On Macedonian Matters

From the Partition and Annexation of Macedonia in 1913 to the Present

A Collection of Essays on Language, Culture and History

Edited by Jim Hlavac and Victor Friedman

SLCCEE

SLCCEE

Studies on Language and Culture
in Central and Eastern Europe

Edited by
Christian Voß

Band 24

On Macedonian Matters

From the Partition and Annexation of Macedonia in 1913 to the Present

A Collection of Essays on Language, Culture and History

Edited by

Jim Hlavac and Victor Friedman

SLCCEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pre-modern and Modern Macedonia
Social Theory, Politics and Law

Acknowledgements

Introduction

Victor Friedman & Jim Hlavac

As with the names of almost all of Europe's modern nation states, the territory covered by the term *Macedonia* has shifted considerably over the course of the centuries and millennia. By the late nineteenth century, however, the name was being used more or less consistently for the Ottoman territory defined geographically by a series of mountain ranges connecting the Pindus, Shar, and Osogovo mountains on the southeast, northeast, and northwest, respectively, down to the lower course of the river Mesta on the southwest, a definition more or less corresponding to that used by Strabo more than two millennia ago (cf. Wilkinson, 1951: 3). With the exceptions of Europe's city-states (Monaco, San Marino, Vatican) and Norway, Sweden, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, and Lichtenstein, the territory of every modern nation-state of continental Europe north and east of the Pyrenees experienced one or more changes in its boundaries between 1908 (the annexation of Bosnia-Hercegovina by Austria-Hungary) and 1923 (the settlement of the Greco-Turkish War). While many boundaries were set at the end of World War One – some of them in place a century later, albeit all of them having experienced vicissitudes – in the case of Macedonia, the Treaty of Bucharest of 10 August 1913 was the more or less definitive territorial partition and annexation by the neighbouring states of the time. With the exception of the fate of the Strumica Valley and a few other details, the boundaries drawn in 1913, remain the boundaries a century later, although the portion assigned to Serbia is now the independent Republic of Macedonia. It was on the hundredth anniversary of this historical moment that Monash University, with support from the Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee (AMHRC), held a conference in Melbourne at which an international cadre of scholars discussed the effects of this partition on the history, cultures, and languages of the region. This book, consisting of fifteen peer-reviewed chapters, is the result of those discussions.[1]

The main title of this book, 'On Macedonian Matters' invokes the title of Krste Misirkov's book *Za makedonckite raboti* ('On Macedonian Matters'), published in Sofia in 1903, which argued for an independent Macedonia, with a distinct Macedonian literary language, whose principles he outlined. The present book also has a strong focus on language with contributions from five linguists. Misirkov's dream of an independent Macedonia was shattered by its partition,

---

[1] The conference –'International Scholarly Conference on the Partition of Macedonia and the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913' – was held 4–7 September 2013 at Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

and discussion on Macedonia here also focuses on the social, political, cultural, national and military circumstances of that partition and its aftermath from a variety of additional perspectives: historical, political, socio-cultural, legal and philosophical.

Our attention turns first to history in Andrew Rossos's paper, entitled 'The Balkan Wars (1912–13) and the partition of Macedonia: a historical perspective'. Rossos's paper provides us with an examination of the roles, interests and actions of the great European powers at the time, and of the neighbouring countries that made up the Balkan League (Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro, Serbia), which entered into combat with the Ottoman Empire. Drawing on a vast range of primary sources from Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Greece, Macedonia, Russia, Serbia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, Rossos examines the question of Macedonia, its importance in the creation of the Balkan Alliance in 1912, and the collapse of the Balkan system of alliances which made the Second Balkan War in 1913 unavoidable. Rossos concludes that partition failed to settle the so-called Macedonian question, either as a Balkan and European political problem, or as a Macedonian national problem. This conclusion is evidenced both by the blockade that Bulgaria and Greece continue to uphold in disputing the rights of Macedonians: Bulgaria continues to deny the existence of a Macedonian identity, a Macedonian nation, and a Macedonian minority in Bulgaria, while Greece denies the right of the Republic of Macedonia to use its constitutional name, the existence of a Macedonian identity, nation, and language, and the existence of a national minority in Aegean Macedonia. Rossos, on the basis of past and present problems, calls for a historical accommodation between Macedonians and their neighbours, which includes an unconditional acceptance by Macedonia's neighbours of the existence of the Macedonian identity, nation, state and external minorities. He concludes with the reminder that a denial of Macedonian identity and the Macedonian people one hundred years ago did little to solve the Macedonian problem then, and a continual denial to do so now does nothing to solve the current Macedonian problem.

