I could write about it.

I don’t know the man and I don’t know if his intentions were honourable, but being the suspicious kind that I am, I couldn’t help myself but question “what is this all about?”

Is this another attempt by the Greeks to muddy the waters by pretending to be Macedonians in order to diminish the real Macedonian cause? Or have the “Hellenized Greeks” (Grkomani), who for years have abandoned their true ethnicity in favour of being “Greeks”, come to their senses and now want to join the Macedonians?

Is this another “Greek ploy” working at a “higher level” to usurp the Macedonian heritage at the expense of the real Macedonians in line with the Greek “Macedonian Party” I wrote about a couple of weeks ago? <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/102681> Or is there a genuine desire by the Grkomani to liberate themselves from the Greek shackles?

Was this person acting as a Trojan horse for the Greeks? Or was he genuinely tired of the Greeks abusing him and wanted to do something about it?

Why did he introduce himself as a “Grkoman” and why ask me if I spoke “Greek” when we both communicated very well in Macedonian?

There are too many questions for which I have no answers so I can’t risk brushing him off as another “agent of Greece” or as a Macedonian who is genuinely concerned for his own kind. Therefore my choice would be to define what a “Grkoman” is, according to my understanding, and leave the rest to the readers to reach their own conclusion.

Plainly put, in this context, a “Grkoman” is a Hellenized Macedonian. But in the eyes of the genuine Macedonian people, a “Grkoman” is simply a traitor.

The “Grkomani” are a product of Greece’s forced assimilation policy designed to Hellenize Macedonia and the Macedonian people.

To truly understand the “Grkoman” or “Bulgaroman” phenomenon one has to imagine an “occupied” people in a world where the conditions for survival are “created” by the “occupier”.

In order to maintain control of the occupied, the occupier needs to know when and where to act and for that he needs reliable information. This information must come from the inside and must be accurate. So, to

gain such information the occupier needs to enlist the services of insiders in the occupied world. Unfortunately, the only insiders who are willing to provide such information are those who are either disgruntled individuals or individuals that can be bought in exchange for something they desire such as sums of money, social status, free education, a better job, power over others, etc. However, to prove his or her loyalty the insider or collaborator is expected to commit some act, usually a criminal act, against his own people. This way the occupier will be assured of the collaborator's loyalty.

So how will a collaborator react to a situation where the occupier is threatened? In such a situation the collaborator will fight for the occupier in order to maintain the status quo.

I am not implying that all "Grkomani" are collaborators but I do question their actions. If these people have committed no harm to the Macedonian people then what are their motives for siding with the occupiers? So my hope here is that many of these "Grkomani" are ignorant of their real identity or are taking advantage of the situation for some small personal gain. Thus, no harm done and there is hope for them yet. But for those who have done serious harm, good luck to them!

To be loyal to family and friends is fine but it should not stop people from thinking for themselves and finding out who they really are. I have been told that loyalty to family comes first and I can't say that I disagree with that. If your parents or grandparents saw themselves as other than Macedonians, for which I am sure they had a reason, that does not change the fact that they have a Macedonian ancestry which, when the time comes, will be recognized as such. So where does that leave you? You can argue with me that, that will never happen just as many in the past have argued that Macedonia will never be free of the Romans, Byzantines, or Turks or you can reconsider where you stand and make the right choice.

The Republic of Macedonia's independence has created a problem for Greece. Greece took the 19th century road but somewhere down the line forgot to take a turn when the whole world was turning.

Yugoslavia was whole at one time populated by "South Slavs". In fact Yugoslavia was touted as the Switzerland of the Balkans. But where is Yugoslavia today? Who would have thought Yugoslavia, the Switzerland of the Balkans, would disintegrate to its elemental level? Who would have thought that Yugoslavia was populated by other than "South Slavs"? Believe me; Greece is not far behind. Its belligerent behaviour towards its minorities, especially the Macedonians, will not serve it well!

So if I may summarize, I see the "Grkomani" falling into three categories;

1. Those who are truly ignorant of their own ethnicity. The ones who learned to speak Macedonian from their predecessors and think it's a "Greek dialect". They call themselves Greek because all their lives they have been told they are Greek.

2. Those who know they are not Greek but pretend to be Greek because there are advantages to “being Greek” or because they are afraid of being harmed if it is discovered that they are not Greek.

3. The ones who in the past, in the name of Greece, have committed crimes against their own people and need the Greeks to protect them from prosecution. These types will do anything to keep themselves safe, even help the Greek cause against the Macedonians in order to maintain the status quo.

If the man who called me on the telephone falls into the first two categories I would be more than glad to help him and I am sure I speak for every Macedonian when I say “welcome back”. But if the man falls into the third category I want no part of him and I will not hesitate to expose him and the crimes he has committed. It is people of the third kind who helped the Greeks make the dreaded “black lists” and sent so many innocent Macedonians to their death and to the Greek concentration camps. It is people of this kind that made so many Macedonians permanent refugees. It is these “sold out” Macedonians that today are so vocal and against the Macedonians gaining their human rights.

Another thing that this man mentioned, which sounded peculiar, was the number of Macedonians living in Ontario. “Did you know,” he asked “that 600,000 Macedonian live in Toronto, or, well, I mean in Ontario and roughly 3,000,000 in Greece?” I did not know that! I didn’t bother to ask where he got his figures, but then I remembered a friend from Australia sent me the following article, part of which I would like to share with you.

“Some Greek community leaders say there are 700,000 Greeks in Australia, implying that one in 25 Australians is Greek by some way or another, but are they? Another interesting perception is that outside Greece Melbourne is the second largest Greek speaking city in the world, but here again is it?

Not by birthplace, or even by parental birthplace.

The 2006 census recorded only 109,989. The 1991 census recorded 136,331.

Not by Language.

The 2006 census recorded 252,216. The 1991 census recorded 274,974 Australians who said that they spoke Greek at home.

Not by Ancestry.

The 2006 census recorded 365,145. The 1986 census, when this question was first asked, recorded 311,942.

If there are indeed 700,000 Greek Australians then that suggests that most Greek Australians were not born in Greece, do not have Greek born parents, do not speak Greek at home and do not see themselves as people of Greek Ancestry. According to various Greek Community sources however, which continuously convey information to the Australian authorities, there are still 700,000 Greeks in Australia.

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics the real figure for the Greek Australian population lies in the 365,000 range. Information relating to the three census questions all point to this figure.

Another misconception portrayed in the Australian Greek media is that Melbourne is the third largest Greek City outside of Greece. But is it?

In Canada the Greek media portrays Toronto as the third largest Greek City in the world.

In the USA the Greek media portrays New York as the third largest Greek City in the world.

The Australian Bureau of Statistic has shown that Victoria has a population of 5.3 million of which 3.9 million live in Melbourne and 128,164 Melbournians are of Greek ancestry.

Despite the census being conducted by government bodies, the Greek media has still managed to convince various authorities in Australia, Canada and the USA that the third largest Greek city in the world is situated in Melbourne, Toronto and New York respectively! How can that be?" (Zoran C.)

We know very well that "Greek" as an ethnic entity does not exist but to maintain the impression that it does, Greeks will resort to anything and everything possible from claiming that people of the Christian Orthodox religion are in reality Greeks to anyone who has a "Greek sounding name" is Greek. Just pick up a Greek community telephone book in Toronto and you will find Macedonians, Spaniards and even Latvians represented as Greeks. As long as it sounds Greek, it must be Greek! But then if you think about it, it all makes sense. If Slavs, Macedonians, Albanians, Christian Turks and Vlachs can be "instant modern Greeks" then why not other people with "Greek sounding" names? After all "Greek sounding" is almost Greek; isn't it? How more fake is a Greek-sounding name of a Latvian than a "Hellenized" Greek sounding name of a Macedonian? I would say they are about equal! "Hellenizing" other ethnic groups, to most Greeks, is equivalent to subjecting them to a "civilizing" process! And what is wrong with that? There is nothing wrong with it except "fake Greeks" have no heritage and cannot be the descendents of the so-called ancient Greeks.

Unfortunately being upright and honest has never been a Greek forte so to cover up their artificiality they resort to not only changing people's name but erasing timeless place names and replacing them with alien ones to suit their purposes.

"But how were the names changed?"

One method was by the direct replacement of the existing names by their ancient predecessors. The usual source was Pausanias' description of Greece, written in the second century AD. When the names stemmed from (ancient) Greek toponyms but had been adopted to the local dialect (i.e. they had been 'altered'), they should be reformed in accordance with the phonetic and morphological rules of Katharevousa. (Marousi, derived from

the ancient Amarynthos became amarousion). Sometimes toponyms were replaced by names that really existed; other times they were changed randomly and hastily. When non-Greek toponyms were adopted, this was done in a total arbitrary fashion, sometimes on the basis of misunderstood morphology (for example, a wooded village might be called ‘tree-less’ (adendron). In other cases, the result was the unsuccessful translation of the non-Greek name. Names that had acquired a commemorative value, particularly since the Revolution of 1821, were often replaced by obscure, antiquated denominations (Tripoly in place of Tripolitza, Aigion in place of Vostitsa, Kalamai in place of Kalamata, Amphissa in place of Salona, Lamia in place of Zitouni, Agrinion in place of Vachori). Even national heroes had to change their names. For example, Rigas Valestinlis had to change to Rigas Pheraios because his village of Valestino was near the site of ancient Pherai. Still, despite apparent chaos, frequently comic results, and general incoherence, the process followed an internal logic: the creation of a ‘Hellenized’ toponymic environment.

Who decided to change the toponyms?

It might have been expected that this would have been done at the initiative of the state: An instruction came from above, from the center to the region. But it did not happen exactly this way. The government used to appoint commissions composed of university professors of history, linguistics, folklore, and archeology. The 1920 commission, set up after the acquisition by Greece of Macedonia, Thrace and Epirus, was constituted by the same persons who had created the ‘scientific’ study of the Greek nation – that is, the creators of the country’s history, archives, and the Museum of National History (Spyridon Lambros), of its folklore (Nikolaos Politis), and of its linguistics (Georgios Tajiadakis).” (“Hellenism Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity”, edited by Katerina Zacharia, pages 232 and 233)

Part 23 – The Need for Intelligence Gathering

We all talk about the tremendous effort and money our enemies spend in pursuit of their interests, which directly affects our ability to pursue ours, but we have no idea specifically who our enemies are. Why? Because we have absolutely no information on who is the enemy. We may not even have information on our own people who make decisions, run our organizations, raise funds, contribute funds, etc. We have little to no information particularly on those who are “influential in the Macedonian community and in Macedonian organizations” inside or outside of Macedonia. So our enemies “might” even be closer than we think. The operative word here is “might” and the question is “how do we know for sure who the enemy is and is not?”

Hearing what we want to hear and assuming that all people who speak positively about our cause have our best interests at heart, nowadays, is not enough to assume that all such people are honest and our friends. Words alone are cheap and cost nothing.

We may or may not have enemies in our midst; all I am saying is that we should have some way of screening our people especially in positions of responsibility, just like every corporation screens its employees, to ensure that they don't have “bad apples”. How many Macedonian Organizations today screen their members, particularly those who serve on executive boards?

Why am I asking these “uneasy” questions and possibly creating suspicion and mistrust among our people?

Too many times, at critical moments, we have witnessed our enemies waltz in and take over our organizations. It has happened to dozens of Village Associations in the Diaspora in the last fifty years or so. It has happened half a dozen times during the Greek Civil War when “friendly” Greeks infiltrated Macedonian organizations and not only rendered them useless but vilified our leaders and true patriots and made them look like traitors in front of their own people. It has even happened at the most critical time in Macedonia's history; the Ilinden Uprising. Did you know that Gotse Delchev and his supporters did not want an “early Uprising” because they knew the Macedonian people were not ready? Yet we had an early Uprising which turned into a disaster for the Macedonian people and for the Macedonian cause. And who benefited the most from the early Uprising? Our enemies of course, the very same ones who occupy Macedonia today! How many times must this happen before we realize that we need to do more to prevent these things from happening again?

This is why it is very important to have reliable information on our leaders, particularly on the Macedonian leadership outside of Macedonia where our enemies can easily infiltrate organizations and lead our people astray.

This is not to accuse anyone here of anything but to suggest that we proceed with caution.

The idea for gathering intelligence is not new; it has been used by every country in the world to keep an eye on its enemies. Unfortunately it has not been effectively implemented in the Macedonian communities especially outside of Macedonia; which has potentially left gaping holes for our enemies to walk through.

Our enemies do not work in mysterious ways when it comes to infiltrating our organizations. They simply find ways to create contention between Macedonians and manage to stifle our progress and divide our people. Instead of sticking to issues, our enemies attack the integrity of good people and make their motives look questionable. I have seen this happen many times to good people who were falsely accused of “wrongdoing” and forced to explain themselves for something they had not done. Found in this situation, most honest Macedonians give up and quit fighting for the cause. There is nothing worse and demoralizing than being falsely accused of “wrongdoing” especially if you have voluntarily devoted your life’s energy to work hard for the benefit of every Macedonian!

One of the more effective methods Macedonia’s enemies employed during the Ilinden Uprising was to infiltrate Macedonian organizations by pretend to be great patriots and by saying all the right things that every Macedonian wanted to hear. Then while having the attention of the Macedonian people, particularly in private, they would find faults, criticize, demean and generally work against the Macedonian leadership.

The worst however that our enemies can do is use our own energies and resources against us. Imagine our enemies raising funds from our Macedonian communities and using those funds against the very same generous and patriotic people who donated them. What measures have we implemented to prevent this from happening?

How many times have you witnessed Macedonian leaders being accused of “stealing money” without a shred of evidence and with absolutely no consequence to the accusers? In what society do people tarnish innocent people’s reputations and get away with it? What have we done to ensure that this does not happen?

It is easy to see why intelligence gathering is so important.

Here is a 120 year old story about a Macedonian patriot who gave up fame and fortune for the sake of helping his people.

“Realizing the Graecizing intentions of the Greek authorities, the young Macedonian poet became a bitter enemy of their policy, and particularly of the Greek clergy, led by the notorious Patriarch of Constantinople. Grigor Prichev (1830-1893) was sufficiently far-sighted to realize that the cultural domination under Greek rule would have much worse consequences for the national and cultural development of the Macedonian people than the politico-social domination under Turkish rule,

which, though it had lasted a long time, was bound to end sooner or later. Accordingly, following the example of his master Dimitar Miladinov, Prlichev decided to wage unremitting war on the assimilating ambitions of the Greek clergy. All this is very significant because Prlichev, this talented Greek scholar, this passionate lover of classical Greek literature, who for long believed there was no greater poet than Homer and no better doctors than those of Athens (as he himself wrote in his "Autobiography"), suddenly changed. Putting love of his own [Macedonian] nation first, he never wrote another line in Greek, although he knew very well that he could have exploited his extraordinary poetic gifts in that language with undoubted success." (Nurigiani, Giorgio. "The Macedonian Genius Through the Centuries". London: David Harvey Publishers, 1972. page 147)

As it was done in the 1800's it is so done today, Hellenism will stop at nothing from swallowing up ethnic groups and turning them into Modern Hellenes, a deadly disease that has not ceased since the formation of the artificial Greek state in 1829. Besides wanting to turn every Macedonian into a Greek, modern Hellenism also sees Macedonism as its mortal enemy with which it cannot co-exist and will do everything in its power to destroy it.

