

Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece

Volume 2



Untruths and Truths

**By
Pavle Rakovski**

**(Translated from Macedonian to English and edited by Risto
Stefov)**

Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece
Volume 2
Untruths and Truths

Published by:

Risto Stefov Publications
rstefov@hotmail.com

Toronto, Canada

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

Copyright © 2019 by Pavle Rakovski

e-book edition

February 22, 2019

INDEX

I. FROM ANOTHER FRIEND	6
A. ABOUT THE ROOTS OF EVIL	7
1. Errors, omissions, weaknesses.....	7
2. Imported dogmatism	9
3. What do the protagonists of the guerrillas think?	11
4. Thorough cleansing.....	12
5. Moments from the CPG’s history	13
6. The CPG founding congress	20
B. THE FASCIST OCCUPATION (1941-1944)	24
1. According to Minister Averov	24
2. Unusual events	25
3. The CPG was first to raise the NOB (National Liberation War) flag	26
4. Facts of capital importance	28
5. A miracle of nature: “Slavophone Greeks”!	35
6. Who was Siantos?	39
7. The attack on Siantos came to full expression	40
8. Anti-Macedonian practices	45
9. The great evil	49
10. They say one thing and think and do another	51
11. Voden Region	55
12. Epilog	58
13. To the previous text.....	58
C. THE GREEK CIVIL WAR AND BEYOND.....	65
1. Nikos Zahariadis (CPG Secretary General	65
2. Unilateral Civil War	66
3. England - a “great friend” of Greece.....	69
4. Some other characteristic maneuvers.....	71
5. Testimonials	74
6. The occult side of events.....	77
7. The most explosive weapon.....	80
II ANTI-MACEDONIAN-ISM	85
A. PRIOR TO AND DURING THE NATIONAL LIBERATION WAR	85
B) IN THE COURSE OF THE GREEK CIVIL WAR AND BEYOND.....	92
Anti-Macedonian-ism in DAG’s ranks	95
Anti-Macedonian-ism in NOF’s ranks.....	97

Anti-Macedonian-ism in the immigrant ranks	103
III THE COURCE AND PROBLEMS OF A SAGA	107
Silence about a crime is equally as strong as the crime itself	107
About the beginning of the Greek Civil War	108
Siantos's CPG leadership and its politics	110
About the Varkiza agreement	114
Zahariadis's CPG leadership and its politics	116
About the politics of the "Greek Axis"	121
The CPG and Macedonian people	128
NOF and the "Greek Axis" (1945-1949)	141
IV. ABOUT THE BOOK "EGEISKI BURI" (AEGEAN STORMS)	160
BY VANGEL AIANOVSKI - OCHE	160
1. A joyous event	160
2. Good reviews	160
3. The reactionaries and NOF	162
4. Significant meaning	164
5. Autobiography	165
6. Irresponsible manipulation of events	165
7. Incorrectness	167
8. Falsification	172
9. Conspiracy	177
10. Throwing mud on others	179
11. He was that which he was not	179
12. Inventions	180
13. Co-authors	182
14. The real Macedonian cadres	184
15. Insufficient endeavors	186
V. PROTEST LETTER SENT TO THE SKM CENTRAL COMMITTEE	190
CRITICAL REMARKS	192
VI. ACTUALITIES FROM A NEWER HISTORY	207
VII. ON THE GROUNDS OF ONE DOCUMENT	222
VIII PROBLEMS FROM THE NEWEST MACEDONIAN HISTORY	236
IX. MATERIALS ON THE HISTORY OF THE MACEDONIAN NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT IN THE AEGEAN PART OF MACEDONIA	284
PROBLEMS FROM OUR MOST RECENT HISTORY	287

X. AS ALWAYS “THE EARTH WILL CONTINUE TO REVOLVE”	348
LITERATURE	372
ACRONYMS	375
About the author.....	377

I. FROM ANOTHER FRIEND

(Note to the publisher: The first seven parts of this book are contained in the author's manuscript entitled "Records (Memories - Reflections - Findings)" - book 2, prepared for publishing in 1977, but have not yet been published. The author has noted that even though every part of these notes represents a complete whole, they are complementary notes and need to be placed in one book).

A. ABOUT THE ROOTS OF EVIL

1. Errors, omissions, weaknesses...

The people's revolution in Greece, as well as the Macedonian people's liberation movement, as its reserve or component, was defeated by the combined forces of the domestic and international reactionaries.

One time it was defeated when the "Greek People's Liberation Army" - ELAS (1941-1945) was liquidated by agreement (Varkiza, February 12, 1945), and the second time was when the "Democratic Army of Greece" - DAG (1946-1949) was disastrously crushed in its own "fortified defensive positions".

The Macedonian people were the backbone of DAG's main strike force and the revolution in the northern part of the Greek state. The Macedonian people suffered the most especially in the main hotspot of the revolution. According to official Greek census statistics taken before and after the people's revolution, in 1940 and in 1951, 46 Macedonian villages in the border zone ceased to exist. The villages were completely destroyed with no one left alive and as a result were erased from postwar geographical maps. The population was halved or significantly reduced in another 179 villages (Naum Peiov, "Macedonians and the Greek Civil War", INI, 1968, p. 172.) Over 15,000 elite Macedonian fighters were physically liquidated in suspicious battles, while another 60-70 thousand were driven out of their ancestral homes and scattered around the world, outside the Greek state. Percentage wise Macedonian losses in the joint struggle were about twenty times higher than the Greek ones, meaning, Macedonians spilled about twenty times more blood, lost more human lives and suffered more material destruction than the Greeks.

Because of this it is understandable why the Macedonian people would be interested to learn the truth and the real reasons why the democratic forces in Greece were defeated.

To celebrate ASNOM's 30th anniversary, the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences organized a symposium on the topic: "ASNOM

- realization of the ideas for creating a Macedonian state and its international echo and reflection”.

Paskal Mitrevski, former NOF president and leader of the Macedonians from Greek occupied Macedonia, as well as a most notable person from that era, was invited to give a talk at this symposium on the subject: “The first organs of the people’s government and the establishment of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece during the Greek Civil War of 1945-1949”.

This is what Mitrevski said about the more important events of that time:

1) “The Greek people along with the Macedonian people were among the first to rise in the struggle against fascism... Significant successes and results were achieved, but due to foreign military intervention, both peoples fell under new slavery...”

2) “The resistance offered by the people... inevitably lead to the establishment of DAG, which spurred a painstaking struggle for the liberation of the country. One of the results of that struggle was the formation of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece and the recognition of the national rights and freedoms of the Macedonian people in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia...”

3) “This recognition was in fact a significant benefit for the Macedonian people and, at the same time, a sort of echo of the ASNOM decisions...”

4) “In a comparative sense, among the decisions and acts of ASNOM and the corresponding acts of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, indeed, there are certain nuances of diversity, both in terms of the approach and manner of passing such acts, also on the motives and forms of their adoption. However, in the integral whole of the goals and interests of the Macedonian people’s national liberation struggle, they are implicitly convergent...” (with their similar content they equally serve the liberation struggle of the Macedonian people, that is, lead to the same final goal).

5) “The first ASNOM session had a positive and strong echo among the fighters and the broad Macedonian masses throughout Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia...”

6) “The final defeat of the democratic forces was due to mistakes... omissions... and weaknesses in the CPG and DAG leadership...”
(See handout given to the symposium participants).

Generally, according to Mitrevski, this was “the true picture of events...”

2. Imported dogmatism

This is what Pavlos Nefeludis, an old Communist and CPG official, wrote in his book “Sources of evil - the deep causes of cleavage in the CPG, 1918-1968” (from the moment of its formation onwards):

“Since February 1968, the Communist Party of Greece has been experiencing a deep crisis. There was no other similar crisis in its history of abnormal situations as there is in the present one. The depth and breadth of the split came about with the CPG’s decisions made in February 1968 during its ‘Central Committee Twelfth Extended Plenum’. The fact that this split occurred during the rule of the fascist military dictatorship (of the Colonels, April 21, 1967, headed by Papadopoulos), when great moral and political unity in the party was necessary, shows how deep the roots of this anomaly go and how great the responsibility of those who caused it is, especially during this most critical time for the Greek people.

Those who created and carried out the cleavage, in all consciousness, are condemned by the Greek people. Every official and member of the party, every fighter from the left, is obliged to contribute to the establishment of unity, but at the same time to also recognize what caused the cleavage. Find all reasons for it, most recent and past, so that the cleavage can be uprooted from its deepest roots for the sake of unity and not for the sake of removing the consequences of some temporary compromise to cover up something without healing the evil. The CPG needs thorough

cleansing and mending in order to get rid of the cause of its suffering...”

Pavlos Nefeludis wrote this in the preface of the second edition of his book (I quoted it from the 1974 fourth edition). When he wrote this Pavlos Nefeludis used CPG official sources and when he wrote about the “Central Committee Twelfth Extended Plenum”, he used quotation marks. It was a characteristic moment when he projected the attitude of the CPG in his book like he was some sort of spy. According to Nefeludis, the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Extended Plenum, its convening and its decisions, were the work of factors that were outside of the CPG. Nefeludis contemplated that, in general, the profound causes in the CPG split, in its various forms or phases, began when the CPG was first created in November 1918. The problems experienced were nothing more than imported dogmatism brought to Greece in the form of dead quotations. These quotations were imported to Greece by CPG officials who were educated abroad. These officials and bearers of foreign influences and interventions unavoidably collided with the internal bearers who expressed the Greek reality and revolution. This resulted in crisis situations in the CPG, which led, among other things, to a tragic end of the resistance movement and the Greek Civil War.

However, on this subject, the CPG Central Committee welcomed Nefeludis’s paper with the following unfavourable comment published on December 3, 1974 by “Rizospastis”:

“One need ask themselves: Who is writing these things...? Is it Mr. Savas Constantopoulos? Or Mr. Georgios Georgalas? Or maybe Mr. Theophilaktos Papakonstantinou...? (These people were former CPG officials, exponents or official enemy agents who had infiltrated the CPG camp, worked for the enemy and later returned to the enemy). Because these things said about the CPG are said by a “pawn” in someone’s hands abroad, or for “rubles” from Moscow, these things are fiction used for decades, by all those champions of anti-Soviet-ism and anti-communism in our country and abroad. These are fabrications that, because they went bankrupt, are used today only by the organs of the Asfalia (security services). Yet, Mr. Nefeludis claims to be a communist...”

3. What do the protagonists of the guerrillas think?

Dominique Euge, French communist and author of the popular book “Les kapitanios” (partisan commanders) wrote: “For understandable reasons, I cannot thank all those people by name and publicly, who helped me with their testimonies in writing this history of the Greek tragedy. Most of them did not talk about themselves but about others... I beg the reader to forgive me for not always pointing out the sources from which I drew my information. I want to warmly thank all the captains, political commissars and all the old partisans, who - in Athens, in Paris, in Bucharest, in Prague, in Belgrade - helped me write this book, their book...” (p. 9, fourth edition, 1974.)

In this book, as well as in Nefeludis’s book mentioned earlier, the tragic end of the resistance movement and the Greek Civil War (the first and second partisan war) is explained mainly by the fact that the leaders of the CPG, bearers of imported dogmatism, did not accept the strategy and tactics of the Partisan commanders who emerged and responded to the living Greek reality and revolution, but imposed or applied their own strategy and tactics, which stemmed from and responded to imported dogmatism, and even direct interferences from abroad.

Dominique Euge, author of the book “Les kapitanios” conducted a wide range of surveys of the “old partisans”, as the critics have correctly observed, and “often behind his voice we hear the voices of the guerrilla protagonists themselves”. What is said through him, we really learn what the “old partisans- protagonists of the guerrillas” think of “the Greek national and personal tragedy...”

Despite resistance, both books have been issued many times in Greece, which shows how popular they are, i.e. accepted by the left and the Greek people. As it turned out this view is also widely accepted: - “The strain that has always bothered the CPG and which has led to catastrophes, is imported dogmatism and foreign interference in the leadership of the people’s revolution in Greece...”

On the cover of the book “Les kapitanios” (fourth Greek edition, 1974) written is: - “The Partisan commanders were caught in a vice between Stalin’s dogma and western tanks. In 1944, they celebrated

a victory that was already stolen right from their hands. They fought in Athens against the English army before the war against the Axis ended. They lay down their arms in the name of “normalization” so that they could be prosecuted as ordinary criminals. They confronted the American penetration into the British sphere of influence anew... In their ranks the guerrillas and the dogmatist politicians, opposing one another, allowed the living revolution and the dogma to clash...”

4. Thorough cleansing

The diagnosis of the “CPG disease” seems to be correct.

However, the more important worker and communist movement events in Greece can not be categorized between... symptoms of this disease, that is, they can not be explained by... imported dogmatism and foreign interference alone.

At the CPG founding Congress in November 1918 (more on this later) the CPG leaders, for example, were advocating, i.e. seeking to recognize the democratic rights and freedoms of the Greek population living outside of Greece (Northern Epirus, Cyprus, Rhodes, etc.) but did not do the same for the Macedonians who, since about five years ago, as a result of the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), were involved and lived in the Greek state, in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia. They did not even say a word about them, that is, about their democratic rights and freedoms in the Greek state...

Another example: In 1924, certain officials and members of the CPG broke away from the CPG and formed a rival party that was hostile to the CPG organizations and parties - “Communist Alliance” and “Socialist Union of Greece” with aims to: break up, dismantle and destroy the CPG. The CPG barely managed to save itself from this.

One more example: In order to strengthen the 1936 Fourth of August Fascist regime, it was necessary to break up and, if possible, destroy the organized revolutionary forces, i.e. the CPG. It was no surprise that, after some time, the CPG leadership began to disintegrate. A CPG rival central leadership was formed from its

ruins: “Central Committee”, “Temporary Directorate”, i.e. several camps. A sharp mutual struggle ensued and slowly and surely it pushed the real revolutionary struggle aside. That was the first stage. Then, there were wide and frequent arrests and the real communists ended up in prisons and concentration camps all throughout the Greek state...

These are events of fundamental importance which are unequivocally unearthing the nature of the disease or “the plague that the CPG has always been struggling with”. How can these and all other “crises and abnormal situations” be missing and explained as... a collision between dead quotations (dogma) and foreign interference with the “living Greek reality and the revolution?” This, most conveniently has been simplified... It is true what Nefeludis said: “The CPG needs a thorough cleansing in order to finally get rid of the ordeal that torments it.” But, apparently, not only from the dead quotes...

5. Moments from the CPG’s history

The information that follows is mostly first-hand. It has been obtained from official party texts, i.e. party-based editions. It refers to people who have climbed to the top party leadership and were creators and holders of party politics.

- Aristos Arvanitis was the first Central Committee secretary who emerged from the party founding congress in November 1918. Nine months after being elected he abandoned his position as first secretary. Looking at this from a different angle, it was a blow and bad propaganda for the party...

- “February 6, 1922 - The first Party conference was convened. Opportunist attitudes prevailed... the Party found itself in a period of organization and agitation and had the need for a long legal existence...” (“Χρονικόν του αγώνα “, p. 19. Also see CPG, Vol. 1, p. 213.)

Given the circumstances at the time, this actually meant that the Party was rejecting its revolutionary activities and turning itself into an ordinary minority reformist party, within the framework of

bourgeois laws. Viewed from this angle, it is an attempt to liquidate the party as a revolutionary “avant-garde” of the working class...

- In September 1923, the Party’s elected extraordinary congress said: “the deep devastating crisis in the party was due to the strife between the liquidating ‘reformist’ and ‘extremist’ tendencies...” (Ibid. p. 20. Also see CPG, Volume 1, p. 504.)

This kind of activity, carried out by the leadership, was stifling the worker and communist movement and was responsible for slowing down and even stopping the advancement of the revolutionary struggle. In fact it was derailing the party itself. All of its energy was misplaced and directed in the wrong direction: Not to the people’s revolutionary struggle, but to the internal party struggle and the destruction of the party...

It was soon revealed that this was the plan all along. Namely:

- As I mentioned earlier, in 1924 the “Leftists” founded another Communist Party in Piraeus under the name “Communist League”, with its central newspaper called the “Communist Vima” (communist tribune). Above all, this was a rival party hostile to the CPG. In fact, it was an attempt to break and liquidate the CPG. The situation was so dire that the Balkan Communist Federation (BKF) had to intervene:

“All sincere and honest revolutionaries in Greece - in the ranks of the Communist Party, must unify...!” said a BKF relevant document. The existence of the so-called “Communist League” is in fact a betrayal to the worker’s movement...” (“ Χρονικον του αγωνα “, p. 23. To KKE, vol. 1, pp. 429 and 501-503. T. KKE, vol. 2, p. 9.)

Then, also from the activists that fell out of the CPG, the so-called “Socialist Union of Greece” was formed which, fortunately, like the “Communist League”, had a short life span...

We then have Gianis Kordatos, Nikolaos Sargologos and Tomas Apostolidis who took over leadership of the party as Central Committee secretaries. Each persistently stood behind and defended the Greek-bourgeois position: No recognition and no rights for the

subjugated Macedonian people who were denied their existence as a non-Greek nation.

During the CPG's Third Extraordinary Congress, in 1924, when the CPG was aligning its party line with that of the Comintern, the CPG recognized the right of the Macedonian people: Self-determination to secession from the Greek state. Kordatos and Apostolidis openly stood in opposition to the Congress.

At this point Kordatos was left out of the Party but not inactive. In the meantime Kordatos wrote an anti-Party text which was then published by the anti-communist newspaper "Revolution proletarian", organ of the French right-wing opposition party, condemning the CPG. Then, during its third regular convention (March 1927), the CPG condemned Kordatos and declared him a man who has lost all connections with the party and is no longer a CPG member. (See: KKE, vol. 2, p. 250).

The same Congress also condemned Tomas Apostolidis's views and actions over the national question, but did not kick him out of the ranks of the party. He was kept under the condition that: He behaved in a disciplined manner. (Ibid. p. 249.) He left the CPG on his own...

Sargologos left the party earlier. In the fifth volume of his book "History of Contemporary Greece", Gianis Kordatos wrote: "Sargologos... returned from Moscow with his lover... And some time later we obtained evidence that he was an official agent of the Second Bureau of the First Army Corps, and of the police. He escaped the moment he found out that the Central Committee knew about this..." (Ibid. p. 617.)

Sargologos took refuge in the United States of America...

- Kordatos also told us the following: Two people were responsible for the extremist political line (starting a rebellion as soon as possible), Evangelos Papanastasiou in Athens and Piraeus, and Sargolagos in Macedonia... When Evangelos Papanastasiou attended a Party conference in February 6, 1922, as a Party delegate from Athens and Piraeus, he was also a police agent (working for

the enemy) and had been a police agent since 1918, when he joined the Party...” (Ibid. p. 614.)

One more thing: “At the CPG Extraordinary Congress, held on October 20, 1922, G. Georgiadis, member of the CPG Central Committee, accused Giani Petsopoulos, the Central Committee’s treasurer, of material abuse and having links with the royal court... A special commission was formed and, after an investigation, Petsopoulos was expelled from the Party...” (Ibid. p. 619.)

Serafim Maximos was appointed member of the CPG Central Committee by the Party’s National Council (February 1924), along with Kordatos and Apostolidis. At the CPG Third Extraordinary Congress, held at the end of 1924, Maximos was appointed to the new CPG Central Committee Executive elected by the Congress. But later he led the anti-party liquidation “movement” of the “centrists” (autumn 1926) which, after the joint declaration of Maximos-Puliopoulos (see below), fused with the liquidator “movement”, i.e. with the liquidators in the so-called “opposition”. Their platforms: The normalization achieved by the bourgeoisie is not temporary, but stable. A new organic capitalism was started, i.e. a new way to allow the productive forces to flourish which would lead to prosperity and improve the living standard of the working people, blurring class contradictions and bringing truce between the opposing classes. Because of this, adventurism would be cut down and so would the struggle of the masses, i.e. strikes and demonstrations in the streets would be eliminated. Therefore the party the way it is now should be dissolved... in order to create a new “serious” Party, composed of citizen intellectuals...” (See: To KKE, Vol 2, p. 632. Or: “Theses for the CPG’s 40th anniversary”, adopted by the CPG Central Committee’s Ninth Plenum, August 1953, as is cited in the book “Forty years of CPG”, p. 709.) The activities of the “United Opposition” and its organ the “Spartakos” newspaper were condemned first during a CPG Central Committee meeting held from February 15 to 18, 1928, and again during the CPG’s Fourth Congress held from December 10 to 15, 1928. They also unanimously condemned Serafim Maximos as a liquidator and, together with his comrades K. Sklavos, T. Hainoglu, L. Hadzhistavros, V. Nikolinikos, G. Papanikolaou, N. Nikolaidis,

V. Polihronakis, all former members of the CPG Central Committee, erased him from the Party... (To KKE, p. 638.)

- Pantelis Puliopoulos stood at the CPG helm as the first Central Committee secretary elected during the Third Extraordinary Congress in 1924. On April 15, 1925, he was arrested by the Mihalakopoulos government. He remained in jail for about 16 months. He was released after Pangalos's dictatorship fell in August 1926 and - quit. He left the party. This is what was said about him in the Party edition "Χρονικον του αγωνα", on page 24:

"Party Secretary Puliopoulos quit his post in August 1926. He justified his own desertion with the "theory" that the party was put together with "the latest dregs of the working class" and that it needed a "serious" injection of bourgeois elements, whose role would be to "bring" Marxist light into the party..." The liquidators were condemned in March 1927, during the third regular party convention...

Puliopoulos left the CPG, but did not limit only himself to that. He also called on other party officials to do the same. He withdrew his candidacy as a CPG parliamentary candidate in the November 7, 1926 parliamentary elections in Greece. And since then he intensified his demoralizing activities against the Party. And this is why he was referred to as the "liquidator". On December 17, 1926, by a decision taken by the CPG Central Committee, as published by "Rizospastis" on January 26, 1927, Puliopoulos was kicked out of the party, and later by a Politburo decision, made on September 25, 1927, he was finally erased from their books...

Elevterios Stavridis proved himself to be one of the most outstanding figures in the constellation of Party leaders from the period prior to the Comintern intervention in November 1931. First CPG Central Committee secretary Puliopoulos, as I mentioned earlier, was sent to jail. While serving his sentence the CPG Central Committee replaced him with Stavridis. Then, as mentioned earlier, after Puliopoulos was released from jail he left the CPG leaving Stavridis in charge until early 1927. Then, following a CPG Central Committee decision, Stavridis was removed and replaced by Giatsopoulos. Later on, in April 1928, while Stavridis was still a

CPG Member of Parliament candidate (he was elected in the 1926 parliamentary elections) he left the Party and joined the bourgeois camp. He joined the bourgeois “Progressive” party headed by Kafantaris.

As an ideologue of the domestic bourgeoisie, through the bourgeois press and through a special thick book of his, the famous “Behind the CPG scenes” book, Stavridis trumpeted to the whole world, waving the bourgeois fictional scarecrow about the so-called “Slavic danger” for Greece:

This is what he wrote: “The CPG program is a program designed to destroy the Greek nation. Greece will not only become Soviet, as some believe, but it will also become completely Slavic. The Greek communists, men and women capable of military service, will join the Slavic armies en masse so that they can perish at some distant front. All Greek children will find their fate like those twenty-eight thousand children abducted during the bandit war (Stavridis referred to the Greek Civil War from 1945 to 1949 as the “bandit” war. DAG for him was a “bandit” army and the evacuated Macedonian children for him were “kidnapped” children). All the rest, the non-Communists, regardless of social rank and sex, one beautiful morning will find themselves on the long road leading to Siberia where they are going to leave their skeletons...” (“Behind the CPG scenes”, p. 5.)

Stavridis got to where he was by writing nonsense. This shows that he was full of anti-communist fury which he managed to control and suppress until one day it erupted.

- Things in the CPG continued to be bad. “The party at that time was surviving the third phase of its internal crisis... It fought a puzzling factional struggle that lasted two years (mid-1929 to mid-1931) during which its class enemy played a big role...” (“Χρονικον του αγωνα”, p. 22.)

The Comintern intervened. On November 1, 2, 3, 1931, “Rizospastis” published the Comintern Executive Council’s famous document entitled “Appeal to all members of the CPG”.

New people were appointed to the Party leadership with Nikos Zahariadis as their leader...

- The first half of 1930 was characterized by a strong rise in the worker and communist movements all across Europe, including Greece. The bourgeoisie was forced to give up its favourite bourgeois democracy because things were becoming dangerous especially in Germany, Greece and Spain. As a result open fascist dictatorships were introduced. The need to strengthen the fascist regimes imperatively required the break-up of the organized revolutionary forces, which meant the break-up of the communist parties. That was achieved in Germany and Spain but with less success in Greece. The communists in Greece were cracked but not taken out. This was done mainly by “transplanting exponents of the domestic bourgeoisie in the CPG leadership” (CPG from 1931 to 1952, p. 104.) At first, as I mentioned earlier, the CPG collapsed into several rival camps, headed by a special central leadership. After that there were unheard of frequent and widespread attacks and the real Communists, members and cadres of the Party, found themselves in concentration camps and prisons en masse...

- The Greek Civil War (1945-1949) followed the fascist occupation of Greece (1941-1944) and was the most decisive revolutionary and critical time in the history of the newly expanded Greek state. The first people who found themselves leading the CPG and the People’s Revolution at this critical time were Georgios Siantos and Nikos Zahariadis. Siantos led the war against the occupiers (ELAS) and Zahariadis led the Greek Civil War (DAG). The people’s revolution was broken both times and its armed forces ELAS and DAG were destroyed.

Analyzing the war against the occupiers, the Third CPG Conference in 1950 concluded that: “...Georgios Siantos was responsible for betraying the revolution...” (Νεος Κοσμος, No. 10/1950. The CPG from 1931 to 1952, p. 219.) By then Siantos was already dead but was posthumously tried anyway, found to be a traitor and convicted.

Analyzing the Greek Civil War, the CPG Central Committee Sixth Extended Plenum (March 1956), during a general party conference, concluded that:

Zahariadis, with his so-called “Greek Axis” policy, justified the English presence in Greece, considering it necessary in order to “safeguard the Greek position and the Greek borders in the north...” (Forty years of CPG, p. 645. Resolution of the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum introductory speech and closing speech given by Nikos Zahariadis, “Riga” (“Ρίγα”), 1945, p. 21.) By doing this Zahariadis weakened the resistance movement and undermined DAG’s victory, which led to its defeat and, in general, caused the revolution to fail.

Zahariadis was publicly condemned and removed from the CPG leadership. Later, during the CPG Central Committee held in February 1953, he was removed from the books.

Of course, when we take all this into account, and all these people who in some way or another climbed to the top Party leadership, it is easier to understand the true essence of their policies, conducted through the CPG and in the name of the CPG...