A second paper with an exclusively historical approach is that of Dalibor Jovanovski entitled 'Greek historiography and the Balkan Wars – in the interest of the nation'. Jovanovski addresses four points: the conclusion of an alliance amongst the Christian states of the Balkans in 1912; military operations during the First and Second Balkan Wars; the consequences of both wars; and the place of Macedonians in the works of Greek historians. Jovanovski describes how Greek historians have portrayed the 'danger' from the north and the mistrust that Greece has had towards Slavic speakers and how these were both sidelined in the formation of the Balkan Alliance as Greece knew that alone, it could not defeat the Ottoman armies to realise its plans for territorial expansion. The entry of

Greek troops into Solun/Thessaloniki is celebrated in Greece as an event that marked the 'liberation' of not only the city, but of Macedonia as well. Jovanovski traces the entry of Greek troops into Solun/Thessaloniki (whose inhabitants were predominantly Jewish, not Muslim or Christian) in October 1912, but also the entry of detachments of the Macedonian freedom fighter, Yane Sandanski, *before* that of the Greek troops. Two Bulgarian battalions entered the city soon after the arrival of Greek forces, and Jovanovski researches the role of retreating Ottoman forces in possibly facilitating a Greek, rather than Bulgarian, seizure of Solun/Thessaloniki. This remains a documented, but little-known event in Greek historiography foregrounding the capture of the city by Greek troops. The outcome of the First Balkan War is seen in Greece as a fulfilment of the irredentist project of the *Megali Idea*, with the gaining of not only Aegean Macedonia, but also Epirus and the Aegean islands, resulting in a doubling of Greece's territory and population. Jovanovski also cites Greek historical sources which show concerns about Greece's social and economic development. The fate of the civilian population, and of non-Greek populations, is rarely mentioned in Greek historical accounts, although Jovanovski is able to cite Greek historians such as, Helen Gardikas-Katsiadakis (2006), who have drawn attention to the apparently uncontrolled and wanton use of violence perpetrated against civilians on the basis of their ethnic affiliations. Jovanovski quotes a handful of other Greek historians who, usually with delegitimising reservations, refer to the Macedonians of northern Greece. Official Greek policies in regard to Macedonia have resulted in little space and little desire for Greek historians to research this topic in a way that differs from the official line. Jovanovski concludes by citing the historian, Basil Gounaris, who admits that Greek historical versions of the Macedonian issue are heavily subject to political influences.

In his paper 'The Scholar and the State: Evangelos Kofos on the International Recognition of the Republic of Macedonia', Loring Danforth provides an anthropological critique of the work of Evangelos Kofos, a key player as one of the most articulate and prolific advocates of the pan-Hellenic narrative that Macedonia is exclusively Greek. Danforth examines the relationship between scholarship and politics, and in particular focuses on the methodological premises that Kofos employs in his writings and the question of whether these meet academic standards of objectivity. Danforth presents a range of examples from Kofos's writing and his proposals for the re-naming of the Republic of Macedonia. Danforth reports that Kofos, as well as other Greek nationalists, are guilty of 'privileging the double standard' in their writing on Macedonia. This includes the employment of particular arguments in a selective manner so that they apply only against Macedonians and the Republic of Macedonia. Danforth explores the claim of "who is attempting to monopolise the

name *Macedonia*" and finds that it is not Macedonians and the Republic of Macedonia that are claiming exclusive use or control of the term *Macedonia*, but Greek nationalists such as Kofos. Danforth concludes with an anthropologically informed evaluation of the Greek nationalist position and with a suggestion for an appropriate solution.

Our attention turns next to three papers that examine the events and the consequences of the Balkan wars which include partition, population expulsions and exchanges, and their social and socio-political consequences. In a paper entitled 'How trauma travels: oral history's means and ends' Keith Brown refers to an important source from the time, the report of the Carnegie Commission on the Balkan Wars, prepared and published in May 1914 shortly after the partition of Macedonia. The Carnegie Commission documented the atrocities committed by Balkan League troops in Macedonia. This report bears witness to the local-level horrors of war. Brown draws on vivid descriptions provided by eye witnesses – refugees, officials, priests and school teachers – of killings that occurred after the Greek seizure of the town of Kukuš (Gk. Kilkis), of the massacre of refugees in Akangeli (Gk. Mouries) in July 1913, and of the execution of prisoners by Greek paramilitaries in the city of Seres (Gk. Serres). Brown locates an almost activist approach in the work of the Carnegie Commission authors, who report a "collective national consciousness of greater crimes than history has ever recorded" (Kennan, 1993: 269). Brown draws parallels between these accounts and oral histories collected from Macedonians and Greeks from Aegean Macedonia who, as children during the Greek Civil War, were evacuated to other countries, often never to see their families and places of birth again. Brown draws on Danforth & Van Boeschoten's (2012) fieldwork among surviving child refugees as an example of documentation that seeks to be less damning in reproaching the perpetrators, "serv[ing] the ends of reconciliation and healing, rather than factionalisation and division" (Danforth & Van Boeschoten, 2012: 294). Brown juxtaposes these accounts with perspectives of Holocaust survivors, some of whom advocate a community of on-going memory, others a more 'future-focussed', pragmatist stance. Brown also applies cultural theorist Aleida Assman's (2011) modes of dealing with trauma and supports her notions of "remembering in order to overcome" and "dialogic remembering". Brown alludes to recent (2013) actions by the British in acknowledging their torture of Kenyans as ones which can apprehend people's pain from past grievances. However, as Brown also informs us, the accounts of crimes committed by the Greek military and their auxiliaries in the Balkan wars are almost unknown, and remain undiscussed in Greece and Bulgaria. No Greek translation of the report of the Carnegie Commission exists. A Bulgarian one was not published until 1995.