"...as it is well known that from a fifth to perhaps nearly a fourth of the inhabitants of Greece are said to be Albanians, whose fathers played so noble a part, both by sea and land, in the war of Greek independence. We believe the following facts have to do with that antipathy. No people have a more ardent national spirit, or cling more tenaciously to their language and ancient customs, than the Albanians. Now the Greeks, to their honour be it said, among the first things they did as a nation, set up a system of National schools, with primary, secondary, and higher education, all over the country; but in these schools nothing was taught but Greek, and hence the Albanians, who did not understand that language, were put to a serious disadvantage. Greek statesmen said Albanian was no language – it had no literature, not even an alphabet – it was a patois, and would die out in a generation, and the children of the Albanian soldiers and sailors would all be good Greeks; and so neither the Government nor private individuals did anything for the Albanian population. But now, at the distance of over half a century, things remain very much as they were when Greece, first was declared independent. Most of the Albanians are rude and ignorant, and far behind the rest of the population; while in the island of Aegina and many other places – nay, only a few miles from Athens itself; there are many families who can't speak a word of Greek. The experiment has failed. It is the same problem that meets us in the highlands in Scotland, in Wales and in Ireland. We do not greatly blame Greece, for she probably believed that she could Hellenize these sturdy Arnauts; but it is high time now to retrace her steps, and complete her admirable schooling-system, by teaching both Albanian and Greek where the population is Albanian. Thanks to the

London Tract Society, there are now school-books in both dialects of languages, while the Bible Society has provided them with the Testament and Psalms. Greek would thus remove the fear of national annihilation, with which so many regard union with her as synonymous, while she will pay a graceful tribute of gratitude to her Albanian people, and raise them from that barbarism in which so many still remain, and, still more, from their deep religious ignorance.” (“The Catholic Presbyterian”, edited by Professor W. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Vol. II., July – December 1879, page 318)

“This preoccupation with Greekness only really began after the War of Independence, when defining what it meant to be a Greek became a vital element in creating a new state. And it never ceased being a national sport. When the Greeks won their freedom from the Ottomans in 1834, their first capital was the smart little Peloponnesian port of Nafplio. It was thought to be far more suitable than the goat-infested ruins and the insignificant, predominantly Turkish-Albanian settlement which existed in nineteenth-century Athens.” (“Euridyce Street a Place in Athens”, by Sofka Zinivieff, page 38)

Part 24 - The Walls are closing in

Nowadays we hear things like “Bulgarian customs officials confiscate Vinzhito material”, “Greek Fascists Disrupt Presentation of the Greek - Macedonian Dictionary in Athens”, “the European Commission Vice President Jacques Barrot referred to the Republic of Macedonia as ‘Northern Macedonia’”, etc., and wonder what has gone wrong in this world? Can’t a tiny country like Macedonia be itself and feel safe in this so-called “civilized” world?

If you have been oppressed like the Macedonians and have been under one or another’s thumb for a couple of millenniums you too will wonder “what have you done that was so wrong to deserve all this?” If my grandfather was still alive he would say, “Be patient my boy we have endured a lot and our time will come some day”. And I suppose it is “hope” like his that kept us “alive” for this long! But unfortunately I do not have my grandfather’s patience or humility so rather than leave my destiny completely to fate, I want some answers!

Well, what have we done to deserve all this?

We have done nothing! But a more appropriate question would be “why are all these people doing this to us?”

Well, if you look at each individual incident separately you will find that each of these people or entities appears to have some issue with us. They don’t want us to succeed as Macedonians! For some reason or another they don’t like us and our presence is causing them discomfort. But why? We are not a threat to them. All these “countries” which have “a problem with us” are militarily more powerful so what possible threat could we be to them?

Well, we are not a military threat but rather a threat of the “embarrassing kind”.

You see Europe has historically wronged the Macedonian people many times for various reasons. Most recently Europe wronged us in 1878 when we were liberated and then given back to the Ottomans without any assurances or safeguards that we would not be further abused. Then they wronged us in 1912, 1913 and 1919 when they signed various Treaties allowing our neighbours to occupy us, partition our country and annex it for themselves; again without any safeguards that we would not be harmed. What happened to us in 1878 and is happening to us to this day is not an accident but rather well planned by the Western Europeans. But worse than that, and bordering on the insane, is for “whom” did the Western Europeans do all this?

If you have been reading these chapters by now you would know that, ethnically speaking, “there is no such thing as a Greek”. And yes you guessed it; the Europeans “sacrificed” Macedonia for the sake of Greece, an artificially created nation of their own making. They took Macedonia from the Macedonian people and gave it to the “fake” Greeks whom they

created from the ashes of the Slav, Albanian and Vlach cultures which just happened to exist on the same soil as the ancient cultures the Western Europeans wanted to imitate!

How is that for a “slap on the face”?

So that there is no misunderstanding I will say it again. France, Britain and Germany, and there may have been others, possibly Russia, took Macedonia away from the Macedonian people and gave it to a bunch of undeserving Greek wannabe Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs who were not only NOT Greeks and had nothing to do with the ancient people who lived on those lands, but were themselves the descendents of “recent immigrants”. They gave our Macedonia away to non-Macedonians who themselves are descendents of immigrants who came to live in the Peloponnesus from the 11th to the 15th century. Then in the 1920’s Western Europeans allowed Greece to settle another 1.1 million Christian Turkish settlers, of whom more than half were settled in Macedonia, and today Greece portrays these Turks as the “real” Macedonians, descendants of the ancient Macedonians no less, and we the indigenous Macedonians roam the world as permanent political refugees being cast out by Greece! Would you not feel “ashamed” if you were responsible for all this? And yes, Western Europeans were party to all this!

So, rather than “correcting” past wrongs and apologizing to the Macedonian people for what they did, Western Europeans today look for ways to “permanently silence” the Macedonians because they are a constant reminder of a “reckless” past not only for committing atrocities but for the “insane” reasons for which they were committed.

Greece was “artificially created” to lay the foundation for a Western European Civilization. This was done, in large part, at the expense of Macedonia and the Macedonian people. The name “Macedonia” is therefore a constant reminder to the Western Europeans that the very foundation that supports their modern Western European culture is a rotten, “false” foundation resting on the corpse of Macedonia.

If I had my grandfather’s faith I would say “that corpse upon which the European foundation is laid is still alive and one day will rise and expose the Western Europeans for what they truly are.”

But if history has anything to say, the Macedonians are not about to disappear and will continue to cause Western Europe “discomfort” until Western Europe learns to be “truly democratic”, faces its fears and gets rid of its old skeletons.

Every country in the world has cleansed itself of its past “wrongs” and as you are reading this, Cambodia is going through that process right now. Every country has come clean except, of course, Greece and Bulgaria. Bulgaria and Greece have “escaped” their punishments for what they have done to their minorities and have yet to exorcise themselves of their past demons. Both Greece and Bulgaria, to this day, desperately “hang on with all their might” to old beliefs that somehow they are “special”,

“homogeneous” and “superior” to the rest of us. Beliefs that should be dead and gone; beliefs that belong in the past together with “Nazism and Fascism”.

Macedonians are here to stay and Greece and Bulgaria along with their “patrons and protectors” must learn to deal with it.

As for Macedonia’s neighbour to the South, we are not done with you yet! As long as you deny our existence and continue to oppress our Macedonian compatriots living on Greek occupied Macedonian soil, we will continue to expose your artificiality and the atrocities you have committed against the Macedonians and other minorities.

It is interesting to note that most Greeks know that their identity is artificial but go along with the majority pretending to be Greeks anyway. What puzzles me is that they, knowing that they are an artificial nation themselves, have the audacity to deny the Macedonians their identity.

There is however a hidden purpose to “pretending to be Greek”, which has little to do with “ethnicity” but a lot to do with “being positioned” high up on the “ladder” of Greek society. Greece, to this day, values and employs “loyal Greeks” at its highest paid positions irrespective of competence, so it is understandable that there are so many scandals in the country. “Real Greeks” (the ones deeply committed to Hellenism) as one Greek professor put it to me, “work in Greece in businesses or in highly paid positions of power” in the Greek government. When I asked him, “who then are the Greeks behind the so-called ‘Australian Macedonian Advisory Council’?” To my surprise the professor said “they are your kind” and would not elaborate on what “your kind” means. So I assume he meant “Hellenized Macedonians”. But what surprised even the good professor is “if they were such loyal Greeks, why have they left Greece for Australia?” Like the professor said, “loyal Greeks work in Greece”. To have left their beloved Greece for Australia means that they were not “good enough Greeks” to be in “good positions” in Greece which puts them at the top of the list for not only being traitors to their own true identity but also “losers” to the Greek identity they value so much and work so hard for.

Let’s face it, every “intelligent Greek” pretends to be a patriotic Greek because it is popular and has its benefits. If you play along with the big boy Great Western European Powers, and be their loyal dog of the female gender, you not only get a country with an illustrious name and history but you also get someone else’s country with an even more illustrious history to boot. I guess “selling your identity” has a price but look at the benefits you get in return? Unfortunately we Macedonians are not “clever enough” to be someone’s loyal dog of the female kind and that is why we not only lost our country but were forced to accept three new and “false” identities.

What were we thinking?

Oh Europe you have messed up so bad it will take years of “psychological treatment” to get you un-messed. If only the world knew what you have done!

Have you noticed how foreigners, particularly Western Europeans, think of the so-called “Balkan mentality” and how “irrational” the people in the Balkans are? Well whose fault is that? We lived without borders as Christians for thousands of years and had no problems among ourselves until the Western Europeans came with their “imperialist” and nationalist ideals and created Greece, the “Frankenstein child of Europe” and gave it a fake identity and instilled in it “dreams of grandeur”. After all that they have the audacity to blame us for “acting weird”? How would you act if Frankenstein’s monster lived next door to you?

“The Greeks had not taken very much interest in their past until Europeans became enthusiastic discoverers and diggers of their ruins. And why should they have cared? The Greeks were not Greek, but rather the illiterate descendents of Slavs and Albanian fisherman, who spoke a debased Greek dialect and had little interest in broken columns and temples except as places to graze their sheep. The true Philhellenes were the English – of whom Byron was the epitome – and the French, who were passionate to link themselves with the Greek ideal. This rampant and irrational Philhellenism, which amounted almost to a religion, was also a reaction to the confident dominance of the Ottoman Turks, who were widely regarded as savages and heathens.

The contradiction persists, even today: Greek food is actually Turkish food, and many words we think of as distinctive Greek, are in reality Turkish. – kebab, doner, kofta, meze, taramsalada, dolma, yogurt, mussaka, and so forth; all Turkish.” (“The Pillars of Hercules” by Paul Theroux”, page 316)

And now I will leave you with this;

“The sign of the entrance at Delphi said ‘Show proper respect’ and ‘It is forbidden to sing or make loud noises’ and ‘Do not pose in front of ancient stones’.

I saw a pair of rambunctious Greek youths being reprimanded by an officious little man, for flinging their arms out and posing for pictures. The man twitched a stick at them and sent them away.

Why was this? It was just what you would expect to happen if you put a pack of ignoramuses in charge of a jumble of marble artifacts they had no way of comprehending. They would in their impressionable stupidity begin to venerate the mute stones and make up a lot of silly rules. This ‘Show Proper Respect’ business and ‘No Posing’ was an absurd and desperate transfer of the orthodoxies of the Greek’s tenacious Christianity, as they applied the severe prohibitions of their church to the ruins. Understanding little of the meaning of the stones, they could only see them in terms of their present religious beliefs; and so they imposed a sort of

sanctity to the ruins. This ridiculous solemnity was universal in Greece.”
 (“The Pillars of Hercules” by Paul Thereoux”)

Part 25 – Reacting to Rumours

Ever since this so-called “name dispute” was invented by Greece there has been no rest or peace for the Macedonian people. The “name dispute”, believe it or not, is not a dispute about “The Name” but a dispute that threatens to destroy the very existence of the Macedonian identity. Every Macedonian, particularly those from Greece, knows this and feels it’s their duty as Macedonians to protect their name. They believe, and rightfully so, that if the name is changed in any way everything that is Macedonian will cease to exist and Greece will make sure of that. No wonder every time there is mention of a “solution” found or a rumour spread about the “name dispute” Macedonians freak out and become terrified half to death. Greece and the Greeks know this, which is why they waste no opportunity to spread rumours every chance they get! I know this because I get frantic calls from people wanting to know – if this time the rumours are true. This has happened over a hundred times in the last four years alone. So I would like to offer my two cents worth.

First and foremost Macedonians must stop reacting to rumours. As the saying goes “fool me once shame on you; fool me twice shame on me!” We can’t help how Greeks conduct their business but we can sure help how we conduct ours. Which means, as a rule, we should never “overreact” to “stories” that are not verified. And how can we “verify” stories? Well here is where I am going to make my second suggestion! Given how rumours are generated and circulated by those who benefit from them and given how Macedonians react to rumours, especially rumours about the name of their country and their identity, it’s time that the Macedonian Government “does something” to “manage” rumours. Given that most of these rumours “implicate” the Macedonian Government of “wrong doing” and given how Macedonians react to them, it’s time for the Macedonian Government to open some communication channels with its people and openly respond to its citizen’s concerns, particularly to those citizens who work for the media. Rumours and all other concerns that “drive Macedonians insane” can be put to rest simply by creating an e-mail address to take questions and a blog to post responses. Then those who have concerns can contact the government directly and get straight answers directly from the government and not from rumours circulated by our enemies.

People have certain expectations from their government and if those expectations are not managed properly, or not at all, misunderstanding can arise and lead to speculation and wrong conclusions. Like I said above, we can’t help how our “enemies” conduct their business but we certainly can help how we conduct ours.

Regarding the “name issue”; if the Government wants to be at peace with the people who elected it then it must follow what the people want and, from what I know so far to this day, the vast majority of Macedonians

who feel and identify as Macedonians do not want the name touched and want the Macedonian government to break off talks with the Greeks and all other parties concerned. The name of this country is not negotiable. The name is not only historical and biblical but it is closely linked to the Macedonian people's identity and history. A change in the name will lead Macedonia down the slippery slope of permanent extinction not only of the name but of the Macedonian identity itself. Just look at what happened in 1912 and 1913. We have living examples of what happened then and this was done "without" the Macedonian people's participation. Imagine now what devastating effects it will have if we "voluntarily" change our name! How can history, past generations who gave their lives for Macedonia and future generations who will never be born Macedonian, ever forgive us if we rob them of their true identity? And what exactly will we be doing this for? What possible gains could we expect to receive for selling out our identity and our children's future? And how would history and those who died for Macedonia label us for doing this?

In all seriousness we should not even joke about changing our country's name. In fact we shouldn't even be thinking about it because such an act is unthinkable. We all by now must understand that Greece and Europe have been planning our demise since 1878 and want us nothing less than extinct. The very same people who designed Nazism and launched Germany to dominate the world created Hellenism and launched the neo-Greeks to destroy Macedonia and erase it from the face of the earth. So far they have destroyed Aegean Macedonia, don't give them the chance to destroy the rest!

The very name "Macedonia" is a threat to Europe for many reasons, which I will not get into at this time, but most importantly everyone must understand that if we "give in", even a tiny little bit on the name, it means that we can be pushed to "give in" more, to acquiesce, to capitulate, to surrender on other things and they will push us to do this again and again until there is nothing more to "give" and there will be nothing left of Macedonia or the Macedonian people as identities. And who will we be then? And most importantly with what we will be laying claim to our fatherland, to our heritage for which our recent ancestors spilled their blood to protect and preserve for us?

In the past they encouraged us to "become" Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians and we joked and laughed about it, we even made expressions like "I am a Greek as much as a donkey is a horse". But in 1913 after they occupied and partitioned our country, made our identity "extinct" and forced us to accept their artificial identities we were no longer laughing; not even smiling. That was then and what was done to us then was done without our consent, but today the very same people are asking us to voluntarily "wipe ourselves out of existence". Are we that naïve and gullible and expected to commit ethnic genocide voluntarily? And for what? To satisfy the wishes of a people who pretend to be Greeks? As I

have said a dozen times before, the modern Greeks are a fabricated identity artificially created by the Philhellenes to serve the needs of the Western Europeans. They are not even real! Are we going to let them push us around? Are we going to voluntarily “kill” our own real ethnic identity just for the sake of satisfying the Greek lust for falsehood and racism? Our cause here is not just noble and about saving our own identity, it has a greater meaning. It is about truth and justice and rising above the falsehoods that have been laid down over us for centuries. Every Macedonian I know wants nothing but justice and the truth to prevail, that is the only way our world can truly become just and democratic, and to live by the very same principles our ancestors in 1903 and in the 1940’s died for. Many Macedonians died in their struggle to pass on to us a decent, united, independent, democratic and free Macedonia. Are we going to let them down? Who among us is prepared to go against the wishes of our ancestors, the very same ones who gave their lives in blood-stained struggles to give us a future? Are we prepared to forget what happened to them and wipe their sacrifices off the face of the earth, and for what? What could be more valuable than freedom, a value for which so many Macedonians over the centuries gave their lives?

Have we already forgotten the meaning of the words “Freedom of death?”

If the Macedonian government wants to “tinker” with “issues” and does not want to get into trouble with the people who put it in power, then it had best learn how to inform the people and make its intentions known without committing itself to something that it will later regret. Westerners have learned from experience not to tempt fate and before officially introducing something controversial they make sure it is “leaked” to the media. If there is a positive reaction from the people (a rare occurrence) then the government can “take credit” for the idea, but heaven forbid if the idea turns out to be a “political hot potato”. The government can then immediately disown it and attribute it to “rumours created by the opposition”. It is a sure method of keeping the government “popular” and ensuring re-election and at the same time “de-popularizes” the opposition. I never said “politics” was decent or honest, but just a way of life in our Western modern world.