6. The CPG founding congress

During its founding congress, held in Piraeus (November 4-10, 1918), the Socialist Labour Party, later named the Communist Party of Greece, was declared a Marxist revolutionary avant-garde Party of the working class. It stood for:

- “The national establishment of all peoples, large and small, with full rights to decide on a governing system... Solve all unresolved national and territorial issues through the will of the people, without any foreign interference or influence...”

The first step, start with the unsettled “Balkan issues”, which were to be resolved on the basis of the principle of self-determination. Regarding this the founding congress stressed that:

- “Full freedom be given to the population in the islands Cyprus, Imbros, Limnos, Tenedos, Samotraki, Kastelorizos, and Northern Epirus (Southern Albania) to decide their own destiny...” (CPG, Volume 1, p. 11- 12.)

However, there was nothing said during the founding congress about the democratic rights and freedoms of the Macedonian people. The “Macedonian Question” was not mentioned or considered as a “Balkan issue” for solving.

There was never and, of course, there never would be a future government in Belgrade, Athens, or Sofia, which would willingly sign an agreement to give up “national territory” for the sake of its neighbours. But, as we know, and this is a historical fact, the governments in Belgrade, Athens, and Sofia did agree and did sign agreements to divide Macedonia among themselves. As history has attested these contenders not only fought over Macedonia but signed documents and left their signatures and state seals that attest to Macedonia’s division. Here they cannot help but show their hypocrisy claiming on the one hand that Macedonians don’t exist and on the other emphasizing the historical truth that:

- “Macedonia is not Serbian, Greek, or Bulgarian, and that the Macedonian people are primarily a Slavic, special self-governing nation.

This explains the unruly behaviour of our conquering neighbours who ruthlessly crushed Macedonia and its people, cut off their Aegean ports from its backdrop, smashed and hampered their economic, cultural and political life and condemned Macedonia’s development to end.

The Greek army also engaged in genocide against the Macedonian people during the Balkan Wars (1912-1913). According to the Carnegie Commission investigating the Balkan Wars, tens of thousands of people were killed. (L. Mojsov, *Around the Question of the Macedonian National Minority in Greece*, p. 244.) The villages around Solun, Gotse Delchev’s hometown (Kukush), as well as the villages in the wider district, were burned down and destroyed. To save their lives, tens of thousands of Macedonians fled and scattered around the world (mostly to “brotherly” Bulgaria), beyond the new Greek borders. And those Macedonians who decided to stay home were completely oppressed and subjected to unusually fierce denationalization and assimilation...

The CPG founding congress, it would appear, knew nothing about these atrocities...

The following was characteristic of the attitude taken by the founding congress:

- “Because of the population’s mixed composition, it was not possible to determine ethnological boundaries...” Therefore the congress proclaimed that: “Unification of all Balkan nations in a single Balkan democratic federation, based on completely democratic principles, would guarantee all nationalities full and genuine political, national and linguistic freedom...” (CPG, Volume 1, p. 13.)

The idea behind this was to exclusively prevent “others” from seeking their ethnological borders in the newly conquered Greek territories. The proposed solution, i.e. “Unification of all the Balkan states under a Balkan Democratic Federation” practically meant avoiding every solution.

This, in essence, was how the CPG leadership, through its Founding Congress, defended the newly conquered Greek territories from the reach of their neighbours.

Considering that there was not a single word about the democratic rights and freedom of the Macedonian people adopted in the texts of the Congress, one would inevitably reach the following conclusion:

- By its silence the Congress ignored and therefore did not recognize the existence of the Macedonian people as an independent non-Greek nation...

This was how the Macedonian people were treated and are still being treated. It is clear and undeniable, however, that the CPG leadership, through its Founding Congress, took exactly the same position as the domestic bourgeoisie when it came to the Macedonian Question...

Of course, this was not a coincidence; in fact, anti-Macedonian politics appeared as a basic accompanying phenomenon, as the main characteristic of a “CPG-affliction” symptom which also affected the CPG’s revolutionary activities. The way the top CPG leadership operated in practice in the territory of Greece, affected the fate of the Greek people and their revolutionary activities which were no better than the fate of the Macedonian people, i.e. their democratic rights. I have already spoken about the many “crises and abnormal situations” the CPG experienced, but for the sake of clarity, let us review some events:

1919: The first secretary of the first Central Committee quit.

1922: During the First CPG Conference it was decided to destroy all revolutionary activities. Reportedly, “the Party was in need of a long period of legal existence,” under bourgeois laws... no less...

1923: There was a strong struggle between the various “liquidation” groups, led by known and unknown potential enemy class agents who destroyed the revolutionary activities of the CPG...

1924: “Leftists” broke away and formed hostile parties which attacked CPG organizations. The CPG itself was barely saved from decay and destruction...

This is how the devastation was started which has “plagued the CPG” since the moment it was formed...

As I have already mentioned, the fascist occupation (1941-1944) and the Greek Civil War (1945-1949) were important revolutionary moments and critical times in the history of newly expanded Greece. Naturally it was important to know how, at those critical times, the CPG came to be plagued with so many problems...

B. THE FASCIST OCCUPATION (1941-1944)

1. According to Minister Averov

Averov wrote: During the “first round” (1942-1944), EAM-ELAS was or at least could have easily been the sole master in Greece and not demand any compromises...

In the course of the “second round” (December 1944), it was possible for EAM-ELAS to complete takeover. It could have accomplished this in the early days. And maybe also between December 14 and 18, especially if it did not undertake a major military action against EDES in Epirus 500 kilometres away from Athens where the main battle was taking place...

Why was action taken against EDES, and why were some of the most qualified (capable) ELAS units and some of the most talented commanders engaged?

One more thing to mention is another chance that the CPG missed out on.

The CPG could indeed have taken over prominent and perhaps dominant functions in the political life of the country had it abandoned the tragic collision in December 1944. At the end of 1944 it found itself in the government. It had allies in all strata of the population... It had penetrated into all the pores of society, and its opponents were weak and divided. Its political arrangement provided advantages: concrete, reliable and, over time, perhaps decisive...

It is hard for a person to understand why the CPG missed out on all those extraordinarily favourable chances in taking power...?

(Αβερφ: Φοτία και Τσεκουρι, p. 171 (second Greek edition, 1975).)

2. Unusual events

The ELAS Voden Macedonian battalion was formed on June 16, 1944. (The ELAS Lerin Kostur Macedonian Battalion was formed a little later, on July 20, 1944.)

- Why so late? Why were these battalions not formed earlier?

News of an all Macedonian military unit appearing, and that an all Macedonian revolutionary army was being created, traveled fast in the Macedonian villages and excited the Macedonian youth. From the first day its formation was announced the battalion grew fast by the day. By late July, six complete units were formed all equipped with weapons, uniforms and various support workshops, support workers and a broad-based organization. The battalion numbered over seven hundred and fifty volunteer fighters.

Then the ELAS Tenth Division command ordered:

- Do not accept any more volunteers into the battalion!

One cannot help themselves but ask:

- What exactly could that mean? Why did ELAS command do that?

Just four months after its formation, the Macedonian Battalion maneuvered its way to escape an armed clash with Greek ELAS units sent to disarm and disband it. (The same happened to the ELAS Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion. It too came close to having an armed conflict with the ELAS Greek units.) The Voden battalion, led by me (Pavle Rakovski), was forced to leave its military and political activities in Greek occupied Macedonia and cross over to the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia, where it continued the fight against the fascist forces. But:

- Why was all this needed? What really happened?

These were unusual but specific events. Their nature, as well as the order in which they were carried out, clearly speaks about the specificity of the conditions in which they originated, about the

specificity of the reasons that caused them. I confess: I am far from understanding this - to think that “imported” dogmatism could have some role in all this...

3. The CPG was first to raise the NOB (National Liberation War) flag

This is what was said in one of the capitalist publications:

“Greece’s triple occupation was fierce, inhuman, bloody and chilling. The occupiers not only grabbed the national treasure of the country, but also planned to use Greece as a strategic staging point for their expansionist goals. This explains the dense occupation of the land and the conversion of Crete into a strongly fortified fortress.

This dilemma was brought before the Greek people: Be subdued and become slaves, or engage the occupiers in a fierce and bloody, but honest, struggle of life and death for freedom and national independence.

The national liberation struggle flag was first raised by the Communist Party of Greece (CPG). The working class party (CPG) and the most advanced force of the working people, faithful to its policy of defending national interests, took on the main role of becoming the driving force in organizing the national resistance in Greece, i.e. the struggle against the triple occupation of the country...” (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, Χρονικον της εθνικης αντιστασης 1940-1944, εκδοσης ΠΛΕ, 1967, p. 21.)

This is what Colonel Hamont (Enks), member of the British military mission, wrote in his report to Major Stevens (Tom Brown), Special Envoy of the British General Staff for the Middle East: “After our withdrawal from Greece the only significant political forces in the country were the Communist Party and the Liberal Party. The former (CPG) possessed great experience and combat ability since the time of the Metaxas dictatorship, when it was forced to act illegally. On the contrary, the Liberal Party was weakened. Immediately after the German penetration into Greece, the Communist Party took the initiative to organize the Resistance

Movement and asked the civil parties to co-operate with it..." (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, p. 67)

On March 13, 1944, London Radio officially recognized that:

- "The Communists, in their eternal honour, were the first to cast themselves in the patriotic struggle..." (Ibid., p. 78)

Now let us take a closer look at events.

With the fall of Crete on May 31, 1941, all of Greece was occupied. One day later, on June 1, 1941, the CPG Central Committee, at its Sixth Plenum, decided on the following:

"The Communist Party of Greece to call on the Greek people and all its parties and organizations to join the national liberation front... To organize a tireless struggle for the everyday needs of all the people and to start an armed resistance against the occupiers. The Party, i.e. each individual communist should, in time, be properly orientated and adapt to important events which change and will change every day and fast, to organize the forces of the popular uprising for the national and social liberation of Greece..." (To KKE ap'to 1931-1952, p. 105.)

After many contacts with individuals and politicians from all civil parties and organizations, the founding conference of the coalition "National Liberation Front" (EAM) came to a close on September 27, 1941. Representatives of the Communist Party, of the Socialist Party E.L.D. (Ελληνική λαϊκή δημοκρατία, (Greek People's Democracy)) and the Agricultural Party attended. The establishment of EAM, with a well-defined program, was announced on September 28, 1941:

- Liberation of the nation from today's foreign yoke and emergence of the country's full independence.

- Immediately after the expulsion of the foreign occupiers a temporary government to be formed from the EAM coalition. The government's sole task will be to conduct elections for a constituent

assembly in which, the people as the true host, will declare the way in which the country wants to be governed.

- Destroy all reactionary attempts to impose solutions that are contrary to the wishes of the people by all means available to the EAM and its organizations, and defend the basic right of the Greek people.

To achieve these goals EAM will engage and fight:

- Against all issues that the Greek people encounter on a daily basis under foreign occupation conditions and guide the Greek people's struggle to meet all demands, as well as provide resistance against looting which is systematically carried out by the foreign occupiers.

- Maintain high morale and the liberating spirit of the Greek people.

- Systematically scrutinize the treacherous role of today's government and any other similar government in the future.

- Ensure possible co-operation with other nations fighting against the Axis powers and coordinate the struggle of the Greek people with the struggle of those nations.

- Organize the people's forces based on adopted rules which are part of the founding resolution.

- Start collecting voluntary contributions, membership fees, and so on, from Greek patriots, in order to provide the necessary funds required for leading the national liberation struggle. (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, pp. 567-568.)

4. Facts of capital importance

This is the historic truth which has been at rest for three and a half decades. Today, it is not difficult to identify a few basic things that are of capital importance, to how this program was realized:

First, the EAM Coalition was founded by the Leftist parties which were led by the Communist Party of Greece.

All bourgeois parties, from the centre down to the far right (mainly representatives of the capitalist oligarchy) canceled their participation. They remained idle supposedly waiting for “better times” or placed themselves in the service of the occupiers. According to Colonel Eddie Myers, head of the British military mission in Greece: “It seems that most of the more important royal officers received orders from the Greek government in exile to stay in Athens and not join any of the democratic resistance organizations...” (Eddie Myers, *Ελληνική περιπλοκή*, p. 103, *Στα αρματα, στα αρματα*, p. 22.)

The EAM founding document contained seven points. The founding parties were struggling to keep the door open right from the start: “The EAM coalition will equally include any party or organization that will work for the successful realization of EAM’s goals. We will not be examining the past or future political orders for a liberated and independent Greece of those organizations wanting to be admitted into the EAM coalition. Their belief in the necessity of the National Liberation Front - EAM, their honesty and their honesty towards it, i.e. their acceptance of EAM principles, will be enough for them to be considered...” (*Στα αρματα, στα αρματα*, p. 567.)

As is well-known, this did not help. The bourgeois parties and politicians remained outside the EAM sphere, one party went with the Germans, the other went with the English, and both worked against EAM...

Second, the occupiers, following Goering’s barbarian comments “Europe will die so that Germany can live!” (KOMEF, number 5/1943, editorial article) monstrously robbed Greece turning it into wasteland and bringing death everywhere. Hundreds of thousands of innocent people of all ages (especially in the big cities) suffered a terrible slow death from hunger. At the same time mass executions and destruction took place all throughout Greece. The Germans demolished the countryside in Kandinos, Crete, as well as executed en masse the population in the villages Pedrivoli, Skines, Alikianos, Furnes (the exact number of victims is unknown). In the Macedonian cities Drama and Doxat and the surrounding villages,

the Bulgarians killed over three thousand anti-Fascists in a three day rage. The village Krmsko in western Macedonia was destroyed to the ground and all men over the age of 15 were shot. In total 165 people were killed. Later, during a second German raid, the rest of the villagers were shot. This time 315 people were killed. The Nigrita Region villages Gorno and Dolno Krushovo were razed to the ground and all men over 15 years old were shot. In total 222 people were killed. The same thing happened in the vicinity of the city Kukush in the villages Musgali, Kodzha Oglari and Murazli. The villages were razed to the ground, and all men over 15 years were shot. In total 96 people were killed. (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, p. 550.)

This was happening until the end of 1941.

Atrocities such as these did not end until the Germans were forced to leave Greece. Of course, it is impossible to think that the people in Greece would have allowed themselves to be destroyed. So, the Communist Party's call "Στα αρματα, στα αρματα" (to arms, to arms), in the national liberation front, for the purpose of liberating themselves, was inevitable and a historical moment to "resist", i.e. the determination of the Greek people to fight for their survival and freedom.

Neither the atrocities committed by occupiers nor the underground activities carried out by the British could prevent EAM from turning itself into a mobilizing force attracting massive popular support all across the Greek state.

Even enemy testimonies attest to that and have special significance.

According to a German report on the political situation in Greece dated July 6, 1943: "Ninety percent of the Greeks are unilaterally unfriendly to the Axis forces and are ready for an open uprising. EAM with its combat organizations appears to be the main bearer of the overall resistance movement against the Axis Powers... From a political point of view, EAM has a leading role and because it is very active and acting under a coordinated leadership, poses the greatest danger to the occupying forces." (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, p. 27.)

This is what Marshal Wilson (a commander in the Allied Forces in the Middle East) wrote on page 66 in his book - Greek Edition “Οκτώ ετη περαν των θαλασσων”: “EAM is organizing strikes and demonstrations all across the Greek state, forcing the Germans to abandon their plans for mobilizing Greeks to work in Germany...” (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, p. 539.)

Third, the task set out for the Party by the CPG Central Committee during its 6th plenum that “everyone, especially communists”, were required to “organize all forces of the popular uprising to aid in the national and social liberation of Greece” was not carried out consistently.

a) It is true that 90% of all Greeks were hostile to the occupiers and were ready for an open armed uprising. But the masses were directed to take their anger on the occupiers through countless strikes, demonstrations and uneven battles in the streets. An armed struggle was not enforced.

It is also true that all was not lost and that the CPG-EAM leadership did achieve significant victories against the occupiers through the general strikes and massive demonstrations. Especially, with the strikes in 1943 when many Greeks were mobilized to dig trenches at the fronts and work in the fields and the factories of the occupiers. This stifled their progress as well as the Bulgarian-Fascist expansion in Macedonia.

But, of course, even with the largest unarmed masses, the possibility of achieving a decisive victory over the occupying forces and the liberation of the country was not possible.

This is what was said in the Party edition “Στα αρματα... Χρονικον της εθνικης αντιστασης”, in connection with this:

“One could notice that not enough attention was paid to the armed struggle. It was not organized and promoted adequately, although for this there were possibilities, i.e. objective favourable conditions...” (Ibid., p. 24.)

b) The second part of the task, the “social liberation of Greece”, for which forces of the popular uprising were to be organized, was completely neglected. But there was more to it than that. On behalf of the CPG Central Committee, the Party’s top leadership made the following announcement:

“While waiting for the ultimate goal - socialism, the party of the proletariat, the Communist Party of Greece - is today fighting for national liberation, and then, after the war is over, it will fight for a people’s democracy...” (CPG Central Committee proclamation delivered on July 2, 1943, after the dissolution of the Comintern. See: “Στα αρματα ...”, p. 567.)

So, Greece’s social liberation struggle was suspended and postponed until after the war ended.

But then, less than six months later, the CPG leadership, through its Central Committee Tenth Plenum, held January 1944, made a request from the Allies to support Greece’s “strategic security” on its northern borders. This means that Greece was preparing to expand, occupy and annex new foreign territories... (CPG Central Committee Declaration made during its Tenth Plenum. See: “Στα αρματα ...” p. 586. And Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, p. 505.)

Fourth, the program task which provided for possible cooperation with other nations fighting against the Axis powers and coordinating the struggle of the Greek people with the struggle of those nations was realized quite inconsistently and scandalously.

Around mid 1943, CPG representatives Tilemahos Ververis and Andreas Dzhimas contacted representatives of the Yugoslav and Albanian Communist Parties for the purpose of cooperating. An agreement was reached to create a people’s revolutionary union encompassing the three countries and to formulate a political and military plan of action. According to a document written in French (a copy of which exists at AM Skopje), among other things, the establishment of a common Balkan general staff was envisaged. This is what Yugoslav representative Svetozar Vukmanovich-Tempo, a CPY Central Committee delegate in Macedonia, wrote in a report dated July 25, 1943, to the CPM Central Committee: “This

is to inform you that among the delegates of the Supreme Headquarters of Greece, Albania and Yugoslavia, an agreement has been reached to create a Balkan headquarters..." (Sources for the Liberation War and Revolution in Macedonia, 1941-1945 Volume 1, Second Edition, p. 169.)

However, the agreement was soon cancelled by the Greek side. Siantos's leadership unexpectedly, and for reasons that we can only speculate on, changed its mind and canceled the cooperation agreement, i.e. the already signed agreement was declared null and void.

This is what Svetozar Vukmanovich - Tempo wrote:

"...I met with the secretary of the Greek party and I discussed with him the overall situation regarding the conclusions we reached on June 25 (1943). They have annulled all the conclusions regarding the creation of a Balkan headquarters and regarding the cooperation between our parties, especially regarding Macedonia..." (This letter was sent to Tsvetko Uzunovski, CPM Central Committee secretary, dated August 25, 1943, published in Volume 1, Second Edition, from Sources for the Liberation War and Revolution in Macedonia, pp. 236-244.)

Instead of joining the communist Balkan revolutionary alliance, Siantos's CPG leadership turned to the English. On July 5, 1943, Siantos's CPG leadership signed an agreement with the British military mission, to place ELAS under the command of British General Staff for the Middle East. (S. Sarafis: O ELAS, p. 130.) British officers, mainly Intelligence Service agents, occupied posts in ELAS supreme headquarters as well as in all larger ELAS unit headquarters. Of course, they lost no time in creating their own extended networks consisting of well paid domestic spies, and they successfully did this with ease and with little to no resistance. According to information provided by Vasilis Bardzhotas, member of the CPG politburo: "All large units, divisions and groups of divisions were actually placed in the hands of the Intelligence Service..." (V. Μπαρτζιωτας, Ν πολιτικη στελεχων του ΚΕΕ στο καιρο της Εθνικης αντιστασης, Νεος Κοσμος, αρ. 9/1950.) (Again "an adversity that afflicts the CPG".)

Fifth, there was not a single word about the Macedonian people living in Greece in the CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, i.e. in the EAM founding program documents. The Macedonian people, as a distinct non-Greek nation and as the largest national minority in the Greek state, were completely ignored. In other words their involvement in the liberation struggle and their democratic rights and freedoms in the liberated new Greece were silently omitted... It was like the Macedonians did not exist in the Greek state!

This was the road the Siantos CPG leadership took in regards to the Macedonian people, which was explained and justified by “the then conditions”. Siantos’s leadership did not mistreat the Macedonians but, given the conditions, it did not provide any revolutionary consistency or democratic rights for them either. It was understood that only after a people’s democracy and a people’s government was installed in Greece would the CPG recognize the rights and freedoms of the Macedonian people. Therefore, the Macedonians were obliged to fight for the victory of a people’s democracy. For now they would have the opportunity to fight in the ranks of the Greek national resistance organizations (EAM, ELAS, EPON, etc.) under the Greek name and flag as Greeks.

There was no formal agreement about anything. In fact whatever was agreed was agreed informally under ordinary conversations between the Greek and Macedonian communists and activists. The Macedonian communists then passed on this information to the Macedonian people and everyone placed their trust behind the CPG which assured them in ordinary conversations that, after they achieved victory, their rights would be recognized and they would be equal to the Greeks.

However, events and action taken have clearly shown the Party and its Marxist principles to be a good thing, but the people (on both sides) running the Party were the ones deciding what needs to do and therefore cannot remain blameless for what they did...

When all the neighbouring nations were fighting against the occupiers, each for their own freedom, it was inevitable that the Macedonian people would do the same through their own anti-

fascist liberation movement by creating Macedonian organizations such as SNOF and later NOF.

But instead of “welcoming” the Macedonians as allies, Siantos’s CPG leadership resolutely started an open frontal struggle against the Macedonian communists and against the Macedonian anti-fascist movement in general with aims at discrediting and destroying the Macedonian leaders and stifling the Macedonian movement...

And, as is known, and mentioned earlier, Greek ELAS partisans attacked and tried to disarm the Macedonian partisans...

The Greeks were reacting in desperate panic inspired by fear from positive changes in Macedonian affairs, namely by the formation of ASNOM and the emergence of the People’s Republic of Macedonia as a Macedonian national state in the federal Yugoslav democratic composition.

5. A miracle of nature: “Slavophone Greeks”!

Our Greek comrades, writing about events of that time, forgot to mention the existence of the Macedonian people’s anti-fascist struggle or Siantos’s policy towards them and against their struggle. It was an intentional omission... The Greeks kept silent about the Macedonians and their affairs...

And because nothing was written about them, of course, the Macedonian people did not exist and their promised rights and freedoms in the Greek state also did not exist. But just because the Greeks were silent on the matter did not mean that the Macedonian struggle did not exist. Refusing to go away, the top people in the CPG had to reconsider their silence and rediscover that Macedonians indeed existed in the Greek state.

As is well-known, the Party’s top leadership, after years of persistent silence, finally, for the first time in December 1945, spoke up publicly about the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement (NOF). Zahariadis did this in Solun while speaking against the Macedonians... As for Siantos’s anti-Macedonian politics, many years later, the CPG Central Committee Politburo accepted the

explanation of what had happened at its meeting held on September 12, 1951.

“The CPG leadership then did not properly understand the Slavo-Macedonian movement. It did not adopt a clear position on the national and social liberation of the Slavo-Macedonians in the joint struggle with the Greek people. It felt that the leadership of the Slavo-Macedonian movement consisted of adventurous and chauvinistic greater Greek elements...” (Νεος Κοσμος, 10/1951. Το ΚΚΕ απο το 1931-1952, p. 269.)

This late recognition of its “mistakes” was launched by the CPG as a conclusion in the famous “conclusions” meeting with 72 Macedonians and CPG cadres. This meeting was prepared and personally convened by Zahariadis in the summer of 1951. These so-called “conclusions” were written by Zahariadis a few months later and formally accepted by the Politburo. Zahariadis did this in order to find fault in the Macedonian CPG cadres and for that fault to be accepted by the Politburo, so that the Zahariadis leadership could claim that the Macedonian national anti-fascist organization - NOF was a foreign and reactionary organization and that is why it was liquidated.

By acknowledging its “mistakes”, the Zahariadis leadership skillfully covered up the true state of affairs - the truth. Namely, it covered up the fact that it never did mention the Macedonian people as the largest minority of non-Greek people living in Greece in any of its party documents of that time, adopted during the CPG Central Committee plenums and during the one CPG conference held in the period during the National Liberation War (1941-1944). It was very careful to avoid even mentioning the Macedonians by their ethnic name. There was only one mention about some kind of “Slavo-Macedonians” and that was during its Eighth Plenum resolution held in January 1942. (Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, p. 473.)

On July 20, 1943, “Rizospastis”, the central party authority newspaper, published the following in response to intensified pressure and demands from the Macedonian communists (cadres, members and supporters of the CPG):

“Macedonia, after the population exchanges, is as Greek as the Attica Region around Athens...”

It was made perfectly clear that no Macedonians or non-Greek people existed in Greece. One cannot even imagine a Macedonian or non-Greek person existing in Attica.

Three days before Rizospastis published the above article, on July 17, 1943, “Elevteri Elada”, EAM’s newspaper, with obvious nervousness, published the following:

“EAM, as the Piedmont for national liberation, proclaims that: Macedonia is and will remain Greek!”

So, having said that, they explained perfectly what they were working towards.

It was an unbelievable situation. The EAM Coalition, the political left led by the Communist Party of Greece, all fearing that Greece would lose Macedonia, did everything they could to suppress the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement. They did not want anyone to know anything or hear anything about any Macedonians or any kind of Macedonian anti-fascist movement.

But then, what about the so-called “Slavo-Macedonians”? Who were they? And what about them?

According to General Stefanos Sarafis, ELAS supreme commander: “They are all Greeks...” This is what he wrote in his famous book “O ELAS” after his visit to the village Perivoli, where he inspected the Second Battalion of the ELAS Twenty-Eight Brigade: “It is composed entirely of... Slavophone-Greeks.” (P. 331.)

This particular battalion, however, was the all Macedonian Lerin-Kostur battalion led by Ilia Dimovski-Gotse which later crossed over into the Republic of Macedonia.

Similarly, in the spirit of what “Rizospastis” published earlier, General Bakirdzhis, commander of the ELAS divisions in Macedonia, in his famous interview with “Laiki Foni”, a Party

newspaper, said that the fighters in the Macedonian ELAS divisions and the Macedonian people in general are “Bulgarophone Greeks!” (Zb. Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War, Volume 1, Doc. No. 191, page 522.)

So, according to “Rizospastis” there are no Macedonians in Macedonia only “Slavophone Greeks” and according to “Laiki Foni” the Macedonians in Macedonia are “Bulgarophone Greeks”.

The CPG-EAM tried to hold onto these absurd and impossible claims by forcing the Macedonian people to join Greek organizations.