In a paper that continues the theme of 'unreal projections' of national statehood and territory, Akis Gavriilidis, in his contribution entitled 'On the Second Life of Institutions: The Ghost-State of Pontus in Macedonia' documents references to the Republic of Macedonia, Macedonian ethnicity and the Macedonian language, in daily newspapers, television news footage, and in the discourse of residents of Solun (Gk. Thessaloniki) and elsewhere in northern Greece. The official line is that the Republic of Macedonia is a 'no-man's land'. The official line is that there is no Macedonian language. So when Pope John Paul II extends Easter blessings in Macedonian, the newspaper *Makedonia* reports that this is a provocation in that the Pope has used the non-existent language of Skopje. Gavriilidis then focuses on a group of people who form a substantial body of the population of northern Greece – refugees from the Black Sea and their descendants. These people came to Greece as a result of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne population exchange between Greece and Turkey, which witnessed the arrival of 1.2 million Greek and Armenian Orthodox Christians. Their presence in eastern and central Aegean Macedonia is particularly strong, owing to Greek government policies. The dreams that the Pontians had for their own homeland, from which they were now displaced, and the intentions of the Greek Government to Hellenise northern Greece coalesced in a particular way. According to Gavriilidis these perhaps disparate intentions coalesced into a common goal which would form a sub-narrative of Greek historiography of Macedonia: the tacit encouragement for Pontians to view their new homeland as a transposed version of their old one, with the added attribute of Greek statehood. Gavriilidis contends that the absorption of the refugees from Asia Minor has occurred as a relatively inconspicuous phenomenon, at least in Greek accounts of Macedonia's history, perhaps for two reasons. First, the narrative of Greek historiography of Macedonia is based on an essentially 'timeless' and 'eternal' Hellenic Macedonia. Therefore, drawing attention to the fact that a very large number of the 'Hellenes' in northern Greece are, in fact, recent arrivals from Asia Minor, with unfamiliar traditions and with a language vastly different from Modern Greek would call into question the supposed timeless and eternal Hellenic nature of northern Greece. Second, Pontians in Aegean Macedonia were supportive of the establishment of Greek statehood in Aegean Macedonia, both as an expression of their own Hellenic heritage, and in a local sense, as an embodiment of statehood in which they could be key protagonists. As Gavriilidis puts it, the Pontians could claim to have created their own *substitute Pontic state in Greek Macedonia* knowing that the establishment of such a state in their original homeland was an impossibility.

The impact of trauma is a key theme in Pandora Petrovska's paper 'Recalibrating the past: using narrative and language education'. Petrovska

locates trans-generational trauma – the repression of horrific events, grieving for lost family members, the indignation of land confiscated and livelihoods destroyed – as a characteristic of the lives of many Macedonians who left northern Greece for Australia before World War Two. In a new country, Macedonians were able to use their own names, practise their own customs and speak their own language – and even open schools for the formal teaching of Macedonian to Australian-born children and elderly migrants who wished to gain literacy in their first language. These achievements were made possible by a host country which initially only tolerated, but later celebrated the diversity of all citizens, within the auspices of a national policy of multiculturalism that had been in place since the mid-1970s. For Macedonians in Australia, therefore, it came as a shock and an unpleasant reminder of what they had encountered in Greece and Bulgaria, that they were the target of an official directive by the Australian Federal Government in 1994, in which they were to be referred to as 'Slav-Macedonians'. In the state of Victoria, their language was renamed 'Macedonian (Slavonic)'. These actions were the result of lobbying by members of the more numerous Greek-Australian community. Teachers of Macedonian, and human rights activists, were finally successful in having these imposed designations removed but it was not until early 2001 that the Slavonic suffix was finally withdrawn. For Australia, pandering to the chauvinist contentions of one ethnic group and arbitrarily re-naming another marked a low-point of social policy. These events rekindled dark memories of arbitrary decisions, victimisation and helplessness. Petrovska documents the means by which she and others sought to ameliorate the trauma imposed by Greeks via the Australian government – through therapy (and activism). The symptoms diagnosed amongst survivors of torture are shared in many of the personal and group biographies that Petrovska provides. Petrovska concludes on a positive note of the tenacity and resilience of Australia's Macedonians.

A characteristic of pre-partitioned Macedonia was a diversity of national groups, faiths and languages. The following five papers provide perspectives on this last feature, language, and provide discussion on multilingualism, the codification of standard languages, the Macedonian language and other languages of the Balkan peninsula, language planning policies and maintenance of the Macedonian language outside Macedonia.

Victor Friedman examines multilingualism in Macedonia in his paper, 'The effects of the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest on the languages spoken in Macedonia'. Among the languages spoken in the Ottoman vilayets of Selânik (Solun/Salonika), Monastir (Bitola) and Kosova or Üsküp (Skopje) just before the outbreak of the Balkan wars were Macedonian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Albanian, Greek, Aromanian, Meglenoromanian, Turkish, Judezmo, Romani, Armenian and