Following are the opinions of other Macedonians regarding recent events that are associated with the “name” issue:

Justice Seeker wrote:

What comes to mind immediately about the “name” is the internationally accepted principles of the right to self determination and self-identification. I don’t buy for one minute any arguments that a name change won’t affect your identity. If that is the case, why the need for a name change? I’d still call myself a Macedonian but I would go to my grave with nightmares of Greeks reminding me unfairly and constantly that I don’t exist.

If there was really a need for a “reasonable compromise”, the only legitimate name that could be used is “The Republic of Macedonia” which is completely distinguishable and shouldn’t be confused with other parts of Macedonia.

Regarding the “negotiations”! First and foremost one’s own identity is not negotiable!

Second, there have been comments on this forum that in negotiations both parties have to give up something. What has Greece given up to this day?

Let me see how the negotiations have gone thus far. The Republic of Macedonia changed its constitution, changed its flag, incurred massive economic losses because of the Greek blockades without compensation, agreed to an interim name that is insulting and contrary to UN rules, the Macedonian people waste their valuable time and emotions on protecting their identity because of brainwashed Greek racists, and all this whilst Greece usurps Macedonian lands, history, heritage, etc. And what exactly had Greece given up? Nothing! It now solidly makes the preposterous claim that Macedonia is Greek. Does that mean the Republic of Macedonia is also Greek? If we give up our name and identity what will we be?

The biggest mistake the Macedonian side has made this far is getting into negotiations with Greece on things that cannot possibly be negotiated; Greece has proven its greater experience. When you negotiate you negotiate an entire package not one thing at a time. Instead, we have seen negotiations progressing on one thing at a time and the Macedonians have been eaten alive. With such farcical negotiating, if we look at the name in isolation we are not playing in the spirit of bargaining, no matter how absurd such a proposition. And what makes you think that the Greeks will stop asking for more and more things to be “negotiated” after we give in on the name? What will be next, our identity? And what after that?

As an example, the Macedonian side should have put forward something along the following on the table; Our name is the Republic of Macedonia and our ethnic identity is Macedonian which are not negotiable! We have the right to self determination and we decide what to call ourselves. You have ethnic Macedonians living on your soil who you need to immediately recognize. If you do all this we will not sue you for the acts of genocide which you committed against us in the last 100 years. We will also forgive you for forcing us to change our constitution and flag and we won’t seek compensation for the illegal economic blockades you imposed on us. Also we will allow you to use the word Macedonia. However as a goodwill gesture you will have to pay us 50 billion EUs for years of obstructing our progress.

I believe this is only fair. But instead of putting something forward like the above, we have allowed Greece to coerce us by tactics which are not genuine or in good faith;

- Greece imposes block on UN entry, Macedonia agrees to interim

agreement, now can join UN under interim name FYRoMacedonia.

- Greece imposes economic blockage, Macedonia gives up flag and changes constitution, Greece lifts blockade.

- Greece vetoes Macedonian entry to EU and NATO, Macedonia must change its name, no way, ok no entry for you.

What comes next? And when will Greece cease to extort more concessions from Macedonia?

About the Albanians living in Macedonia! The Albanians in Macedonia can do a lot more for Macedonia than they have up to this point. But instead they have chosen to act as pawns for Greece. Macedonia cannot enter NATO because of Greece and its high time the Albanians recognize and admit to that. Why not do something useful and pressure Albania and Kosovo to put pressure on Greece or the EU to end this Greek fiasco.

The Albanian minority should be screaming at its western friends to put pressure on Greece who is in breach of all human rights principles and international laws.

In conclusion, the issue is not simply about a “name” but part of Greece’s long term strategy to annihilate the Macedonian national identity. They did it in Aegean Macedonia and they want to do it in the Republic of Macedonia and the rest of it.

It’s simple, Greece does not want an independent people called Macedonians in NATO, in the EU or anywhere else for that matter, because the open border policy will effectively prove to those living in Aegean Macedonia, that they are real, decent people live in the Republic of Macedonia, people like us, not monsters as depicted by the Greek propaganda machine. That is the essence of all this.

It is with quiet displeasure I read that the Albanian minority is threatening the Macedonian government (and effectively the Macedonian people) that their patience is wearing thin about the name issue and that they will take some sort of action if this is not resolved soon. If this is true, this is not only repulsive but is blatantly an indication of the true nature of this minority and their lack of engagement with the country they live in.

I ask one simple and obvious question, why is their issue not with Greece who is the real cause of all the problems? A country that does not respect or acknowledge its minorities, a country that openly is committing genocide, a country which usurps other peoples’ history, heritage and livelihoods. Why have I not seen or heard any attack upon Greece from these ethnic Albanians who are citizens of the Republic of Macedonia?

As citizens of the Republic of Macedonia they should openly be damning Greece and not the Macedonian Government or the Macedonian people. What they are doing is nothing short of treason!

Posted by Justice Seeker on www.maknews.com/forum

Maknews wrote:

How is pressuring Macedonia to appease Greek racism a legitimate Albanian concern?

Posted by maknews on www.maknews.com/forum

Rogi wrote:

For those who contemplate a name change; Do you believe the Greeks have legitimate claims against us and accept or even support their position, agreeing that we should change our name?

Tell me, why must Macedonia change its name? What defeatist reasoning would you have to justify that?

I'm completely disappointed in people who think this way, I can only hope that those who share these treasonous and naïve views are but a small minority.

Any acceptance of any name for internal or international use, because of a dispute with Greece, is against the very principles of sovereignty and against the sovereign right of the Republic of Macedonia in its assertion of its historic name and national identity.

There is a historic dimension to this also and you seem to ignore that. You look at a name change from a purely technical view, where the name can be detached from its meaning. Any name change for Macedonia will be acceptance of the end of the Macedonian people.

That everyone naively accepts the baseless fear-mongering is indicative of their incapacity to realize the full implications and consequences of a name change and this is because those people cannot look at things from a historical perspective and in a historical context.

This is why such people are prepared to accept a name change basing their idea that 'we will still be known as Macedonians' on nothing but hope. You are playing a dangerous and risky game with absolutely nothing based on certainty - your politics stink, it is flawed and there is no reasoning, logic, plan or strategy to justify it.

Posted by Rogi on www.maknews.com/forum

Phoenix wrote:

Beware of 'Greeks' bearing gifts...It's no coincidence that the 'Greeks' are pushing for a geographical identifier, it has the vile ability to diminish our history, culture and language, our identity is at stake here...adopting such foolishness is akin to turning over a new leaf, to start from scratch and to abandon our past.

A geographical identifier, if adopted, will be bound by water tight legal mumbo jumbo within the straight-jacket confines of international law and will dramatically alter the way each and every one of us identifies in the Diaspora, how we name our language, our church, our cultural organizations, our social clubs, our sports clubs and every association that exists today...

For any of you thinking that a geographic identifier is the course of least resistance, you're kidding yourselves...

Posted by Phoenix on www.maknews.com/forum

Prolet wrote:

Some of you might see the “name change” as an olive branch however its more like a Trojan horse if you ask me, because the Greeks expect this “new name” to be used everywhere and our name and identity has to be changed in our constitution, our passports, our citizenship papers and a whole lot of other places.

Some say “Northern Macedonia” is better than FYROM however when you look at it the problem is deeper and there is much more to it than that, there are many hidden catches to this name which will hurt us badly in the long run.

Posted by Prolet on www.maknews.com/forum

“The modern Greeks, as we know, have no relationship to the Latins, nor for that matter with the ancient Greeks. Modern anthropology has shown that they are brachycephalous Slavs, while the ancient Greeks were dolichocephalous, which fact is sufficient to establish an absolutely fundamental separation between the modern Greeks and their pretended ancestors.” (“The Psychology of Socialism” by Gustave Le Bon, page 206)

Everyone who has read these chapters must know by now that “Greeks” are not real but an artificial fabrication designed to serve some “Western European” purpose which by now is no longer valid or required. Hellenism was a Nazi experiment to test the idea of creating a “superior race” by convincing a variety of people into believing that they are “superior”, something which they are not. Obviously the existence of Greece today is proof that the experiment was a success. But that’s just it, Greece is not real only a racist experiment, so why should we be expected to sacrifice our own real and vibrant culture for the sake of propagating and keeping alive a lie and a “Frankenstein’s monster”? Food for thought!

Part 26 – The Unconvinced

This chapter is dedicated to all those “good natured”, “kind” Macedonians who try so hard to “convince” the Greeks that “Macedonians really do exist” and “Macedonians are people too and should be treated with respect”.

Welcome to my world!

I am ashamed to admit it but I too was once like you. I thought that by explaining myself I could get Greeks to listen to my side of the story and surely they could also see things my way and we could reach a “common understanding”.

I spent the better of my last thirty years trying to accomplish just that by taking the time to explain to the Greeks that “yes, Macedonians do exist and here is proof” only to be ridiculed and insulted even more. Unfortunately, to this day, I am sorry to say that I have not convinced even a single Greek of anything. Why? Have I not been truthful and forward with them? Have I not provided enough evidence to them? No!

The problem here is not with “me” or with “us” not trying hard enough or not being forward enough, the problem is that Greeks are “brought up” believing that, with the contradictory information which we provide to them, we “intend” to bring them harm. From the moment a Greek is born they are taught to believe that we are their enemy out to rob and murder them and steal their heritage. They are suspicious of everyone, the “Slavs” (whoever they may be), the Bulgarians, the Turks and the Americans and particularly of us who call ourselves Macedonian. The Greek educational system and the Greek Church have brainwashed them to believe that Macedonians don’t exist and those of us who say we are Macedonians are doing this to bring them harm and to steal “their” Macedonia from under them. Naturally they don’t know their true history and have no clue how they acquired Macedonia. They don’t even know that they are not “real” Greeks either.

Most Modern Greeks, at least the ones I dealt with in the past, no matter what we tell them will not believe us, not only because it contradicts what they learned from their government sponsored educational system and from the Greek Church but because, in the back of their minds, lurks the fear and suspicion that “we are out to get them”, to do them harm, to steal their Macedonia from under them or to rob them of their “precious” heritage. Also, above and beyond their programming to be “suspicious”, Greeks are programmed to believe that they are “superior” to us on account of being told that they are the descendents of the “superior ancient Greeks”; an ancient race of racists and xenophobes turned demigods by the Philhellenes of the 19th century.

In addition to being programmed to be frightfully suspicious, Modern Greeks are also programmed to be “all knowing” and “egotistical”. A combination such as this not only makes them “not want to listen to us”

but they feel the need to lecture us, to educate us about “who we are” and they do that with an air of arrogance and with a superior attitude. Greeks are not the kind of people who would give an impression of “doubt” or “uncertainty” about anything or would take kindly to you telling them your side of the story especially when it contradicts theirs. Greeks do not need to provide “real” proof of anything, “Greek logic” will suffice and their word alone is proof enough. This is why they go along using meaningless slogans like “Macedonia is Greek” but have no idea how, why, when, or how much of “Macedonia became Greek”.

Anything you say that contradicts their understanding of history, particularly about Macedonia, will be met with fierce vitriolic opposition full of overconfidence and spite. Normal law abiding, kind Greeks will turn into raving lunatics just by mentioning that you are Macedonian. Macedonians from Greece are used to this but Macedonians from the Republic of Macedonia and non-Macedonians find it shocking.

Dear Macedonians, from what I have told you so far, what chance do you think you have of ever convincing a Greek of anything? So why waste your time trying? Take it from someone who has been there, don't waste your time!

Apart from wasting your time, you are also being distracted and misled to fall into the classic “Greek trap” from which there is no escape of being drawn into nonsensical discussions about who was who 2,000 years ago. The only thing Greeks are good at discussing is ambiguity and mythology!

Our “beef”, if I can call it that, with the Greeks is not about what happened two thousand years ago but about what has happened since 1912 and 1913 when our country was invaded, occupied and partitioned by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria without our consent. Talking and debating about who was who and what happened two thousand years ago is a “Greek distraction”, a ploy to keep us busy and away from discussing and learning about more recent and tragic events like the atrocities committed by the Modern Greeks against the Macedonian people.

The changing of all our names, the banning of our language, the non-recognition of our ethnic identity, the confiscation of our lands, the exiling of our people including innocent children, the torture of our people in their concentration camps, the killing of our people, the burning of our villages, the destruction of our books, monuments and cemeteries, and so on are the real issues that we should be discussing with the Greeks. These are important issues that we need to bring to the forefront!

The next time you are confronted by a Greek asking a rhetorical question “demanding to know what language Alexander the Great spoke” think about what is more important (1) to debate a nonsensical issue that will lead you into an endless “cyclical trap”, or (2) to say leave ancient history to the ancient historians and let's talk about what you Greeks have done to us Macedonians since 1912!

I know it is unfair to “paint all Greeks with the same racist brush” and I apologize to those who are not like that but please prove me wrong! Stand out in the crowd and say “I am a Greek and I understand and support you Macedonians”, give me a reason to also say something good about you!

Why do Greeks behave this way? This is a question that I have struggled with for the last decade. To get a real appreciation as to why “Modern Greeks” behave the way they do we need to understand some things about their predecessors before they were “made” into “Modern Greeks” by their Philhellene patrons.

The quest for creating a “Modern Greece” began in late 18th century; years after the Arabs in Spain made Western Europeans aware that an “ancient civilization” existed in the Region of Morea, modern day Peloponnesus. Although the Western Europeans had learned much about this civilization’s accomplishments, they had no plans to use them until the late 18th century when a need arose to develop an all exclusive European Civilization. Unfortunately the “ancient civilization”, which declined with the Macedonian conquests in the fourth century BC, had completely ceased to exist. But two thousand years later that did not stop the Philhellenes from attempting to resurrect it.

Not completely satisfied with its disappearance, the Philhellenes were confident that they could recreate their civilization if only they could “train” the local people who lived on the same lands to behave and imitate the ancients. In their zeal to “create” such a civilization, the 19th century Philhellenes “convinced, coaxed, coerced, or bribed” the living and vibrant local cultures to “give up” their true “ethnic and cultural identities” for the promise of becoming “Greeks”, something supposedly “bigger”, “better” and “more glorious” than what they already had. Naturally there was opposition to this but those opposing lost out in the end. So in order to protect their investment from “being eroded” the Philhellenes surrounded it with a number of “defensive mechanisms”; one of these being the instilment of mistrust in the new generations. Through the educational system and through the Greek Church new generations of Greeks were taught to “mistrust” those who opposed or strayed away from the Philhellene indoctrination. Two centuries later this defense mechanism is still active and working as expected.

To keep those who signed on as “Greeks” to stay on as “Greeks” and to attract new “Modern Greeks” the first generation of “Neo-Hellenes”, with help from the Philhellenic Academia, not only gave Modern Greece a glorious past but convinced the New-Greeks that they were “truly” the descendants of the Ancient people who once created that “sought after” civilization.

After creating the tiny Greek Kingdom and consolidating their power the “Neo-Hellenes”, with help from the Philhellene patrons, continued the process of incorporating new lands and new people into the Modern Greek

fold. Since its inception in 1829 the Greek State has incorporated Thessaly, Epirus, Crete, 51% of Macedonia, Thrace, the Dodecanese Islands, etc. It would have also incorporated Asia Minor but its ambitions were cut short by its catastrophic defeat by Modern Turkey. Now that the Republic of Macedonia has become independent, removed from the clutches of Serbia, Greece is developing new taste for old ambitions and the wish to incorporate another 39% of Macedonia into its Greek fold. If that is not the case then why advertise to the world that “Macedonia is Greek”?

In its greed to expand its territory and assimilate people into its Hellenic fold, to date, Modern Greece has swallowed up and assimilated the Albanians and Slavs of Morea, the Albanians of Epirus, the Vlachs of Thessaly, the Macedonians of 51% of Macedonia, the Cretans from Crete, the Turks from Thrace and the Christian Turks from Asia Minor, not to mention the Roma, Latin, Armenian, Baltic, Russian and other ethnic groups living in Greece today.

Of all the ethnic groups assimilated into the Modern Greek “phenomenon” the Macedonians are the most dangerous and pose the greatest threat to Greece. This is because of two important factors.

First, by the 1920’s Macedonia was divided into four pieces and was given to Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Albania. What was once a single ethnic Macedonian entity became four diametrically opposed entities separated by artificial borders. Macedonians have not only not forgotten this but they can hardly accept that their kin over the “false” border are now “ethnically different” from themselves. Macedonians cannot accept being “51% Greeks”, “39% Serbians”, “10% Bulgarians” and “some small” percentage Albanians; all at the same time.

Second, Macedonians has an illustrious history with deep roots and traditions that extend to ancient times. Modern Macedonians, irrespective of which country they live in today, are well aware of their history and their attempt over the centuries to free themselves from their occupiers and restore their united, free and independent Macedonia.