Instead of allowing the Macedonian people to join their own Macedonian organizations, the CPG and EAM leaderships forced them to join Greek national organizations such as EAM, ELAS (reserves), EPON, EA, and others... This meant that:

The CPG in fact did not recognize the self-determination of the Macedonian people and as a result their national existence as Macedonians was denied and so was their right to organize themselves in their own revolutionary organizations, the right to create and join their own anti-fascist liberation struggle, and the right to fight for their own freedom as an equal and as an ally of the Greek people...

- They (CPG leadership) did not find the means to suppress the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement and when it erupted, to suppress it as the bearer expressing the uniqueness of the Macedonian nation...

- When the national council (Εθνικον Συμβουλιον) of democratic Greece convened in May 1944, somewhere in the liberated territory, it completely ignored the Macedonian people, that is, it treated them as a Greek people, and proclaimed the Greek character of Macedonia... (Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War, Volume 1, Doc. No. 104, page 407. See also Στα αρματα..., p. 328.)

This was Siantos’s anti-Macedonian policy about which Zahariadis said nothing when he wrote about “mistakes” made. In fact, the

people who constituted the CPG leadership under Siantos, were the same people who constituted the CPG leadership under Zahariadis...

6. Who was Siantos?

On May 20, 1947, Siantos had a heart attack and died. Zahariadis, however, claimed that the intelligence service liquidated him because he was one of their agents and they feared that he was going to be discovered. They killed him to stop him from talking... (Ξενοκρατία, page 103.)

Three years later, during the Third CPG Conference, while analyzing Siantos's policies during the fascist occupation, it was decided and declared that: "Georgios Siantos was a traitor who betrayed the revolution..." (Neos Cosmos, no. 10/1950. To KKE απο το 1931-1952, p. 219.)

Later, on April 3, 1973, Dimitrios Vlantas, a DAG general and member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, said: "Siantos was a traitor from a long time ago. He was a traitor at least since 1932 when I was secretary of the Communist Youth of Macedonia and a member of the CPG District Committee. One day, the secretary of the District Committee asked me to find a house to hold a secret meeting. For such things I used the house of a businessman in Solun. He was my trusted contact. I asked him if we could bring seven people to a meeting. 'Do you know them?' he asked. 'I know them,' I replied. We started to assemble and, at one point, I saw the businessman making hand gestures for me to go to the kitchen. He looked angry and then said: 'Comrade did you bring comrades or traitors here?' 'What traitors are you talking about?' I asked. 'That one there!' he said while pointing at Siantos who I did not know at the time. 'They call him Georgios Siantos,' he said. 'We served together in the same unit. Even then he was a spy – an informant,' he concluded."

This is also what Vlantas said: "Siantos was always a provocateur and, in my opinion, an intelligence service agent. This is how he managed to play his part - to suppress the national resistance

movement during the occupation and then, during the December events...” (Ξενοκρατία, p. 105.)

7. The attack on Siantos came to full expression

If Siantos was working for the “Asphalia” (intelligence service) and was put in the ranks of the CPG (he was certainly neither the first nor the last), then it is important to note the following:

- The CPG was damaged from the inside by the people the Metaxas fascist dictatorship managed to plant (Το ΚΚΕ από το 1931-1952, p. 104). The Metaxas dictatorship arrested many of the CPG leaders and activists and sent them to jail. It is well-known that many CPG activists were imprisoned by the Asphalia and held at various prisons and camps. Imprisoned among them were also several hundred plants who worked for the Asphalia. Then, when the Germans arrived, these activists were handed over to the Gestapo. In the meantime the Asphalia allowed a certain number to “escape”. The most significant among them was Siantos who was then put in charge of the CPG during the fascist occupation, that is, during the national liberation struggle.

During this decisively critical and revolutionary time, all these people, i.e. the Asphalia, its bosses, the ministers, and the prime minister of the Greek government in exile, were all appointed, maintained and their activities financed by the English government. And, of course, they all worked to serve English interests in Greece.

For as long as Siantos was an agent of the Asphalia he and those around him made sure that all CPG-EAM policies, more or less, directly or indirectly, served English interests in Greece.

Here are some characteristic moments that the reader may find interesting:

First, the CPG Central Committee, during its 6th Plenum, held in July 1941, called on all the Greek people, their parties and organizations, to rise up in a national front against the occupiers. The CPG then separately set the following task only for the Party

and for each communist: “To organize the popular uprising forces for the national and social liberation of Greece...”

It was all normal, nicely formulated and well-suited for the historical moment. However, in the work done, the most important and revolutionary task of all was to organize the popular uprising for the national and social liberation of Greece... However this was not done. The actual uprising for the social liberation was not promoted but diluted as a secondary task and was carried out only systematically to undermine the occupier (strikes and demonstrations), but be harmless to English interests in Greece. In other words the struggle for the social liberation of Greece was completely and publicly abandoned...

Second, the EAM Coalition, i.e. the political left headed by the CPG leadership, succeeded in achieving wide national unity among the Greek people, the kind that never existed before. Never in their long history have the Greek people been united like this. Of the approximately eight million Greeks, over 70% of the voters who participated in the elections voted for EAM candidates (CPG) and elected members of the National Council...

Given its popularity and strong position among the Greek people why then did the CPG persistently and systematically propagate the need for “national unity” with its arch enemy the Greek government in exile which was formed, maintained and funded by the English? Why did the CPG persistently try to raise the English creation’s authority and popularity among the people...?

Third, by mid-1943, an all people’s partisan war was already in progress on the ground. The ELAS partisan units, led mainly by the communists, were growing more numerous by the day...

So, why was there a need to put ELAS under English control and not under the control of the neighbouring peoples’ revolutionary alliance? According to Sarafis: “ELAS was placed under ‘allied military command’ headed by the British General Staff for the Middle East. All operations undertaken by ELAS were under the orders of General Staff...” (S. Sarafis, O ELAS, p. 120.) All orders from Supreme Headquarters were given by British officers and

delivered to each headquarters also by British officers. So ELAS units carried out their operations in accordance with orders given by British officers and British command. This is what famous Intelligence Service agent Christopher Montague Wunthouse (Chris), then deputy chief and head of the British military mission, competently and authoritatively said:

“If there were no British officers in the resistance movement in Greece, the history of not only Greece but also of Europe would have gone in a completely different direction... The presence of the British military mission in Greece prevented the Communists in 1943-1944 from placing Greece under their absolute control. If the communists had taken power when the Germans withdrew from Greece in September 1944, it would have been very difficult for us to seize it away from them in the eyes of the world...” (Secret Archives of the Wehrmacht, “To Vima”, June 11, 1963, Hristo Andonovski, Macedonians under Greece in the struggle against fascism, p. 214.)

Siantos’s maneuver to place ELAS under English control was of historical significance because it prevented it from joining the national revolutionary alliance in the Balkans.

Fourth, with the Treaty of Lebanon in May 1944, the CPG, EAM and ELAS voluntarily and formally renounced any attempts to seize power in Greece. At the same time they recognized the English-created Greek government in exile as the “legitimate government of Greece” and as the “government of national unity”.

But there was more...

They also agreed that ELAS could not be the national army of Greece and that a national army would be required in the near future. This responsibility was left to the Greek government in exile and to the English General Staff for the Middle East... And so was the fate of ELAS. They decided to disband ELAS. (See “Στα αρματα, στα αρματα...”, pp. 330-333.)

“The Treaty of Lebanon not only did not help and did not strengthen national unity, but helped the English imperialists and domestic

capitalist oligarchy to re-establish the old fascist regime and prevent the people from deciding their own destiny...” (“Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, Χρονικον της εθνικης αντιστασης”, page 31.)

Fifth, the Treaty of Caserta, signed in September 1944, paved the way for an English military invasion of Athens and other Greek territories abandoned by the Germans. This was not done to chase the Germans out but simply to occupy Greek territory, especially Athens. According to an official German document found in the archives published in Greece, there was an agreement between Churchill and Hitler to allow German troops to freely withdraw from Greece. This is what was published in the Athens newspaper “Ta Nea”: “The British fox achieved two purposes: Strengthened the German forces against the Russians and occupied Greece unhindered.” (“Ta Nea”, 14.1.1978, p. 12, “To Vivlion”).

Naturally the English invaded Athens and other important strategic positions in Greece to prevent ELAS from taking them...

To further influence events in Greece, British General Skobi was proclaimed Supreme Commander of the Greek Armed Forces.

This meant that ELAS too was subordinated to him and to the English, and ELAS units had to act strictly under Skobi’s orders. In other words the English now controlled every aspect of ELAS.

This is what was said in the celebrated and well-known thesis compiled for the CPG’s 40th anniversary adopted during the CPG Central Committee Ninth Plenum, held in August 1958: “The Treaty of Caserta placed the Greek Armed Forces under English command and in General Skobi’s hands. The English decided to exclude ELAS from participating in the liberation of major cities, and important strategic regions such as Athens, Central and Eastern Macedonia, Epirus, etc. The most important strategic zones were given to the fascist organizations the likes of EDES, PAO, etc...” (See: Forty years of CPG, p. 715.)

Sixth, the provoked military clash in Athens in December 1944, was a well-staged ground for disarmament and disbanding, i.e. liquidating ELAS. Undoubtedly Siantos and Partsalidis had a lot to

do with it. With their signatures on the Varkiza Agreement (February 12, 1945), all ELAS units, all throughout Greece, except for some reserve units stationed in Athens, were disarmed and liquidated. The ELAS reserve units in Athens were attacked and defeated by the combined English and domestic reactionary forces.

“Georgios Siantos and Mitsos Partsalidis, the CPG Central Committee Politburo representatives who signed the Varkiza Agreement violated the requirement for the general unconditional amnesty given to all ELAS fighters and democratic forces by the Politburo. (This amnesty was given in order to protect the ELAS fighters and democratic forces in general, from English and domestic reactionary persecution). The Varkiza Agreement only called for the surrender of weapons. It seems that Siantos and Partsalidis deviated and were arbitrary on the question of the general and unconditional amnesty. They agreed to ‘unconditionally’ disarm the resistance movement, i.e. unconditional capitulation with no amnesty. On the one hand, this created opportunities for the English to restore the Monarcho-Fascists in power and to completely break down the people’s democratic forces in Greece, and on the other hand, constituted a serious obstacle to a rapid political and organizational consolidation of the people’s democratic forces...” (This assessment was made by the party edition “Χρονικον του αγωνα” 1878-1951, p. 49.)

Seventh, when we take into consideration that with the numerous strikes and demonstrations in the larger cities and across Greece, of the millions of people mobilized, 90 percent were categorically hostile to the occupiers and were ready for an armed uprising. Clearly, under these conditions, there were plenty of opportunities to create a huge revolutionary army that would have inflicted heavy blows on the occupying forces like it was done in Yugoslavia, China, Cuba, Vietnam etc. With an army like this, given its economic exhaustion, England would not have dared do what it did especially in a prolonged and dangerous revolution.

But, what can we say? “The mountain bore... a mole”. Thanks to Siantos’s CPG leadership and to the EAM coalition’s policies, only a small number of people, a few tens of thousands, out of the

millions who were ready to join the revolution, were recruited into ELAS...

According to Sarafis (p. 276): “ELAS forces at the time of the liberation numbered 48,940 soldiers, of whom 5,240 were officers...” These numbers do not include the ELAS forces in Athens or on the islands Samos, Mitilini and Crete. According to Hutas: “ELAS forces numbered 80,000 fighters”. Similar information was also given by E. Fotiadis and K. Tsolakas... (See: Andrikopoulos, Volume 2, p. 174.)

ELAS was quickly brought under English control so that it could be destroyed... This was yet another atrocity committed by the CPG... which “afflicts” it...

8. Anti-Macedonian practices

The Bulgarians, as allies of the Germans, by their San Stefano illusions, immediately took it upon themselves to protect the Macedonian population, especially those Macedonians who were imprisoned in the concentration camps by the Metaxas fascist dictatorship. Thousands were released by the Germans, over eight thousand from the island Chios alone, and were allowed to return home.

This chance was also given to 27 CPG activists from Macedonia, mostly Macedonians, imprisoned in the infamous Akronavplia prison. Among them were Tashko Karadzha, Lazo Trpovski, Andreia Chipov, Lazo Dimovski-Oshenski, Trpo Kalimanov...

According to “Glasnik”, organ of the Institute for National History: “Not a single Macedonian, prominent communist or activist, was given the opportunity to work in the districts among their Macedonian compatriots or with the Macedonian population. It was a common occurrence that during the occupation, there was not a single Macedonian CPG secretary in the regional committees in Lerin, Kostur or Voden Regions where the Macedonian population was compact...” (T. Simovski, Tashko Karadzha, “Glasnik” no. 1/1975, p. 120.)

Naturally Siantos's CPG leadership made sure preventative measures were taken to prohibit Macedonians from taking leadership positions and from developing a Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement.

But there was more...

Some of these Macedonian activists, probably the most dangerous ones in this respect, soon died under very suspicious circumstances. Tashko Karadzha, for example, came to Solun to work with the CPG Provincial Bureau and while waiting in one of their central offices was arrested by an Asphalia agent (April 8, 1942). Later he was killed by the Germans. Lazo Trpovski was also killed in a similar manner. He got a directive to go to Solun to do some work but never made it. It turned out that the Asphalia in Solun was expecting him and knew about his travels. Lazo was killed in an ambush. Only those who gave him his orders knew which route to Solun he was going to take.

This explains the paradox: Not one of the many prominent Macedonian revolutionaries succeeded in becoming a leader of the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement in Greece.

The Macedonians, however, did not stay leaderless for too long. New leaders surfaced about whom the CPG knew nothing. Not being aware of who they were, and of their role in the Macedonian movement, the Siantos CPG leadership did not pursue them...

During the fascist occupation the Macedonian CPG core organizations in Voden and Voden Region, Lerin and Lerin Region, and Kostur and Kostur Region were obliged to be connected via EAM, ELAS, EPON channels because they were not allowed to have their own. As a result they were unable to maximize their participation in the struggle against the foreign fascist occupiers.

The Siantos leadership, through its CPG secretaries such as Logas and Evtimidis, installed in those regions, made sure of that. (As it turned out, Evtimidis was an agent of the Asphalia.)

Here is another thing, characteristic of the times: The only news the Macedonian activists at the districts received was what the CPG, EAM, ELAS, EPON, newspapers published. These newspapers were always full of news about events from the distant fronts and from all across Greece, but persistently kept silent about nearby events taking place in the Macedonian districts, even in the closest ones.

This, no doubt, was another of the Siantos CPG leadership's prevention policies to keep the Macedonian antifascist forces fragmented and isolated from each other, even in their own districts and surrounding areas. This proved to be a heavy blow against the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement.

This explains why Macedonians created more than one liberation movement organization...

For example the Macedonians created:

MAO (Macedonian Anti-Fascist Organization) in Voden, SOF (Slavo-Macedonian Liberation Front) in Lerin Region, and SNOF (Slavo-Macedonian People's Liberation Front) in Kostur Region.

Each was created without the knowledge of the existence of the others...

The CPG Greek leaders agreed to allow the creation of MAO in Voden because of the strong pressure put on them by persistent demands from the Macedonian Voden Communists. But even after MAO was created the Greek leaders kept a lid on it and no one outside of Voden knew about it, not even the activists in nearby Meglen (Karadzova) and Ostrovo Regions where I worked in the underground. There was no news at all of its creation or existence in any of the CPG or EAM newspapers. MAO even had its own newspaper called "Red Star" and a "Newsletter" which it barely managed to publish only several times. Its small circulation unfortunately was limited only to the city Voden.

But when MAO became popular with the Macedonian people in Voden the Greek leaders deliberately disbanded it, and shut down its newspaper the “Red Star” and its “Newsletter”.

A little later the Greek leaders decided to “give in” a little and allowed the founding of a single Macedonian organization in Lerin and Kostur Regions under the name SNOF. But, as events showed, they did this because they hoped that without Greek help SNOF would soon fade away and become a fictitious organization. But they were mistaken... SNOF quickly turned into a dynamic combat organization. And so did MAO in Voden, which is why it was quickly disbanded.

And on top of that the Greeks became very hostile...

They began to attack, slander and discredit the Macedonian leaders with aims at destroying their credibility and strangling the Macedonian movement.

From the logic of the events that took place, we can conclude that:

“Like MAO, SNOF was created by the CPG on the assumption that it would remain stillborn and fictitious. These Macedonian organizations were dissolved because they grew rapidly and became the material force of Macedonian self-awareness and as living and active bearers and expressers of the Macedonian identity and Macedonian national existence... Of course, this “collided” with the “Greek character of Macedonia” (Εθνικον Συμβουλιον), and with the thesis that “Macedonia is as Greek as Attica” (“Rizospastis”) and with the thesis that the Macedonians are “Slavophone Greeks”.

Having this in mind, it becomes quite clear as to why the Siantos CPG leadership has never mentioned the Macedonians in any of the official Party texts as having participated in the national liberation war against the occupiers. Not only has the Macedonian participation been omitted, but the entire Macedonian existence in Greece has been completely ignored. Of course, to speak of the Macedonians as a non-Greek people and about their rights and freedom would mean that:

The CPG would have to publicly admit to the existence of a Macedonian national question, which then would mean that it would have to recognize that existence. And that would diametrically oppose the CPG leadership's line that "Macedonia is Greek" and that the Macedonian people are "Slavophone Greeks"...

9. The great evil

On August 8, 1948, in his report to the CPM Central Committee, Svetozar Vukmanovich-Tempo, CPY Central Committee delegate in Macedonia, wrote:

"At the request of Greek headquarters our troops from Bitola Region were sent to Greek Macedonia, to Lerin and Kostur Regions, and there they made political breakthroughs with the Macedonian masses. The Macedonian people welcomed them as their liberators and all the counter-bands voluntarily surrendered their weapons. The Macedonian people wanted to be placed under the command of our Macedonian Headquarters. We rejected this because of the attitude of the Greek Party (CPG) regarding the Macedonian question..." (Sources of the Liberation War and Revolution in Macedonia, p. 183.)

The fixed events in the above quotation (an original document of that time), especially the existence of counter-bands in the Macedonian villages in the aforementioned areas, clearly indicates that the EAM coalition, i.e. the left wing headed by the CPG and the Siantos leadership, suppressed the Macedonian liberation movement which greatly facilitated the work of the German-Bulgarian propaganda. Taking away the Macedonian people's inalienable right to organize and fight for their own freedom, without offering them anything in return, the Siantos CPG leadership left the Macedonian people at the disposal of enemy propaganda.

The Germans and Bulgarians tried to win over the Macedonian people by offering them an autonomous Macedonia under the auspices of "brotherly Bulgaria" or "mother Bulgaria", with Hitler's blessing. They wanted to mobilize and arm the Macedonian people and by doing so, they were hoping to acquire considerable territory and a living force that would significantly weaken the anti-fascist

liberation movement in Macedonia. And then this would have given the Bulgarians a foundation to be proud of and to call the Macedonian people “Bulgarians from Macedonia”.

The Bulgarians did manage to convince a small number of Macedonians to come to their side but the CPG never explained why... The CPG also did not explain why the occupiers armed a number of counter-bands. A large part of these counter-bands in the Macedonian villages were armed because they wanted to protect their villages from Greek ELAS unit attacks. On many occasions Greek ELAS units attacked several unprotected Macedonian villages and killed the local leaders because they were courageous enough to criticize CPG-EAM policy and publicly demand “equal rights” for the Macedonian people and not just empty promises.

ELAS units killed Macedonians because these Macedonians insisted that they wanted to fight for their own rights in a struggle of their own... and not in a Greek struggle... and not in the ranks of Greek national organizations... and not for the national liberation of Greece... These Macedonians died at the hands of ELAS because they wanted to struggle for their own democratic rights and freedoms.

Macedonian people died at the hands of ELAS because they did not want to struggle side by side with the Greek people. They wanted to be an equal ally and not just an unpaid mercenary. And so on, in that spirit.

As is well-known, the most dangerous Greek nationalist armed bands, which attacked the Macedonian villages and wreaked havoc on the Macedonian people, were created by the Greek reactionaries under the initiative of the occupiers...

The very fact that the occupiers resorted to this kind of measure against the Macedonian people, indisputably and convincingly speaks of their inability to attract the Macedonian population to their side. In other words their offer of an “Autonomous Macedonia under the cover of fascists” had no effect on the Macedonian people.

The reason why the Macedonian people felt compelled to accept arms from the occupiers was to defend themselves against Siantos's anti-Macedonian practices, the chauvinistic outbursts from Greek ELAS units, and the savage outbursts from Greek nationalist gangs. It was necessary to survive, and there was no other way...

This is what happened and this is how things were and that is why when the Macedonian partisans from the Bitola region arrived in Greek occupied Macedonia, they were welcomed as liberators and the counter-bands (armed Macedonians) voluntarily surrendered their weapons. And this is why these Macedonians demanded that they be placed under the command of the Main Headquarters in Macedonia (Republic of Macedonia).

When the Greek CPG leaders and the people from "Greek headquarters" found out from Tempo (Vukmanovich) that the Macedonian counter-bands were surrendering without a fight to the Macedonian revolutionary troops, they asked for help from the Macedonians from the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia. ELAS did not have any "all Macedonian units", and if it took action against the counter-bands with its Greek ELAS units, it would surely have faced massive losses. That is why the Greeks demanded that the Macedonian units be made with fighters from the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia. This, of course, was done out of desperation and necessity. At the same time the Greeks had to acknowledge that their "Slavophone Greeks" in Greece were the same people as the Macedonians from the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia...

10. They say one thing and think and do another

TO: THE MACEDONIAN COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE

Dear comrades,

According to a directive issued by Comrade Tempo, delegate of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia's Central Committee, we are directed to make contact with your Committee for Cooperation.

Our National Liberation Party units, together with yours, have acted against the German and Italian fascist occupiers. We want to strengthen this relationship and cooperation.

In that sense, our representative, Comrade Pitu, sent two letters on July 1, 1943, one to the CPG Central Committee, and the other to the Lerin CPG Regional Committee, suggesting that representatives of your and our party organize a meeting.

According to Comrade Tempo's directive, we would also like to invite your representative to a meeting with a representative of our Central Committee for closer acquaintance and cooperation.

Upon receipt of this letter, let us know when and where we can hold the meeting. You can schedule the meeting by replying to our letter or through Comrade Tempo...

July 16, 1943.

Greetings from your communist comrades.
Death to Fascism - Freedom to the People!
CPM Central Committee (Sources of War and Revolution in Macedonia, pp. 161-162.)

The meeting took place in Solun. Representing the CPM Central Committee was Tsvetko Uzunovski-Abbas. The talks and agreement were summarized in a letter, dated September 26, 1943, sent to Dobrivoe Radosavlievich, CPY Central Committee instructor:

“Twenty days ago I was in Solun and met with one member of the CPG Central Committee with whom we came to the following agreement:

1. Regularly exchange information.
2. Maintain continuous contact and meet once a month.
3. Send a comrade to Solun Region to work among the Macedonians. (Ibid. p. 319-323.)
4. Similarly send a comrade to Lerin Region.
5. Send two typewriters to allow them to publish information in Macedonian.

6. Form separate Macedonian units with a Macedonian flag and a five-pointed star.
7. Allow our partisans to carry out joint actions together with the Macedonian Partisans from Greece, as they do with the Macedonian partisans from Bulgaria...

These were the main points we discussed and agreed to after a long discussion..."

Siantos's CPG leadership however had no intention of implementing any of the agreed upon items, especially points 5, 6, 7. There was no newspaper issued in the Macedonian language at all. But in November 1943, the CPG decided to establish the Macedonian organization SNOF in Lerin and Kostur Regions. Then, at the initiative of the SNOF district boards, two Macedonian newspapers appeared. The newspaper "Sloboda" appeared in Lerin Region in the Macedonian language written with Greek letters, and the newspaper "Slavianomakedonski glas" in the Macedonian language written with Cyrillic letters appeared in Kostur Region. But as soon as they appeared they were pulled out by the Greek leadership. Also, a few months after its founding the CPG declared SNOF a "reactionary" organization... a "crypto-fascist" organization... and dissolved it in April 1944. It then abolished its regional newspapers which had only limited circulation...

The situation became tense and electrified.

Only then, for understandable reasons, the Siantos leadership ordered:

The formation of one all-Macedonian unit as part of the ELAS Ninth Division (Lerin - Kostur Region) and one all-Macedonian unit as part of the ELAS Tenth Division (Voden).

The Lerin Kostur Macedonian ELAS Battalion was formed on June 20, 1944, during a meeting in the village Pozdivishta, Kostur Region. It was formed by combining existing Macedonian armed partisans from the "Trpovski", "Karaorman" (N. Peiov) and fighters from SOV (M. Keramitchiev) groups. Aminadas (an Albanian from the village Lehovo, Lerin Region) was appointed commander of the

battalion, and Ilia Dimovski - Gotse, from Lerin (originally from Statitsa), was appointed battalion commissar.

News that a Macedonian army was being created in the ELAS composition, in a strange way, very much influenced the Macedonian youth to join. This is what reactionary Greek historian Polis Ioanidis wrote: “The Slavs joined the military en masse with three hundred of them being sent to Langa, ELAS Twenty-sixth Brigade headquarters, to be armed. Brigade commander, H. Lazaradis, however, armed only fifty and dispersed them into the units of the brigade, and the rest he sent home, back to their villages where they came from, giving them vacation with appropriate documents...” (Polis Ioanidis, To misterion gotse, newspaper “Elinikos voras”, July 4, 1955. H. Andonovski, The truth about Aegean Macedonia, p. 132.)

This is what Renos Mihaleas, at the time responsible for agitation and propaganda in the ELAS Ninth Division, wrote in connection with the formation of the Macedonian battalion, and the inconvenience it created for Leonidas Stringos, then CPG secretary of the Provincial Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace:

Stringos: “Why did you create an entire battalion, when the order given was to create only one unit in Voden and Kostur Region?”

Renos: “What would be the harm if divisions were created?”

Stringos: “You are so naive. If the Macedonians had divisions, we Greeks would not be in Macedonia...” (Handwritten letter in Greek from Renos Mihaleas to D. Radosavlievich. A copy of the original can be found in the INI archive in Skopje.)

In the meantime, the very appearance of the Macedonian battalion with its armed Macedonian units and military and political activities in the Macedonian villages, speaking Macedonian and singing Macedonian songs, brought joy to the oppressed Macedonian people who, for the first time in a long time, felt like Macedonians and not like “Slavophone Greeks”.