Circassian. Large segments of the population across the Macedonian vilayets were bi- or multilingual. These social conditions were amenable to cross-linguistic influence among these languages that resulted in many structural similarities that are now shared amongst the languages of the southern Balkans, forming what linguists call the *Balkan Sprachbund*. Within the Macedonian linguistic area, a prominent feature is the presence and value of multilingualism. This is a legacy of Macedonia's pre-partition history. To demonstrate this, Friedman discusses folk music, folk tales and locally produced dictionaries. Folkloric texts from the nineteenth century, as Friedman reminds us, were one of the cornerstones of nation-building. Hybridity, including the hybridity of multilingualism, is "antithetical to the 'purity' that was instrumental in the nation-building projects that grew out of the Enlightenment." In contrast to folklore collectors in other countries that typically privileged a single national narrative, collectors in Macedonia provided the folklore of the multiple languages spoken in Macedonia, as well as tales that involved more than one language in a single tale, thus indexing the role of multilingualism in Macedonia's distinct identity. The effects of the Balkan wars and partition in 1913 on this landscape were disastrous as they attempted to eliminate both Macedonian and multilingualism. Friedman describes an increasingly homogenised linguistic landscape with the nation states of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and inter-war Yugoslavia imposing monolingual policies with laws and punitive measures taken against minority-language speakers. In post-WWII Yugoslavia, and in the SR of Macedonia, the codification and introduction of Macedonian as an official language was not accompanied by policies proscribing the use of other languages. Friedman concludes that "the Republic of Macedonia instantiates the proclaimed multilingual values of the European Union more consistently and effectively than the current EU members [Bulgaria and Greece] to which parts of Macedonia were assigned a century ago."

The second paper with a linguistic theme is Peter Hill's 'The development of the Macedonian literary language in the nineteenth and early twentieth century and the codification and elaboration of the Macedonian standard language under the conditions of partition'. Hill provides an overview of the history of Standard Macedonian with added reference to contemporary developments in both homeland and émigré Macedonian. He places this description in the context of how modern languages are codified and standardised, with references to the standard theoretical literature. Seen in this light, the development of Modern Standard Macedonian is like that of many other European languages, including all the standard languages of the Balkans. In fact, we can note in passing that while the Modern Macedonian standard achieved its current shape in 1944, the Modern Albanian standard was not unified until 1972, while the Modern Greek

standard suffered from diglossia until 1976. The demise of 'Serbo-Croatian', along with the break-up of the former Yugoslavia, is even more recent. Hill identifies the socio-political circumstances under which the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, as a constituent republic of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, was the only area of Macedonia in which codification of Macedonian could occur as a key factor in accounting for the models that were often adopted from Serbian. We can note, however, that in 1903, Krste Misirkov, who was from Postol (Gk. Pella) in Aegean Macedonia, advocated the adoption of precisely the same west-central dialects of what became the Republic of Macedonia as those that did in fact serve as the basis of the standard. Some Aegean Macedonians were aggrieved that, in the first place, the teaching of Macedonian and the development of a local literary tradition was not permitted in the areas of northern Greece that they inhabit(ed), and that the decisions made by the codifiers of standard Macedonian reflected primarily the linguistic norms of that part of Macedonia that was then part of Yugoslavia. Hill also reports on his experiences as a university lecturer who co-taught the Macedonian Studies program at Macquarie University, Sydney. He reports the reluctance of some older Aegean Macedonians in the 1980s to support their children's decision to study standard Macedonian at university level, partly for political reasons (as a language codified in then communist Yugoslavia), partly for the choices made in codification (as a language that in some cases was or appeared to be influenced by Serbian models). Hill notes that since the independence of the Republic of Macedonia, Aegean Macedonians living in Australia have largely embraced the Macedonian Standard Language as "their" language, while he notes that those who reside in areas of northern Greece adjoining the Republic, to a considerable degree, also now identify with it. Hill locates macro-political events as the key features responsible for the circumstances in which the standardisation of Macedonian was completed.

Linguistic human rights and practices of linguicism – ideologies that effectuate an unequal division of power and resources between groups defined on the basis of language – are the focus of Grace Fielder's paper entitled, 'Partition, Linguistic Identity and Language Standardization'. Examining the use of discourse markers *ama* and *ami,* which can be variously translated as 'but, well, you don't say, you're kidding, etc.', Fielder locates how these forms are used in the central geolinguistic zones of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, namely Bulgarian, Macedonian and Greek, and in zones peripheral to these in this respect, viz. Albanian, Turkish, Bosnian, Serbian, Romanian and Croatian. Fielder employs Coupland's (2003) notions of 'establishment authenticities' and 'vernacular authenticities' and posits that Greek displays the most 'establishment' values, Macedonian the most 'vernacular' values while Bulgarian occupies an in-

between position, reflective of the chronology of the development of the modern standard for each language. In her analysis, Fielder shows how typically vernacular forms, such as discursive particles, bear witness to the heteroglossic character of speakers' repertoires, counter to the often purist narratives that condemn the use of 'inappropriate' forms. The partition of Macedonia in 1913 brought about the suppression of long-standing, heteroglossic and often multilingual repertoires, but not their complete disappearance. Using the tools of sociolinguistic and ethnographic research, Fielder reports that the influx of Macedonian-speakers from Aegean and Vardar Macedonia to Sofia after the partition of Macedonia led to the emergence of a distinct western variant in the city's linguistic landscape that marked these speakers as migrants. Decades of establishment policies in Bulgaria (and Sofia) have not resulted in the elimination of this migrant-marked speech. The linguistic legacy of Macedonians, although officially non-prestige and marginalised, continues to live on in Sofia, 100 years after their departure from Macedonia.