Macedonians have no collective memory of ever “coming to Macedonia” from somewhere else. They do however have traditions that extend well into ancient times. Modern Macedonians on many occasions through history exhibited traditions associated not only with the exploits of the Ancient Macedonians but also with the development and spread of Christianity and culture all throughout Eastern Europe. The brothers Kiril and Metodi from Solun and their students Kliment and Naum from Ohrid are perfect examples of that. Macedonians were responsible for Christianizing millions of people from the bottom of the Balkans to the top of Siberia. How can Macedonians “conveniently” forget all that just because their enemies and current occupiers want them to?

It is very difficult to convince an accomplished people such as the Macedonians that they “don’t exist” and that they are really “not

Macedonians” at all but something else. Of course no one can explain what that “something else” might be. And all this comes from who? The Greeks and Bulgarians, the very same people who brutally invaded, occupied and partitioned Macedonia?

Even though most people don’t know this, Greeks do have good reason to be afraid and suspicious of the Macedonians. Greeks over the years have committed many atrocities against the Macedonian people which the Macedonians are not about to forget.

The Greeks know and if they don’t know they should learn two things; one, Modern Greeks occupied and annexed Macedonia by force for the first time in 1912 and ever since have committed many atrocities against the Macedonian people. And two, the Modern Greeks of today are not “Greeks” at all but an artificial Philhellene creation made up of a collection of Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs, Macedonians, Christian Turks and others. Modern Greeks are not who they claim to be and they are lucky and should be grateful that they even have Greece, a country to call their own.

And now a few words about the so-called “name negotiations”

Rogi wrote:

If Macedonia pulled out of the so called “name negotiations” it would kick up pride amongst Macedonians all over the world, it would be a complete change, a refreshing change, from the defeatist Macedonia we have seen to date.

Pulling out of the negotiations would be a bold move for Macedonia standing up in such a way and defending itself against Greece, which has been trying to destroy Macedonia and its Macedonian ethnic identity for over 100 years. Such an act will reinvigorate the Macedonian spirit everywhere.

It will be the David and Goliath story, told among all Macedonians - the modern heroic story of the Macedonians standing up for themselves, to be told and retold to our children and grandchildren.

There will be euphoria and pride in the Macedonian nation more so than there was in 1991 during Independence. It would signal a whole new beginning and belief in the Macedonian nation. I am certain that such a move would generate great interest in Macedonia among Macedonians all over the world.

That would be more than enough to show the Macedonians around the world (who have largely lost hope due to corruption, scandals, etc.) that Macedonia IS worth fighting for and the Macedonian people in Macedonia ARE prepared to keep Macedonia and a new dawn is upon Macedonia.

It will open the gates for Macedonians in the Diaspora to invest in Macedonia, with a whole new belief and a new hope for Macedonia.

In the alternate scenario, if Macedonia gives in and changes the name, it will destroy whatever hope and belief there is for Macedonians around the world in the Republic of Macedonia and its existential purpose as the

Guardian and Home of the Macedonian people and the Macedonian identity.

This means no interest in Macedonia, no hope and belief in Macedonia, it will no longer really be the home and guardian of the Macedonians rather it would become a nameless, faceless nation-state on paper, nothing unique about it.

You'll see a lot more Macedonians prepared to leave the country, particularly among the Macedonian patriots presently living there. That would then open the doors to corruption and disintegration. Everyone will look out for themselves, not the nation; you will lose a lot of patriotism and hope. There would be no real purpose for the existence of a Macedonian state (since it would no longer be Macedonia in name or in form).

People talk about the situation Macedonia is in now with unemployment, etc. and the need for the EU funds and so on. But when the nation no longer has a dream and a purpose, things will become far, far worse.

From there you'll see just how quickly division of the territory will take place, how easily corruption will reign and how soon the country will disintegrate.

Changing the name will be the beginning of the end of the independent Republic and cause irreversible damage to the Macedonian spirit.

It would be the historical moment with which, the never fading Macedonian spirit, which faced thousands of years of oppression and conquerors, was destroyed by the very Macedonians themselves who gave everything up and wiped themselves out of history – that moment will be when the Macedonians destroyed themselves, something no conqueror, no occupier, no enemy could ever do.

Posted by Rogi at www.maknews.com/forum

Christoff wrote:

Dear Friends,

As these farcical “name negotiations” drag on I can't help but recognize a systematic flaw in the basis of Macedonia's participation in these talks. First of all, the entire question of the dispute is one sided and predicated on a hidden assertion.

Example in law; If an attorney poses a question as such; "How many times a week do you beat your wife?"

The formulation of the question contains a hidden assertion. It assumes the fact that you beat your wife!

Example pertinent to this so-called name dispute; The Greeks require a "mutually acceptable solution to the name problem". It contains the hidden assertion that there is a mutual problem with our name that must be resolved! Macedonians however, have no problem with our name! Any participation in this process on the part of the Macedonians serves to legitimize the Greek hidden assertion!

THERE IS NO NAME ISSUE THAT MACEDONIANS NEED TO RESOLVE!
THEREFORE MACEDONIANS “MUST” WITHDRAW FROM THE PROCESS NOW!
CALL THE GREEK BLUFF AND EXPOSE THEIR HIDDEN AGENDA!
RESTORE AND PRESERVE THE MACEDONIAN HONOUR!

Posted by Christoff on www.maknews.com/forum

“No Albanian that I ever met in Greece thought of himself as an Albanian. He thought of himself as a Greek, because he lived in Greece and that is where he had his pastures or his fields. This seems to have happened from the very earliest times when migrants first came to Greece. They used the Albanians from then on as mercenaries and also as settlers of the areas which were derelict. So the Albanian incursions into Greece continued under the Turkish system and went on right into the eighteenth century.” (“Greece Old and New”, edited by Tom Winnifrith and Penelope Murray, page 45)

Part 27 – Time to Stand Up

By now everyone must know that without the Macedonian support for the so-called “name dispute” with Greece there would be no “name dispute” at all, just plain old “complaining”, “crying” and “throwing temper tantrums” by the Greek side. There is no need for a “mutually agreed upon name” because Macedonians are happy with the existing name, just the way it is. Would any Macedonian contemplate changing the name if there was no pressure from Greece? Certainly not! So where is the need to change the name?

Again this is another Greek ploy to keep Macedonians distracted from pursuing more important matters like the “status of the Macedonians in Greece” and, in the long term, to wear down and break the Macedonian people.

Dear Macedonians it’s time for us to recognize where these Greeks are coming from and where they are going with this so-called “name dispute” and stand up to them and say “no more leading us by our noses”! No more making up issues about nothing! No more lies and deceit! Let us once and for all recognize that without the Macedonian participation in these so-called “name negotiations” Greece has nothing to negotiate and no leg to stand on!

But as long as there is a single (one) Macedonian willing to entertain the Greeks on this issue Greece will continue to push “the need to find a mutually acceptable solution”. Greece will continue to parade us around like a bunch of fools who are willing to “negotiate” away our own precious ancestral name and for what? To please the Greeks, the very same people who since 1913 have been planning and executing our demise? Are we that naïve, willing to give up our name so that the Greeks will allow us to cross another “road block” on the road to where? Our own extinction?

Is anyone foolish enough to believe that if we “give in a little” Greece will leave us alone and will never demand anything of us again? How are we going to be sure of that? By signing an agreement? By signing the same kind of agreement that lead us to this situation in the first place? How are we going to enforce such an agreement against a country that has broken every international law known to mankind?

Do you think Greece wants us to change our name because it is afraid of little old Macedonia having “territorial aspirations” against a monster country like Greece? The only country here that has “territorial aspirations” is Greece itself against Macedonia. Greece has never given up on the idea of “possessing” all of Macedonia and has always looked for ways to annex more Macedonian lands. Now it sees its chance coming and is looking for ways to destabilize Macedonia so that it can walk in and take over. Hence the slogan “Macedonia is Greek”. If we are not careful it will be 1913 all over again!

If you as a Macedonian believe that we are negotiating a “mutually acceptable solution” then (1) you must also believe we are “not happy” with our current name and (2) you obviously have never been bullied before.

Greece is like a school yard bully picking on a small child demanding the child hand over his lunch money. If the child gives up the money to escape the situation without a fight do you think the bully will be satisfied and will go away and never bother that child again? Or do you think the bully will come back the next day and demand not only the child’s lunch money but also his candy and other goodies. And if the child gives in again and again do you think the bully will stop “bullying” and go away? NO! Neither will Greece if Macedonia gives in, even a millimeter! So its time to take a stand and say NO to these negotiations and to any other negotiations that may be harmful to Macedonia and the Macedonian people! We are happy with our name just the way it is and we don’t want to talk about it, to anyone, any more. However we are not happy with the way the Greeks are treating us, especially our Macedonian compatriots living in Greece and we DO want to talk about that.

Many of you have written me and expressed your disgust with the way Macedonians are being treated by the Greeks. Unfortunately there is nothing I can do about how “Greeks behave” but there is definitely something we can all do about how we react to it. Instead of paying attention to these Greeks and following their lead we need to stand up and simply say enough is enough “we don’t care about your childish issues”, and if they don’t like it “too bad”!

On the other hand if you do want to talk about matters of importance with Greeks then take the lead and challenge them to talk about granting human rights to Macedonians and other ethnic groups living in Greece. Now there is a real “issue” you can sink your teeth into.

If you are interested in “talking” let’s start “talking” about how Greeks treated us in the last 100 years. Why don’t we get together (with the Greeks) and talk about how we are going to correct the past wrongs they committed against our people since Greece invaded, occupied, partitioned and annexed our country.

Dear Macedonians we DO have many “disputes” with Greece and NONE are about our name! Our disputes with Greece are exactly what the Greeks don’t want us to think about and that is why they have concocted the “name dispute” to distract us. That is why we must stand up to these bullies and take the lead and say NO to the “name dispute” and YES to “human rights for the Macedonians in Greece”.

The name dispute and everything associated with it is nothing more than a Greek ploy to destabilize the Republic of Macedonia so that Greece can one day walk in and annex it, just like it annexed 51% of Macedonia in 1913. This is why Greece has been insisting on using the slogan “Macedonia is Greek”.

How is Greece attempting to destabilize Macedonia you say?

By blocking Macedonia's entry into International Organizations and keeping Macedonia from achieving prosperity on account of a phony "name dispute". Greece is putting extreme pressure on the Macedonian people to make a decision between two choices. If enough pressure is applied, for a considerable time, Greece hopes to divide the Macedonian people into two opposing camps, one supporting a name change and the other opposing it. To some extent this is already happening today. Such a division has the potential for starting a civil war and destabilizing the country. Be warned, if this is allowed to happen the outcome will be unpredictable and definitely unpleasant and disastrous for Macedonia and the Macedonian people. It is up to us Macedonians to not let this happen by immediately pulling out of the "name negotiations" and to no longer entertain anything to do with our name or ethnic identity. By pulling out from the "talks" we will render this matter "defunct" and no longer a threat!

As I write these words I am reminded of the older days when Krste Misirkov, Yane Sandaski and other Macedonian patriots, who, after the failed 1903 Ilinden Uprising, tried to warn the Macedonian people not to trust Greece and Bulgaria on their "false" promises of offering to "liberate" Macedonia and the Macedonians from the Ottomans. I can understand their frustration when their warnings were ignored and brushed aside as nonsense by people with no foresight. Ten short years later Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria did invade, occupy and partition Macedonia and they did it under the pretense of liberation.

Are we now going to let the same thing happen again? Have we learned nothing from our history? Are we foolish enough to think that our neighbours have relented or have given up on their dreams to possess more of Macedonia? Have we forgotten how both World Wars were started?

How can we be so sure of anything our neighbours say when we know for a fact that we are lied to even about our own existence? The fact that Greece does not recognize the Macedonian ethnic identity is a declaration of war on the Macedonian people.

What troubles me the most about this is, why are we "negotiating", and with our enemies at that, over something that is clearly already ours? And more troubling than that is "what are we getting in return for negotiating away our very own existence?"

When it comes to the preservation of our eternal name and precious ethnic identity, all Macedonians from every political party, from every walk of life and from every continent on this planet "must" stand together united and with a single voice to say "NO" to Greece or to anyone else who wishes us harm. That is the only way we can get the "proverbial monkey off our backs" and perhaps earn some respect while doing it! Unity IS our strength! United we stand, divided we fall! It's that simple.

Paul wrote:

Macedonian politicians are negotiating our identity. Whether they agree with Greece, or reject Greece's position - is neither here or there. My point is "We" (Macedonians) are the ones who have put our identity up for negotiation. We have only ourselves to blame.

If the Macedonians, instead, had chosen to defend our rights, defend our sovereignty and NOT engaged Greece, our name and our identity would not be open or up for negotiation!

By Paul from www.maknews.com/forum

“As early as 1770’s, intellectuals were prompting what could be termed ‘cultural evangelism’ (Kitromilides 1990) or Hellenization of the highly diverse populations of the Balkans. As Kitromilides remarks, authors of multilingual dictionaries of the period such as Theodoros Kavalliotis and Daniel of Moschopolis, invited non-Greeks to Hellenize, pointing out the social mobility benefits associated with Hellenization (Ibid.: 26-7). Similarly, there is evidence that non-Greek speakers themselves saw education and fluency in Greek as a major advantage for themselves and their offspring – Vlach, – Bulgarian - and Romanian speaking – merchants quite often opted for Greek schools in order to be able to benefit from the possibilities that these presented.” (“Tormented by History Nationalism in Greece and Turkey”, by Umut Ozkirimli and Spiros A. Sofos, page 24)

Part 28 – Twenty-five more authors

If God himself came to earth and spoke to the Greeks and said “these people here are Macedonians” the Greeks would not believe him. If Greeks start believing that Macedonians exist in Greece then they will also have to believe that Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs also exist in Greece. If Macedonians, Slavs, Albanians and Vlachs exist in Greece then Greeks will be asking “who then are the Greeks?” And as I have found out in my quest for “searching for the Greeks”, ethnically speaking, there are no Greeks.

But how can that be? The entire world knows that there is a country called Greece populated by 10 million Greeks who are 98% pure Greeks and 2% Muslim Greeks!

Well there are people who identify as “Greeks”, unfortunately, ethnically speaking they are not “ethnic Greeks”; they are “politically” Greeks. Did I just say “politically Greeks”? Yes politically Greeks. They identify as Greeks not because “they are” ethnic Greeks but because they “want to be” Greeks! It’s a matter of choice. How else can one explain Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs, Macedonians, Christian Turks, Armenians, Russians and a whole group of other ethnicities ALL identifying as “Greeks”?

In other words, anyone can be Greek provided they agree with the “Philhellenic indoctrination” of what a Greek is. Anyone who speaks Greek, claims to be a descendent of the so-called Ancient Greeks, pretends to be superior to other people, claims minorities don’t exist in Greece, is arrogant and insensitive to non-Greeks and hurls slogans like “Macedonia is Greek” can be a Greek. Can an Asia Minor Christian Turk settler who was deposited in Macedonia in the 1920’s be a Greek? Yes they can! They can even be a Macedonian, descendent of the Ancient Macedonians! Can a Macedonian whose family identified as Macedonian before Greece annexed Macedonia in 1913 identify as a Greek? Yes they can, provided they accept and swear by the “Philhellene Indoctrination”. Can any of my relatives, like myself who were born in Greece, with whom I share great grandparents be Greeks even though I identify as a Macedonian? Yes they can! They can in fact also be “full fledged” Macedonians, direct descendents of the Ancient Macedonians! Can I be a Greek, and I did ask this question, on account of some of my family members identifying as Greeks? The answer was a flat NO! And according to the same “Greek authorities” who said I could never be a Greek, I don’t even qualify to call myself Macedonian. According to them I am a “Slav” and a “Skopjan” from some “other” country called “Skopje”, which I have yet to find on any “world” map except on maps made in Greece!

If you are still not convinced that the Greek identity is a 19th century Philhellene fabrication; an identity “created” purely for political purposes, then you had best read the following twenty-five excerpts;

1. “There were, however, several magnificent specimens of Greek palicars, who added to the advantage of soldier like, but rather swaggering carriage, all the accessories of their picturesque costume. Nine or ten of them performed the Albanian national dance, to the sound of a bad fiddle and a jingling guitar played with a quill for the amusement of her majesty, who did not seem enchanted with this exhibition.