This was very upsetting to the CPG Greek leadership which resolutely called for the liquidation of the battalion. This kind of “nationalism” was inadmissible and could not be allowed to exist. But the fight was not over. Promises made to the Macedonian people were not fulfilled. Their rights and freedoms were not delivered so the Macedonians refused to disband the battalion. As a result the Greeks in ELAS began to force the issue under hostile acts and came close to having an armed conflict. To avoid bloodshed the Macedonian battalion moved to the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia. This is what, among other things, battalion command wrote:

“...We declare before the entire world that:

...2) Claims made against us as to why we left are lies and fabrications. We left as a measure taken to avoid ELAS intentions against us. You all know that one of our units was captured and disarmed by the Greeks of ELAS. You also know that ELAS military units from Kostur Region and Prespa were dispatched to pursue and disarm us. That is why we took measures to avoid a fratricidal collision... They ordered us to go south into Greece so that they could break up our Macedonian partisan movement...” (H. Andonovski, *The truth about Aegean Macedonia*, p. 141, the document can be found in Ilia Dimovski – Gotse’s personal archives.)

11. Voden Region

The formation of the Voden Macedonian battalion, about which I wrote in some detail in another document, was another matter altogether. Without a proper directive, we the CPG Macedonians activists in Tresino (Orma) and Meglen Regions were not even sure if we could do this. But as a CPG Voden regional committee we did it anyway; we created the Voden ELAS Macedonian battalion.

Here I will only mention a few details. We had a meeting on June 15, 1944 and, after my introductory speech, on my request, we agreed the next day that myself and local activist Georgi Atanasovski-Blaze would go out to the villages and mobilize Macedonian fighters for an all-Macedonian Voden battalion.

Regional Committee Secretary Barba Traiko (Niko Papasermidzhis) was obliged to notify the CPG District Committee and obtain its approval as well as find a secluded place for us to establish the headquarters of our secret committee.

What follows is a source document of that time, which explains why the formation of the Voden battalion was allowed:

“RADIOTELEGRAM number 94

To: The 10th Division (ELAS)

Information on the political organizations in the city Voden by Bulgarian Command: The purpose of arming the Macedonian villages is to create an Autonomous Macedonia under the auspices of the Bulgarian Government with Hitler’s consent. The head of the autonomist movement is Vancho Mihailov. The action is concealed to avoid disputes with the Greek reactionaries. Many Macedonians are drawn into this. Some Macedonian political cadres are also sympathetic with this autonomy. The political organization in Voden, with Panos in charge, has decided to form independent Macedonian groups, with red flags and with the sickle and hammer. (Panos was subsequently criticized for this and removed from all functions...) We expect your orders. Petros.

Sent on May 30, 1944

Received on May 30, 1944 (Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War, Volume 1, Doc 115, page 416.)

This is what it was all about: German affairs were definitely winding down and the Germans would soon be leaving Greece. The road and rail track Solun-Voden-Bitola was one of the most important arteries for their withdrawal. The passage “Muarem An” (Voden-Ostovo) was one of the most dangerous sections of this artery. The Germans and Bulgarians had to secure it so they called on the Macedonian people to rise up and fight for a “free autonomous Macedonia”. The Germans and Bulgarians created the “Ohrana” military formation in Voden with promises of a free Macedonia. They then armed it with modern German weapons. “Ohrana” in turn, through threats, put pressure on the Macedonian people of the surrounding villages that

dominated Voden, i.e. the “Muarem An” passage, and managed to arm them...

In other words, the German and Bulgarian occupiers, using their strong Macedonian aspiration for freedom, tried to manipulate the Macedonian people to work for their interests.

However, both the false autonomist movement, on the one hand, and the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement, on the other, had extremely disastrous consequences for the Greeks. Namely, almost nothing remained because of the systematic Hellenization which had been carried out by the Greek church and state for decades.

The Siantos CPG leadership did not hesitate, however, from the two “evils” (the Macedonian autonomist movement and the Macedonian partisan battalion) to hold on to one of them (the Macedonian partisan battalion) and dance with it. It then decided to keep the Macedonian battalion and use it against the other evil (the false autonomist movement)...

This is what happened and how it happened: With the emergence of the Macedonian battalion “Ohrana’s” strength dried up. Remnants of the “Ohrana” and Greek fascist gendarmerie then began to join and serve the Germans. What kind of “free Macedonia” was this? What kind of “free Macedonia” would ally itself with its worst enemy the Greeks fascists? There was no “free Macedonia”! Only empty promises of one! As the battalion grew rapidly, “Ohrana” began to melt away. And when “Ohrana” and the false autonomist movement was broken, the CPG leadership began to accuse the Voden Macedonian battalion of being “nationalist” and leading “nationalistic propaganda” among the Macedonian people. Following that, Greek ELAS units were secretly dispatched to attack, disarm and liquidate it (the same way they did with the Lerin - Kostur Region battalion)...

It was under these conditions that the Siantos CPG leadership, like the foreign occupiers, used the Macedonian people’s strong desire for freedom to serve the interests of others, i.e. to defend “Greek national” interests in Greek occupied Macedonia...

12. Epilog

Since the CPG Sixth Congress took place in December 1935, the CPG's official line on the Macedonian national question has been: "full equality for minorities". Regarding the Macedonian national question, the Congress underlined the following:

"The Party will not cease to declare that the Macedonian national question will ultimately and definitely be resolved "brotherly" after the Soviet government achieves victory in the Balkans, which will "break" all "dishonest agreements" on the exchange of populations and will take all practical measures to erase imperialistic injustices. Only then will the Macedonian people fully realize their national establishment..." (To KKE απο το 1931-1952, p. 75.)

This means that the CPG Sixth Congress recognizes the distinctiveness, that is, the national existence of the Macedonian people.

This was the CPG official line both during the time of the fascist occupation and during the national liberation war against it. But instead of that the CPG declared that "Macedonia was as Greek as Attica" and the Macedonians people were "Slavophone Greeks". This is how it was: The CPG leadership decided what and how things would be conducted...

The Macedonian anti-fascist movement, during the occupation, when neighbouring nations were fighting for their own freedom, did not fail despite all Greek attempts to squash it.

Despite the fact that the Greeks did everything in their power to stop it, the Macedonian movement continued to grow without help from the Party. On the contrary, the Party did everything in its power to suffocate the Macedonian movement after it broke out. This is yet more evidence of the symptoms of "CPG affliction".

13. To the previous text

Let us now examine what today's (more than three decades later) CPG governing factors think about Siantos's policy:

“The fact that the Greek people fought heroically during the war against the Italian-German invaders, and the historic victory of the Soviet army, made conditions very favourable for the creation of a free independent and democratic Greece. Unfortunately the Party leadership did not perceive the resulting internal and external conditions for a victorious end to the national liberation struggle. In fact, the Party was preoccupied with the belief that EAM, even though it attracted a large majority of the Greek people under its banner, could not win against the will of England that controlled the Mediterranean. And so the CPG leadership capitulated to the English reactionaries and signed the Varkiza agreement... with which the CPG handed over all weapons to the enemy and left the democratic fighters at its mercy...”

Here is what the CPG Central Committee said about this in a letter, dated April 1956, addressed to all members of the Communist Party of Greece (adopted by the CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum in March 1956 See: Forty years of the CPG, p. 644.):

“The first serious error was made in July 1943, when the CPG subordinated ELAS to the English General Staff for the Middle East. By doing this it lost its autonomy... The CPG did this even though it had EAM and PEEA (Political Liberation Commission) on its side. Even though the CPG was supported by the majority of the Greek people and was the only power in the free territories with a significant armed force, while the Greek government in exile in Cairo controlled only a small minority with small arms, the CPG made great and unacceptable concessions, which did not match the ratio of forces... The Lebanon Agreement signed in May 1944, was another mistake which helped the English imperialists and the plutocratic oligarchy to restore the old fascist regime and prevent the people from deciding on their own destiny... The Caserta Agreement, signed in September 1944, was a continuation and expansion of the Lebanon Agreement error... Under it all Greek armed forces were placed under the command of English General Skobi, and it was forbidden for ELAS to enter the larger cities in Greece or to take control of important strategic positions such as Attica, Central Macedonia, Eastern Macedonia, Epirus, etc. At the same time it allowed EDES, PAO, and other fascist organizations to

take control of certain important areas... The armed encounter in December 1944 was organized and instigated by the English imperialists in cooperation with the Greek plutocracy with aims at breaking the democratic anti-fascist struggle and the national liberation forces. The aim was also to impose an anti-democratic regime, to restore capitalist rule and imperialist dependence. In this (December) collision ELAS suffered partial defeat. But its basic armed forces were still functioning. EAM could have relied on these forces and by utilizing them against the weaker English and reactionary forces, implemented a political solution that corresponded to the real ratio of forces. But instead the CPG signed the Varkiza Agreement and capitulated to the English imperialists and the domestic reactionaries...”

These are the most serious mistakes the CPG made during the national liberation struggle 1941-1945. The basis for these mistakes was: The CPG leadership being incapable of overcoming the strength of the English imperialists and the reactionaries as well as underestimating the power of the Greek people, and the absence of faith in the possibility of creating a free and democratic Greece, free from foreign imperialist dependence... The CPG Central Committee cultivated the opportunistic theory that “we are incapable of dealing with the English”...

All this was stated in the theses: “Forty years of CPG”, adopted during the CPG Central Committee Ninth Plenum in August 1958 (see: “Forty years of CPG”, pp. 715-716).

This kind of analysis, at least as far as I know, is still widespread and accepted by the Greek communist leadership movement of all colours. Of course all this was in the past so, naturally, the Greek leaders are now preoccupied with the problems of today. But when they do need to address the past, they always talk about their “mistakes” - the Lebanon, Caserta and Varkiza Agreements.

But, one cannot fail to notice one striking thing:

That nothing has been said about Siantos’s policies. The CPG has been persistently silent on the Siantos CPG leadership’s decisions:

As to why the military and political plan to ally with the neighbouring people's revolutions was cancelled? As to why was the signed agreement for creating a common Balkan general staff was canceled? And as to why ELAS had to be placed under English command and control?

Why was the people's anger against the occupiers used to perform harmless actions (strikes, demonstrations and uneven battles in the streets) that served English interests? Why was it not used to create a strong armed struggle? Why did EAM recruit only a small fraction, only a few tens of thousands, of fighters into ELAS from the millions of people available to it?

Why did the CPG Central Committee, during its Sixth Plenum held in June 1941, decide to violate its decision to "organize a people's uprising" to achieve a socialist liberation? Why did the CPG Central Committee, during its Tenth Plenum held in January 1944, call for "strategically securing the borders", which means occupying and annexing new territories?

Why did CPG representatives Roussos, Porfirogenis, and Zvolos violate the CPG Central Committee Politburo's decision, and behind its back signed the Lebanon Agreement, an agreement they were not authorized to sign? Why was the CPG Central Committee Politburo's decision violated again, behind the CPG's back when Siantos and Partsalidis signed the Varkiza Agreement they were not authorized to sign? Etc...

There is plenty of time and opportunity and, of course, sooner or later the real reasons will come out and the answers to these questions will be revealed.

My task at hand is to look at these events from a different angle, different from those of most writers...

* * *

Here is some information derived from an interview with General Markos Vafiadis conducted by the Zagreb-based newspaper "Vus":

Vus: “There are people in the world who believe the fate of your struggle and today’s political order in Greece... was determined elsewhere, outside of Greece, and that... (in any case) would be completed in the same way as it ended... (for) no one could do anything before this ‘higher force’...”

Markos: “What kind of ‘higher force’?”

Vus: “You are familiar with Churchill and Stalin’s Moscow agreement of October 1943, according to which Greece, as it is known today, belonged absolutely to the Anglo-Saxon sphere of influence and it ‘legalized’ the intervention of Great Britain and the United States in Greece...”

Markos: “Of course, it would be easiest for us to exclusively blame the external factor for our defeat and for everything that happened during the struggle. But the culprits for those problems are still among us... For us, my friend, the tragedy was in the disunity of our leadership, the betrayals and the attitudes of capitulation, dating back to before Yalta, which contributed to Greece’s crushing destiny in Yalta... I don’t just want you tell you this; I want to and will provide it to you... I don’t deny Stalin’s responsibility and engagement around Greece, but before we point our finger at him and at Churchill, we need to look for the guilty culprits for the catastrophe of our liberation movement at home. We should first, as the saying goes, sweep our own yard, because the way it was it set the course of events in Greece... When the question of forming a Greek government was raised in the spring of 1944, Papandreou, leader of the Greek Social Democratic Party, came up with a program to form such a government. On May 17, 1944, the various delegates met in a mountain resort in Lebanon where, after a stormy row that lasted three days, it was decided to establish a new administration in Cairo, which would include all the groups led by Papandreou as president. In the meantime a united group in the mountains in Greece, thinking of ELAS, would continue the fight against the German occupiers... However, the day before the start of the Conference, on May 16, 1944, a letter was sent to Churchill, signed by all the members of CPG Central Committee Politburo plenipotentiary delegates at this conference in Lebanon:

Petros Rasos, member of the Politburo, who later served under Zahariadis, was a foreign minister in my interim government,

Miltiadis Porfirogenis, also a member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, was minister of the economy in the interim government,

Zvolos, was also a member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo...

Churchill received the letter the same day and immediately submitted it for publication in the British press. Here, let me show you the document. We may not have translated it literally, but the content is roughly this:

‘Your Excellency, in our capacity as representatives of Greece who are fighting against the occupier, we would like to express our deep respect and appreciation for your exceptional interest and engagement in relation to our country and its future. In fact this is a century-old British tradition towards the Greek people. This exceptional interest and care especially came to the fore and strengthened in the time of your government. Your Excellency, we are convinced that your concern is closely related to the successful resolution of the Middle East crisis in connection with the known events (the British intervention against members of the CPG-EAM in the Greek army serving in Egypt when they shot fifty Greek officers and soldiers, leaders of the resistance anti-fascist movement). What happened in the Egyptian sands provoked our resentment and condemnation. Therefore, let us, as representatives of the Greek resistance movement that is fighting bloody battles in the cities and mountains of Greece, once again and on this occasion, express our appreciation that you have so far been right when you decided to disarm our rebellious units. You have been right and, in a moral sense, this decision has been invaluable: It has given us confidence that we can always count on the help of our great allies, especially from Great Britain and its great and respected leader, Winston Churchill...

Lebanon, May 16, 1944
Members of the Delegation:

Petros Rousos,
Zvolos...’...” concluded Markos.

Then, with a raised tone of voice, Markos continued:

“Not even with this document, did our most legitimate CPG leadership representatives untie Churchill’s hands, or later stop his interventionist troops from doing whatever they felt like in Greece, and turn it into a first Vietnam, and manipulate subsequent governments, with power of weapons, and crush our democratic movement. With this kind of argument in his hands, it was not hard for Churchill to convince Stalin... in whose field of influence Greece should be. Later events uncovered who is who and who serves who... the fifth column was so deeply rooted in the Party and in the movement, that, as ordered by Zahariadis, two of those leaders found themselves in my interim government. This treachery, our tragic defeat, and this persecution unleashed on us, crushed the hopes of tens of thousands of fighters... and scattered people everywhere in the world without a homeland...” (Vus, No. 1297, March 19, 1977, pp. 52-53.)

C. THE GREEK CIVIL WAR AND BEYOND

1. Nikos Zahariadis (CPG Secretary General)

Nikos Zahariadis was the man whose policies at that time created the conditions for the political situation in Greece. I would say many amazing things were written about him. The Fourth of August Fascist regime (1936-1941) sent him to prison on the island Kerkira and to Athens. The Asfalia (Greek intelligence service), then headed by Maniadakis, had more and more agents imbedded inside the CPG leadership. As is well known, the Asfalia “inflicted heavy blows on the Party”. (CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum resolution, taken in June 1941. See: *To KKE απο το 1931-1952*, pp. 103-104.) As a result the CPG found itself “broken” with its organizational cadre pyramid destroyed. It was alleged that Zahariadis helped with this destruction from inside prison. Maniadakis organized secret nightly “conversations” with his most prominent police agents known as “Communist hunters”. Zahariadis was one of those people who participated in those nightly conversations. After a rich feast Zahariadis lectured the communist hunters on “how to effectively fight against communism in Greece...”

When the Germans occupied Greece the Asfalia surrendered Zahariadis to the Gestapo. But, even though he was imprisoned in the infamous Dachau prison, Zahariadis was well looked after. Namely, he did his time at the prison headquarters where it was clean, warm and cozy. He was also fed well. Here he “worked” as an interpreter. While Zahariadis, a very important communist, enjoyed his time in prison the Gestapo and the SS furiously looked for ordinary communists among the captured soldiers on the fronts and among the occupied and enslaved nations, and, as soon as they were found, they immediately shot them. They even shot communist sympathizers...

When the war was over, Zahariadis found himself in London, a guest of the English intelligence service. After spending two or three weeks in England, on May 29, 1945, Zahariadis was flown from England to Greece on a special British military aircraft, wearing a British military uniform. The English delivered him to Athens. The Siantos CPG leadership welcomed him back and immediately gave

him his old position - CPG Secretary General, the function he served during the war...

All of these things, however, can't mean that Zahariadis was not one of those capable agents of international anti-Communism, entrenched in the leadership of the Communist movement in various countries of the world.

History of diplomacy says: There are no eternal friends and enemies in politics, there are only interests.

It is precisely because of these modern Great Power interests that England has included Greece in its affairs. And that is why the English were in Greece and did what they wanted for their own benefit and no one bothered them. If Zahariadis was indeed an international anti-communist and in charge of the CPG, then the CPG, more or less, directly or indirectly, served English interests in Greece. This means that the CPG, more or less, directly or indirectly, undermined the democratic forces and robbed the people of their victory in the revolution in Greece.

As we now know, the CPG Central Committee, during its Sixth Extended Plenum, a general party conference held in March 1956, looked at Zahariadis's policies and publicly condemned him and removed him from the CPG leadership for what he had done. After that he persistently, but without success, tried to return to Greece and land in the hands of the "enemy" - the junta, that is, the domestic reactionaries and their English and Americans patrons. He even went on a hunger strike, but died alone in 1973, in the USSR, completely abandoned and despised. (Ξενοκρατία, page 259.)

Let us now have a look at some of the more important and distinctive moments that resulted from Zahariadis's policies...

2. Unilateral Civil War

After the Varkiza Agreement was signed on February 12, 1945, and after ELAS was disbanded, the government of "national unity", spending English money and relying on English tanks, began a cruel and open campaign against the democratic forces: To disorganize

them and, ultimately, to break them. This was the main goal of the English in Greece.

Helping the local reactionaries to break up the liberation forces, along with exploiting the country and people was an old, well-known, English colonial policy.

A strange and incredible phenomenon, known as a “unilateral civil war”, was unleashed to physically liquidate a large number of people who fought in the people’s revolution, including a large number of members and middle cadres belonging to ELAS, EAM, and the CPG.

With the dissolution of ELAS, the democratic forces were disarmed, but not disorganized and crushed. As a result the English were not in a hurry to enforce the Lebanon Agreement, i.e. to create a “non-partisan national army” with a partial or general mobilization. It was still too early for that. For the time being, it also meant that the political left CPG-EAM would be arming itself all over again. To defend against that the English used the various pro-fascist elements and political right-wingers who assisted the occupiers such as the Tagmata Asfalias, the Higes, the Paogides, and so on. The English used these relatively small groups to pacify the massive and well-organized democratic forces.

The English, through the Siantos and Zahariadis CPG-EAM leaderships, achieved miraculous and incredible success in Greece. Namely, on the one hand the CPG-EAM leaderships sent telegrams to the heads of the major powers - the Soviet Union, America and England, “protesting over the terrorist orgy in Greece”, and on the other capitulated to England by allowing ELAS to be disarmed and liquidated. (One of the first protest telegrams sent by the EAM Central Committee, among other things, said: “In the four months since the signing of the Varkiza Agreement, 500 fighters from the national resistance were killed, and more than 30,000 were imprisoned. There are about 150 terrorist gangs and more than 20,000 unlawful armed terrorists killing and terrorizing the democratic population...” Further on, the telegram demanded that “the Yalta decision be applied in Greece with help from the Allied Commission...” (Hronikone tou Agona, p. 52.)

On top of capitulating to the English the EAM and CPG leaderships called on the people to endure and resist passively. Namely, they called on the people “to endure... in humility and discipline”. Here we are simply forced to point out that:

With this, objectively and substantially, in fact, the CPG-EAM leaderships facilitated the English and the Greek government’s murderous attacks which helped the English strengthen their position and power in Greece...

Here we are going to quote some details from the information referring to Greece from March 8 to December 5, 1944, from the two volumes “1944 - κρίσιμη χρονιά”, by Gianis Andricopoulos, which make use of the texts from 300 unpublished documents from Winston Churchill’s personal archives (released with the approval of the British government).

On p. 94, of the second volume, Andricopoulos wrote about Georgios Papandreou’s preparations to return to Athens, right after the Germans left Greece. Georgios Papandreou at the time was Prime Minister of the Greek government in exile. Papandreou at the time was deeply concerned about the situation in Greece and constantly sent telegrams to the Greek king in London, seeking urgent assistance from the English. In one of these telegrams (borrowed from Papandreou’s memoirs), sent on September 14, 1944, Papandreou said:

“When our government arrives in Athens without its own forces or without allied military forces, I will become a prisoner of the EAM... Therefore I ask of you to find a few necessary allied soldiers, at any cost... I will consider this a national debt...”

On September 18, 1944, Georgios Papandreou telephoned London and, among other things, said:

“London, you are my only hope!”

Just to be clear now, Papandreou, the English appointed Greek Prime Minister was concerned and afraid to return to Athens, among

the Greek people, because he had absolutely no support at home and humbly begged foreigners to help him? Did he not know that Greece fell under English influence and that England had made sure that Papandreou would find an ally in the CPG-EAM leadership which would welcome him and hand over Athens to him...?

3. England - a “great friend” of Greece

The Macedonian political organization “People’s Liberation Front” (NOF) was founded in April 1945 in the Republic of Macedonia. Also, heavily armed units formed from the Macedonian fighters who fled Greece (former ELAS fighters) were acting on the mountain massifs of Vicho, Kaimakchalan and Paiaik Mountains...

All these events were influenced by the founding of ASNOM and by the creation of the People’s Republic of Macedonia, a nation state of the Macedonian people within democratic federal Yugoslavia. This was an inevitable echo and reflection of a joyful historical event...

The people from Zahariadis’s CPG leadership reacted as follows:

Just two months after NOF was founded, the CPG Central Committee, during its Twelfth Plenum, vigorously declared that:

“The CPG is resolutely opposed to all territorial claims against Greece made by anyone. The preservation of the territorial integrity of the Greek state is the first task of every Greek patriot...” (To KKE απο το 1931-1952, p. 110.)

(The CPG Central Committee Politburo, during its September 12, 1951, meeting confirmed that the Party at the time allegedly feared that: Through NOF, i.e. with NOF’s help, “Tito was going to join Aegean Macedonia to Yugoslavia...” (Ibid., p. 271.) Before that, during the CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, held in October 1949, Zahariadis’s CPG leadership openly spoke of Tito about having some “military plans against Greek Macedonia...” on the basis of NOF, i.e. of the Macedonian people’s democratic liberation movement. (Ibid., p. 205.))

This is how the famous “Greek territorial integrity”, an event of fundamental importance, came into being:

The Greeks believed that Greek territorial integrity at its northern borders was weak and declared unreliable and would be threatened without English presence and support. Hence, England was declared a “great friend” of Greece in the CPG plenum resolution.

The document, in part, read as follows:

“The plenum proclaims that with England and Russia, two of our great friends being near us, and with their presence and support Greece will have peaceful development, brotherly bargaining and democratic cooperation with its northern Balkan democracies...” (Ibid., p. 111.)

Here, as one can see, Russia comes after England. Even so, this was done for propaganda purposes only. Secretary General Zahariadis, in his plenary meeting opening address, specifically said that England’s presence in Greece was indispensable:

“In order to ensure our positions and our borders in the north...” (Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, p. 645. Αποφαση, vol. 12 Ολομ, Τις ΚΕ-ΚΚΕ ..., p. 21.)

After that to the end of the Greek Civil War his Party was: “Democratic co-operation” with the British and “συμφιλίωσης” (reconciliation) on the inner plane, parallel with suppression of the Macedonian People’s liberation movement.

This basically was the general Party line followed by the CPG leadership, led by Nikos Zahariadis.

Regarding all this, viewed from a certain angle, and within the familiar political situation in Greece in the past, it can be said that: While a large and well-organized democratic force, headed by the CPG, existed in Greece, England, of course, had a great need for a well-executed propaganda offensive that:

- would diminish any consequences resulting from the open British military intervention against ELAS,
- would strengthen Greek desires to accept the English in their country,
- would provide a comfortable stay and work environment for the English in Greece with as little English military forces and costs as possible.

This was quite understandable and, of course, indisputable.

When one considers all this, it is not difficult to see that:

This kind of huge scale and duration propaganda offensive was indeed implemented with great skill by the Zahariadis CPG leadership, and, unfortunately, had a huge effect on the struggle. Waving the Greek bourgeois invented hatchet known as the “Slavic danger” for Greece, Zahariadis effectively:

- justified the presence of the English as a “national” requirement for Greece’s security,
- suppressed and weakened the people’s resistance, and
- undermined DAG’s victory, which led to the final defeat of the democratic forces... which was England’s goal in Greece all along.

4. Some other characteristic maneuvers

I made a note in one of my books (“Records”, purchased as part of my memoir by INI in Skopje) in which was said:

As a consequence of the terrorist “plutocratic neo-fascist” orgy and the people’s resistance movement, the economic chaos and political crisis in the country deepened and widened.

The bourgeoisie English appointed Greek governments fell one after another: On October 18, 1944, Georgios Papandreou’s government

in exile arrived in Athens from Cairo. After two reorganizations, that took place on October 24 and November 2, 1944, it fell apart.

The new government, headed by Nikolaos Plastiras, lasted less than two months before it fell apart.

It was replaced by a newly formed “administrative government” headed by naval officer Petros Vulgaris. After it was reorganized on August 11, 1945, Petros Vulgaris, on October 17, 1945, was forced to resign.

Authority over the government was then taken over by the regent Archbishop Damaskinos, but only for a couple weeks, before it too fell apart.

On November 1, 1945 a new government was formed, this one headed by Georgios Kanelopoulos. This government only lasted three weeks before it fell apart...

There was imperative need to legalize and strengthen the power of the reactionaries in Greece but through “elections”. To this end, the English used their main and last trump card, the liberals headed by Themistoklis Sofoulis (November 22, 1945).

During this crucial moment, the CPG came to the rescue. (Yes, yes, it did indeed!). It came out in support of the Sofoulis government. In a press release dated November 25, 1945, the CPG Politburo told the “entire democratic world, civilian citizens as well as the armed forces, to do their duty, by any means possible, to prevent the political right from taking power and follow the directives issued by Sofoulis!” (KOMER, number 12/1945, chronology, p. 50.)

So, at the time the English sponsored liberal government needed support to legitimize itself in the eyes of the Greek people, the CPG and EAM gave it their support. And because of the general support it received “from all sides”, (which was not the case with previous English creations), it placed itself in a position to perform an “electoral coup” against the political right and lead up to the March 31, 1946, falsified elections.

By not participating in the elections, the CPG and EAM, through especially characteristic maneuvers, stopped a large number of democratic people from voting and thus prevented an “undesirable” outcome for the English and the reactionaries and thus transferred the struggle from the streets to parliament.