Christina Kramer's paper, 'Partitioning Language Policy and Status Planning in Macedonia', also draws on descriptive studies of language planning, and focuses on status planning – the functions assigned to a language in public and private domains. This is a sub-discipline of language planning congruent to corpus planning, which is the focus of Peter Hill's paper. Kramer reminds us that macro-political circumstances determine the status of a language, i.e., the socio-political ideology of a state will determine whether it privileges only one language for all functions or allows or supports the use of two or more languages for all or some particular function. An important function in this respect is the language of education – not only for the key role that it plays as a medium with which schoolchildren have regular and on-going contact, but also for the status that such a language occupies as the basis of being one in which young citizens are instructed. Drawing on regulations that proclaim the state policy on language use, and in particular, the rights of linguistic minorities to receive instruction in their own language, Kramer focuses on status planning of the language(s) of education in those countries which have Macedonian-speaking populations: Bulgaria, Albania, Greece and post-WWII Yugoslavia and the SR Macedonia within it. In Bulgaria, the national policy of denying Macedonian identity means that Macedonians are not classified as a national minority in the way that Turks or Roms are, and school instruction in Macedonian is not provided (although it was provided from 1946 to 1948, while Bulgaria recognised a Macedonian minority). In the case of Albania, Macedonian has been taught through to grade four in primary schools in the Prespa region. In Greece, education has been used as an effective tool of ethnic and linguistic assimilation. Macedonian has remained an unrecognised and even proscribed language in Greece, with only

some notable exceptions. One of these exceptions was the publication of a primer for mother-tongue primary education in Aegean Macedonia in 1925, but it was never used. There were small scale attempts to establish schooling in Macedonian towards the end of WWII in northern Greece, and in those areas controlled by the National Liberation Front during the Greek Civil War. Since then, Greece has maintained a policy of intransigence in denying not only the existence of a Macedonian language, but also Macedonian ethnicity and national culture. The consequences of this are evident in the shift to Greek in the personal domains of Macedonians in Greece, with young people's use and proficiency in the language now receding.

The fate of Macedonian in a transposed setting is also the topic of Jim Hlavac's paper entitled 'Partition without fragmentation: a cross-perspective analysis of Macedonian language maintenance in Australia'. His paper presents sociolinguistic data from three generations of Macedonian-speakers in Australia – first-generation speakers (those born in Macedonia), second-generation speakers (those born in Australia) and third-generation speakers (those whose grandparents were born in Macedonia). Macedonian is the 'best maintained' European language in Australia, referring to the percentage of first-generation speakers – approx. 86% – who report that they use it as their 'home language' in response to questions for census collections. Ninety-eight informants from all three generations, and from both Aegean Macedonia and the Republic of Macedonia, provided responses to questions about their language choice(-s) in the following domains: home/family; friendship and religion; workplace and neighbourhood. In addition, data on language attitudes were also elicited. One of the reasons for the 'robustness' of Macedonian in Melbourne is the post-migration replication of Macedonian-language communicative networks within speakers' families, in the friendship/social network domain, the work domain, and, to a lesser extent, also the neighbourhood domain. Amongst all second generation informants, exposure to Macedonian is medium to high. A noticeable difference pertains to the reporting of monolingual vs. mixed codes. Macedonian is spoken widely, more so than emblematic switching, in social networks, the workplace and religious domains, but less so in the neighbourhood. Whilst these domains are not 'monolingually Macedonian', the continued use of Macedonian in these domains account for not only the comparatively high level language maintenance levels according to census collections, but also self-reported proficiency in Macedonian amongst second generation members. Third generation informants rely on their grandparents as linguistic models. Use of Macedonian in other domains such as friendship, workplace and neighbourhood appears to rest on family acquisition of the minority language, where its use is likely to be at least partly emblematic. Hlavac concludes that fragmentation is not ascertainable amongst this sample of

migrants and their (grand-)children from the two main source countries of Macedonians in Melbourne: Greece and the Republic of Macedonia.

The four remaining papers deal with themes from pre-modern and modern Macedonia and have social theoretical, political and/or legal perspectives.

In his paper 'The partition of Macedonia and international law', Vasko Nastevski approaches the division of Macedonia at the time of the Balkan wars from the viewpoint of the legal justifications employed by the countries of the Balkan Alliance (Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia) and the legitimisation of the partition of Macedonia through international treaty. Nastevski describes the events and conduct of the respective states of the Balkan Alliance, and those of their parallel European Power sponsors, and identifies the contradictory pretexts employed to seize as large a part of Macedonia as possible: pretexts based on the Clausewitzian concept of war that views it as part of the continuation of politics by other means and the Grotius notion that recourse to war should be based on just causes. At the same time, the respective nationalist agendas of the Christian Balkan states, and the ambitions of the Great European powers towards that Ottoman territory remaining in Europe indicate that there were political relationships at play that advanced the possibility of war as a 'necessary strategy'. The centuries of rule by the Muslim Ottomans formed the basis for the claim of a 'just war' in order to achieve the 'liberation' of Christian subjects in Macedonia. While this doctrine was amenable to the narratives of Balkan nationalisms, the nature of the Balkan wars was characteristic of a Clausewitzian concept of war. Nastevski then discusses the notion of *jus in bello* ('law in war') and draws on the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, to which Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro and Serbia were signatories. The Carnegie Endowment Report from 1914 outlines violations of the Conventions by all sides. Accounts are drawn on from Greek soldiers themselves as to their actions: "We are to burn the villages, massacre the young, and spare none but the old people, children and minors". The principle of *uti possidetis* ('as you possess') has been invoked throughout history as a guiding standard in the determination of boundaries for emerging new states. It relates to a doctrine that old administrative boundaries will become international boundaries when a political subdivision achieves independence. In practice, the Balkan Alliance chose to resolve the issue around boundaries *de novo* – boundary-drawing occurred on the basis of acquisition of territory. Unsurprisingly, international law has generally reflected a preference to acknowledge rights over territory where there is actual physical control over property. Nastevski concludes that the military actions of the Balkan Alliance in seizing and partitioning Macedonia and subjecting its population to a regime of subjugation are characteristic of the Clausewitzian strategy, notwithstanding the Alliance's invocations of *jus ad bellum*. Whilst the Macedonian Christian