And these men, who were exposing themselves in this absurd manner, were the far-famed Colocotroni, Nikitas, surnamed the Turkofagos, or Turk eater, Makryani, Vasso of Montenegro, Nota Botsaris, and other equally celebrated.” (“Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine”, Vol. XLIII, January – June 1838)

2. “When Athens was chosen as the site for the modern capital of the new nation, and its (re)construction was planned along lines of Hellenic purity, the unsettling evidence of Greece’s Ottoman heritage along with local vernacular forms had to be confronted, all the more so when situated in the immediate vicinity of remains of classical antiquity. Early nineteenth-century Athens was viewed as a ‘disgraceful site’ (Boyer 1996: 163) full of imperfections, ranging from the city’s physical aspect to the spoken language that called for, ‘filtering-out’ interventions.” (“Contested Landscapes Movement, Exile and Place”, Edited by Barbara Bender and Margot Winer, page 23)

3. “In 1851, at the time of her enfranchisement, Greece possessed about one million inhabitants, of whom a quarter were Albanians or Walachians. The population was a residue of invaders of all peoples, and notable of Slavs. For centuries the Greeks properly so called had disappeared from Greece. From the time of the Roman conquest, Greece was regarded by every adventurer as a nursery of slaves, which everyone might have recourse to with impunity.” (“The Psychology of Socialism”, by Gustav Lo Bon, page 206)

4. “The Greek influence which has partially Hellenized the Vlachs of Macedonia to-day can hardly date from before the Turkish conquest. It is the work not of the Byzantine Empire but of the modern Church, and seems to have reached its height during the eighteenth century.” (“Macedonia its races and the future”, by H. N. Brailsford , page 181)

5. “Greek statesman said Albanian was not a language – it had no literature, not even an alphabet - it is a mere patois, and would die out in a generation, and the children of the Albanian soldiers and sailors would all be good Greeks.” (“The Catholic Presbyterian an International Journal Ecclesiastical and Religious”, vol. II, July – December 1879, edited by Professor W. G. Blaikie D.D., L.L.D., F.R.S.E., page 319).

6. “ We have many instances of the daring of these Greek robbers, one of which I shall here relate, as received from their chief, no less a personage than Colocotroni, who was in our service, and has since, as may be remembered, made himself conspicuous in Greece. He is an Albanian,

and, as he acknowledges, a kleftis (robber).” (“Selections from my Journal during a residence in the Mediterranean”, pages 110 and 111)

7. “...the historical absurdity of declaring Hellenic civilization the expression of a culture uncontaminated by foreign elements can be explained by a simple fact that tends to be disregarded – namely, that Hellenic civilization that we know it was in effect the invention of the ‘Science of Antiquity’, of Classics. As such, it could have been (and was) endowed with whatever signification the discipline found useful.” (“Dream Nation Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece”, by Stathis Gourgouris, page 134)

8. “After successive treaties, (London 1913, Bucharest 1913), Greece acquired much of Macedonia, Epirus, Crete and the north-eastern islands of the Aegean. Greek land increased by 70 percent and the population almost doubled from 2,800,000 to 4,800,000 some of whom were Slavs and Turks.” (“Entangled Identities Nations and Europe”, Edited by Atsuko Ichijo and Willfried Sohn, page 112)

9. “Yet so much of the Sclavonian element had been infused into the latter that the modern Greeks are found to differ widely from their remote ancestors.” (“Foreign Quarterly Review”, Vol. XXVI, 1841, page 73)

10. “...the question of Greece’s political and ethnic status generated a considerable amount of debate in western Europe. As Michael Herzfeld argues in ‘Ours once more: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece’: ‘to be a European, was in ideological terms, to be a Hellene’ (1982: 15). Many Europeans of the time, however, believed the contemporary Greeks to be an adulterated version of the Classical Greeks – ‘Byzantine Slavs...’ (“Grafting Helen The Abduction of the Classical Past”, Matthew Gumpert, pages 239 and 240)

11. “...since the Greeks are a composite people among whom the descendents of the veritable Greek of old are in a great minority. The majority are of Albanian and Solute blood, races which even the Romans found untamable.” (“In Greek Waters: a Story of the Grecian War of Independence (1821-1827)”, By G.A. Henty, 1893, page 40)

12. “General interest was first aroused by a controversy as to the racial derivation of modern Greeks. The War of Independence had won the sympathy of Europe; and it was a rude shock both to Greece and her champions when Fallmerayer announced that her inhabitants were virtually Slavs. The race of the Hellenes, he declared in his ‘History of Morea’, was routed out and Athens was unoccupied from the sixth to the tenth century. Only its literature and a few ruins survived to tell that the Greek people ever existed. What the Slavs had begun the Albanians had completed.” (“History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century”, by G.P. Gooch, pages 490 and 491)

13. “Old Corinth passed through its various stages, Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Turkish. After the War of Independence it was again Greek, and, being a considerable town, was suggested as the capital of the new

Kingdom of Greece. The earthquake of 1858 leveled it to the ground with the exception of about a dozen houses. A mere handful of the old inhabitants remained on the site. But fertile fields and running water made it attractive; and outsiders gradually came in. At present, it is an untidy poverty-stricken village of about 1,000 inhabitants, mostly of Albanian Blood.” (“The Encyclopedia Britannica” Eleventh edition, Vol. VII, 1910, page 148)

14. “The modern Greeks possess none of the qualities which make nations great. Their existence is due to the battle of Navarino, for in the autumn of 1827 Greece was unquestionably conquered by the arms of the Grand Vizier Reshid Mehmed and by Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt, and again the ‘untoward event’ of Navarino could only occur at a time when Phil-Hellenism was a sort of social disease, caused by hallucinations and by the illusion of finding in the present a mongrel inhabitants of the Morea and Attica the descendents of the ancient Hellenes.” (“The Syrian War and the decline of the Ottoman Empire (1840-1848)”, by Byron Augustus Jochmus, page 100)

15. “The notion of a ‘Greek’ identity in the modern sense is itself in large part the creation of the movement towards statehood. It was not until the nineteenth century that the term came to describe a homogenous ethnic group in the modern sense. Instead, the people of the Peloponnesos, including Argolida, made up an intricate mosaic of ethnicities and languages. In Argolida dialects of Albanian, Greek, Turkish and other local languages were spoken (Andromedas 1976).” (“Blood and Oranges Immigrant Labour and European Markets in Rural Greece”, by Christopher M. Lawrence, page 12)

16. “...Greek national feeling was already quite strong at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even the Albanian-speaking Orthodox did not regard themselves only as Rum (members of the religious community or Orthodox Christian millet) but also as real Greeks.” (“From Geopolitics to Global Politics”, editor Jacques Levy, page 174)

17. “...he devoted his personal attention exclusively to the latter, assigning Joannina to his son-in-law, Thomas Preliubovich, in 1367, and Aetolia and Akarnania to two Albanian chiefs, belonging to the clan Boua and Liosa – a name still to be found in the plans of Attica. Thus, about 1362, all north-west Greece was Albanian...” (“The Latins in the Lavant a History of Frankish Greece (1204-1566), by William Miller M.A., 1908, page 294)

18. “Overrun by the Goths and Vandals, it became a pay, by the second half of the 8th c., to bands of Slavic invaders, who found it wasted by war and pestilence. Gradually however, these barbarians were subdued and Grecianized by the Byzantine Emperors. Nevertheless the numerous names of places, Rivers, etc., in the Morea of Slavic origin, prove how firmly they had routed themselves, and that the Moreotes are anything but

pure Greeks.” (“The International Encyclopedia a Compendium of Human Knowledge”, edited by Richard Gleeson Green, 1890, page 204)

19. “...between a cheer and a whine, and presently their Imperial Majesties of Greece, cantered up the hill attended by four dignitaries, and as many equerries. The queen was dressed in a dark green riding-habit, black beaver with drooping feather, and veil. King Otho wore the Albanian costume of crimson, gold embroidered jacket and legs, white fustanela, with a richly chased saber belted over his shoulder.” (“Scampavians from Gibil Tarek to Stamboul”, by Harry Gringo, 1857)

20. “There was little interest as to the nationality of the Rayahs while Turkish rule was strong. They were nearly all Christians of the Byzantine type, those in Europe at least, and were hence regarded as one people, for oriental theocracy cannot conceive nationality apart from religion. They themselves know the difference in their origins and in such traditions as they had: some were Slavs, some Vlachs and some Albanians...; they were all non-Muslims, all Rayahs, and in a sense all Greeks.” (“Political Science Quarterly”, Columbia University, 1908, page 307)

21. “The revolution of 1821 has restored the ancient appellation ‘Elines’, but as it is used chiefly by the inhabitants of Bavarian Greece, who perhaps don’t constitute more than one fourth of the Greek nation, it may safely be said that the mass of the people still call themselves ‘Romaïi’ and their language ‘Romaiki’.” (“A Romaik Grammar”, by E.A. Sophocles, 1842, page iv)

22. “From their manners, their features and their names of many of their neighbouring places, I should be tempted to regard them [Mainiotes] proceeding of Slavonian blood: many travelers pretend, however, to have discovered in these barbarous hordes traces of a Spartan origin.” (“Recollections of a Classical Tour through various parts of Greece, Turkey and Italy made in the years 1818 and 1819”, by Peter Edmund Laurent, 1821, page 182)

23. “The Greeks have not taken much interest in their past until Europeans became enthusiastic discoverers and diggers of their ruins. And why should they have cared? The Greeks were not Greek but rather the illiterate descendents of Slavs and Albanian fishermen who spoke a debased Greek dialect and had little interest in the broken columns and temples except as places to graze their sheep. The true philhellenists were the English – of whom Byron was the epitome – and the French, who were passionate to link themselves to the Greek ideal.” (“The Pillars of Hercules” by Paul Thereoux, page 316)

24. “...Neohellenic Enlightenment sanctioned a selective tradition, with particular emphasis upon an imaginary classical antiquity, and sought to suppress what was deemed to be a ‘non-significant tradition’, mainly the Byzantine and Ottoman legacy. Through this ideological management of the past, it achieved the displacement of a substance part of the history, memory and experience of those it sought to shape into modern Greeks.”

(“Tormented by History Nationalism in Greece and Turkey”, by Umut Oskirimu and Spiros A. Sofos, page 24)

25. “There are two other difficulties involved in the history of the Turkish period. In tracing the movements of merchandise and men in the Balkan peninsula it is extremely difficult to differentiate the various races involved. Western travelers knew little, Turkish authorities cared less. Even the polyglot Vlachs themselves knew nor cared a great deal and until the rise of national consciousness at the end of the eighteenth century were probably quite happy with the label of Greek, which was good enough for outside observers.” (“The Vlachs the History of a Balkan People”, by T.J. Winniffrith, pages 124 and 125)

So, what have we learned from the 75 authors I have presented so far? Fifty at this link: <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/view/101938> and 25 more in this article?

Well, we have learned that the Greek identity is not an “ethnic identity” at all but rather a “politically motivated artificial identity” created by the 19th century Philhellenes to serve some greater political purpose. We have learned that the 19th century Greeks, recent ancestors to today’s Greeks, were not “ethnic Greeks” at all. The majority belonged to the Slav, Albanian, Vlach and later Macedonian ethnic groups. In other words they became “Greek” either by force or by choice. This cannot be disputed!

What can be disputed however is the ownership of a heritage that does not belong to the Modern Greeks. For example Modern Greeks cannot claim the heritage of the so-called “ancient Greeks” as their own just because they call themselves “Greeks” and learned to behave like the Ancient Greeks. This is like saying that I can claim my neighbour’s father’s house if I changed my last name to match his and pretend to be my neighbour’s brother. Can I legally do that? Can I one day show up at my neighbour’s house and say “I am your brother and this house is mine”? Wouldn’t I have to prove my descent from the man I claim to be my father?

Well this is exactly what the Greeks are doing! With the help of a bunch of Westerners, they usurped the Ancient Greek heritage, which does not belong to them, and now they think they are the owners of Greece. Ah, but that’s not all! Since they annexed a large chunk of Macedonian land in 1913 by war, they also usurped the Macedonian heritage, that is, until they were challenged by the real Macedonians. They usurped the Macedonian heritage the same way they usurped the Greek heritage by “pretending” to be Macedonians, descendants of the Ancient Macedonians and by pushing the real Macedonians out into extinction. How clever is that?

I don’t think any Macedonian cares what the Greeks call themselves, who they are and who they “pretend” to be but they sure care when these “pretenders” try to lay claim to the Macedonian heritage especially at the expense of the real Macedonians! Sharing the ancient heritage is one thing

but claiming it to be exclusively theirs, especially since it can be proven that they are imposters, is another.

We are faced with two problems when dealing with this issue. First, the Modern Greeks are not Greeks at all. They call themselves Greeks not because they are Greeks but because they want to be Greeks. There are benefits to being Greek. There is a country “Greece” to call their own, which should never have been created in the first place because such a country never existed before. Then there is that illustrious past with all its glory which should never have been “assigned” to a people who had nothing to do with it. Second, these same people were not only allowed to annex 51% of Macedonia but were given full rights to “assimilate” the Macedonian people, turning them into Greeks, and usurping the Macedonian heritage as their own. Hence the slogan “the Ancient Macedonians were Greek” therefore “the Modern Macedonians must also be Greek”.

But wanting to be Greeks is not the same as “being” Greeks. Just because one “wants to be a Greek” does not mean one has the right to lay claim to the Ancient Greek heritage just as I have no right to lay claim to my neighbour’s house just because I “want” to be his brother!

This leads to the very important legal question; if these people are Greek because they want to be Greek and they are Macedonian because they want to be Macedonian, then legally what right do they have to either the Ancient Greek heritage or to the Ancient Macedonian heritage? Given that we have proven that the Modern Greeks are “not Greek at all” what moral and legal right do they have to interfere in the affairs of the Macedonian people? More importantly, as Macedonians and rightful heirs to the Macedonian heritage, why are we allowing these imposters to interfere in our affairs? Isn’t it about time to tell them to “hit the road and mind their own business”?

On the so-called “name dispute” Osiris wrote:

The only name that is logical and natural for Macedonia is Macedonia! We as people are of Macedonia, which has been called Macedonia for at least two millennia, and that is beyond dispute. All other names are politically inspired propaganda coming from our Balkan neighbours which are debatable and will never be resolved because they are based on conflicting historical myths.

The fact that all our neighbours covet the remaining piece of Macedonia tells us that they all want it for themselves, and would do and say anything to get it even destroy an independent Macedonia. They incorporated it into their own nation.

It seems like its 1900’s all over again; a political Balkan ground hog day.

By Osiris from www.maknews.com/forum/

Part 29 – My fascination with Greeks?

A lot of you have written to me over the last six months asking “what is my fascination with the ‘Greeks’, why do I write ‘denigrating’ things about them and am I jealous of them or something?”

Let’s say that I know more about the “real” Modern Greeks than the average person and I can tell you that if writing about them is “denigrating” then so be it! As far as being jealous, how can one be jealous of a “fictitious” identity such as the Modern Greek one?

Being fascinated with the Greeks? Is that a “Greek wish” to have “outsiders” even your opponents, be fascinated with your “fictitiousness”?

“It was never my intention to delve into the modern history of Greece, but the Greeks kept on and on with their bull-crap about who I am and who I have the right to be so I felt it was time to discover who these fanatics were, and lo and behold I found they were not who they pretended to be, but I still don’t care, I am happy for them to claim they are Greek all I expect in return is they afford me and my people the same rights they claim for themselves.” (Osiris from <http://www.maknews.com/forum>)

What can I say; Osiris beat me to the punch! He expressed exactly how I feel! There is no fascination, only the necessity to fight back and defend our Macedonian identity the only way Greeks can understand; by attacking theirs!

Greeks, your identity is not as solid as you think; it is not a solid sphere made of stainless steel as you portray it to be; your identity is more like a fruit, a polished “dark-red” apple with an amazing tantalizing shiny red skin and all rotten inside. When you bite into it you think you are going to get a sweet juicy alluring apple-taste but instead you get a brown rot filled with bitterness! No thank you. I’d rather be “real” and take my chances at being who I am; Macedonian, no matter how difficult it has proven to be!

Here is another excerpt from yet another “Westerner” and “impartial” observer on the formation of your “artificial” Greek identity;

“Within the context of romanticism, the term ‘Philhellenism’ refers generally to a love of Greece, foundational to which were the beliefs that Greece had a direct cultural link to Western Civilization as a whole, and that, concomitantly, the ‘modern Greeks’ (that is the Greeks of the Ottoman and modern periods) were the direct descendents, biologically and culturally, of the ancient Greeks. In its most specific sense, philhellenism refers to the nineteenth-century historical phenomenon of western Europeans (largely British, French and German) rallying behind the Greek struggle of independence from Ottoman rule (1821-30). The link between philhellenic sentiment and the Greek War of Independence was evident in the numerous cases of western Europeans contributing money, materials, and in some cases manpower to the Greek effort. In the specifically Romantic context, it was evident in the turn-of-the century

efflorescence, of paintings, works of literature, and musical compositions with a central Hellenic theme.