Understandably, “election victory” was granted to the Monarchists of the Populist Party and, thus, the “legalized” path for the restoration of the monarchy and counterrevolution power in Greece was strengthened - a precondition for breaking the political left...

In the meantime, Zahariadis’s CPG Central Committee, during its Second Plenum held in February 1946, decided to inform EAM that: “It was urgent to take all organizational and technical measures” and start acquiring weapons. “The state of a unilateral war perpetrated by the criminally plutocratic neo-fascist regime against the people can no longer be tolerated and from today onwards, we must respond to our enemies with the same means until we achieve a decisive victory...” (To KKE *απο το 1931- 1952*, p. 146.)

So as not to fall dangerously behind events as a result of the murderous terror which gradually and in large numbers pushed people into the mountains and created DAG, the new revolutionary army, and above all, to maintain a hold on the “unilateral war”, EAM began to arm itself but at the same time maintain a treaty with England.” (To KKE *απο το 1931-1952*, p. 146. From Zahariadis’s CPG Central Committee 20th Plenum Resolution held in February 1946.)

At the same time Zahariadis’s CPG top leadership was doing everything possible to make sure the new growing uprising was not directed against the presence of “the great friend” England and co-operation with the English was maintained.

The English in turn acted decisively. They forced a unilateral war against the democratic forces in the country. However, an attack against a strong opponent, naturally, would cause strong counteraction - resistance. This swift attack, however, gradually led to stronger and more frequent counter-attacks from the democratic forces - DAG all across Greece. Soon afterwards, in April 1947,

Royal (reactionary) General Staff was forced to order the withdrawal of all field garrisons and gendarmeries and concentrate them in the larger cities. This allowed the resistance movement to create extensive free territories. The English and reactionaries, at this point were faced with low morale while DAG and the resistance movement were experiencing high morale. Slowly, but inevitably, the bourgeois camp was forced to face a crisis:

A broad mobilization was also conducted and turned DAG from a small rebel army into a major revolutionary army.

Unfortunately, even in this critical and decisive crucial period, Zahariadis's CPG leadership did nothing to corner its opponent, who at the time was weakened because of the severe crisis it was experiencing due to the people's resistance. The CPG allowed this crucial moment to pass by without doing anything to take advantage of the situation...

5. Testimonials

(CPG Central Committee Seventh Plenum, April 1957)

According to Leonidas Stringos, member of the CPG Politburo:

- Had our Party, in the course of 1946-1947, decided on an armed struggle, with a decisive mobilization policy to increase the military effectiveness of DAG, the issue of reserves, one of the most basic issues, would have been successfully and timely resolved. But then Zahariadis told the Provincial Bureau that:

“Our forces in Macedonia should not be more than two thousand fighters...”

According to Panagiotis Mavromatis, member of the CPG Central Committee and the CPG Provincial Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace:

- After the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum, held in February 1946, took place, the Provincial Bureau informed

Zahariadis that we in Macedonia can mobilize up to 25,000 volunteer fighters within a month. To that Zahariadis said:

“There is no need for that because the armed struggle is just a bluff...!”

General Markos Vafiadis said the same thing twenty years later, in his interview with the Yugoslav weekly *Vus*: “A few weeks after the CPG Central Committee’s Second Plenum (February 6th), our CPG Macedonian-Thrace District Bureau informed the CPG Central Committee Politburo that we were ready to fight with 25,000 armed and organized fighters. But we did not find understanding and support for that action. Secretary General Zahariadis told us to stop with these proposals because the armed uprising was just a bluff to intimidate the government in order to obtain concessions...” (*Vus*, no. 1290, January 29, 1977.)

During the CPG Central Committee’s Seventh Plenum, held in April 1957, DAG Supreme Commander Markos Vafiadis, among other things, said:

- The period between 1946 and 1947 was the most favourable time to develop the armed struggle, to even take power in Greece... During almost all of 1946, however, the CPG leadership was full of apathy towards the drama survived by ordinary members of the Party and by former fighters of ELAS. Then, during the first months of 1947, when CPG activists in the field committees raised the issue of seizing power in Greece, Zahariadis said:

“We are not going to seize power for now. We will see, maybe in 1948...”

During this time, the CPG leadership was mostly concerned with economic problems and “symphiliosis”. ELAS fighters were forbidden from becoming partisans, and those who did so, due to the intolerable terror perpetrated by the Monarcho-Fascists, were accused of being cowards, suspicious characters and provocateurs...” (Seventh Plenum, *Νεος Κοσμος*, No. 4-5/1957.)

DAG headquarters:

In January 1947, a letter was sent to the Politburo asking for people and for military and other material so that DAG could oppose and dismantle the opponent's planned general offensive.

The request was rejected with an explanation that: "The aim of the Party is not to take power by an armed struggle..." (Timeline, p. 141.)

General D. Zafiropoulos (DAG's opponent) in his book "Ο αντισημοριτικός αγών", on p. 190, wrote:

"In July 1946, when the Taxiarchy insurrection movements were discovered in the city Kozheni, command was powerless to restore order, and had the partisans found out about it they would have had the opportunity to dominate the entire area, from Thessaly to the northern border. This critical situation was overcome thanks to the extreme measures taken by Second Army Corps command which acted beyond the limits of legality, because the partisans were operating outside of the law..." (Ξενοκρατία, p. 76)

General Zafiropoulos did not write (and maybe he did not even realize) that the extreme and unlawful measures taken by Second Army Corps command and the goal it achieved were due to the help it received from the provocateurs in the CPG leadership...

This is what Dragan Kliakich, "Vuk" correspondent, wrote about what General Markos Vafiadis had said to him: "It is a pity that many ELAS officers and generals did not join our ranks (DAG) earlier before they were arrested. Their rich combat experience would have greatly benefited DAG. When a group of well-known senior ELAS officers were called to appear in police stations on August 16, 1947 (with written invitations), they addressed the CPG Central Committee leadership asking what to do? Zahariadis and his like-minded people told them: 'Of course, you need to go to the police. And do not take any unlawful steps'..." (Vus, No. 1290, January 29, 1977.)

It is well-known that the English were determined to establish a firm pro-English regime in Greece. A precondition for this, of course,

was to defeat the democratic forces (the political left), i.e. bring the CPG down to its knees but not with English military forces because the general world political climate would not allow it. This was going to be achieved using Greeks against the Greeks through a civil war.

However, due to England's economic exhaustion from the war (WW II), and above all due to the strong democratic movement in Greece, it took a lot longer to establish the framework for installing a pro-English regime. Above all, it took direct American intervention to prepare the groundwork, to create a government army, a gendarmerie and to bolster the police and the Asfalia, before the political left could be broken in the cities and on the battlefield.

It goes without saying that all this time the CPG and EAM, with millions of people supporting them, could have taken decisive measures. Unfortunately, in some sort of anticipation, EAM and the CPG remained passive and indecisive.

In other words, the English, through Zahariadis, achieved brilliant success...

6. The occult side of events

After being silent for thirty years, Markos Vafiadis, then commander of DAG, decided to speak. He first spoke to the Greek weekly "Epikera" and later to "Vus".

Vafiadis spoke about the Greek Civil War which, according to him, rocked and exhausted Greece and led to the final break up of the political left and the democratic movement in general. His comments were published in "Epikera" issue numbers 436 and 437, on December 9 and 16, 1976.

Here, in part, is what he said:

"We did not want a civil war. It was organized and imposed on us by the English and by the reactionaries, i.e. the collaborators who came to power immediately after the Varkiza agreement. Being unable to break the strong democratic movement they banded

together to form a new collision. And so they began with the terrorist gangs to whose challenge we responded...”

Markos Vafiadis explained that the Greek Civil War was a consequence of a number of accumulated contradictions. But at some point all this depended on one specific event: “For the political left to participate or not to participate in the March 31, 1936 upcoming elections?”

The decision - yes or no - solved everything.

Markos Vafiadis continued: “If we took part in the elections, in the cities where terror was minimal and in Athens and Solun where there was no terror at all, we would have received at least 110-120 seats from a total of 300 in the Greek parliament. We would have been a strong opposition, and that was a big deal. A completely different ambience would have been created in which we would have had the opportunity to resist the violence from the reactionaries by legal means, by defense in parliament.

When we discussed this issue Partsalidis, as the head of a delegation, was sent to the Soviet Union and a similar delegation was sent to England. Among the many questions posed to our Soviet comrades was one about the elections. Our side said: ‘Zahariadis and the other members of the Politburo think that we should not be participating in the elections. What advice would you give us?’

Stalin said that it would be proper for us to participate in the elections.

When the delegation came back Partsalidis informed Zahariadis of what Stalin had said. Nothing more was said about that. As it turned out it was made to look like Moscow had suggested that we should not be participating in the elections. But we did not find out until 1948 what Stalin had really said, which was too late by then.

So we were drawn into the civil war.

This was God’s gift for the English and the reactionaries...

When the Civil War was over and the political left had been broken we re-evaluated whether we should have taken part in the elections and whether the decision for the CPG not to participate in the elections was itself a decisive mistake. In September 1961 (after Zahariadis was removed from his position), K. Koligianis, first Party secretary, in his presentation at the Eighth Party Congress, made the following official statement:

‘The non-participation in the elections was one of the Party’s most serious tactical mistakes... Starting from the wrong assessment that there was a revolutionary situation in the country, the CPG Central Committee decided not to participate in the elections and oriented itself towards an armed struggle...’

The Party Eighth Congress in its own resolution underlined: ‘The people wanted and fought for a democratic development to be realized peacefully without any shakeups. And there were real opportunities for that. So, the only correct policy was to participate in the elections... Ignoring the election was a mistake of fundamental importance, with very serious consequences for the Party and for the democratic movement’ ...”

It was under these conditions that Zahariadis’s decision to opt out of the elections was condemned. However, no one challenged the other CPG and EAM top leaders who went along and did not oppose Zahariadis’s decision. Were they sheep following Zahariadis or more cold-blooded, smarter and more mature than Zahariadis?

Markos Vafiasis, undoubtedly told his side of the story which corresponds to the historical truth. In fact, it illuminates the infighting side of the known events.

If the political left had participated in the March 31, 1946 elections, the situation in Greece could have been calmer (and a serious failure for English interests). This, however, was happily avoided and fulfilled the English plans to have a civil war. The decision to have an armed (rather than a parliamentary) struggle was the English plan all along. Therefore England is guilty of starting the Greek Civil War.

This, of course, was accomplished through Zahariadis and even more so, with Partsalidis who made it look like Moscow, and not London, had plunged the political left in Greece into the whirlwind of a civil war.

7. The most explosive weapon

Andre Molro in his “Antimemoari”, among other things, wrote about his impressions of his visit to China. He noticed that Chairman Mao’s axiom became a folk song: “The enemy is coming, we are leaving. The enemy is camping; we do not give them peace. The enemy does not accept our challenge, we attack him. The enemy gives up, we hunt him down...”

The partisan way of fighting was to start the revolution with small armed but fast-moving groups, so that you could create a huge revolutionary army and finally break up the enemy. The revolution in China, Yugoslavia, Cuba, Vietnam, etc., triumphed in this way...

General Markos Vafiadis was an experienced fighter who not only fought in ELAS but had the opportunity to study the tactics applied by the Yugoslav partisans, i.e. Tito’s strategy and tactics. So, the question is:

- What tactics did Markos Vafiadis apply when he was in command of DAG?

Markos’s answers: “Constant and continuous movement! For me it was important to attack the opponent when he was not expecting it, above all, to attack him in his initial bases while he was still planning his attacks. Then, when he started attacking, we would suddenly appear in his background and on every side, attack him as much as possible to bring experience to your units while breaking the opponent’s initiative. One of the opponent’s weaknesses was that he was unable act simultaneously at any time or at least not in multiple areas at once. With our extensive maneuvering we achieved our goal - the enemy was not able to follow our (true and false) continuous movements in all directions. We almost always imposed on him the place, time, and action we took making sure it was a surprise attack. In this way, we almost always managed to disable

our opponent's plans and break his units..." (Vus, number 1293, February 19, 1977.)

This coincides with the historical truth. Namely: During 1946, 1947 and 1948, while DAG was led by Markos Vafiadis, it successfully prevented English and reactionary intentions and crushed the opposition. As is well-known, the English were hopelessly fighting a war in which they continued to spend money on enlarging the Greek government army but without success and no victories. And this is why the English engaged the Americans, who, with their vast resources, created a huge military machine. But, how and what to do against the unattainable victory against an opponent who is like a ghost?

No problem! Zahariadis's leadership was successful in dragging the political left into a defined armed struggle in which the domestic reactionaries and the English could win.

First and most successful, on the other hand, was Zahariadis's ability to prevent a massive partisan army from forming by calling the armed struggle a "bluff". But, even so, with the small force created, the democratic movement was still able to hold on its own. So, something more had to be done because after a three-year struggle with a small rebel, hit and run army DAG was still able to hold its own...

In this way DAG was able to prevent the opponent from achieving success, and at the same time demoralizing and breaking him...

But then, on Zahariadis's orders, Markos Vafiadis was removed from his position as supreme commander of the DAG forces. And with Vafiadis out of the way, DAG lost its ability to fight partisan warfare. Zahariadis effectively and instantly turned DAG from a mobile to a stationary army. DAG in effect became a stationary target for the huge military machinery of the opponent...

(On January 15, 1948, Zahariadis convened a CPG council in Prespa involving the highest military and political cadres. To express his line in Peloponnesus he sent Stefanos Giuzelis, member of the CPG Central Committee. At that time DAG controlled almost two thirds

of the territory, with 1,200 villages and smaller towns, like Kalavrita, and others. (See: Civil War in Greece by G. D. Kiriakidis, p. 288.)

All this success was achieved by DAG exclusively thanks to its partisan warfare tactics, about which Nikos Belogianis, one of the commanders and a Greek national hero, wrote:

“This tactic is nicely adapted to local conditions and peculiarities, and is based on continuous movement, maneuvers and unexpected attacks. Instead of concentrating in one place where the opponent could surround them, partisans constantly change their place, suddenly appearing in various regions occupied by the enemy, inflicting losses on him and compelling him to chase them...” (see: Demokratikos stratos, no. 6/1948, p. 200.)

DAG’s main task was to engage the hostile forces, impede them here and there and exert constant losses... DAG was very successful in doing that.

Immediately upon his arrival in Peloponnesus, Stefanos Giuzelis, united the separate partisan units in a brigade and assigned them the task to free a number of towns and administrative centres. This led to the concentration of DAG fighters in several places, and here they were surrounded by much greater opponent forces and destroyed...)

All this was achieved by the enemy through Zahariadis and his “like-minded” cronies in the Politburo the likes of Mitsos Partsalidis, president of the interim democratic government, Petros Rusos, Miltiadis Porfirogenis, ministers in the interim democratic government, and others.

As was mentioned earlier, Siantos and Partsalidis both ignored Politburo directives when they signed the Varkiza Agreement. They signed the agreement even though they had no authority to sign it and, as a result, derailed ELAS and the democratic movement. Partsalidis, former president of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, (a revolutionary and partisan in his day) today freely travels in a limo through the streets of Athens. He is not

a danger to the “national interests” of the Greek capitalist oligarchy or to the regime in Greece.

And then we have Petros Rusos, Miltiadis Porfirogenis and Zvolos, top CPG leaders, who overwhelmingly overstepped their powers in the Politburo and signed the Lebanon Agreement, even though they were not authorized to sign it, and they too brought great harm to the democratic forces and movement in general. People like Rusos, Porfirogenis and Zvolos (I believe they are dead now), had no problem living in Greece because they were never dangerous to the “national interests” of the capitalist oligarchy or to the regimes in Greece.

And then, on the other hand, we have thousands of ordinary DAG ex-fighters, as well as their children (born somewhere outside of Greece) who cannot return to their homeland, to their native villages, to their grandfather’s hearth, because they are “some kind” of danger to the Greek state.

Nevertheless, despite all this, for decades now it has been widely believed both inside and outside of Greece that imported dogmatism and Moscow’s interventions were to blame for DAG’s catastrophe.

It is understandable that in this case it was the thief who was shouting: “Thief, get the thief!” while pointing in the opposite direction. It is amazing how easily this succeeded in Greece. Popular Greek publicist Kiriakos Diakogianis reluctantly found himself in the “hell of the State Information Service”. In his book by the same name he provides first-hand evidence that on the eve of the establishment of the Colonel’s military-fascist dictatorship in April 1967, about 40,000 people in Greece were on the CIA list.

Judging by how widely and intensively this viewpoint was cultivated where all the troubles the Greek people and the Greek state experienced and all the suffering the democratic movement went through in general, were blamed on some kind of imported dogmatism and on Moscow’s intervention. But here we can easily say that:

Greece was truly flooded with mercenaries of international anti-communism.

So, no one should be surprised that today the Greek communist movement is broken into five rival communist camps!

Obviously: The Greek Communist Movement (CPG) needs to cleanse itself from its foundation up if it truly wants to finally get rid of the injuries that are bothering it from the inside. In these nearly six decades since the CPG was established, such efforts have proved unsuccessful. Of course, such a cleansing and rebuilding could be done with success, but on one condition: The Communist movement itself would have to enter the governing bodies of the Asfalia, the State Information Service and so on... (April 1977)

II ANTI-MACEDONIAN-ISM

(critical remarks)

A. PRIOR TO AND DURING THE NATIONAL LIBERATION WAR

“National minorities should not be a border problem. They should be a bridge between neighbouring states... they should not be a hindrance in relations with neighbours...”

The people who would today treat Macedonia like it’s a non-historic community... would actually accept the bourgeoisie thesis of the past. They would deny the Macedonian people the ability to judge and decide for themselves. In other words the Macedonian people must be for the second time in one of the neighbouring nations - whether it is the Serbian, Bulgarian or Greek nation...

It has come out so that, for the Macedonians, others know more than the Macedonians themselves know, especially for that - what they need, and what they should not be doing...

There were times when Macedonia was seen only as a geographical term, a space to which all neighbours were entitled, which was to be filled with some other national content – but not Macedonians...”

Veliko Vlahovich

1. Macedonia and the Macedonian people have been a political illness for the CPG since the day it was formed. The Macedonian phenomenon has been a characteristic symptom of the “CPG affliction” since the day the CPG was created.

Let us briefly look at some of the more characteristic events in this relationship:

The CPG Founding Congress, in November 1918, in its program principles accepted the people’s right to self-determination. The

CPG then called for the recognition of the Greek population living outside of Greece, in Albania (North Epirus) and on some of the islands.

But, at the same time, it ignored the Macedonian people, the non-Greek Slavic speaking people, who, only about five years ago (after the Balkan Wars), fell under Greek rule. The Party's adopted program did not foresee any rights and freedoms for the Macedonian people living inside the Greek state. In fact, the CPG leaders took the same position as the domestic bourgeoisie whose slogan was "There are no Macedonians in Macedonia. No Macedonians exist in Greece as a non-Greek nation..."

2. Towards the end of 1924, during its CPG Third Congress, while aligning itself with the Comintern and with the Balkan Communist Federation line, in the presence of delegations from these forums, the CPG leadership recognized the Macedonian people's right to self-determination and secession from the Greek state. The CPG agreed to the creation of a separate united Macedonian national state that included the parts of Macedonia that was occupied by all the Balkan bourgeoisie states..."

But, on November 7, 1926, during the next Greek parliamentary elections, the CPG leaders, led by Eleftherios Stavridis, in their pre-election campaign, unveiled their official CPG program in which there was not a single word about any democratic rights and freedoms for the Macedonian people. Namely, they referred to the Macedonian voters as Greek people.

3. During the 1924 so-called renowned initiative to establish a united Macedonia by combining the three parts of Macedonia, it was decided to form a minority organization under the name "Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (United)" abbreviated as "IMRO (United)" whose purpose would be to help the Macedonian people, as well as other nationalities living in Macedonia, to advance the struggle for their liberation. The CPG leadership, unable to formally reject this proposal decided to accept it. Namely, they accepted to create an "IMRO (United)" organization in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia.

But, even many years later, the CPG still kept quiet about it and never did take any action to implement what it had promised.

4. Almost a decade later, and after some criticism and pressures from the Comintern and the Balkan Communist Federation, the CPG leadership was forced to create IMRO (United).

Nikos Zahariadis became CPG leader in the early 1930's during which time he entrusted the task of forming IMRO (United) to Stelios Sklavenas, member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo (then publicly known as a renegade and provocateur). For as long as he was in Macedonia (Solun, Ber, Voden), from time to time, Sklavenas called formal but unproductive meetings with activists from the local population, mostly Macedonians. Then, when the CPG Central Committee Fifth Congress was convened, in March 1934, delegate K. Veriotis from Western Macedonia, where the Macedonian population was preserved in compact masses, announced the following:

“The CPG membership, here in Western Macedonia, felt that there should not be a ‘Macedonian question’ for the Party in Macedonia because apparently Macedonians do not exist as a self-recognized, non-Greek nation, that is, they have been immersed among the Greeks, and now feel they are Greek...” (see: “Μαρξιστική βιβλιοθηκή”, no. 4/1934.)

This statement was well-calculated to give a false idea of the situation in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia, especially for the foreign delegates attending the Congress and for those abroad, that is, to explain why the CPG had not created the organization IMRO (United) for a whole decade. The CPG basically said: “Why create a Macedonian minority organization for a Macedonian minority that does not exist?!”

Of course, even today, and even more so then, all one had to do was visit one or more of the Macedonian villages in Lerin, Voden, Meglen or Kostur Regions and see if Macedonians existed or not. By visiting these places people could see for themselves the non-Greek people who wore non-Greek traditional folk costumes and spoke a non-Greek language. Even those people, who did speak

Greek, spoke it with an accent, like foreigners. All these visitors would need was five minutes to be convinced that these people were Macedonians and could not possibly be Greek...

All these things that were happening: the sharp condemnations from the Congress, keeping silent on the Macedonian question, parallel with Sklavenas's unwillingness to create IMRO (United) were patterns the Zahariadis CPG leadership followed to blur and conceal the true state of affairs regarding the national question...

Given these conditions it is no wonder that IMRO (United) not only was not created in the three parts of Macedonia but disappeared almost without a trace, like water in sand, in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia. IMRO (United) was created in name only and remained an imaginary and fictional organization without a statute or program, without a political line and without any political involvement. The stillborn IMRO (United) Central Committee was based in Solun and remained idle with nothing to manage. Nothing depended on it and nothing was left of it. The people who constituted this committee, headed by Andrea Chipov, on their own initiative organized (see: Andrea Chipov, "Notes", manuscript, INI, Skopje) an illegal Macedonian printing press in Solun but, "in the interests of the workers movement and revolution", the CPG forbid them from using it. Their aim was to publish their own newspaper and other propaganda materials, in the Macedonian language using Cyrillic letters, but they were not allowed. They then tried and succeeded in organizing the introduction and spreading of other Macedonian publications such as the "Balkan Federation" and "Macedonian Works", published abroad, but again they were quickly shut down.

And so, today there is hardly any information about the formation of IMRO (United) in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia. With no information of its existence then one can easily conclude that IMRO (United) never existed here...

5. One year after the CPG Sixth Congress took place, the Zahariadis CPG leadership fiercely attacked the Macedonian people's democratic rights. Namely, during the CPG Central Committee Third Plenum, held in March 1935, Zahariadis took away the

Macedonian people's right to self-determination and secession from Greece, and replaced them with minority rights.

In December 1935, during the CPG Sixth Congress, the CPG confirmed this as follows:

“Making such a change does not mean that we are abandoning the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination for nations... The population in the Greek part of Macedonia, however, is Greek in its majority today, and the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination requires that the old slogan and line be replaced to reflect today's conditions...” This, of course, was only done in the interest of the workers movement and revolution (according to the official interpretation). And so:

a) The CPG did not give up on the principle of self-determination for the occupied and oppressed people to secede from the oppressing nation, but recognized the Asia Minor colonists instead, i.e. it recognized the alien population deposited in Macedonia as Greek. The CPG decided to forget Macedonia's annexation to Greece and forgo the Macedonian people's rights to self-determination and succession from Greece in favour of recognizing the colonists as Greeks (annexation under the Marxist mask).

b) Being occupied and annexed by a foreign country and by foreigners, the Macedonian people from the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia, in their own historic homeland, were then treated as part of the Greek homeland and as a minority in this Greek homeland, without the right to self-determination.

c) From recognizing the historical reality that the Macedonian people and their homeland Macedonia constitute an ethnic whole, occupied by neighbouring bourgeois states, the CPG reversed direction and actually went to ignoring the Macedonian people's national existence and accepting the Balkan bourgeois imperialist thesis that Macedonia is only a geographical term, that is, a space where all its neighbours have the right to fill it with some other, non-Macedonian, national content.

d) From an open and unequivocal condemnation of the domestic bourgeoisie imperialist policy, which proclaimed that the occupied part of Macedonia was an indisputable part of Greece, in which the Macedonian people were persecuted and driven out of their homeland, and Macedonia was re-populated with colonists in an effort to artificially alter the national composition in favour of the Greek ethnic element, the CPG leadership openly and unequivocally adopted the domestic bourgeoisie's imperialistic policy in the interest of "the labour movement and the revolution in Greece..."

6. In an effort to obscure and conceal their true motives, i.e. to paralyze the Macedonian revolutionary movement, the CPG leadership, during its CPG Sixth Congress, chose its words carefully when it said:

"The Party has not stopped declaring that the Macedonian question will finally be resolved fraternally after the Soviet government becomes victorious in the Balkans, which will tear down all dishonest agreements regarding the exchange of populations and take all practical measures to eliminate all imperial injustices. Only then will the Macedonian people achieve their complete national establishment..."

In effect, the CPG Sixth Congress did recognize the Macedonian people as a special and unique nation which, finally, should achieve its full national establishment. This remained the official CPG line in the coming years, that is during the fascist occupation, during the national liberation war and a little further on.

But the only reason why the CPG made this statement was to further motivate the Macedonian people to fight against the fascists in the newly emerging critical conditions. In reality the CPG had no intention of ever solving the Macedonian question in favour of the Macedonian people and continued to implement the bourgeoisie policy which did not recognize the existence of a Macedonian nation and claimed that:

- The Macedonian people are "Slavophone Greeks", and
- Macedonia has a Greek character like Attica.

At the same time the CPG kept attacking the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement frontally in an attempt to stifle and crush it in an effort to hide its existence. The CPG did this so that it could maintain that no other anti-fascist movement, other than the Greek people's movement, existed during the liberation struggle. In fact, what the CPG was doing was no secret to anyone. Outside of the many documents that point to these events, today there are still thousands of living witnesses that can testify to that effect...

This was how things were conducted up to the end of the fascist occupation and up to the end of the national liberation war...

B) IN THE COURSE OF THE GREEK CIVIL WAR AND BEYOND

1. After being released from the fascist concentration camp Dachau, Zahariadis was taken to London where he spent a few days before he was flown in a special British military aircraft to Athens on May 29, 1945. The second part of Zahariadis's career began as head of the CPG.