population may have yearned for an end to Ottoman rule, what they encountered from 1912 onwards was continued subjugation through Bulgarian, Greek or Serbian occupation. Later, not even in the Wilsonian concept of national self-determination provided the Macedonian population with any succour, as their legitimate claims were left ignored by the Great European Powers of the time and in succeeding years.

George Vlahov's paper, 'A survey of the 'Macedonian Question' in relation to Greek nationalism', traces the use of the name 'Macedonia' from a sociological perspective, with reference to ancient history and the problems of applying attributes of modern nation states and the modern concept of nationality, which is a product of national romanticism that arose in Europe only in the 18th century. Vlahov locates sources from ancient history in which 'Hellenes' and 'Macedonians' are presented as contrasting and complimentary groups, rather than the latter group being a sub-set of the former, which is the official line of Greek nationalism. Vlahov examines socio-political attributes of the populace that inhabited the area of today's (and Strabo's, see above) geographic Macedonia and the influences on a changing populace. These changes included Hellenisation, annexation as a Roman province, the establishment of the Eastern Roman Empire, the arrival of the Slavs (as well as the presence of other groups such as Albanians, Vlahs, and Jews), Ottoman rule, the competing national projects of newly independent Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia in the nineteenth century, and the growth of a Macedonian national identity also in the nineteenth century. Vlahov then turns to the partition of Macedonia in 1913 and its consequences for Macedonians in northern Greece/Aegean Macedonia, drawing on Greek and non-Greek scholars who report on coerced emigration, internal exile and deportations to which Macedonians in northern Greece were subjected. In actions that would today be called *ethnic cleansing,* the Greek state not only displaced populations, but also switched place names, relabelled churches and schools and renamed people's religious affiliations and linguistic repertoires. Such policies were pursued by successive Greek administrations. Vlahov also reports on the negative political, economic and social effects that the Greek blockade of the Republic of Macedonia had not just on the country itself, but on the whole Balkan region when the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia broke up and Macedonia declared independence in 1991. Both Brussels and Washington have been lacking in the political will to confront Greece's policy of intransigence. The intransigence, which was ostensibly to be addressed by the UN 'Interim Accord', has proven an effective diplomatic weapon. Even after being found guilty of violating the Accord's terms by the International Court of Justice in December, 2011, Greece continues to pursue its intransigent policy, for

which few Western politicians and diplomats have sympathy but against which none have the will to stand up.

Katerina Kolozova's paper addresses the metaphysical nature of virtual, transposed and re-created homelands in the Republic of Macedonia itself in her paper entitled 'Beyond identity: an impossible place'. In the Republic of Macedonia, ordinary citizens can be confronted with questions as to the legitimacy of their nationality, culture, ethnicity, language, citizenship and even their first and family names as soon as they pass, or try to pass, a border crossing. Kolozova surveys public and private discourse in the Republic of Macedonia that reflects on the tacit and explicit pressure that EU representatives exert on Macedonian officials with regard to the so-called name issue. The EU has, in this matter, demonstrated that if one member-state adopts a retrograde, discriminatory policy against a non-EU country, all other EU members are bound, by the principle of unanimity and solidarity, to uphold the same retrograde, discriminatory policy. Kolozova spells out the demand that has been put to Macedonians by some EU representatives that they need "only to change the name of the nation, the language and the adjectives referring to their culture and heritage, but they need *not* change their identity". Kolozova draws on the work of Judith Butler and Jacques Lacan and states that the erasing of a social category discursively implies its annulment as a reality, rendering it 'unreal'. This evokes not only mirthful and ironic exchanges between people in Macedonia about whether "their national identity is part of their 'true identity'… and whether they need an identity". It is without precedent that any group, in Europe or elsewhere, has been subjected to intense and high-level pressure to change its name, the name of its country, language and ethnicity. We are reminded of Todorova's (1997) critique of the western Europe's 'balkanisation' of the Balkans, that is, the projection of a phantasm in which Western Europe is utopia and the Balkans a kind of dystopia. A paradox of this approach, as Kolozova points out, is that the EU's so-called 'cultural sensitivity' to Greece's demands is far more irrational than the 'Balkan irrationality' that it aims to counter.