A famous visual instance of this Romanticist artistic fascination with Greece is the frontispiece to Marie Gabriel, Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier's 1782 *voyage Pittoresque de la Grece*, an engraving entitled 'Greece in chains', in which Greece, allegedly as a beautiful but manacled woman, reclines upon a tomb in a cemetery dotted with monuments to such great men of antiquity as Lycurgus, Miltiades, and Themistocles. The image captures perfectly the Romantic vision of Greece as noble but faded, glorious yet much reduced, enslaved but poised to be free once more. Also quintessential of Romantic Philhellenism is the explicit link the image draws between the modern Greeks of the late Ottoman period and the Hellenic greats of antiquity.

In the years just prior to and during the Greek War of Independence, countless such images were in wide circulation in Western Europe – the most famous perhaps, being, those of Eugene Delacroix (1798-1863), the consummate representative of French Romantic philhellenism.

This cultural trend worked hand in hand with the political development in the Ottoman Empire to fuel growing interests within Europe for Greece and the modern Greeks. While the travel accounts penned by 'grand tourists' were hugely popular, the apparent military and economic decline of the Ottoman Empire commanded huge attention, particularly in Britain, which felt that British imperial fortunes were tied to the political status quo. While the Congress of Vienna (1814-15), which concluded the Napoleonic Wars, emphasized the need to keep the Ottoman Empire intact, growing numbers of Philhellenes felt that the special cultural link between Greece and the West demanded intervention on behalf of the Greeks under Ottoman rule. In this debate, philhellenic position would ultimately dominate, with Britain ending up a major backer of the Greek struggle and the subsequently formed Greek state.

The wide circulation of a number of Western works which had as their central theme the exoticisms and depravities of the Ottomans (and the plight of the noble Greeks who suffered beneath their rule) furthered the scope of philhellenism, to the extent that general sentiment in Europe gradually overcame the initial political position of European governments regarding the Greek War of Independence. Lord Byron, Francois August Rene de Chateaubriand and Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe are the best known creators of such works, but a veritable plethora of lesser-known, musical, literary and artistic figures followed the themes popularized by them.

Philhellenism is properly understood as a reflection not of any reality concerning Greece and the Greeks, but rather as the manifestation of a purely European, and not entirely magnanimous, impulse. That is to say, the passionate response with which the Greek War of Independence was met in the West was less a reflection of European love of the modern

Greeks than of European love of the idea that Western Civilization as a whole could be traced back to Pericles-era Athens.” (“Encyclopedia of the Romantic Era 1760 – 1850”, edited by Christopher John Murray, Volume 2 L-Z index, page 872).

It is not common to create “ethnic identities” for “political reasons” in order to have a modern civilization mimicking a dead and long gone culture. Ethnic identities are living and vibrant entities that grow and evolve over time and are naturally bound together without “politically motivated” pressures. One cannot create an instant “ethnic identity” just as one cannot create an instant family by putting a bunch of strangers together and calling them grandparents, parents and children. A fake “ethnic identity” is like a fake family which has no real relationships, no real family tree and no real history. It’s made up, like the Brady Bunch on television, to serve a specific purpose! But behind the scenes each individual person belongs to a “real” family, has a “real” mother and father and a “real” family tree and history. Sort of like the various ethnic groups, the Slavs, Albanians, Macedonians, Asia Minor Christian Turks and other ethnicities constituting the fictional “Greek” family.

If there was a purpose for Europeans to “feel Greek” at one time, as per the quote above, that “feeling” is no longer there so then I ask you, “What is the purpose of Greece today?” Does it serve as a “model of Civilization for the New Europe?” Or is Greece a “remnant” of something “old and embracing” whose time has long passed and should have, like the dinosaurs, died a long time ago?

The world is evolving like it should and in more cases than not, taking steps forward, but not Greece. The more Greece moves forward the more it falls behind.

Greeks, the need to pretend to be “ethnically homogeneous” is no longer there. There is no need to pretend to be superior, arrogant, or “better” than your neighbour. Frankly nobody cares about your obsessions. Like all things in life, everything has its time and the time for “pretending” is over. It’s time to face reality and take your place with the rest of the world!

You realize that your “fake” identity would have never been revealed had you done the right thing and accepted the Macedonian identity for what it is. Through the stubbornness of your political leaders you not only “wiped out” the image of your “Greek-ness” that you spent two centuries building but you have revealed to the world your true “racist” selves which you had managed to hide for over two centuries now. But, this is only the beginning, next will come the “revelation” of the atrocities that you have committed against the Macedonian and other people who lived and died in agony in Greece since those lands became a country for the first time in 1829. After all that is revealed, how many people in the world do you think will see Greece as the “cradle of democracy” or as the birthplace of

the “European Civilization” as opposed to “the cradle of oppression and racism”?

Greece was built as a country and the modern Greeks were paraded as “the cradle of European Civilization” for a single purpose; to show the world that “Western Europe” was not only “civilized” but far superior to the rest. Europeans found a model in the “Ancient City States” that not only “explained” their “imperialistic war like behaviour” but venerated it and made it “okay” to “enslave” people and “colonize” their lands.

Politically Greece, the way it is today, is an “ancient relic” whose time has expired and belongs in a museum together with “Mussolini’s Italy and Hitler’s Germany”! But it is never too late to “evolve” peacefully and bring positive change with “amends” to past mistakes!

And now I leave you with this;

Dear All,

I am drawing on my 'Macedonian experience' here to guide both my aim to end the “Name” negotiations between Greece and Macedonia immediately, and to bring to light a movement for change in Macedonia, and elsewhere.

There are issues of human rights at stake, our Macedonian nationality happens to be at stake, and issues of power at play.

It is a simple point, but one that needs to be made. The fact is that as Macedonians we are a legal entity, we have our Republic of Macedonia, and we are certainly legitimate. We are recognized by over 125 countries, and with time that number will rise. Our institutions will in time receive the due recognition they deserve, and have coming to them.

It is simply a matter of time. Both this government and UMD in Washington have over reached. The value and weight they place on "membership" is not justified. A far more sensible look at the situation suggests that the Macedonian economy and nationality can gain as much, and far more, by pursuing bilateral relations. Good economic relations will have positive political outcomes for the Macedonian Republic, but the shortsightedness of the government suggests it has panicked, or failed to consider alternative workable strategies with real long term benefits.

The current line of thinking that we cannot claim to be complete as a legal and legitimate nationality, until we have attained EU and/or NATO membership, is also a dangerous, and irresponsible train of thought. It needs to be justified, or put to rest immediately, both in the government, and at the lunatic fringe of the Diaspora. What recent experience demonstrates is that we can have most of the benefits offered by these organizations, and 'not' be an official member of them, or irresponsibly risk our Macedonian nationality to get there.

I believe the time has come for another change in our approach to the "problem". The fact is that the Macedonians do not pose a military threat

to Greece, and they do not pose an economic threat to Greece. The "threat" if one is to be identified here, is perhaps political, or ideological.

It is worth recalling another fact. The Macedonians respect and recognize unreservedly the sovereignty of the Greek State, and its right to self determination. Is it too much to ask the Greeks to in turn do the same? What can we glean from this fact about the nature of the current "dispute"? The "problem" if we need to identify one (and I believe we do), is an issue internal to Greece. The long standing issues Greece has with its landscape, is the issue. It is simply exporting its policies that have subjugated various communities in Greece, for 150 years over the border. But this is not intended to be a backward looking historical exercise. My point is this. For there to be peace Greece must change, not the Macedonians.

There is another key point to be made here. For Greece to change, the EU must change. That is unlikely to happen in the short term.

This last point raises the question of who or what are we up against here - Greece, or the EU, or both? There is the "system" of negation to consider here. My advice would be that it is not "smart" to engage an entire system at one point on the surface of it, believing that one can change the whole system, beneath and behind it. The political will and the power, the amount of resources Greece has mobilized to turn our "non-existence" into a metaphoric and transformative reality is vast, and old. It is a system rooted in the policies and practice of Europe, against the Macedonians going back a hundred years. Consider for example, the recent statement by an EU official, who referred to us as "Northern Macedonia". We cannot, and should not try to take on these old social structures. As long as Greece stays the way it is, we will always have problems. It would be far more sensible and logical to bring the faults of Greece to the attention of the EU (and highlight the faults of the EU in that way). But for that to happen, we need to be principled. We need to ask that our sovereignty and our rights, be respected.

I want to add another aspect in this survey for political change. Macedonian democracy respects the cultural rights of its various communities. Greece does not. The attitude in Macedonia is that these communities enrich its society, rather than threaten it. In Greece, everyone and everything is a threat. Now, given this fact - why does the EU insist on "blocking" Macedonia? If we were to measure the quality of a State by how it treats its minorities, and based EU membership on those criteria, Macedonia would be at the top of the list. The point to be made here is that the EU is not a functional organization. Its uneven-handedness, and even ridicule of Macedonia and its institutions, is about favoring Greece - not about diligence or compliance. Shouldn't there be a protocol in the EU that states that members, whose human rights practices are not up to standard, have their privileges 'suspended'? There are many possibilities we could pursue here. The EU, and the UN, have both taken positions that are contrary to their Charters, and have shown to favor aggressive, irrational

member states, over obedient, compliant ones. Why would we want to be a 'member' in principle - of that?

As Macedonians, we are ideological outlaws, in a very small circle of nations. There is the rest of the world at our fingertips.

We have our nation now, and we have our nationality. Are we going to let all that generations of Macedonians have accomplished, and sacrificed, end in a terrible disaster? Why are we putting our nationality at risk? There are native movements all over the world who would love to be in our position, and defend their nationality with all of their might and power. I can think of the Palestinians, for starters. Why risk it? We have seen that individuals are willing to do that. I would call them reckless, and more dangerous than anything an enemy has been able to throw at us. The only people who can take our nationality away from us, are the Macedonians (and if it comes to a second referendum, the Albanians I am certain, will have the final say in the matter). This last event is completely lost on people, but it will eventuate.

Will our fight for a Macedonian nationality end in a historical scenario where we no longer have one?

We must rethink whether "membership" is justified and right for us, when clearly we can enjoy many of the benefits of being an EU member, without actually having to negotiate our nationality and put all at risk, to get there.

By Paul from <http://www.maknews.com/forum>.

Part 30 – Who writes my books?

Just as I was about to end this book and go on to something new, there was something else that drew me back. This is the third time I ran into this so I figured it was time I dealt with it.

There are some rumours out there circulating that I don't write my own books. The reasoning behind it is "how can one person write so many books in such a short time?"

So far I have thirteen books to my credit. Eleven are published, one is on its way to the printer and should be out by the end of August and I am currently working on finishing the thirteenth. One of those books I co-authored with Dr. Michael Seraphinoff. One was translated from English to Macedonian and a thousand copies were donated to the Macedonian cause. One was specifically written for non-Macedonians and one thousand copies were donated to politicians throughout the world. One was donated to a Literary Association in Australia and they in turn published it and printed one thousand copies for educational purposes. One, a forty page pamphlet, was also written for the Macedonian cause and one thousand copies were printed to be given away. I not only write these books but I also publish them myself.

So the question is "how can one person write so many books in a span of less than ten years?"

But that's not all! In addition to writing books I also write occasional articles for a couple of newspapers, one in Toronto and another in Australia, I translate articles and entire books from Macedonian to English and I publish a monthly e-magazine called the Macedonian Digest. On top of that I also write weekly articles for the American Chronicle.

But how can I do all this, after all I am a "Slav" and "incapable of amounting to anything?" So my Greek friends tell me!

So the geniuses gathering in the donut shops, with nothing better to do, "figure" it must be "someone else" who writes my articles and books. But the question is who?

I don't know who started these rumours but I first heard of them from a Macedonian, the kind that hangs around "donut shops". You know who you are!

The first time I ran into this rumour was about a year ago. I heard it from a person I have known to be Macedonian but I was not quite sure which way he leaned deep in his heart, Macedonian or Grkoman? His question, which he asked me on two separate occasions, was; "Who writes your books? Come on tell me, who writes your books?" In both instances I was caught by surprise and did not even comprehend its implication. Come on, what kind of a question is that?

The second time, a statement was made to my face by a known Grkoman, whom I have known for years. He said "You are 'Slavs' and have nothing to do with the Macedonians and as 'Slavs' are incapable of

comprehending the complexities of academics. Show me a ‘Slav’ who is capable of writing books?”

Ironically he said this in full view of all my books displayed in front of him.

Again I ignored his comment because I knew where it was coming from. My only concern for him was that he was about to be lynched by a number of Macedonians who overheard him. When asked to explain himself he started babbling Greek propaganda.

The third time I heard the rumour was from a “reliable Macedonian” who hangs around a certain group of Macedonians at a certain “donut shop”. I know these people and they know me so I find it surprising that they would be circulating such rumours.

The person who told me about this would not disclose any details as to who said what mainly because these guys are his friends and he did not want to embarrass them by naming them. But I know who they are and after this they too will know that I know!

Because they know that I work alone, these “clever geniuses” also know that Risto Stefov is the genuine article and not a composite made up of multiple writers. So their conclusion was that “my wife must be writing my books for me!”

No disrespect to my wife but upon hearing this I laughed m.a. off.

Guys my wife is a nurse, a graduate of the University of Toronto Faculty of Nursing, not a graduate from the Faculty of “Macedonian History”? You all know my wife is also Canadian, a Westerner, who had never heard of Macedonia before she met me. How does that make her an accomplished historian? And where do you “geniuses” place me in the “scheme of things”? Am I in this just for the glory of putting my name on the books and articles?

When I told my wife about this I figured she would be happy to be placed so high on a pedestal. To my surprise however she was not happy at all. In fact she pointed out and rightly so, that “we are our own worst enemies!” “Instead of encouraging and praising such accomplishments we find ways to destroy them.”

I know you didn’t start these rumours (at least I hope you didn’t) but why do you have the need to propagate them? And not just rumours about me but about many things Macedonian? How can we expect to move forward or surface above our own crapulence, if we can’t even get our act together? Why do we continue “business as usual” without comprehending the damage we are doing to our cause? Do you think spreading “unfounded” rumours and “unsubstantiated” allegations will make you “more patriotic” Macedonians? How does “denigrating” Macedonians “help” the Macedonian cause? I have seen so many young Macedonian patriots “quit” fighting for the Macedonian cause simply because of stupid things like this!

As for me, I choose to work alone, voluntarily and without compensation. I am not a composite and I do write my own articles and books. If you don't believe me you can believe what you like. I have made many personal sacrifices to do this and expect nothing in return, no praise and no recognition. And thank God for that because so far I have received very little. But on the contrary I have received much abuse and not just from the Greeks, but also from Macedonians, even from some who beat their chests and call themselves "patriots".

But I have to admit I am not alone in this endeavour, there are many Macedonians out there, to whom I am thankful, who help me with my research and send me source materials for my books and articles. They encourage me to continue to write and in return I will not disappoint them. I will not allow this "small-mindedness" to stop me from what I am doing! In fact the more abuse I receive the more I am encouraged to write. It reminds me why I am doing it!

The only reward I want is to see Macedonians proudly proclaim who they truly are, Macedonians, without fear and without having to cringe and feel awkward when they are asked "what ethnicity are you?" Especially by Greeks!

It was difficult for me to write this chapter, since I have sworn not to take up "words" against fellow Macedonians, but I felt it was necessary because there is a need to look at ourselves and our attitudes towards one another! If we can't manage to pull together because of our "low opinions" of ourselves how then can we expect to escape from the clutches of our oppressors? If we can't recognize when we are lead by our noses and made to "unjustly criticize" one another how then can we speak with a single voice and justly struggle to free ourselves from our enemies?

Every Macedonian must learn and understand that our enemies, particularly the Greeks, work on many levels. Lies and rumours are not beyond them. Those Macedonians who like to repeat what they hear must learn to "weigh the evidence" and determine if it is "for" or "against" our cause and then act on it appropriately. God gave us brains, let's use them and not just for "parroting" everything we hear. I am sorry to have to say this but some of you gave me good reasons to speak up!

It is never good to speak against Macedonians, especially about things that are not true. And it would not hurt to challenge those who do speak foul and put them in their place!

Now if you wish to know what the Greeks think of me, here is an example of the type of abusive e-mails I get every day;

"Comrade Risto and all your compatriots need to know and put it in their thick and stubborn heads that they are not the phony descendants of Alexander the Great because the Macedonians never produced bastard descendants with South Slavonian identity and the their fraudulent claim that they are <Macedonians> is a BIG MYTH that only an insane, paranoid and schizophrenic person would say or think.