What kind of policy did Zahariadis implement in relation to the Macedonian people?

Let us have a look at some specific events:

Zahariadis continued with the unfriendly campaign against the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement that was started by the Siantos CPG leadership during the national liberation war against the fascist occupiers. This unfriendly campaign, over time, continued to grow with unprecedented intensity...

2. Nothing was said, not even a single word about the Macedonian people at the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum, held in June 1945. The CPG leaders did not draw any public attention to the existence of the struggling Macedonians or to their democratic rights and freedoms as Macedonians. There was nothing about them in the adopted texts or about the Macedonian struggle they were leading. All of these things were completely ignored (posing such questions would have only strengthened the Macedonian revolutionary spirit). The CPG leadership behaved like there were no Macedonians there at all...

On top of that and in the presence of the Macedonians, who at the time were organized and struggling en masse to free themselves from the humiliating position of being a completely disadvantaged people, the CPG leadership, during the same plenum, proclaimed that: The Greek border to the north was endangered.

And then the CPG leadership turned to England and the domestic bourgeoisie asking them for their "co-operation" to secure the northern border. On top of that the CPG willingly accepted

England's presence in Greece calling it "friendly" and part of the internal plan to fight against the "non-existent" Macedonian democratic liberation movement...

3. During its CPG Seventh Congress, held in October 1945, when NOF and its military formations were well-developed as an armed force which could not be ignored, the CPG said:

"The CPG condemns, as a crime against national interests, the persecution committed against the Slavo-Macedonian minority by official Greece during the December events..."

That is all. Not another word about the Macedonians. The CPG in fact condemned post-December Greece (the government in Athens) for committing violence against the Macedonian people and blamed Athens for the Macedonians organizing their struggle against Greece, implying that this was in no way good for Greece's "national interests" in Macedonia...

4. During the CPG Provincial Bureau for Macedonia-Thrace meeting, held in Solun on December 26 and 27, 1945, about two months after the Seventh Congress took place, Zahariadis, CPG Central Committee Secretary General, said:

"NOF is a democratic political organization of the Slavo-Macedonians, and every Greek who is a true democrat should cooperate with it..." (See "Laiki foni", December 28, 1945, "Chronology", p. 63.)

But, despite what Zahariadis had said, the CPG Party press in Macedonia continued with its hostile campaign against the NOF leaders and organizers...

During its CPG Central Committee Second Plenum, held in February 1946, the CPG said:

"The CPG condemns the persecution and violence carried out by official Greece against the Slavo-Macedonian population... and is committed to fight to recognize the rights and equality of the

Slavophones who live in Greek Macedonia in the lands of the Greek state...”

I mentioned the above to point out certain characteristic CPG practices of how the CPG treats the Macedonian people - not as part of a certain nation, but rather as a disfigured people, a Slavophone speaking crowd which lives in a Greek landscape.

By doing this, the CPG was in fact ignoring the existence of the Macedonian people as a nation and was erasing the existence of the Macedonian national question, inside and outside of Greece.

At the same time the CPG was refusing to recognize and ignored the fact that the Macedonian people, with weapons in their hands, had already won their freedom in some parts of their homeland.

The CPG went as far as not recognizing and ignoring the existence of the Republic of Macedonia, a free Macedonian federal national state belonging to the Macedonian people within Democratic Federal Yugoslavia. It was also well-known that NOF was constituted on the same ideological basis.

And this is why the CPG leadership not only refused to recognize NOF but did everything in its power to vilify it. Namely, the Party press in Macedonia (mainly the district newspapers that addressed the Macedonian people) did not stop the hostilities against the NOF leadership, despite Zahariadis’s statement and despite the Second Plenum decisions.

Zahariadis spoke of NOF not as the Macedonian people’s national revolutionary organization, but as a different NOF, as a political organization of the “Slavophones living in the lands of the Greek state”. This was clearly expressed at the Second Plenum and included in its program principles - supporting “the rights and equality of the Slavophones”, a likely people imagined by the CPG leadership.

This kind of NOF did not yet exist but would be created in the future. Zahariadis’s statement made in Solun and the decision taken by the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum were the

determining factors, that is, the ideological basis for creating this kind of NOF. So, the wheels were set in motion to create it.

This did not mean that the CPG was going to create a new NOF as a rival political organization, to compete with the existing NOF. This kind of NOF would have had no prospect for success. The idea here was to use the existing NOF and make it operate in such a way that slowly it would turn into its own negation and destroy itself.

Let us now have a look at some of the more characteristic events:

Zahariadis used the Macedonian people's natural aspiration to struggle for unity with the Party and the Greek people, as well as NOF's acceptance by the people, to create a kind of Trojan horse to infiltrate the NOF fortress and take it over from within. In the end he succeeded in doing exactly that. He managed to lay his hands on both the Macedonian military forces and NOF. (A representative of the CPG met with the immediate NOF leadership in the village Turie, Lerin Region, on November 21, 1946 to work out a "unity" merger.)

Anti-Macedonian-ism in DAG's ranks

5. Soon after establishing "unity" between the Macedonian and Greek forces, the Macedonian battalions were withdrawn from Macedonia and sent south, deep into Greece. As soon as they reached their destination, where only Greeks lived, the battalions were "reorganized" and their Macedonian commanders were removed and replaced with Greek commanders who were supposedly "more experienced". There was resistance but it was quickly choked by executing those who resisted. On top of that, a NOF directive was issued to place DAG command under Greek control. After that the Macedonian battalions, in the Greek south, were ordered to fight against a much stronger foe in uneven battles fighting overwhelmingly strong enemy units. This literally destroyed the Macedonian battalions as well as the Macedonian revolutionary elite fighters composed exclusively of Macedonian patriots and bearers of the Macedonian national ideal. Simply put, Zahariadis managed to kill most of the Macedonian fighters who were not afraid to publicly proclaim that they were proud of being

Macedonian. With their removal from Macedonia, the CPG watered down the Macedonian revolutionary movement and began to rebuild it with a “Greek character” making Macedonia look more like Attica. Fulfilling the claim that: “Macedonia, after the exchange of populations, was as Greek as Attica.” (Rizospastis (July 20, 1943). In other words, the Macedonian military forces were withdrawn from Macedonia in order to be destroyed. This left NOF terribly impoverished and weakened...

6. Simultaneously with the liquidation of the Macedonian battalions in the south of Greece, many individuals, especially those who were prominent activists in the Macedonian Liberation Movement (NOF), were murdered.

Here are some examples of how Macedonian activists were murdered:

Georgi Urdov-Dzhodzho was NOF’s representative for Central and Western Macedonia at DAG headquarters. While performing his duties as ordered he found himself surrounded by a hostile unit. He fought fiercely and to avoid capture he used his last bullet on himself. But, as it turned out, the “hostile unit” was not an enemy unit but a number of “executioners” sent to ambush and kill him...

7. One day Vangel Shamardanov, then commissar of a DAG battalion and former president of the NOF board for Voden and Voden Region, approached me and confidently told me that he was afraid of his Greek “comrades” around him. Then one day soon after that he was shot in the back... Vangel truly died from what he feared... being shot in the back...

8. During a meeting with myself and Mihailo Keramitchiev, Georgi Kalkov, a prominent activist from Kostur Region, told us that he was convinced that he was going to be killed if he returned to his DAG unit. Kalkov, like Shamardanov, was not wrong in his assessment. He too was killed...

9. Lazo Koroveshovski was killed on his way to the cauldron to pick up his food. A “stray” bullet left him dead on the spot. His killer, of course, was never found...

10. On August 27, 1948, the democratic government of Greece adopted a decree somewhere in the liberated territory, to form eight divisions from the overall DAG forces.

Three divisions of volunteer fighters were formed in western Macedonia, where the Macedonian population was preserved in compact masses. They were the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh divisions. In other areas of Greece only one division was formed per province as follows: Epirus Eighth, Thessaly First, Rumeli Second, Peloponnesus Third and Eastern Macedonia-Thrace Sixth.

It is true that the Western Macedonia divisions had some Greeks in their ranks, but the divisions in the neighbouring provinces, Eastern Macedonia-Thrace, Thessaly, and Epirus had a greater percentage of Macedonians than Greeks.

Anti-Macedonian-ism in NOF's ranks

11. In July 1947, a directive, signed by Zahariadis, arrived at NOF Central Council Headquarters requesting that the NOF constituency and all members of the central NOF agitation and propaganda department report to DAG Headquarters, located somewhere in Epirus, for a meeting with Zahariadis. Zahariadis also specified what route to take, i.e. to follow a path through the villages Prekopana, Kostarazi, Pesiak, the church on the hill, over Gramos and through the village Likovrahi in Epirus where information would be given to us on how to get to DAG headquarters.

As it happened we ran into a number of people who had just finished a meeting and took to the road along with them. Shortly after midnight, the group of fifteen people crossed the Bistritsa River and landed in the village Pesiak where we decided to take a break... This saved our lives...

While sitting there we were talking to each other in the Macedonian language. An old Macedonian man standing at the window of his house overheard us and came out to warn us. He said: "There is an enemy army unit present in the village. This is the third day since it arrived here and in the evening went out on those hills waiting and

looking for something, perhaps to ambush someone. The soldiers are there right now..." (The old man then pointed in the direction where the unit was located and told us to go back). If we had continued on our way on the road as planned, we would have fallen into its hands, but thanks to the old man's warning we were saved...

In parallel with destroying the Macedonian battalions in the Greek south, our enemies in the CPG made attempts to also destroy NOF's ideological and political cadres. In other words, to behead the Macedonian People's Liberation Movement...

12. Fearing to again try the same thing, the Zahariadis CPG leadership resorted to using tactics they learned from the Bulgarians. Namely, the Bulgarians achieved significant successes against the Macedonian National Liberation Movement by infiltrating it with their own agents of Macedonian descent. The Zahariadis CPG leadership had several such agents in its service who were not only loyal to the Greek cause but willing to do the job. The Macedonian people called them "Grkomani" (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause). Zahariadis and his like-minded people from the Politburo and the CPG Central Committee, through the First NOF Congress held in January 1948, and through the NOF Central Council First Plenum, held on August 1948, made sure that NOF was infiltrated by these Grkomani who would rise to take over NOF and replace and neutralize the true NOF Macedonian leaders and bearers of the Macedonian national ideal.

Leading the new "fake NOF leadership" were Kotsopoulos and Koitsis (until this moment public enemies of NOF). Under the old and true NOF leadership the Macedonian people were expected to look to Skopje as their national centre, the new and false NOF leadership however had a mandate to turn the Macedonian people's view towards Athens, in the spirit of the Greek-supremacist motto: "We are part of Greece - part of the Greek people..."

13. While the NOF central agitation and propaganda department was busy to quickly develop a Macedonian cultural and educational national centre, the CPG was working feverishly to break it down. By order of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, in April 1948, the NOF agitation and propaganda department, together

with several other NOF activists (a total of 38 people. See: Timeline of the National Liberation War in Aegean Macedonia, page 213), were sent to join various DAG units. In other words the NOF central agitation and propaganda department was shut down...

14. The NOF cultural and art group played a huge role in mobilizing Macedonian fighters. It not only mobilized a large number of people, but it also provided moral support for those Macedonians who were already mobilized and fighting. So, it was only logical to have more such groups, perhaps one group district. But no, the CPG did not want them to exist and the only one in existence was dissolved.

15. There was also the people's Macedonian wind instrument orchestra which was first integrated into the 18th DAG Taxiarchy under the watchful eye of commander Vainas and commander Gousiopoulos. It was later placed in the service of DAG Headquarters. It too was eventually dissolved.

16. The Macedonian teacher's school and seminar were also abolished and replaced with a Greek teacher's school for "Slavophones".

17. One or two days before the first AFZH Congress took place at the end of April 1948, the invited delegation of Macedonian women (AFZH) from the Republic of Macedonia was prevented from attending the Congress by the CPG...

18. The CPG persistently and systematically gave the impression that it was trying to show that it was in favour of a joint Macedonian-Greek armed struggle. However, when we look at what the CPG was actually doing, we cannot fail but see that their actions were in essence anti-Macedonian. In other words, in practice, the CPG was waging a war against the Macedonian national ideal...

However, the CPG found out that the Macedonian ideal could not easily be destroyed, more or less, by "neutralizing" its carriers. By replacing the true top NOF leadership with a "new NOF subservient leadership to the Greek cause", Zahariadis was unable to provide the "national ideals" demanded by the Macedonian people. As a result

NOF's foundation began to dry. Namely, NOF became an isolated and superficial organization. The Macedonian people were refusing to accept its foreign body.

Based on the expression made by the Siantos CPG leadership during the CPG Eighth Plenum held in 1942, and on the expression made by the Zahariadis CPG leadership during the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum held in February 1946, regarding the "Slavophone Macedonian population", DAG Headquarters on Mount Kaimakchalan began to publish a paper section in Macedonian called "Osloboditeli" in its already existing newspaper "Λεφτεροτης". The Macedonian section was printed with Macedonian letters. The already existing Macedonian newspapers "Nepokoren", "Nova Makedonka" and "Bilten" also enlarged their printing space by three and circulation by four. More specifically each newspaper printed about two thousand copies... The network of correspondents was expanded so that they could cover DAG units and Macedonian villages. The network of those responsible for receiving the Macedonian newspapers for group reading in the field units, in DAG's hospitals and the Macedonian villages was also expanded.

Publishing news in the Macedonian language helped Zahariadis, more or less, slow down the wave of mass desertion of Macedonian fighter from DAG and encouraged the Macedonian people to struggle and not feel that their participation was pointless and meaningless. In other words, Zahariadis was desperately trying to maintain the Macedonian people's participation in the struggle, especially after he beheaded NOF and replaced its leadership with "Grkomani" (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause).

It became obvious to the CPG leadership that the strength of the Macedonian liberation movement was not "artificial" and the work of "paid adventurers". The CPG top leadership sold the idea to its own membership that NOF was an artificial creation and by removing its leaders and replacing them with Zahariadis's own people, they could change the course of the Macedonian struggle to their advantage. Remove them, neutralize them and everything will be fine! An absurd notion! The main bearers of Macedonian-ism were the Macedonian people themselves...

This is why Zahariadis had to take the next step (allow newspapers to be printed in the Macedonian language), a very characteristic move by Zahariadis and those around him...

19. After removing General Markos Vafiadis, his deputy, and his other associates from DAG Supreme Command, Zahariadis decided to change DAG's fighting tactics and turn DAG from a partisan hit and run army to a standing army. DAG was ordered to start taking "defensive positions" which, in fact, proved to be a maneuver that destroyed DAG and the uprising. In fact DAG was ordered to take defensive positions in and around the very Macedonian villages in the liberated territory that supported DAG. This, in effect, guaranteed the destruction of both the Macedonian people and their villages and homes. This maneuver, implemented by the top CPG leadership, no doubt was aimed at destroying the Macedonian villages around the liberated border zone by means of a total mobilization of the remaining women and girls, and by having the enemy bomb their homes out of existence. This was a maneuver aimed against the very bearers of the Macedonian ideal and at the Macedonian people themselves...

With the help from previously unseen demagoguery, the Zahariadis CPG leadership through:

- The CPG Central Committee's Fifth Plenum,
- The NOF Central Council's Second Plenum,
- The NOF Second Congress,
- Acts of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece,
- Creation of a separate Macedonian battalion, led by Garefi (which was disbanded about one month later because of intensive propaganda),
- The formation of KOEM, a separate communist organization for the Macedonians,

- Appointment of NOF representatives to serve in the interim government and in DAG supreme command, etc., managed to keep the Macedonian people engaged in the struggle en masse...

Then, when Zahariadis desperately needed the Macedonian people to be fully engaged in his war, to the last person, so that he could destroy them all, he promised to recognize their right to self-determination and separation from the Greek state. He literally said: "In northern Greece, the Macedonians, the Slavo-Macedonian people, have given their all to this war and are struggling with heroism and self-sacrifice. There should be no doubt that, as a result of DAG's victory and the victory of the people's revolution, the Macedonian people will achieve their complete national establishment, as they themselves want, which they earned today with the shedding their blood..." (CPG Central Committee Fifth Plenum, January 30-31, 1949, see: CPG from 1931 to 1952.) He later said: "The Macedonian people will have the right to unify the three parts of Macedonia in an independent Macedonian state in the framework of the People's democratic federation of Balkan nations..." (NOF Central Council Second Plenum February 3-4, 1949. The statement was written personally by Zahariadis as a "proposal" and was adopted by public vote. In addition to other articles, this resolution was also published by the DAG newspaper "Προς τη νικη" number 12, February 27, 1949, and even more spectacularly, it was broadcast on the radio station "Free Greece".)

Zahariadis's maneuvers worked. In the end he succeeded in emptying the Macedonian villages around the border zone and placed the entire Macedonian population in a "defensive position". While the children were sent across the border, of course, under CPG jurisdiction, that is, in the hands of the Zahariadis CPG leadership, their parents were sent to fight in the frontlines in a war where they had no chance of winning. And if they wanted to see their children again, they had no choice but to fight... until they were all killed to the last one...

Then, when the situation became more desperate, even old Macedonian men and women, the only people left in the villages, were collected and sent to fight.

This, no doubt, was Athens's plan all along: To get rid of the Macedonian people by any means possible, burn down and destroy their villages and repopulate them with Greek families from Epirus and the south of Greece... And this is exactly what happened... And, of course, with help from the CPG top leadership.

Anti-Macedonian-ism in the immigrant ranks

20. Even the immigrants who had left Greek occupied Macedonia began to openly and fiercely attack NOF, bearer of the Macedonian ideal. They shamelessly criticized everything about NOF, its involvement in the struggle and its great contribution to DAG both materially and militarily, calling NOF a “crypto-fascist” and “reactionary” organization, which allegedly tried to “turn the Macedonian liberation movement from a reserve revolution into a reserve counterrevolution.” (See: CPG from 1931 to 1952, p. 272.)

NOF was dissolved and all its members were persecuted, judged and tormented to death. In a word – NOF was destroyed...

The CPG created another organization for the Macedonian people to replace NOF. The opportunity the CPG was looking for had finally arrived. As usual, in an attempt to fool the multitude of Macedonian DAG fighters and the Macedonian people who had fled (about 70 thousand) Greek occupied Macedonia, the CPG named the new organization “Ilinden” following in the Macedonian people's national revolutionary traditions. Zahariadis himself selected the name and sketched the details which then were reviewed by Vainas and submitted to the founding congress. Zahariadis spoke well of the Macedonian people living in Greece and their current and future national prospects in terms of civil and national rights as equals with Greek people.

These, of course, were only elements of the already traditional declarative CPG policy. By abusing the name and authority of the party, i.e. its Marxist principles, with intensified systematic demagoguery (revolutionary phraseology), Zahariadis again tried to deceive the Macedonian people in order to deflect and paralyze their resistance, thus facilitating the implementation of his real anti-Macedonian policy:

Zahariadis made sure “Ilinden” was staffed with carefully selected Macedonian janissaries, “Slavophone Greeks” or as the Macedonian people called them “Grkomani” loyal to him and the Greek cause. The organization “Ilinden” was created to function as an anti-Macedonian entity and to struggle against the Macedonian ideal. Zahariadis used the name “Ilinden” to not only fool the Macedonian people into believing that it was a Macedonian organization but with it to vilify everything that was Macedonian. Namely, to kill the spirit of Ilinden... Following are some actions Zahariadis took in that regard:

- The CPG rejected the use of the Macedonian alphabet after declaring it “foreign” and decided to replace it with another alphabet, a hastily put together alphabet based on the Russian and Bulgarian alphabets.
- The Macedonian literary language and grammar were also rejected because they were considered to be allegedly imposed by “paid adventurers” and were replaced by a mutilated form of language, the kind Kotsopoulos spoke. A new Macedonian grammar and a new Macedonian literary language were compiled and much effort was expended to popularize them, i.e. to give them literary value.

The infamous anti-Macedonian policy of non-recognition, of denying that a single Macedonian nation existed with its own culture and language, practiced by the bourgeois, was now practiced by the top CPG leadership feverishly working against all Macedonians including those living outside of the Greek state, and especially against those exiled Macedonians living in the socialist countries.

In addition to having the Macedonian territory divided and the Macedonian people separated physically, politically and economically, (an agreement reached by the neighbouring monarchies - the Balkan Wars), Zahariadis and the CPG leadership were now attempting to break up the Macedonian people’s culture and language, with an obvious goal to make sure the Macedonian people disappear.

In the name of Greek “national interests”, the CPG top leadership, which tirelessly portrayed itself as the champion of protecting the working movement’s interests and the revolution in Greece, was also making sure that every single Macedonian who survived the Greek bourgeois genocide, i.e. the denationalization and assimilation policies, must not survive as a Macedonian. Macedonians must not exist except as a “Slavophone” Greek, a complimentary addition to the Greek people, until they are all assimilated or otherwise disappear to the last one.

In other words, the CPG top leadership did its best to “erase” not only the Macedonian ideal from the Macedonian people, but everything that was Macedonian in Greek occupied Macedonia and it did this under the following conditions:

- The rise of the People’s Republic of Macedonia as a federal state within the Yugoslav composition, and
- The emergence of the Macedonian people’s liberation struggle, here, in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia (an event which still torments the CPG).

Eventually, the CPG top leadership was forced to take off its pretentious communist mask of being “friend no. 1” to the oppressed Macedonian people and openly emerge as the self-appointed architect of the Macedonian people’s fate.

This is exactly how the CPG top leadership behaved towards the Macedonian people no matter how hard it tried to make things look positive.

It is understandable that it was not an easy job to destroy a people like the Macedonians. Hidden in them was a healthy and strong nation with primordial forces that maintained it, filling it with what it had lost and healing its wounds. Therefore, like others before them, Zahariadis and his comrades also failed at their task. The so-called “Slavophone” Greeks, or “Grkomani”, not only failed to uproot the healthy Macedonian roots, but on the contrary. Remembering how they were treated by the Greeks, they began to wake up and lead the Macedonian struggle. As a result the

organization “Ilinden” began to increasingly take on the colour of a national organization for the Macedonians.

It did not take too long before “Ilinden” too was dissolved...

Without a Party or any other organizations, the Macedonian people in Greek occupied Macedonia, once again were left without any rights, except for the declarative right to equality as was stated in the Party program. In other words the Macedonian people lost all rights to organize and develop their own struggle to fight for elementary civil and national democratic rights. They lost their right to struggle against the disadvantaged and humiliating position they were put in by the Greek state and sentenced to disappear in the name of “other people’s interests”...

It is worth mentioning at this point that, even today the leaders of the Greek Communist movement think that. “Dogmatism prevailed when Zahariadis led the CPG in the period from 1945 to 1955. This was a time when the Party experienced gross errors, contradictions and a lot of infighting...” (See: Forty years of CPG, p. 717.)

Of course, this is a matter for historians to figure out whether or not we should, or should not see Zahariadis as an international anti-communist. I am only trying to contribute to that by looking at events from a different angle, different from the other writers...

III THE COURSE AND PROBLEMS OF A SAGA

(Naum Peiov: “Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece”, Institute of National History edition, Skopje, 1968.)

At the time when I was writing this book, only a few books existed in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia that dealt with the specifics, the role and contribution of Macedonian people in the Greek Civil War. This is why Naum Peiov’s work is very important, as a first attempt, to provide insight into the Civil War in Greece and to highlight the Macedonian contribution to it, which is of particular interest.

My aim here is not to engage in some kind of book review to show peculiarities characteristic of it; this has already been done by Academician Mihailo Apostolski in the preface to the book. My intention here is to contribute to the discussion on the material already presented by the author. Of course, I will only deal with the more important moments and provide my personal opinion...

Silence about a crime is equally as strong as the crime itself

On page 6 in his book Peiov wrote: “The Macedonian position, role and contribution in this war was belittled, silenced or falsified by many ‘friends’ and ‘enemies of the Macedonian people’...”

That is correct. In less than twenty years after the Greek Civil War ended, the Greek public and the public beyond Greece was literally flooded with various versions of the story, written by both our “friends” and “enemies”, which very much complicated things for us. This was their attitude toward us all along; we could not expect anything different from them. The best thing for us to do then, we thought, was to keep silent. Why were we silent?

As is well-known, about three hundred thousand Macedonian people, from the youngest to the oldest, actively participated on the Democratic side of the titanic struggle that pitted the domestic and

international reactionaries against the democratic forces in Greece. As is also well-known, that over 3,500 Macedonian women were drafted to work on the frontlines in Vicho, building trenches and bunkers to protect the partisans from enemy artillery and aerial bombardment. Many Macedonian women and girls were also drafted, through several mobilizations, and, after a short preparation, sent to fight at the frontlines. About 8,000 Macedonian orphan children, who had lost their parents to the war, were also collected and sent to friendly European socialist countries that were willing to take them. The first partisan woman to be convicted by a military tribunal and executed was a Macedonian. Her name was Mirka Ginova and she fought to liberate Greece. Over ten thousand Macedonian fighters were killed at the front lines. Peiov named 179 of them and the Macedonian villages from which they came. According to official statistics, taken during the 1940 and 1951 censuses in Greece, the Macedonian population had significantly declined or halved. It was recorded that 46 Macedonian villages were completely destroyed during the Civil War and were not mentioned in the 1951 census. This kind of destruction was comparable to the devastation experienced during the Spanish anti-fascist war and during the Vietnamese war against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

But, here we are, twenty years later, still not talking about it, and allowing others to minimize our experience until it's forgotten. Our sacrifices, the Macedonian people's interests, it seems, are not of any political significance, not even important enough to speak about them. Our own silence, unfortunately, belittled our cause and demeaned our great Macedonian contribution in the struggle for freedom against the Greek and international reactionaries. This, in itself, is a crime against the Macedonian people.

Naum Peiov was one of the very first authors in our country to give importance to the events and problems experienced during the Greek Civil War and to the Macedonian contribution, regardless of how it was viewed. Taking this first step was of great significance which ended the unjustified silence...

About the beginning of the Greek Civil War

On page 9, Peiov concluded that: “The December clash in Athens between ELAS and the Greek forces in exile, aided by English troops, ended with the famous Varkiza Treaty, signed on February 12, 1945. And this was the beginning of the Greek Civil War”.

When speaking about the Greek Civil War it is necessary to remember the following:

- According to the well-known division of spheres of influence between the Great Powers, Greece was left in the English sphere of influence.
- England preferred to have the Greek bourgeoisie as its partner to protect its interests in Greece and rejected the persistently bridged CPG, EAM and ELAS friendship.
- The fascist occupation and terror in Greece gave birth to the people’s revolution which inevitably led to the political left CPG, EAM and ELAS increasing its power and influence.
- Under the then conditions in modern Europe and in the world, England could not just send troops to conquer Greece, as it had once conquered its colonies.
- The safest option for England was to take Greece from the CPG, EAM and ELAS through a successfully organized civil war with help from the Greek reactionaries. And as is well-known, England did exactly that.