Vasko Nastevski's second contribution, 'A legacy of the partition of Macedonia and international human rights law', examines the provisions of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (ICCPR)*,* a UN binding document first signed in 1966, and the work of the UN Human Rights Committee in reference to the respect of human rights for minorities in Greece, after Greece ratified and acceded to the ICCPR in 1997. Nastevski also presents findings from other organisations, e.g., Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the Organisation/Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, the Danish Helsinki Committee and Minority Rights Group-Greece. Nastevski's paper systematically documents

human rights abuses that Macedonians in Greece are subjected to and the relevant international or European regulations that prohibit such abuses. These include minority language education (cf. the 1960 UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education, which Greece has not ratified), freedom of thought, conscience and religion and freedom of cultural expression (cf. the 1953 *European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*), and discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin or membership of a national minority (cf. 2000 *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*), as well as Greek legislation that expressly prohibits the return of those who left Greece during the Greek Civil War who are not Greek by 'race' (Gk. *genos*) (v. 1983 Ministerial Decree No. 106841 with passages to the stipulations of Law No. 400/76). Nastevski concludes that these persistent human rights abuses against Macedonians living in Greece are manifestations of the Greek nationalist narrative, from the time of the Balkan wars, which still holds that there are no ethnic Macedonians, but only Greeks in northern Greece. Nastevski also observes that despite frequent and prominent reports of human rights abuses in Greece, today's great powers – various member states of the EU and NATO – are reluctant to enforce these human rights standards. This state of affairs is inconsistent with the monitoring of minorities and human rights abuses in candidate countries to the EU (or NATO).

In conclusion, we return to the title of this book, which raises the question of how important events can or should be marked, a century later. In 2013 in the Republic of Macedonia itself, the 100-year anniversary of Macedonia's partition was marked with a number of manifestations, including scholarly conferences held in Skopje and Ohrid. The partition of Macedonia in 1913, which changed the lives of all Macedonians then and the lives of future generations of Macedonians, was marked in a sober and subdued way, with the Prime Minister, Nikola Gruevski, addressing the conference with a reminder of injustices committed in the past and in the present. He drew a parallel between the Treaty of Bucharest of 1913 and the Bucharest NATO summit of 2008 at which the Republic of Macedonia remained sidelined and marginalised, due to the blockade policies of Greece.

In Greece, the state that gained the largest part of Macedonia's partitioned territories, the 100th anniversary of this event was marked with celebrations. In Solun/Thessaloniki, festive events were organised in October 2012 to mark 100 years since the "liberation" of Thessaloniki. These included a military parade in the main streets and some cultural and artistic events, sponsored by public authorities. But there is little evidence that a festive atmosphere prevailed amongst Greeks in Aegean Macedonia, from October 2012 onwards into 2013. In part, this can be explained by the debt crisis and an economy verging on

bankruptcy that affected all parts of Greece. Given Greece's dire economic straits, it is unsurprising that the Balkan Wars, in keeping with Greek national mythology, are commemorated in a celebratory way.

In Bulgaria, the Balkan Wars were also marked, albeit not in a festive way. From October 2012 onwards, President Rosen Plevneliev, together with government ministers, marked the events of 1912 and 1913 in solemn ceremonies held in Blagoevgrad, Stara Zagora and Bansko. The Balkan Wars, perhaps unsurprisingly, were commemorated in Bulgaria as almost exclusively military events, where attention was devoted to the military sacrifices and losses sustained by the Bulgarian army, and particularly "over the division of the spoils in Macedonia" (*Novinite* 2012). In Bulgaria, as in Greece, the nationalist narratives at the time of the Balkan Wars were reproduced 100 years later without a hint of reflexive insight.

One is tempted to look around to see how 'momentous events' of 100 years ago are commemorated in other countries. What we find is that narratives of 'nationhood' are invoked, even where, as in all parts of partitioned Macedonia, these narratives were for most part exportations of others' narratives and recognisably 'non-local'. In Australia, there were centenary celebrations held in 2001 to mark the declaration of Australian Federation in 1901. This was a luke-warm affair, with a variety of officially sponsored events such as exhibitions and concerts, which attracted modest interest and attendances. There is perhaps an ambivalence in many sections of Australian society about the merit of celebrating an event that continued to entrench the disenfranchisement of indigenous Australians.

A war of independence is perhaps a less ambiguous event that may attract wide support. But if the event is less 'clear-cut' as an example of nation-building, then celebration may be less ostentatious. Cuba's marking of the Cuban War of Independence (1895–1898) is an example of this, where the outcome served only to remind Cubans that the terms of their freedom would be partly dictated by a neighbouring power (USA), rather than a distant power one (Spain).

Elsewhere we see other, low-key memorial tributes, as in South Africa, where very modest centenary commemorations of the Second Boer War (1899–1902) took place. In modern South African historiography, the Boer Wars are now widely seen as events that barely punctuated a period of diminishing colonialism, to be followed by a period of semi-independence for some, and continuing subjugation for others within that same country.