Risto, you are nothing more than a <Macedonized> South Slavonian janissary and one of the worst the world has ever seen. You are a miserable Makedoman but very hateful and hostile to the people you came from just like the Ottoman Turk janissaries were towards the people they came from.

When I say you are not <Macedonian> I am not taking anything away from you or denying an identity that belongs to you or your comrades because, if there was a time that you might have called yourself a <Macedonian> you lost that right when you denied your Hellenism just like the rest of you <Macedonized> South Slavonian janissaries.

You gambled and you lost. You cannot have both ways. The Macedonian name has only one meaning and does designate two people with two different ethnic origins. The Macedonian Greek people cannot be duplicated by any charlatan like yourself and the rest of your comrades.

Get it through your thick skull of yours that if you think you can change reality or rather the Macedonian Greek actuality. All the lies, misleading distortions, deceptions and fraud and forgery can be only good for internal consumption or for fooling the idiots who listen to you because of ignorance, lack of education and simple lack of historical and ethnic knowledge of the Greek people and their nation.”

Nick H.

Perhaps Nick H. was looking at his own reflection in the mirror when he was writing this e-mail. The more fanatical these Greeks get the more they reveal themselves. Nick H. speaks of the “Macedonians being a big myth” when we know very well that it is the Modern Greeks who are the biggest myth. He calls the Macedonians “janissaries” when he knows that the Modern Greeks are the true janissaries, the little bullies of the Balkans! If he doesn’t then he should also know that the Modern Greeks are the true “adopted” children of Western Imperialism which makes them more janissaries than anyone else in Europe!

The words in Nick H’s e-mail ring truer of the “fake” Hellenes than of any Macedonians I have ever known.

“When the Macedonians became rulers of Greece, Athens had twenty-one thousand citizens, ten thousand resident aliens, and four hundred thousand slaves.” (“Race of Mongrel”, by Alfred P. Schultz, page 86)

“The resident aliens were mainly Aryan-Hametic-Semetic-Egyptian-Negroid mongrels.

Mongrelization was inevitable.” (“Race of Mongrel”, by Alfred P. Schultz, page 87)

“The truth is that Hellenic varnish was given to the East and that Hellas became Asianized, the Greek race thoroughly mongrelized and completely destroyed. The mongrelization of Hellas put an end to the true Hellenic spirit...” (“Race of Mongrel”, by Alfred P. Schultz, page 88).

“Sultan Mohammed II settled Turks in the Peloponnesus.... The ‘Greeks’ are the descendents of races so different that their crossing can never produce anything else than human mongrels.” (“Race of Mongrel”, by Alfred P. Schultz, page 92).

Part 31 – Ilinden 1903

Before the formation of the independent and sovereign state the Republic of Macedonia in 1991, before the formation of the Peoples' Republic of Macedonia in the Yugoslav Federation of Republics in 1945 and even before Macedonia's partition by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria in 1913, the Macedonian people came together and rose in 1903 against their oppressors the Ottoman Empire in a bid to free themselves and create a united, free and independent Macedonian state.

Termed by some as the greatest rebellion in Europe since the French Revolution, the people of Macedonia violently rose on Ilinden, August 2nd, 1903 and rebelled against the Ottoman Empire. It was a grass roots revolution like no other involving ordinary people from ordinary villages but with extraordinary courage. Their desire was to live free in their own independent state. Unfortunately it was not to be but only because of circumstances beyond their control.

Today is August 2nd, 2009, the 106th anniversary of that famous Ilinden Uprising and to celebrate it I would like to dedicate the following essay entitled "The Course of the Ilinden Uprising" written by Dr. Krste Bitovski and edited by Risto Stefov;

After visiting several of the regions in the Bitola Revolutionary District and finding out more about the situation and the preparations for the popular uprising, the General Staff, towards the end of July 1903, decided to meet near the village Smilevo for the purpose of drafting and distributing a proclamation announcing the start of the Uprising. In part the proclamation said: "Death is a thousand times better than a life of misery. The day has been decided when the people from all of Macedonia and Odrin must come together with guns in hand to meet the enemy. That day is Ilinden, August 2nd, 1903. Down with tyranny! Long live the people, long live freedom!"

The day of the uprising remained an absolute secret from the Ottoman authorities. Not a single copy of the proclamation, which couriers carried to the leaders of the six boroughs in the Bitola Revolutionary District, fell into the hands of the authorities. The enemy was caught by surprise, and this was of enormous significance for the initial success of the Uprising.

On August 1st the General Staff sent their final instructions to all the leaders which stated that the uprising was to begin on the evening of August 2nd during the Sv. Ilija (St. Elias) or Ilinden festival – which is why it was called the "Ilinden Uprising". It had been made clear that battles would have to be fought partisan style using terrorist and anarchist tactics, which meant in practice forming small military detachments to go into simultaneous action in all parts of the District. It was also recommended that the insurgents not engage in long battles with all their forces concentrated, in order to avoid offering the Ottoman troops the chance to do major damage. The longer the uprising lasted the greater the chances

were – in the General Staff's opinion – that there would be European powers military intervention. The rebel detachments were instructed to only attack the small Ottoman garrisons stationed in the Christian villages and also to surprise government posts, border towers and similar buildings, but the Ottoman women and children were not to be touched.

The proclamation also stated in part that: "We are taking up arms against tyranny and inhumanity and we are fighting in the name of liberty and freedom. Those who suffer in the dark empire of the Sultan are our brothers. Today all Christian people and Ottoman peasants are unjustly treated and made to suffer. We have a common enemy and that is the Ottoman government..."

The representative body of the Organization in Sofia also took part and informed the world public that the uprising had begun through a declaration issued by the Central Committee of the Internal Organization. A justification for the Uprising was also given explaining that the Christian population had no choice but to rise up against the Sultan's tyrannical power.

The Uprising in the Bitola Revolutionary District began on August 2nd, 1903 as was planned. The Borough of Bitola, the largest borough of the District, was divided into the following Regions: Krushevo, Gjavato, the Bitola plain, Demirhisar, Resen and Prespa (Lower Prespa). The battle for the liberation of Krushevo and the declaration of the Krushevo Republic were the most glorious events in the history of the Ilinden Uprising.

The Gjavato Region covered the area between the villages Capari, Gjavato, Smilevo and the Bigla Mountain; the centre for this Region was the village Smilevo. The start of the uprising was in fact proclaimed in Smilevo in the presence of the General Staff. On the night of August 2nd, 1903 two hundred rebels attacked a garrison of eighty Ottoman soldiers, while in other parts the rebels burned all the houses of the Ottoman Beys, cut the telephone lines and destroyed the bridges on the road between Bitola and Resen. In the Bufkol Region, which was closest to Bitola, the rebels set fire to haystacks to let the people of Bitola know that the Uprising had begun.

The Demirhisar Region was one of the best organized and provided nearly a thousand armed insurgents. These insurgents attacked the Ottoman garrisons in a number of villages and one of the most famous battles fought was that in the village Karbunitsa, near Kichevo. After the initial attacks there was a period of calm but also of intensive preparation for further battles.

Prespa was divided into two Regions: Resen (Upper Prespa) and Prespa (Lower Prespa). Prespa was well organized throughout, which made it easier to form a larger number of detachments. One of the major actions of the uprising was the attack on Resen, which was aimed at throwing the enemy into panic and confusion. Most of Resen Region and

Lower Prespa were liberated by mid-August and lay in the hands of the rebels.

On the morning of August 2nd the people of Ohrid woke up to street posters, written in the Ottoman language, advising Ottoman inhabitants to remain neutral because the battle which had just begun was not directed against them but against the intolerable Ottoman regime. The Ilinden Uprising in the Ohrid Region was supported by a well-prepared plan and well-organized stocks of supplies. Arrangements were made to stockpile food, build secret bakeries and bullet-casting workshops, as well as a medical aid service and a hospital.

Ohrid Region was divided into several sub-regions and the fiercest action took place in Malesia, Upper and Lower Debar and in Ortakol.

For the first ten days after the start of the Uprising battles were fought more or less regularly around Ohrid. Ottoman troops were constantly coming in from Albania and Debar and destroying the villages which the local detachments bravely defended. The Ottoman authorities were given support by bands of Albanian professional brigands who spread terror throughout the Macedonian villages. In spite of this, however, the mountain lords stayed with the rebels.

On Ilinden about five thousand Ottoman troops attacked Kichevo, captured it and then left it to its own accord. The bloodiest battles fought that day in Kichevo Region, as mentioned earlier, were in the village Karbunitsa. Instead of guns, knives and bayonets the two sides fought hand-to-hand combat leaving thirty rebels and over one hundred Ottoman soldiers dead. After this bloody debacle the Ottoman troops no longer used their strength to attack and most of the Kichevo Region was left free until the beginning of September.

Through its revolutionary vigour, its dynamic energy and concentration of power, and through the results achieved, the Kostur Revolutionary District fought the hardest in the Ilinden Uprising. Kostur Region was divided into several military centers with their own village detachments, commands and flags.

In addition to its central detachments, the Kostur Region Revolutionary District also had two regional detachments with one hundred and fifty insurgents each and a special detachment. The detachments were commanded by Lazar Poptrajkov, Vasil Chakalarov, Pando Kliashev and others. The proclamation of the General Staff announcing the start of the Uprising was received by the people of Kostur on the very day the Ilinden Uprising began. The regional command announced this historic event as follows:

“The Uprising begins today. Macedonia has declared war on tyranny...We call on all of you who bear arms and are capable of fighting to join the ranks of our fighters. Long live Macedonia. Let us fight for freedom, liberty and autonomy...”

The Uprising began with a number of attacks all throughout Kostur Region and on August 5th, 1903 more than 600 insurgents began a concentrated attack on the Ottoman stronghold in the town of Klisura. Within a few hours the Ottoman force was annihilated and the town fell into rebel hands.

Klisura's liberation was marked as a great occasion and its liberators were welcomed with open arms by the local inhabitants. The commanders made speeches explaining that war was waged in the interests of all the oppressed, and for the autonomy of Macedonia. Klisura remained in the hands of the insurgents until August 27th, 1903 during which time a revolutionary government was formed and people enjoyed their short lived freedom.

The Kostur Region detachments, unlike those from other Regions, were in constant movement, always pursuing and attacking the enemy.

On August 25th, 1903 the Kostur Revolutionary District joined forces with detachments from the Lerin Region Revolutionary District and attacked and liberated the town of Neveska.

The Uprising in Kostur Region was carried out on a massive scale with the entire population, particularly in the northern region, taking part and risking life and property. From the start the Kostur Region leadership kept up the offensive, acting swiftly, almost always in large units, and scoring great successes in battle.

Of all the Revolutionary Districts that took part around the Bitola Uprising only Lerin Region fought in the offensive Partisan style. While the people did not abandon their villages and stayed home, more than 500 insurgents took up arms and attacked Ottoman garrisons, cut telephone lines, destroyed rail and road bridges and took over Ottoman Bey strongholds.

The August 2nd, 1903 Uprising was not limited to Bitola and surrounding Regions but also spread throughout most of Macedonia as well. But in some Districts like the Solun Vilayet (Solun and Seres Revolutionary District) there was no mass participation mainly due to lack of arms and ammunition. The districts were poorly supplied with arms and often fiercely clashed with the pro-Bulgarian Vrhovists (Supremacists) which severely depleted their ammunition and energy. The Solun assassinations too had serious consequences for the Solun Revolutionary District.

The rebel action in the Solun Revolutionary District coincided with that of the Bitola District provoking a number of armed clashes in the Kukush, Enidzhevardar, Voden and Tikvesh Boroughs and spread the rebel force thin. In addition to battling the enemy, the insurgents also employed sabotage tactics using dynamite and blowing up various parts of the railway lines between Solun and Bitola and Solun and Skopje.

The Uprising in the Skopje Revolutionary District unfortunately was also not a mass movement and only fifteen skirmishes took place mainly in

the Kratovo, Kochani, Skopje and Shtip Boroughs and in Maleshevo and Preshevo. Part of the railway line between Skopje and Solun, together with thirty-two railway trucks, was blown up and other acts of sabotage were carried out. The rebel action in the Solun and Skopje Revolutionary Districts forced the Ottoman authorities to maintain a strong military force in these parts of the country and this to some extent eased the situation in the Bitola Revolutionary District, particularly in the beginning of the Uprising.

At the beginning of September, while the Bitola District was already full of Ottoman troops spreading terror throughout the Macedonian villages in their attempt to quell the Uprising, the Seres Revolutionary District held a congress at which it was decided to begin action in this part of Macedonia. The Uprising in this District began on September 27th, 1903 on Krstovden (Holy Cross Day) without the participation of the people. At the congress a commanding body was elected and a plan of action was drawn up.

After considerable negotiations the District Command decided to allow the Supremacist detachments to join the Uprising. Unfortunately the distrust between the revolutionaries of Seres, led by Yane Sandanski, and the Supremacists was so great that closer co-operation was not possible. Sandanski, as one writer put it, "received the supremacist detachments, which were entering an unfamiliar region, not only without warmth and friendliness but also without the courtesy to be expected". One of the detachments had come from Bulgaria wearing Bulgarian military uniforms and the insignia of the Bulgarian army; Sandanski ordered these men to strip off their insignia. Most of them complied but some refused which brought more tension between the two groups.

There were several battles fought in this district – in Nevrokop, in the Melnik region, in Gorna Dzhumaja, Seres, Drama and Demirhisar. The Region actively covered by this Revolutionary Organization also included the Odrin District which did not belong to Macedonia. The uprising in Odrin began on August 19th, 1903 and was met with great success. In addition to the local inhabitants of this District, a number of Macedonians also took part in the Uprising.

The Ottoman authorities were not aware of the starting date of the Uprising, although they were already in possession of information, indicating the likelihood of an uprising in the near future. Ottoman officials in positions of responsibility did not pay sufficient heed to these warnings and did not want to believe that such an explosive situation might occur. This is why the Ilinden Uprising caught them by surprise.

Shortly after the outbreak of the Uprising the Grande Porte (the Ottoman Supreme Command) correctly concluded that the uprising in the Bitola Revolutionary District could only be stamped out with a far larger force than what was locally available at that time. But a fair amount of time would be needed to concentrate such a military force, and, until this

was done, the initiative lay with the rebels who had liberated not only three towns but also great stretches of mountain territory together with many mountain settlements.

Ottoman preparations for a general offensive against the rebels were completed by August 25th, 1903. In addition to equipping the regular army, the Ottomans also armed a great number of Muslim civilians (Bashi-bazouks) in order to assist the military operations.

The primary objective of the Ottoman Command was to take Krushevo. But in spite of all efforts Krushevo still remained in rebel hands despite the fact that Rudzhi Pasha, the Ottoman Commander in Chief, employed fifty thousand Ottoman soldiers.

Dissatisfied with Rudzhi Pasha's performance, the Ottoman government had him removed and appointed Nazir Pasha in his place. At the end of August the Ottoman troops under his command started the general offensive. The difference in strength between Ottoman forces and those of the rebels, in both men and arms, was so vast that it was incalculable. Demirhisar alone was attacked by twenty thousand Ottoman soldiers.

On August 26th, 1903, with the assistance of Karavangelis the Greek Metropolitan in Kostur, the Ottomans set out to crush the uprising in Kostur Region. Over five thousand soldiers were dispatched from inside the city and more were recruited from the surrounding areas and by the start of September the enemy force was numbering over 15,000. Fierce battles broke out everywhere and were fought with ferocity. The bloodiest battles were fought in Grmeshina, Ohrid Region, near a camp where 1,700 women, children and old people were hiding. Unfortunately the rebels were unable to withstand the pressure as the Ottoman soldiers stormed the camp and massacred many of the women and children, leaving 160 dead.

By the second half of October the uprising in the Bitola Revolutionary District, as it was in most of Macedonia, had been brutally crushed and was followed by reprisals and torture. With the Macedonian people, however, these reprisals went far beyond the "normal" bounds and turned into genocide. It is impossible to describe all the horrors that were committed both by the regular army and by the Bashi-bazouks, not just against the insurgents but also against the non-combatant population. Here is what the Serbian envoy to Bitola had to say: "Every conceivable form of torture, murder, hanging, cutting children out of their mothers' wombs and flinging them to the dogs, seizing women and girls, breaking into homes and burning them – all this, I think, is every bit as terrible as the violence and bestiality to which the Ottoman lords and governors resorted, as the book describes, before our first and Second Uprisings..."