When we take all this into consideration, we can see a pattern emerging that would eventually lead to a civil war. For instance, there were many clashes in the course of 1943 between ELAS and EDES, ELAS and EKKA, ELAS and PAO, ELAS and IEE, ELAS and Anton Chaush, etc. ELAS stood alone on the political left and fought against all these organizations and groups which stood on the political right and which were openly tolerated by the German occupiers and secretly supported by the English. These were all Greek organizations helped by outsiders to fight against ELAS. But, as is well-known, ELAS finally defeated and destroyed them all in the autumn of 1944. Unable to defeat the CPG, EAM and ELAS on

the battlefield in Greece, the English and their creation, the Greek government in exile, found a way to tie their (CPG, EAM and ELAS) hands by having its agents in the CPG surrender ELAS to English command in the Middle East. Even that did not destroy them (CPG, EAM and ELAS) so the aforementioned clashes in the streets of Athens were instigated with aims at flaring up a unilateral civil war following the Varkiza and other agreements... All these events were in fact phases and forms of a single civil war organized by the English and their creation, the Greek government in exile, and assisted and enabled by the CPG top leaderships led by Siantos and Zahariadis.

I believe we will be more objective and will get closer to the historical truth, if we see and understand events the way they were.

Siantos's CPG leadership and its politics

It's not about "ideal political confusion"

"Even though the resistance movement in the country, the EAM massive organization, and the ELAS armed forces were created by the CPG, and the Communists were the most effective fighters, the CPG leadership made major ideological and political mistakes leading to unprincipled compromises which contributed to its defeat..." (Ibid. p. 14.)

When Peiov wrote this in the introductory part of his book he was specifically thinking of Siantos's CPG leadership. Peiov was referring to the widely accepted view that Siantos and his comrades made "mistakes" because they did not have a "clear view of the very nature of the national liberation struggle, namely, that they could not see that the national liberation could not be separated from the national democratic character of the uprising and the establishment of a democratic government and from the CPG leadership itself." (Ibid. p. 14.)

Let us have a closer look at this: It is true that the CPG leadership consistently struggled, throughout the duration of the fascist occupation, for a "national liberation" of Greece through "national unity" with the bourgeoisie parties. All parties, organizations and

individuals agreed to form an “interim government of national unity and work together to liberate Greece through a national struggle and after the occupiers were driven out the people would have a choice to freely express what government they wanted.” (Ibid. p. 15, Peiov here quotes the CPG Central Committee Tenth Plenum.) But as is well-known, however, in the middle of 1944, when the Germans were preparing to leave Greece, while ELAS had already liquidated the forces of EDES, EKKA, PAO, IEE, ELAS and Anton Chaush, and was alone in all of Greece, the CPG leadership voluntarily handed over power to the bourgeois Greek government in exile, by recognizing it as the legitimate and sole government of Greece (in accordance with the Lebanon Agreement).

As is well-known, the CPG leadership fought hard within the same “national struggle, by all means possible, to prevent the Macedonian national liberation movement from developing. On top of that, the CPG looked to England to secure Greece’s northern borders. The need to secure the northern border was openly and publicly proclaimed during the CPG Central Committee Tenth Plenum. And as Peiov has correctly noted, this was an open claim and a Greek aspiration for expanding Greece’s territory beyond its current borders. Now if we really want to know exactly what the CPG leadership truly wanted from the “national struggle” all we have to do is carefully examine the sequence of events and what they led up to. Having done that we will realize that there is no “ideological and political mess” as was quoted on page 16 and it would be absolutely wrong to think that Siantos did not know what he wanted and how to get it. Remember:

- Siantos resigned as leader of the national liberation struggle for a people’s democratic government;
- Siantos rejects the offer for close cooperation with the Balkan national liberation movements, especially with Yugoslavia;
- Siantos fought against the Macedonian national liberation movement, declaring it a “crypto-fascist,” and “reactionary” movement.

- Siantos surrendered ELAS to the English and placed it under English command and control (Sarafis-Eddie declaration).
- Siantos recognized the English right to act as regulator and judge in the political quarrels with the political organizations EDES and EKKA and in military clashes with their military forces, that is, the right to interfere with and manage Greece's internal affairs while Greece was still occupied (Plaka Agreement).
- Siantos voluntarily waved all claims to power in favour of the Greek bourgeois government in exile, recognizing it as the legitimate government of Greece (the Lebanon Agreement).
- Siantos accepted the Caserta Agreement, which not only paved the way for the return of the Greek government in exile and its fascist units, but also placed ELAS units under government command.

In the end, Siantos signed the Varkiza Agreement to disarm and dismantle ELAS all across the country, except for some ELAS auxiliary units in Athens which were later attacked and defeated by a joint force consisting of government and English units.

Siantos did all this to save Greece. He demanded “national unity” with the bourgeoisie at all costs because he believed that England would only support this kind of national Greek government and with its backing would save Greece. Only England would support Greece's integrity, help to expel the Bulgarians from Eastern Macedonia, diminish all Macedonian demands, and secure Greece's northern borders. (Peiov obtained this information from the book: “Forty years of CPG struggle 1918 to 1958”, CPG Central Committee, selected documents, p. 504.)

It was never the intention of the CPG during the national liberation struggle to take power and install a people's democracy in Greece. It should not have been and it was not practical for the CPG to take power given the circumstances of the “day”. Such a task would have obviously been directed against the bourgeoisie and would have ruined Greece's friendship with England. On top of that Greece would have had to cooperate with the national liberation movements of its northern neighbours which would have prevented any strategic

securing of its borders. In such a scenario Greece would have been forced to make concessions to the Macedonian people, which would have threatened Greece's territorial integrity. Siantos clearly anticipated all this and resolutely opposed it. Siantos refused to carry out any sort of internal socialist revolution that would be in favour of the Greek people and the minorities living in Greece. Siantos also refused to cooperate with any of the other people's revolutions. This tells us that, in Siantos's view, the people's interests were not his most important priority during this historical moment. Siantos accepted his task to save Greece and with all his energies committed his forces to carry out a "national struggle" through "national unity" with the bourgeoisie who were supported by the English. He did this because the Greek national interests of the "day" were the most important thing that the situation imperatively required of him, the CPG and the Greek people to fight and defend. The Siantos CPG leadership had countless chances during the struggle to take power and install a people's democracy in Greece but he insisted that this be done "after the war was over." He insisted on waiting for the ultimate goal to install socialism... later. "...Today, the party of the proletariat, the Communist Party of Greece, is fighting for national liberation, and later, after the war it will fight for a people's democracy." (CPG Central Committee proclamation, June 2, 1943, issued on the occasion of the Third International dissolution.)

The Third CPG Conference held in October 1950, which ended with the "culmination of lessons learned and conclusions made during the decade from 1940 to 1950", proclaimed Siantos a traitor to the people's revolution. This, in part, was what was adopted: "G. Siantos consciously betrayed the revolution..." (See: "CPG from 1931 to 1952", CPG Central Committee edition, p. 219.)

It is true that attempts were made to challenge the veracity of this conclusion. But the facts are the facts. In the history of the Greek labour movement Siantos will be remembered as the first great-Greek, carrier of the Greek national bourgeoisie "Megali Idea" (Greater Greece), and traitor to the people's interests. Siantos managed to get to the highest level in the CPG and became its leader during Greece's most crucial historical moment. He then betrayed the people and turned them into victims with huge material and human losses and untold suffering that has not ceased to this day...

About the Varkiza agreement

“With the December uprising, one page was closed in our history and another was opened. This was a transition, a turn in the road, a crisis... The uprising did not succeed and neither was the movement squashed. These were the basic elements in the December clashes...” announced the CPG Central Committee during its Twelfth Plenum held in June 1945.

Peiov confirmed that the political right did sign the Varkiza Agreement. Why? “The political right was fully aware of its strength. Namely, that the forces on the side of the revolutionary movement were so strong that if it tried to put them down it would be defeated. The political right, by signing the Varkiza Agreement, accomplished that task without having to fight...” explained Peiov on page 38.

However, what really happened was not as simple as Peiov put it. The political right did not agree with the details of the Varkiza Agreement but signed it anyway because it gave it the means to triumph over the resistance movement, i.e. to disarm and dissolve the entire ELAS military force all throughout Greece. “The Varkiza Agreement required ELAS to lay down its weapons... This was a means of disarming the movement and constitutes unconditional capitulation...” (See: “Chronicle of the Struggle”, CPG Central Committee, 1952, pp. 48-49.) And that’s what the December disturbances were all about...

These were not “mistakes” made but an indisputable betrayal.

Unfortunately the CPG leadership did not see the Varkiza Agreement as a betrayal, and in its distortion of things, declared it a great victory for the democratic forces. This was definitely self-deception and a verbal smoke screen, a shameful way to hide the treachery committed by Siantos and his people at the helm of the CPG. They knowingly signed an agreement designed to liquidate ELAS. A person today must have some kind of blinders on not to be able to see things for what they truly were, especially if one takes into account that:

- The Greek government in exile, with its entire military force, could hardly handle the few remaining ELAS units in Athens, without help from the English, and that:

- It was not easy for the English to engage the ELAS forces in a long-running war in Greece. The English involvement in the December conflict was short-lived and was quickly regulated by the Varkiza Agreement. In other words it did not create much public attention. So, by surrendering the ELAS forces to the English, Siantos did England a great favour. It first disarmed and dissolved the majority of the forces and then allowed the Greek government, with English help, to defeat the ELAS forces in Athens. With ELAS out of the picture the Greek government, again with English assistance, began to create its own army, police and gendarmerie as well and the famous armed gangs which began to attack the democratic organizations all throughout Greece unhindered.

Those who speak about the CPG leadership “making mistakes” are in error. The CPG did not make any mistakes but intentionally withdrew from the fight in Athens in order to sign the Varkiza Agreement. Even if ELAS lost the battle in Athens in December, it had the option of retreating from Athens and continuing the war anywhere within Greece. But the CPG decided to surrender all of its forces everywhere in Greece, via the Varkiza Agreement, and on top of that made no provisions in the agreement to safeguard the survival of the democratic movement in the country... (Naum Peiov: “Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece”, Institute of National History edition, Skopje, 1968, p. 38.)

This can only mean that, what the CPG did was an indisputable and obvious betrayal. Just one look at the events and one would be convinced of it. When the Germans left, it did not mean the “national struggle” was over. Being supported by England the “national government” had yet to make sure that the basic task of the “national struggle” was realized. This meant “establishing the full integrity of Greece by strategically securing all borders...” The Siantos CPG leadership consistently did everything it could in order to create the right conditions for this. Namely, Siantos refused to cooperate with the national liberation movements in the Balkans,

especially with Yugoslavia, because such cooperation would have prevented securing its northern border. Yugoslavia, through the Macedonians, could have jeopardized Greece's territorial integrity. To avoid that, the CPG leadership systematically and by all means possible struggled to suppress the Macedonian national liberation movement in Greece because, as I said, it could have jeopardized the Greek position and the northern Greek border.

As is well-known, ELAS was not created by the Siantos CPG leadership, but came about as a result of the Fascist occupation and the need of the people to protect themselves from being pillaged and terrorized. But, no sooner had these resistance groups begun to grow than Siantos's CPG leadership and the English quickly stepped in to put them under their control. In the meantime Siantos made sure that the Greek government in exile was recognized as the legitimate government of Greece and paved the way for it, along with its fascist military units and its masters, the English, to freely return to Athens after Greece was liberated by ELAS. Siantos made sure that ELAS would not block the English and their armed forces from marching in the streets of Athens and all over Greece. And, as it turned out, after the Germans left Greece, ELAS became dispensable. Because ELAS was a people's army, its very existence posed danger to the "national government". The provoked clash in Athens was staged to prove that ELAS was indeed dangerous and needed to be disarmed and dissolved. Siantos made sure that much was accomplished.

This is exactly what happened. No CPG blunders... No CPG mistakes... Only calculated betrayals...

Zahariadis's CPG leadership and its politics

Three characteristic cases

a) According to Peiov, four and a half months after the Varkiza Agreement was signed, the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum concluded the following:

"Greece is the only country in Europe from the camp of the victors where fascists, collaborators of the occupier, quislings and traitors

are, once again, suppressing democracy. The resistance movement has found itself under fierce persecution. Hundreds of people have already been killed and the killings continue. Tens of thousands are in jail. Hundreds of thousands have been exiled. This is the hallmark of political adventurism which drives the country and has turned it into a disaster...” (Ibid. p. 33.)

During the same Plenum Zahariadis said:

“The reactionaries and those on the political right who follow, support and tolerate them, after taking solid positions with foreign aid, after the December events, have taken the following line:

- They bend the people’s will and force them to leave their homes by applying wild terror, which surpasses every precedent in the history of our country.
- They employ defamatory campaigns and unheard of falsifications to isolate the CPG, the popular avant-garde of the people, in an effort to smear the Party with accusations calling its leaders “killers”, “traitors”, “sold people” in order to isolate and destroy it.
- They employ chauvinistic and pathetic tactics to distract the people from their internal problems of their daily life by putting the blame outside so that they can lead an anti-people’s economic policy, imposing the full weight of the situation on the people and increasing their misery tenfold...” (Ibid. p. 37.)

Peiov wrote:

“The CPG leadership’s fatal mistake was based on the fact that, once it concluded that a ruthless and devastating war was being waged against the democratic forces in the country, not politically but primarily by military means, and knowing that the political right wanted to get rid of the democratic organizations and progressives throughout the country (by a unilateral civil war), the CPG continued to oppose this move by political means... (In other words the CPG was playing politics while a military war was waged against it.) The CPG membership was deceived by illusions that success could be achieved via a political struggle and an armed

struggle was unnecessary and even condemned. The CPG membership was led to believe that an armed struggle was the desire of the “class enemy” and was being provoked by “class provocateurs”, and so on. (Ibid. p. 37.) According to Peiov, the CPG “was supposed to revise its tactics of expectations” at the request of a “coalition government” and “free elections”. In the post Varkiza period however, in the then constellation and based on the attitude of the forces in Greece, it was clear that the conditions for “peaceful development”, “free elections” and a “coalition government” were excluded. (Ibid. p. 49.)

And that’s true. Yet the CPG leadership, headed by Zahariadis, continued to struggle with political means, proposing and demanding compromises and cooperation, a “coalition government” and “free elections”. In other words, the CPG was making empty demands that were not part of any agreement.

This, in effect, was “the fatal error” that Peiov was talking about...

b) With the terrorist orgy perpetrated by the political right against the democratic people, the civil war was slowly moving into a new phase: it began to turn from a one-sided war to a mutual one. This widened and deepened the economic chaos in the country. The bourgeois governments were falling one after the other, and the English, by changing governments and individuals, were trying to give the public new hope that the crisis would soon be over.

For its part, Zahariadis’s CPG leadership consistently and stubbornly demanded a “equitable democratic deal” with the English for a peaceful settlement of the Greek question, proposing the formation of a “coalition government” and “free elections”. Peiov rightly pointed out that Zahariadis used consistently intensified “armed resistance”, only as a “means of pressure”. The English, on their own terms, chose the liberals, headed by Temistokles Sofoulis, to take power. And so Zahariadis bravely fell into a trap: The CPG Central Committee Politburo supported Sofoulis. Regarding this, Peiov wrote: “The whole democratic world, both citizens and those who are in the armed forces, now have a supreme national debt by all means possible to prevent a coup by the Monarcho-fascist right, by listening to and following Sofoulis’s directives...” (Ibid. p. 52.)

Unfortunately it was Sofoulis who led the way for the political right to carry out the “election coup” and falsify the March 31, 1946 elections. And as Peiov rightly said: “To legalize the lawlessness and pave the way for the restoration of the monarchy and to re-strengthen the counterrevolution in Greece.” (Ibid. p. 53.) In this way, it has been once again shown that when bourgeois society is in crisis, when decisive measures need to be taken, and when class interests are at stake, the liberal bourgeoisie abandon “liberalism” and sincerely defend the bourgeois class and its interests.

“The CPG leadership seems to have forgotten this truth...” wrote Peiov.

c) Peiov wrote: “With Napoleon Zervas becoming Minister of Public Security in March 1947, and with the introduction of the massive harsh terror, all CPG and EAM organizations ceased to act openly (went underground). The armed struggle and the partisan units, as an objective, had the need to constantly grow: new fighters were coming from the ranks of the democratic organizations... In particular, the movement was gaining momentum after April 1947, after the royal general staff issued an order for the withdrawal of the royal army and gendarmerie from the field to the cities.” (Ibid. p. 66-67.)

As is well-known, DAG’s strong upsurge in the armed uprising during this period worsened the crisis in the bourgeois camp. In August 1947, under civil war conditions Greece was left without a government for almost two weeks. The English could not find a suitable person who could form a new government. Quite correctly, Peiov wrote: “There were no defensive objects (not yet built) in the cities where the royal army had withdrawn, so the morale in its ranks was very low, while the morale among the DAG fighters was high. However, DAG did not take advantage of the favourable conditions created during this period to decisively bolster the revolution.” (Ibid. p. 67.) Zahariadis’s CPG leadership and DAG did not use even the most favourable conditions, to take the offensive or conduct a broader mobilization outside of the cities or even in the cities, to create a large military force capable of restoring peace in the country and allowing the democratic movement to develop. The

CPG allowed this critical and decisive moment to pass it by, which gave its opponent the necessary time to gain strength and overcome the crisis. And by not bolstering its own forces, the CPG not only lost its opportunity to take power, but also never became a danger for its opponent. So, the question here is “why didn’t the CPG bolster its own forces while it had the chance and why did it leave the question of DAG reserves unsettled...?”

According to Peiov: Zahariadis and the CPG leadership were using the armed struggle for posturing purposes only:

- The armed uprising was still seen as a means not for a decisive victory over the enemy, but as a means to compel the enemy to compromise.
- As the centre of gravity shifted to the armed struggle, the CPG and EAM leaderships still existed legally. With that the revolutionary forces were divided: The leadership was not united in its position to demand concessions for the needs of the revolution.
- Because of this, the line regarding the direction of the struggle that needed to be taken was unclear. It was unclear for the leadership, for the masses and for the armed rebels.
- The spirit and tactics of ELAS were used, to a great extent, in order to save DAG’s forces...” (Ibid. p. 67-68.)

Even though all of this is true, it does not explain why Zahariadis preferred compromise and cooperation, and accordingly used DAG as a means of extricating this compromise instead of executing a decisive victory over its opponent - the English and the bourgeois government. When the opponent collapsed from the severe crisis exacted by the people’s resistance, instead of ending the crisis with a general offensive, Zahariadis continued to ask for an “equitable democratic agreement” with the English for a democratic settlement of the Greek question, waiting and expecting a compromise and operating legally.

About this Peiov wrote: “We don’t know what the CPG and DAG leaders thought then, but the fact is that the most favourable

conditions for starting an offensive were omitted... so the Monarcho-fascist regime could survive this, perhaps the most severe crisis in the civil war...”

However, the reason for Zahariadis holding out, as outlined in the three cases (a,b,c) mentioned earlier, and to the end of his leadership leading the CPG and the people’s revolution, lies in the fact that he was absolutely consistent with himself, that is, with his well-developed familial politics of the “Greek Axis” adopted at the Twelfth Plenum, and established at the CPG Seventh Congress. The starting points, i.e. the theses on the basis of which this was built, as well as the perfectly clear final goal of this policy and all the moves the Zahariadis CPG leadership made then, were quite clear. It is true and everyone knows that in all three cases, Zahariadis did the things he wanted to accomplish. It is simply incredible that Peiov did not see these actions as elements of a single policy, did not see their inner connection and sense... but instead he speaks of a “fatal mistake” in the first case, that the CPG “forgot the experience and role of the liberals” in the social crises, and that “we do not know what the CPG leaders thought...” as was in the third case.

The attitude of the Zahariadis CPG leadership towards the Macedonian national liberation movement (NOF) can be fully understood and properly evaluated only within the framework of Zahariadis’s “Greek Axis” politics. This is where that attitude emerged even though it was only briefly considered by Peiov, which was a serious omission on his part...

About the politics of the “Greek Axis”

It is well-known that during the Twelfth Plenum, held in June 1945, when the new CPG leadership, with Zahariadis at the helm, replaced Siantos and his CPG leadership, the CPG outlined its core foreign policy for the post-Varkiza period:

“In the foreign policy field... the CPG resolutely opposes any territorial claims from any side against Greece. The preservation of the country’s territorial integrity... is the primary task of every Greek patriot... The establishment of a fairly close allied friendly relationship with England and Soviet Russia... should serve as the

basis for a Greek democratic foreign policy... The Plenum proclaims: With the friendly support of our two great friends - England and Russia, our peaceful development depends on the brotherly accord and democratic cooperation with the northern Balkan democracies..." ("CPG from 1931-1952", CPG Central Committee edition, p. 110-111.)

The CPG adopted this foreign policy based on Zahariadis's report in which, among other things, he said: "A realistic foreign policy... should move between two basic poles: the European-Balkan pole with Russia as the centre, and the Mediterranean pole with England as the centre. A correct foreign policy is that which would constitute a 'Greek axis' that would bind these two poles in a way that would best serve Greek interests..." (CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum Resolution abstract and final report and speech given by Nikos Zahariadis, "Rigas", 1945, p. 21.)

A few months later, in October 1945, under Zahariadis's leadership, the same CPG Congress voted in favour of the "Greek axis".

So, for a peaceful development of the country, through a brotherly accord and democratic cooperation with the northern neighbours, in addition to being supported by the USSR, the CPG made sure that the friendly presence and support of England was included because it was deemed very necessary. Like the Soviet Union, England was also called "a great friend" of Greece. And preserving Greece's territorial integrity was proclaimed as the primary task of the CPG...

In time, the Bulgarian fascist occupation of Eastern Macedonia forced the Siantos CPG leadership to change its primary task. Instead of carrying out an internal socialist revolution in favour of the working people, Siantos's primary task changed to carrying out a "national struggle" in "national unity with the bourgeoisie" for "maintaining Greece's integrity and strategically securing Greece's borders" at the expense of its northern neighbours, while struggling against the Macedonian national liberation movement developing inside the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia. With the borders secured and the denouncing of closer co-operation with the Balkan peoples' revolutions, especially with that of the Yugoslav peoples, the Siantos CPG leadership openly fought against the Macedonian

people from the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia by firmly turning to the Mediterranean, i.e. to England. (According to Zahariadis' own expression.)

Where this led to is very well-known.

The question is, what drove Zahariadis's CPG leadership to again accept the "preservation of the Greek territorial integrity" as the primary task in the struggle, only four and a half months after the Varkiza Agreement was signed, and thus turning back to the Mediterranean pole with England and proclaiming that England's friendly presence in Greece and its support were an indispensable factor in securing the country's "peaceful development"?

The English were the primary reason why ELAS was disarmed and disbanded, and the resistance movement disabled. The English were the ones who financed the terrorist orgy of the plutocratic neo-fascists (unilateral civil war) who terrorized the democratic forces, and with a publicly open goal: To destroy the democratic people's rights and freedoms. At the same time the CPG was very eager to proclaim England as Greece's "great friend", whose friendly presence and support would ensure a peaceful development in the country... This, in fact, looks unclear indeed. But only at first glance. Bearing in mind that, 19 months before this CPG foreign policy was established, the Second Session of AVNOJ, convened on November 29, 1943, established the People's Republic of Macedonia as a federal state in the Yugoslav federation. Strongly influenced by this event the Macedonian people in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia began to quickly develop a huge revolutionary force with NOF at its helm. So, it is not difficult to see why the CPG reacted to these developments the way it did. At the time the CPG was already hostile towards NOF and naturally this hostility only escalated as a direct response to the events taking place in the People's Republic of Macedonia as well as the events taking place at home in the northern part Greece.

This was not denied by the CPG leadership.

Zahariadis's CPG leadership demanded England's "friendly presence and support" because, as Zahariadis himself said at the

Twelfth Plenum, “it is necessary for Greece to secure its positions and borders in the north...” (“Forty years of CPG struggle”, 1918-1958, CPG Central Committee edition, p. 645.)

As the CPG Central Committee Politburo confirmed at its meeting on September 12, 1951 (in fact, this was confirmed countless times in party publications of the time), the CPG was afraid that, with help from NOF, “Tito was going to join Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia to Yugoslavia...” (“CPG from 1931-1952”, CPG Central Committee edition, p. 271.)

As for England...? England too had many reasons to be interested in how the disputed issues between Greece and its northern neighbours would be resolved. It was not just a singular issue for England of whether or not, the “Slavs” would reach the Mediterranean Sea through the Aegean Sea, or, as Zahariadis put it during the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum, “the road that connects England with the Suez Mosul Petroleum, with India, and still further with China and the Pacific... With one of the most strategically sensitive and significant points... one of the most vital traffic arteries of the British Empire... A pillar of its world building...”

That is why Zahariadis and his leadership feared NOF and Tito, and had no confidence in the USSR. That is why Zahariadis and his leadership counted on English support as a sure way of securing the Greek state’s position and borders to the north. The policy of an “equitable deal”, understanding and co-operation with England (in the presence of CPG political supremacy over all bourgeois political parties) in itself seemed to have a basis and looked like a realistic policy. According to Zahariadis, this kind of policy “was before and now feasible...”

(See: “Book on the work of the Twelfth Plenum” edition, “Rigas”, p. 21.)

It is true that the terrorist orgy committed by the “criminally plutocratic neo-fascists” pushed the Zahariadis CPG leadership to say the following during the CPG Central Committee at the Second Plenum, held in February 1946:

“EAM should urgently take all organizational and technical measures to enable our people to reject the murderous terror and to frustrate the fascist plans of its exploiters... The state of a unilateral civil war conducted by plutocratic neo-fascists against the people must not be tolerated, and we should decisively respond to our enemies with the same fierce means, until we achieve our victory...” (“The CPG from 1931 to 1952 “, pp. 146-147.)

This, however, was done “without stopping EAM from proposing an equitable democratic agreement with England... but not by begging, because it was not in accordance with our national dignity...” (Ibid. p. 146.)

So, even after the CPG leadership armed the resistance movement, it did not cease to seek understanding and cooperation with England, and in this respect, as proof of its sincerity, was prepared to work with its enemy in Greece - the bourgeois political parties.

Peiov correctly observed: “The CPG’s position was to ‘strengthen the armed struggle’ but without the will to force a government take down and to take power, but to serve as a means of pressure, to force the government to withdraw its terror tactics and implement a peaceful parliamentary solution...” (Ibid. page 61.)

But Peiov was wrong when he claimed that “this attitude of the CPG leadership was in force until October 1947, when the CPG Central Committee Third Plenum was held and a clear course for the armed uprising was taken as follows: The American intervention in Greece closed the door for an agreement between the two opposing sides, as a result the Party was faced with the question of raising the people in an armed struggle...” (Ibid. p. 60-61.)