One hundred years is a time period too long to allow any substantial number of people to have personal recollections of how things were. But one hundred years is a period which is certainly recent enough for our parents' and grandparents' and great-grandparents' generations to provide us with

recollections and narratives of 'what things were like back then'. The contributions in this book include primary, 'first-hand' sources of events of over 100 years ago, and also secondary ones which discuss, debate and interpret these same and other events. We hope that these articles, with their different topics and from their different perspectives, contribute to a reflective and considered understanding of Macedonia and the peoples that inhabit this region.

<div style="text-align: right">

Jim Hlavac and Victor Friedman
Melbourne and Chicago
October 2014

</div>

References

Assman, Aleida: From Collective Violence to a Common Future: Four Models for Dealing with a Traumatic Past. In: Martin Modlinger, Philipp Sonntag (Eds.): Other people's pain: narratives of trauma and the question of ethics. Bern: Peter Lang. (2011), 14–22.

Coupland, Nikolas: Sociolinguistic authenticities. In: Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7 (2003) 3, 417–431.

Danforth, Loring/Riki Van Boeschoten: Children of the Greek Civil War: Refugees and the Politics of Memory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

European Parliament: Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, (2000/C 364/01) (2 October 2000), <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf>, Accessed: 22.4.2014.

European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: (1950), (entered into force 3 September 1953) as amended by Protocol No 14 (2010), (entered into force 1 June 2010), <http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf>, Accessed: 22.4.2014.

Gardikas-Katsiadakis, Helen: The Balkan wars 1912–1913: their effect on the everyday life of civilians. In: R.A. Stradling (Ed.): Crossroads of European histories. Multiple outlooks on five key moments in the history of Europe, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2006, 89–99.

Official Gazetteer of the Government of the Republic of Greece: Part Two, Ministerial Decrees and Approvals, No. 106841, "Free repatriation and return to Greek citizenship of the political refugees", Athens, 5 January 1983, p.1.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: opened for signature 16 December 1966, 999 UNTS 171, art 4 (entered into force 23 March 1976), art 27, <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CCPR.aspx>, Accessed: 22.4.2014.

Kennan, George: Introduction. In: George Kennan (Ed.) The Other Balkan Wars: A 1913 Carnegie Endowment Inquiry in Retrospect with a New Introduction and

Reflections of the Present Conflict. Washington, D.C. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1993.

Novinite: Bulgaria commemorates Balkan War Centenary, 05.10.2012. <http://www.novinite.com/articles/143845/Bulgaria+Commemorates+Balkan+War+Centenary> Accessed: 02.08/2014.

Todorova, Maria: Imagining the Balkans, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

UNESCO: Convention Against Discrimination in Education, adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on 14 December 1960, entry into force: 22 May 1962, in accordance with article 14, art 5.1(C), <http://www.wwda.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/12//discedu1.pdf>, Accessed: 22.4.2014.

Wilkinson, Henry, Robert: Maps and Politics: A Review of the Ethnographic Cartography of Macedonia. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1951.

History
The 1913 Partition and its Political and Socio-Political Consequences

1. The Balkan Wars (1912–13) and the Partition of Macedonia: A Historical Perspective

Andrew Rossos
University of Toronto
andrew.rossos@utoronto.ca

On one of my research trips to Bulgaria in the mid-1980s, I was introduced to a well-known Bulgarian writer. In the course of our conversation, which touched on the Macedonian question, he made a comment that has stayed with me ever since. He said: "We loved the Macedonians to death." I did not dare to ask him to explain what he meant. In those days it was rather delicate to debate the Macedonian issue in a café in the center of Sofia. Todor Zhivkov was dispatching conscious Macedonians to labour camps in the east.

However, I have tried to come to terms with his comment, to understand it. I now think that it reflects rather accurately the historical reality of Macedonia: Macedonia's neighbours – Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbs – "loved" the Macedonians so much that each claimed them as its own and for itself; and could not conceive, let alone permit, any other existence for them and their land. Each one was telling the Macedonians: "You are either with us, as our own, or there can be no other future for you and Macedonia." This profound obsession with possessing Macedonia and the Macedonians turned the Macedonian question into the central issue dividing Macedonia's neighbours in the second half of the nineteenth and throughout the twentieth century.[1]

On 8 October 1912 the allied Balkan states – Macedonia's neighbours and Montenegro – went to war against the Ottoman Empire. Their declared aim was to defeat the Turks and drive them across the Straits into Asia Minor and thus liberate their so-called enslaved brothers still under Turkish rule. However, their sole and real aim was to attain their expansionist ambitions in the remaining Turkish possessions in Europe particularly Macedonia, which had become

---

[1] There is no comprehensive survey of the entire history of the Macedonian question in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Among the most useful works in English are Rossos, Andrew: *Macedonia and the Macedonians. A History* (Stanford, Cal.: Hoover Institution Press, 2008), and "The Macedonian Question and Instability in the Balkans," in Norman M. Naimark and Holly Case, eds., *Yugoslavia and Its Historians: Understanding the Balkan Wars of the 1990s* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 2003), 140–159 and 245–254; Wilkinson, H.R.: *Maps and Policies: A Review of the Ethnographic Cartography of Macedonia* (Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1951); Barker, Elisabeth: *Macedonia: Its Place in Balkan Power Politics* (1950; reprint, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980); Stavrianos, L.S.: *Balkan Federation: A History of the Movement Toward Balkan Unity in Modern Times* (1944; reprint, Hamden: Anchor Books, 1964).