He continues: "The facts we have at hand indicate that the plan used in pursuing is not only to crush the uprising, nor to destroy the guerilla detachments – for such as they are they cannot be put down – but to wipe out the entire population that was in hiding..."

Describing the massacre in the village Armensko, Lerin Region, the Austro-Hungarian consul to Bitola wrote: "It is quite impossible to describe in detail the acts of bestiality. Women have had their wombs ripped open, their eyes torn out or their breasts cut off, the heads and bodies of small children have been brutally stabbed with ordinary pocket-knives, infants have been torn apart and flung to the dogs, nineteen women have been hung and three girls savagely butchered."

The well-known von Gaben, then advisor to the Ottoman authorities in Macedonia, alleges that an Ottoman colonel told him: "The rebel detachments fight like the Boers and we should follow the example of the English in putting them down. We shall burn their villages and their estates, and when they no longer have anywhere to hide they will be forced to scatter or give themselves up."

Despite instructions from the insurgent Revolutionary Command to conduct the Uprising along partisan lines, in practice the Uprising took the character of a mass Uprising particularly in the Bitola Revolutionary District. It was a peoples' uprising because the Macedonian masses took part in it, determined to make the highest sacrifices to win their freedom. The Liberation Movement was led by the Macedonian intelligentsia, who mostly belonged to the petite bourgeoisie, but it was the peasant masses that were the striking force behind the Ilinden Uprising. In essence, the Uprising was a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

At the beginning of the Uprising the tactics of the General Staff varied from those of the people who had risen in revolt. The instigators of the Uprising and the General Staff believed that the object should be to force the European states to intervene and oblige the Ottomans to grant autonomy to Macedonia. The people, however, took up arms and set out to fight in order to free themselves and their country by themselves. They liberated several towns and established their own authority, driving Ottoman troops and government organs out, acts which were unplanned and unforeseen by the High Command.

There were undoubtedly several basic reasons for the failure of the Uprising. It was not properly prepared and therefore could not have covered all of Macedonia. Even in the district of Bitola, which was somewhat better equipped, there were not enough arms and those available were extremely primitive. Also it did not take long, after the start of the Uprising, for the Ottomans to realize that the main rebel force was in the district of Bitola and that this was where the bulk of the Ottoman troops should be sent; and this they would certainly not have been able to do if the Uprising had been carried out with the same intensity throughout all of Macedonia.

On the other hand, the Macedonian people were placed in a situation in which they themselves had to fight against the Ottoman Empire. It is well known that the Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians, when fighting against Ottoman rule, won their freedom largely due to the military and diplomatic

aid from foreign powers, chiefly from Tsarist Russia. When the Macedonians rebelled, Tsarist Russia and the other great powers were on the side of the Ottomans and advised the Ottoman Empire to use all its strength to establish “order” in Macedonia. Morally backed by the governments of the Great European Powers, the Sultan was able to mobilize an enormous army with which it overran Macedonia, particularly the district of Bitola, and put a bloody end to the Uprising.

The attitude of the neighbouring Balkan states towards the Ilinden Uprising was also hostile. Since they were interested in partitioning Macedonia, the ruling circles in Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia regarded the Uprising as an act directed against their artificially conceived interests. Hence they were not interested in a victorious outcome for the Macedonian people.

Indeed Greece openly sided with the Sultan. No sooner had the Uprising begun than an Ottoman-Greek front was created to discredit the Uprising in the eyes of Europe. Protest meetings were organized in Greece against the Uprising and aid was offered to the Sultan to crush it. Inside Macedonia the Greek factions consisting of Greek teachers, priests, metropolitans and others began a propaganda campaign to discredit the Uprising and stood in support behind the Ottoman regime. It was precisely this kind of attitude, expounded through Greek propaganda that prompted the Serbian consul in Bitola to write to his government: “There is an aspect of the Krushevo question which stands out clearly, and I mention it with the feeling of great satisfaction which I have as a Slav. For I join the other Slav groups here in their delight that the Krushevo rebels have lasted out longer in their battles against the Ottoman troops than the Greek soldiers did in the last Ottoman-Greek war (1897). My satisfaction is all the greater since the Greeks are growing more and more despicable through their mercenary services to the Ottomans...”

The struggle to win their freedom was, of course, dearly paid for with the loss of many lives. In Macedonia alone nearly 150 villages, or 9,850 homes, were either totally or partially burnt and about 58,000 people were left homeless. Over 2,000 innocent people were killed and about 10,000 people left Macedonia altogether.

The Ilinden Uprising was the most important revolutionary event in the recent history of the Macedonian people right up to the Second World War. It was “a glorious expression of the Macedonian peoples’ desire for freedom”. The Ilinden Uprising was also an epic struggle to create a free and independent Macedonian state which marked a turning-point in the historical development of the Macedonian nation. The traditions inherited from this Uprising will have a powerful influence on future Macedonian generations and on the development of future Macedonian revolutionaries.

Happy Ilinden to all Macedonians worldwide!

And now I leave you with this;

“It was during the eighth century that Slav influence became greatest in Greece. In 746 a great plague breaking out in the near East reached Monemvasia in the Peloponnese, and, from there, spread over the whole Empire. The population of Greece suffered heavily, and was then further reduced by the migration of many skilled workmen to Constantinople; whose families left both the mainland and islands. Empty districts were thus left free to be colonized by Slavs who now pressed southwards in greater numbers than ever. In the words of the imperial historian, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ‘all open country was Slavonized and became barbarous, when the plague was devouring the whole world’. According to W. Miller, this is the real explanation of the Slav colonization of Greece. Whatever be the truth, the Slavs had by now spread widely over the Greek lands. So widespread were their settlements that in the eighth century the southern Balkans lands and mainland Greece were known as ‘Sclavinia’.” (“A Short History of Greece” by W. A. Heurtley, page 20).

Part 32 – Conclusion

My aim in bringing you this book was to show you that the Modern Greeks are not only not “pure Greeks”, as they claim to be, but that they are not even “Greeks” at all. In fact, except for their proportions in various regions, the people in the entire Southern Balkans today are the same people who lived in the Balkans before the new and modern 19th century countries were created. Modern Greece, or Ellas as the Greeks like to call it, is not only not “homogenous” but the people living there are not “Hellenes” at all. The people living in the Southern Balkans today are, in modern terms, predominantly ethnic Albanians, ethnic Vlachs and ethnic Macedonians, the same kind of people (but in different proportions) that live in the Republic of Macedonia and the entire Southern Balkans for that matter. The so-called “Greek ethnic identity” is a 19th century modern phenomenon, artificially created by the 19th century Western Philhellenes.

Think about it, since Philip II conquered the City States in 338 BC there have been no borders in that entire region. The first borders were artificially erected in the 1800’s AD. This means that people for the last 2,100 years freely flowed between regions and in time of war, disease, famine and poverty moved around. In fact there is documented evidence of Byzantine Emperors, on many occasions, moving people from region to region to re-populate depleted regions, a practice that was later continued by the Ottomans.

So if anything is true about the southern Balkan people today it is that they are all of a similar stock which descended from the 19th century Albanians, Macedonians, Vlachs and all other peoples that had settled in that region over the centuries. While the Republic of Macedonia has allowed its people to self declare, Greece has opted to force a fabricated identity on its people, claiming descent from a people that disappeared a long, long time ago.

My problem here, and the Macedonian peoples’ problem in general, is not with what the Greeks do or do not claim to be but with Greek interference in Macedonian affairs! Historically Macedonia and the Macedonian people have never been Greek! In fact if we examine history we will find that the Ancient City States, the region that today constitutes the southern part of Greece, was conquered by the Macedonians. Based on that fact and the fact that those Greeks never freed themselves, we can conclude that today’s Greece belongs to the Macedonians!

That being said, however, the problem we are faced with today is not “historic” but legal. “Do Macedonians have the right to their own heritage or not?” That is, do Macedonians, under international law have the right to self declare, speak their language, identify as Macedonians and call their ancestral homeland Macedonia? This is a legal problem not a historic one.

Clearly I have given enough evidence, if not to prove, at least to place doubt on the authenticity of the Modern Greek identity and again I must

ask; “By what right do Modern Greeks deny the Macedonians their rightful heritage?”

What is more interesting about this is that some “mainstream” historians and academics of today have taken the Greek side knowing full well that the Modern Greek identity is not authentic. This was done to placate Greece either because of their dedication to the “Western cause” or because of indifference to the plight of the Macedonian people. Then for the sake of “political correctness” they allowed the Greeks to go “unchallenged” and to use this “false” history as a weapon against the Macedonians to a point of absurdity, causing the Macedonian people to suffer humiliation and indignity.

Macedonians exist and are alive and well and if modern history and today’s historians cannot accept that, then we must ask the question not “if Macedonians exist” but rather “is science, that prides itself on being factual, actually authentic?” I must also add that if history is truly factual, why have modern historians utilized “Greek myths” in recording the history of Modern Greece and the Modern Greeks, why have they ignored all sources that point to a different kind of Greece?

If historians rely on the Greeks to provide them with information “about the Greeks”, why not offer the Macedonians the same courtesy? Why are people like Professor Miller calling themselves scientists while peddling “pseudo” science? Are there no purists and truth seekers in science any more? Is there no longer anyone in the scientific community that cares?

It is time for those who have taken the “Greek side” to really examine their position. The fact that Greeks are not who they claim to be and the fact that Macedonians exist and are not going anywhere any time soon, should be a wake up call for them. A decision to support the “Greek side” should be based on facts and not on fiction!

There is no doubt that Greeks will attack anyone who challenges their myth but are we expected to sacrifice “science” to feed someone’s dream? And in the case of the Macedonians, are they expected to sacrifice their identity, heritage, history, language, culture and dignity in order to continue to give life to a Greek lie?

Seriously ask yourselves; Who are the Modern Greeks and what gives them the right to interfere in Macedonian affairs?

When I began this book I was hoping to find some Greeks who I could identify as “authentic Greeks” so I asked around: “Show me some authentic Greeks who came from Macedonia?” To my surprise I was shown my own relatives! So then I ask “if not for the ethnic Macedonians, who are the Greeks that so many Greeks claim live in Macedonia?” The more questions I asked the more I was lead to more ethnic Macedonians, more Vlachs, more Albanians and more Christian Turk settlers from Asia Minor. One can ask this question of every Macedonian that comes from Greece and most would say; “Yes I too have relatives who identify as

Greeks!” This then begs the question “who are the ‘authentic’ Greeks?” I haven’t found one yet! That is why I can say with confidence that “Greeks as an authentic ethnic group do not exist”. Modern Greeks are a fabrication of the Philhellene imagination. So then I ask again, what gives these so-called “charlatan Greeks” the right to call themselves Greeks and, least of all, interfere in Macedonian affairs?

While discussing this subject let us not forget that our plea as Macedonians is not about who these Greeks are but rather about basic human rights for those who want to be identified as Macedonians. Let us not forget that buried beneath the rhetoric and denials are the forgotten Macedonians who today are living inside Greece without the least of basic human rights.

If there is indeed anything in this world that needs changing it is Greece’s attitude towards its ethnic minorities living inside Greece on their own native soil.

Greece, it seems, needs “conflict” to keep its people in check. It needs enemies like the Slavs, the Turks, the Bulgars, the communists and now the “Skopians” to keep its people preoccupied and afraid. Greece needs enemies to vilify its own people who stray away from the flock. Without fear Greece is afraid it will “unravel” at the seams while ironically Greece prides itself on not having any seams. This explains Greece’s constant and unwarranted irrational behaviour towards its minorities be it in war or in peace.

The so many former Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs and others who so “easily” accepted the Philhellene indoctrination and became the “willing Greeks” who today are the “leading figures of Greece” can only be explained by the fact that these people don’t care about “who” they are as long as they possess power and wealth. This begs the question; “If they don’t care about their own true identities why should they care about who the Macedonians are?” Naturally they don’t, so this entire issue cannot be about “history” or about “identities”, therefore it must be about power and wealth. Isn’t it always?

Will Greece unravel at its seams if it “de-homogenizes”? Of course not! But all the lies told in the past will be exposed! Those who built influence by barking lies and Greek propaganda will be exposed and will become the fools and laughing stock in the face of their own people. Influential and prominent Greeks can’t afford to have that happen.

Again I must emphasize strongly that I, and most Macedonians in general, have no problem with these people calling themselves Greeks and claiming the ancient Greek heritage but again I do have a problem with people who deny my right and the Macedonian people’s right to be who we are, Macedonians!

Paul wrote:

The United Nations has been largely deceived by this intricate framework of negation. Briefly, because the Macedonian-Greek “talks”

about the name "Macedonia" have the blessing of the UN - the Greek attack on our sovereignty and our rights - have also been given institutional legitimacy in the UN. It is up to the Macedonians to say "the Greek position constitutes an existential threat to our right to exist" – and this should have been done 19 years ago. However, it is never too late to do this. The "illusion" is that the entire UN (world) is against us, when it is actually one or two (possibly three) states. The world and our own people need to realize this.

If one can accept that the Greek position is an attack on our State and our right to exist - the rest should be easy (one would think).

Rejecting the Greek position, on that basis, is simply a matter of taking a principled stand. Of saying 'No' to Greece because Greek terms violate our sovereignty, our self determination, and right to exist, as we are.

The World knows that the Greek position violates our rights. Our rights are enshrined in every international law, charter and treaty. We only need to ASK that our rights be respected, as we respect the rights of others. We cannot be held hostage for that, and we will free ourselves. Our enemies are few - and there is of course the rest of the world, we can embrace.

The problem for us is that our Macedonian leadership right now is inexperienced, and possibly fearful of the political damage Greece could do. I have analyzed the conditions very carefully and there is nothing more Greece can do - politically, or economically, they have not already done. If they are concerned about the term F.Y.R.O.M, they should not be. The UN has violated its own charters before, only to see the error of its ways later. These cases are well known. In any case, there are many strategies the Macedonians can use to change the term F.Y.R.O.M, which is a concern to be sure, but not something to panic about.

On the issue of "name talks". This is a euphemism. It hides the fact that the Greek position constitutes an existential threat to our State, our people and our history. There are many handbooks out there, many sophisticated works that chart ways in which elites and political actors can create, manipulate, and even dismantle the identities of ethnic groups, States and nations. (Agulhon 1981, Beaune, 1991, Corse 1996, Hobsbaum 1992). The Macedonians have given the Greek attack some legitimacy, which gives our enemies the advantage over us (even though they are few). By rejecting the Greek attack, on principled legal grounds - there is nothing more Greece can do, but change its position, or stay in limbo forever, while the little Macedonian Republic prospers, exponentially. This is why we should reject the "talks".

If, and it is a big if, the Macedonian leadership is going to be discussing anything - the first rule is it should not be one on one, with the Greeks. What the Macedonian leadership should do (they have an opportunity to do this at any time), is raise a very serious issue at the UN. The Macedonians (with the help of a sponsor), should raise the issue that

the Greek position constitutes a direct attack to the Macedonian sovereignty and its right to self determination - that issue should then be put to a vote and a UN resolution. You see what I am driving at here. These "talks" have the institutional backing of the UN and the European Union (thanks to the Macedonian government) - the Greek attack has institutional backing in these institutions, because of the "talks". But Macedonia is a sovereign state, and can decide on its own. The Macedonians then have an option. They can if they chose, pass a resolution on the floor of the UN that the Greek position constitutes a direct threat to the sovereignty and right of self determination of the Macedonian people. It would be a legal position, not a historical one. On a related matter, that is why I have said that for there to be peace Greece needs to change, not Macedonia. Our minorities have their human and cultural rights - ethnic groups of Greece do not. Macedonian democracy embraces diversity, Greece is still deceiving people that it is "pure". Whether the Greek position actually constitutes an attack on our sovereignty and our rights should be (in my opinion) the ONLY thing they should be discussing, and ONLY on the floor of the UN.

This business about negotiating our Macedonian Nationality, as though it were a bargaining chip in a poker game, is deadly for us. There is a way out. I have outlined it above. I just hope we see the light.”

By Paul from www.maknews.com/forum

And now I leave you with this;

A few weeks ago a friend gave me some very interesting news which may prove why Greece behaves irrationally towards the Macedonians.

He said that in the Turkish archives exists secret information of a Great Power agreement that states that “if one of the parts of divided Macedonia becomes independent all of Macedonia is to be reunited”. Turkey wanted to open these archives to the Republic of Macedonia but due to objections from the “Western Powers” that information is still locked up in the archives.

This information is still at the rumour stage and could be fact or fiction, but like I said if it is fact it certainly explains Greece’s erratic behaviour. It also opens new possibilities for the Macedonian people. It is definitely worth further investigation.

If anyone out there has more information, please write me.