It is true what Peiov said, that the goal at the plenum was to: “Liberate the country and ensure its independence and democratic development.” An immediate task for that was to: “Create a greater free territory and to form a democratic government.” For that purpose, “the democratic army mobilized more people and grew in numbers, raised their morale, developed a general plan of attack, carried out constant offensive tactics, and expanded and increased its attacks...” (Ibid. p. 61.)

But, it is not true that Zahariadis's CPG leadership abandoned the "Greek Axis" policy towards England... "Friendly support" from England was still necessary to successfully suppress all potential dangers to Greece's position and northern borders (it was so at least in Zahariadis's mind). Therefore Zahariadis did not declare war on the "foreign occupiers," but continued to demand understanding and cooperation from them. The military measures provided for by the above-mentioned decision were intended to serve only as a means of exerting pressure to reach "an equitable settlement" and compromise. In fact, the very decision made at the Third Plenum, without any hesitation, was to make the point that: "The primary duty of every Greek patriot was to put all his forces to work for DAG and to believe that the decisive strength of the people and DAG would bring victory in their struggle against the foreign occupiers and their domestic servants. The more this pressure was applied the more it was surely possible to force them to agree on a democratic solution to the Greek question as proposed by EAM..." (See "The CPG from 1931 to 1952", p. 167.)

The CPG's calm and permissive policy and its continual desire to gain an "equitable deal" with England, as noted by the wider CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, held in March 1956, "objectively justified England's interference in Greece's internal affairs which weakened the Greek people's resistance against the English occupiers. By doing this the CPG was in effect "spreading hesitation and indecision among its Party organizations all over the country, and especially in the cities". During the Third Plenum the CPG concluded: "The work of the Communists and the rise of the people's struggle in the cities are lagging behind... The imperative task of the Communists, without any delay, is to mobilize all forces and together with all the democratic people, overcome this lag..." ("CPG from 1931-1952", p. 167.) Of course, the Third Plenum: "Decisively condemned all the hesitations and fluctuations which certain Communists had experienced in terms of continuing the implementation of the popular revolution..." (Ibid. p. 167.) But, as I said before, the leadership itself never did call for a war against the foreign occupiers, but continued to seek an "equitable deal", and therefore continued to use DAG's armed struggle, not to liquidate the foreign interventionists, but to force an agreement with these

foreigners. It is therefore not surprising that during the CPG Central Committee Fourth Plenum, held in July 1948, the CPG again stated: “The main fundamental weakness of the CPG... is that it failed to break the opportunistic permissiveness and fluctuation within the party organizations and, above all, in the cities...” (“CPG from 1931 to 1952”, p. 172.)

- As is well-known, the CPG did not overcome its “fundamental weakness” until the end, because this weakness stemmed from the very calm and permissive nature of its own basic political line - the “Greek axis”. The consequences of this are well-known:
- The revolution’s basic driving force, the proletariat in the cities, remained outside of the armed struggle in anticipation and never did become a weapon in the hands of the CPG.
- The question of DAG’s strategic reserves, which was the main issue in the armed struggle, remained unresolved. (In addition to the proletariat in the cities, about 700,000 villagers, not engaged in DAG as reserves during 1947, were forcibly collected by the enemy and moved into the cities. There they were encircled by minefields and barbed wire fences so that they could not escape and were used by the enemy as reserves.) And everything ended in disaster.

During the CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, held in March 1956, Zahariadis was held accountable for his policies and was removed from all party functions.

So, like Siantos, Zahariadis:

- Built CPG policies based on the thesis that the Greek state position and northern borders were threatened. In fact Zahariadis jeopardized the real interests of the Greek working people, who were threatened by the foreign interventionists and by the domestic reactionaries, in favour of the Greek bourgeoisie imperialist position and the 1913 borders that partitioned Macedonia and mutilated the Macedonian people.
- The CPG proclaimed the “preservation of the territorial integrity of Greece” as its primary task. Exactly: Not the national integrity of

Greece, but the territorial one. This meant that the CPG was fighting for the preservation of Greece. In other words, the CPG intentionally lied to the Macedonian people and as a result committed injustices against them just like the injustices committed against the Macedonian people by the imperialists. The CPG did this to protect the imperialist interests of the Greek bourgeoisie.

- England's "friendly presence" in Greece was a decisive factor for the successful accomplishment of the aforementioned "primary task". But, in order to secure England's "friendly presence" the CPG had to struggle at all costs to reach an "equitable deal" with England. (At the same time the CPG was well-aware that England's presence meant strengthening the reactionaries at the expense of the working people's rights and freedom.)

- The Macedonian national liberation movement (NOF) was seen as a potential danger to the Greek position and its northern borders, a fact which determined Zahariadis's true motives towards the Macedonian national minority; to adopt a policy to weaken and destroy the Macedonian liberation movement by all means possible.

- In the end, both Siantos and Zahariadis consciously neglected the interests of the people and betrayed the revolution, especially during the most crucial moments when the revolution had the most favourable chances of winning (during the summer of 1947).

The Ancient Greeks used to say: Ουδεν κρηπτον υπο τομ ηλιον (nothing remains secret under the sun). I believe that the day will come when everything will be revealed about Siantos and Zahariadis and some of the people next to them. Both Siantos and Zahariadis and those people who served under both of them danced to the tunes of the same piper...

The CPG and Macedonian people

Referring to the CPG's policy towards the Macedonian people in the period between the two world wars, Peiov wrote: "The CPG leadership did not always find consistent strength in its political action and organizational practice to mobilize the forces of the Macedonian people. This was apparently because it feared the ruling

bourgeois ideology: the nationalist and chauvinist ideas of a “Greater Greece” which was fanatically proclaimed by the bourgeoisie...” (Ibid. p. 105.)

This assessment is obviously superficial, and therefore not accurate. The question of national minorities is a matter of applying democracy consistently. It is absolutely frivolous to claim that the CPG leaders were afraid of the fate of the workers’ movement and, therefore, in the interests of the workers’ movement renounced democracy because of the Macedonian people. It cannot give up on consistent democracy, its essence, in the interests of the workers’ movement. Something else is in question here. Let’s take a closer look at the facts:

In 1918, the Socialist Workers’ Party was founded. In 1920, it became a Communist Party (the word communist was added). And in 1929 the title “Communist Party of Greece” was adopted, and in brackets: the Greek Communist International.

By 1924, the CPG leaders seemed to know nothing of the genocide against the Macedonian people. Not a word was said throughout this time in defense of the completely disadvantaged Macedonian people. And there was no Macedonian national question in the CPG program, that is, a question about the democratic rights and freedom of the Macedonian national minority. On the other hand, however, at the founding congress, the CPG demanded that the Greek national minority in Albania (northern Epirus) be recognized with the right to self-determination.

Every person who is familiar with Greece’s recent history understands the parallelism in the CPG’s politics with those of the Greek bourgeoisie. It is obvious that they both serve “Greek national interests”. They both dance to the same tune.

However, the Balkan Communist Federation in 1923 (at the Sixth Conference), and a year later, the Communist International (at the Third Congress in Moscow) decided to ask the CPG to include the Macedonian national question in the CPG program. Namely, the CPG Third Extraordinary Congress, held at the end of 1924, recognized the Macedonian people and “their right to self-

determination to secession from Greece and the establishment of a single and independent Macedonian state, which was to include all parts of Macedonia occupied by the three Balkan bourgeoisies”. (“Forty years of CPG struggle, CPG 1918-1958”, CPG Central Committee edition, p. 157.)

The bourgeoisie sharply reacted to the CPG’s recognition of the Macedonian national question and immediately declared the Party treasonous and began, with its famous terror courts, to prosecute the fifteen Party members in Solun as well as many other members and CPG supporters throughout Greece. There were also sharp and unpleasant reactions from inside the Party. “...Comrades and members of the Solun branch... protested against the Party’s policy...” (Regarding the Macedonian national question.) See: “Rizospastis”, February 23, 1925.

But all this slowly and surely subsided and disappeared and the Macedonian national question remained on paper only. In other words, none of it was implemented. In fact during the 1926 pre-election campaign in Greece, the CPG remained silent regarding its policy on the Macedonian national question, indefinitely postponing the struggle for the democratic rights of the Macedonian minority.

Then, during the Third CPG Congress, held in March 1927, the CPG leadership admitted that it was wrong to keep silent on the issue of Macedonia’s independence and condemned the views of those comrades who proposed to cancel the Macedonian right to a single and independent Macedonia during the last parliamentary elections. At the same time the CPG underlined the need to intensify the propaganda campaign for internationalism and strengthen the struggle against the bourgeoisie nationalist and chauvinist propaganda... (CPG from 1931 to 1952, Volume 2, pp. 40-41.) But these solutions too were hushed up. The party did not continue to fight, that is to do practical work among the masses for the recognition of the democratic rights of the Macedonian national minority. The CPG leaders in fact looked the other way ignoring the daily drama and genocide that was perpetrated in (Greek occupied) Macedonia against the Macedonian people.

In its appeal to the CPG membership in November 1931, regarding all this, the Comintern Executive Council pointed out the following: “The CPG has lagged far behind in developing the oppressed Greek people’s national revolutionary liberation struggle. The CPG did not take into its own hands to stabilize, with organizing measures, the hefty sympathy it enjoyed from the communist movement among the repressed nationalities (Macedonians, Turks, Albanians, Jews) - a fact that has helped the bourgeoisie isolate and alienate the communists and terrorize the revolutionary masses of the oppressed nations. The party must, without delay, lead the fight for the right to free self-determination of nations to secession, and against national suppression and persecution of the Macedonian people...” (Forty years of CPG struggle”, p. 307.)

Unfortunately the appeal did not help. The policy of silence and postponements continued and the Macedonian people’s struggle for their democratic national and social rights and freedoms kept being ignored. In that respect, the CPG Central Committee, during its Fifth Plenum, held in 1932, concluded the following: “The struggle for the national minority question has practically marked no progress despite the unseen economic impoverishment of the masses and the national minorities... The conditions were right to raise those masses in a revolutionary struggle and to create favourable conditions for us - for our successful work among them...” (“Five Years of Struggling”, CPG Central Committee edition, p. 139.)

Two years later, in January 1934, the CPG Central Committee, during its Sixth Plenum, concluded that: “The national districts were the most elusive sectors in the work of the Party despite the favourable conditions for its work among the Macedonians... The Party did not task itself to step up the party organizations in the national districts in order to help organize mass national revolutionary organizations and popularize the Party’s line on the national question of the repressed nationalities among the Greek working masses...” (CPG from 1931-1952, p. 40.) At the Fifth Congress, held in March 1934, K. Vermitis, a delegate from Western Macedonia, in his speech, published in the “Marxist Libraries” in June 1934, unequivocally stated that “the Party until today did not do any work for the national minorities, except for the famous call from above for a single and independent Macedonia...”

Vermittis also said that members of the Party from Western Macedonia felt that there should not have been a Macedonian national question because, in their opinion, the Macedonians had already been Hellenized.

Look at this: In Macedonia itself, most characteristically in western Macedonia, where the Macedonian population was well-preserved in compact masses, the CPG opinion was, of course, that there were no longer Macedonian people, not even in the party ranks among the Communists. This may not be difficult for a person to say outside of the party ranks in Macedonia and outside of Macedonia, in other areas of the Greek state, where people may not have known that Macedonians existed in Macedonia, or that non-Greek people existed in “northern Greece”... But to say that in the face of the Macedonian people was very regrettable...!

The problem, of course, was readdressed during the Fifth Congress where it was decided that: “The CPG should be resolutely fighting to eradicate the great Greek state nationalism and its manifestations in the CPG ranks, as well as the international education of Greek workers and farmers...” (CPG from 1931 to 1952, p. 57.) Other tasks were also set out during The Fifth Congress to allow the CPG “to win the trust of the national minorities...” (Ibid. p. 57.) Unfortunately nothing of what was said was actually done. The CPG remained “silent” in regard to the Macedonian people’s struggle for democratic rights and freedoms.

When the Macedonian fighters from the Democratic Army of Greece (DAG) appeared in Thessaly and Rumeli (1947-1948), the local people listening to them speaking and singing in the Macedonian language began to panic, thinking that Greece was being invaded by Bulgarian soldiers, or by members of some foreign legion?! In other words, the CPG did nothing to inform the Greek people of the Macedonian existence in Greece.

Due to the same situation, i.e. local people in Epirus panicking because they heard the Macedonian soldiers speaking Macedonian, in 1948 DAG Eighth Division command ordered the Macedonian fighters in Epirus to speak Greek only and represent themselves as Greeks and refrain from singing songs in the Macedonian language.

Even more characteristic was the fact that the commanders (Statis - Alekos) of DAG Supreme Headquarters, in 1947, addressed the Macedonian fighters in Kaimakchalan (in Macedonia itself), who were also members of the CPG, by calling them: “Brothers, Greeks...!” like they were “Slavophone Greeks” or Greeks with a reduced national consciousness...

These are only a few examples of how the Macedonian people were treated by the CPG, which tells us that both in the Party ranks and among the masses the CPG practiced silence and endlessly postponed the Macedonian struggle for democratic rights and freedoms in this part of (Greek occupied) Macedonia, a practice that was continued by the CPG leaders for many years...

Even though the CPG policy regarding minority rights was not implemented on the ground, it did not mean that such a policy, or at least the CPG’s theoretical position on the national question, did not exist. One year after the Fifth Congress took place, the CPG Central Committee, during its Third Plenum, abandoned its position on the “right to self-determination to secession...”, and adopted a new position: “Full equality rights for the national minorities”. Regarding this, the CPG during its Sixth Congress, held in December 1935, declared that:

“Such a change did not mean abandoning the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination for the national minorities... The population in the Greek part of Macedonia today is Greek in its majority, and the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination required that the old slogan be replaced with a slogan that reflects today’s conditions...” (CPG from 1931 to 1952,” p. 74.) So, all this was done to look like it was done in the interests of the workers movement, that is, the people’s revolution. However, here again we are dealing with something else. Objectively, this change was a hundred and eighty degree turn, done for public acceptance of the CPG line, which directly negated what was agreed to in the past. Namely, so far the CPG acknowledged that Macedonia is not only a geographical but also an ethnic whole occupied by the three Balkan bourgeoisies. The CPG in effect promised the Macedonian people that they had the right to self-determination to secession from

Greece and the right to “unify their country as a single and free Macedonia”. With this, the CPG openly and unambiguously condemned the imperialist Greek bourgeoisie policy, and proclaimed that this part of Macedonia was occupied by Greece and that the Macedonian people were endlessly persecuted and, in general, the Greek state was carrying out a policy of genocide against the Macedonian people. At the same time the Greek state was colonizing Macedonian lands with a non-Macedonian population thus artificially altering the national composition of the population in favour of the Greek state.

With its new line and its one hundred and eighty degree turn, the CPG was now saying that: “Today the population in this part of Macedonia, in its majority, is Greek” which requires that the “Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination” to be applied in favour of the Greek majority. As for the Macedonian people, all that was needed was that they only be recognized as a minority with minority rights (even though this Greek majority, in general, was not a majority in Macedonia compared to the entire Macedonian population). By proclaiming the Macedonian people a minority in their own homeland, the CPG in fact recognized the rights of the artificially created Greeks as a majority. This in fact meant that the CPG treated this part of Macedonia as part of the Greek homeland. Accordingly, the CPG now denies or ignores the fact that the Macedonian people and Macedonia are an ethnic whole occupied by the three Balkan bourgeoisies. With this, the CPG unambiguously confirmed and accepted the imperialist policy of the Greek bourgeoisie, which it had previously rejected.

And so, in the name of the workers movement and the revolution, the CPG (headed by Zahariadis), this time too, openly supported “Greek national interests” at the expense of the Macedonian people.

By pursuing Greek national interests as a priority over the Macedonian question, the CPG adopted a don't care policy toward the Macedonian national minority and Macedonian issues ceased to occupy a place in the CPG Central Committee's plenum agendas, as was the case before. As a result work done in the national districts was interrupted. For the top CPG leadership, the question of the Macedonian people's democratic rights in the Greek state ceased to

be an actual issue for consideration, In other words, it was removed from the agenda and the words “Macedonia” and “Macedonians”, etc., disappeared from the CPG’s political vocabulary. The commitment for “full equality of minorities”, in relation to the Macedonian people, was no longer supported by any concrete activity, not only on the ground among the people, but also at the CPG leadership level and beyond.

As is well-known, this was the time when international reactionaries and fascists were attacking the workers movement all across Europe. As was every attack against the rights and freedom of oppressed people, this attack in Greece against the rights of the Macedonian people, was a bad harbinger for all people of all oppressed nations and, in this case, for the Greek working people as well. In 1936, the Greek bourgeoisie established the Fourth of August dictatorship by which they abolished the democratic rights and freedoms of the Greek people. At the same time a silent war of extermination was waged against the Macedonian people, which quickly became systemic and was reinforced at the highest degree. The period of the Fourth of August dictatorship (1936-1941) became the period of the fiercest attacks of great chauvinism against the Macedonian people.

The Greek bourgeoisie, during this period, removed Zahariadis and a number of his associates from the political scene. The CPG had to use agents to do its work and for the first time experienced many breakdowns. In other words the CPG broke up into several smaller and independent groups. This clearly indicates that the CPG’s presence and activities were not completely eliminated. Those who study the party documents from this period will inevitably conclude that no party leadership – no central, provincial, or district party leadership, came to the fore to condemn the criminal orgy perpetrated against the Macedonian people by the Greek reactionaries... The Macedonian people themselves rose to this task...

Naum Peiov, however, did not analyze or try to explain this great event; the Macedonian people proclaiming themselves as a Macedonian nation in their own homeland. This, certainly, was a serious omission on Peiov’s part. But, for some reason, Peiov mistakenly, by some far reaching comments, attributed this to the

CPG. He tries to attract the reader's attention to some insignificant things, underlining in vain the verbal promises the CPG made, like its empty promises that it would fight for a final and definite decision on the Macedonian question... but only after a Soviet victory in the Balkans..." ("Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece", Institute of National History edition, Skopje, 1968, p. 102.) Peiov also pointed out that the CPG, in this same resolution, confirmed its increased responsibilities to help the minorities with their struggle before the Soviets took power in the Balkans. (Ibid. p. 102.)

Of course, immediately below, Peiov, without a doubt, concluded that: "The CPG leadership, during the struggle in the Balkans, forgot about its revolutionary obligations and made gross 'mistakes' in its political activities and organizational measures, both during the national liberation war and during the Greek Civil War." (Ibid. p. 107.)

Peiov briefly, but accurately and convincingly, pointed out that the objective conditions during the Fascist occupation of the Balkans not only allowed but also demanded, both for political and organizational reasons, a revision of the Macedonian national question and its new setting in the newly emerging reality; objectively favourable conditions for its final settlement. Peiov correctly pointed out that this only happened because some leaders from the interested Communist parties were prepared for it. In this respect, Peiov also listed the Siantos CPG leadership's "mistakes":

"...The CPG took an extremely opportunist attitude... It did not show modernity to properly set and resolve the Macedonian national question as an inevitable objective request in the new conditions... The CPG leaders obviously broke with their natural place and their natural development path, with regard to the Macedonian people's struggle, right from the beginning to the end of the national liberation war, and even then when the war was lost and power in Greece fell into the hands of counterrevolutionaries... The CPG systematically worked to block the Macedonian factor from growing and from allowing the Macedonian people to independently take their fate into their own hands... The CPG persistently opposed the formation of a Macedonian national liberation organization, the

formation of separate Macedonian partisan units, and the development of Macedonian national cadres...” (Ibid. p. 108-109.) And for my part I will add that the CPG also used weapons against the Macedonian fighters in certain cases...

However, to say that the CPG made “mistakes”, in itself, is a superficial approach. If that were the case then the entire CPG general line might as well be called a “mistake”. On the contrary, what the CPG did was a consistent application of the CPG general line. Peiov made a mistake by failing to consider what was inside that line and to show its connection to the actual line that the CPG practiced at that time...

As I have already pointed out in the previous statement, after the Macedonian people made their own proclamation as a Macedonian nation in their homeland, the CPG accepted a practical policy of ignoring the very existence of the Macedonian people. What was then called “Greater Greek nationalism” - a requirement that no Macedonian national question existed, turned into a factual policy, that is, a permanent CPG practice. No one down on the ground or up at the top spoke about Macedonia and the Macedonian people or their democratic rights and freedoms within the Greek state. The CPG leadership tried to extend this practice during the Fascist occupation. As is well-known, the CPG, during its CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, held in July 1941, decided the following: “The Communist Party of Greece calls upon the Greek people, all its parties and organizations, in one national liberation front, etc...” (“The CPG from 1931 to 1952”, CPG Central Committee edition, p. 105.) No Macedonians there!

In other words the CPG Central Committee made no mention of any Macedonians or their liberation struggle as Macedonians side by side with the Greek people. The CPG leadership literally ignored its own interests of this liberation struggle against a common enemy. In fact, the CPG completely ignored the existence of a Macedonian people and the Macedonian national question in Greece which it was expected to resolve.

The same thing was repeated during the CPG’s Seventh Plenum held in September 1941.

EAM, ELAS and PEEA program documents, which defined the CPG's general line of practical applications, never mentioned or foresaw the Macedonian people and their democratic rights in the "new" Greece. The Macedonian people were simply ignored, and worse than that, they were treated like they were Greeks. According to S. Sarafis, ELAS's popular chief commander, in his famous book "ELAS", wrote: "...Then I went to the village Perivoli and there I inspected the Second Battalion of the 28th Brigade, which was composed entirely of 'Slavophone Greeks'..." (Ibid. p. 331.)

So, according to Sarafis, no Macedonians existed as a separate people in Macedonia.

As for "full equality" for the Macedonian people, that was recognized in exchange for the abolishment of the "right to self-determination to secession". Life however proved that this was only required for external needs and not to be internally implemented, that is why it remained in the CPG program.

Minority rights in Greece were of a theoretical nature and that is how they were reflected in the CPG's general line during the fascist occupation. The CPG's actual line, as practiced, however, as we stated earlier, was: National struggle in national unity with the national bourgeoisie and with English friendship and support, carry out a national liberation, to fully establish the integrity of Greece and strategically secure Greece's northern borders against external attacks, which meant expanding the Greek state at the expense of its neighbours (Macedonians). This was exactly the same line that exclusively served English and "Greek nationalist interests". In other words the CPG was in actual fact struggling to preserve "nationalist interests" during this fateful historical moment.

Only when we take all this into account can we begin to reasonably and accurately understand:

- Why did the CPG, during the occupation, recruit only a small number of Macedonian activists, a number that could be counted on the fingers of one hand, and why were the more active Macedonians killed very early in the struggle, like Tashko Karadzha, member of

the CPG Central Committee for Macedonia, killed in May 1942, and later legendary Lazo Trpovski, also member of CPG Central Committee for Macedonia?

- Why were those few Macedonian cadres in the CPG not allowed to lead the Macedonian national liberation struggle, and why was the armed Macedonian national liberation struggle, led by new, and until yesterday, unknown people, allowed to be extinguished almost silently?

- Why was there an unavoidable conflict between the Macedonians and CPG, EAM and ELAS, after the Macedonian national liberation struggle broke out?

It would appear that the Macedonian people's struggle, with its national features and aspirations, represented a potential danger to the Greek position and to Greece's northern borders which the CPG, EAM and ELAS leaders could not ignore. That is why the CPG never helped the Macedonians before the Macedonian liberation movement broke out and that is why the CPG, EAM and ELAS were upset with the Macedonians after the Macedonian liberation movement broke out. The collision of interests between the Macedonian national liberation struggle and Greek national interests was the basic cause that defined the CPG's attitude and the actions it took against the Macedonian people, which according to Peiov, were "mistakes".

Peiov wrote: "SNOF (Slavo-Macedonian National Liberation Front) and the SNOV (Slavo-Macedonian National Liberation Army) partisan units were created in the fall of 1943, from pressures exerted by the situation on the ground..."

That is correct. It was well-known that some Party officials in those days were complaining that "armed opportunists" were sowing discord among the peaceful Macedonian villages, and if they were not there, there would supposedly be peace and order in those villages. In other words, SNOF and some of the smaller Macedonian partisan groups were formally created to disarm those so-called "armed opportunists" and prevent them from creating an unpleasant situation for the CPG.

However, instead of a formal and imaginary organization, SNOF quickly grew into a national organization that turned the fledgling Macedonian national liberation movement into a strongly organized and armed revolutionary movement.

Not wanting the Macedonian revolutionary movement to gain any ground, the CPG quickly, in a manner of several months, dissolved SNOF because, according to the CPG, it was an “autonomist”, “crypto-fascist” and “reactionary” organization.

Unfortunately, Peiov’s explanation of the process the CPG leadership followed was superficial and inaccurate. According to Peiov, the CPG leaders acted this way “because EAM and PEEA in their program principles and in the agreements they signed with the Greek government in exile, did not foresee and did not defend the rights of the Macedonians, nor did they help the Macedonians create their own forces to defend those rights...” (Ibid. p. 109.)

Clearly, Peiov’s “clarification” explained nothing. Peiov should have answered the questions: “Why did the CPG leaders not foresee and defend the Macedonian people’s democratic rights? Why instead of helping them did they place obstacles in their path, developing their own Macedonian national liberation struggle?”

Of course, there were fundamental differences and contradictions between what Siantos and his associates were trying to do as compared to what the Macedonian people were trying to do. The Macedonian people wanted to win their rights and struggled in support of Macedonian national interests which conflicted with the “Greek national interests” supported by Siantos’s CPG leadership. In other words there was no place for the Macedonian national liberation movement within the general line that the CPG practiced. In fact the CPG did not even want to acknowledge the existence of the Macedonian people and the Macedonian national question, never mind support them. In fact the CPG sacrificed “Macedonian rights” and the Macedonian people themselves, to safeguard Greece’s existing border. Accordingly and by that logic, the CPG was opposed to everything that would threaten Greece’s integrity including the Macedonian national liberation movement...

Naturally, Siantos and the top CPG leadership had no problem betraying the Macedonian people. This was one of Siantos's many sins committed against the people in Greece and against the Greek people's revolution. As we now know, the culmination of these "perpetrations" were part of the Varkiza Agreement, with which Siantos managed to quickly and efficiently liquidate the entire ELAS military force and rob the people of their revolution.

NOF and the "Greek Axis" (1945-1949)

After Siantos died, Zahariadis took his place. Zahariadis, it appears, was a survivor who in a strange way managed to survive for many years as a communist, first in the hands of the Greek fascist Asfalia (security services) and then in the hands of Hitler's Gestapo in Dachau... As a communist he managed to live through all that and come out alive and well to take over the CPG leadership in Greece.

In the meantime, the Macedonian national liberation movement (NOF), despite CPG opposition, formed a strong national revolutionary organization which managed to touch every Macedonian.

The CPG, headed by Zahariadis, continued with its open hostilities against NOF, always attacking its leaders and organizers and accusing them of "adventurisms" and calling them "autonomists", "traitors" and other such words in order to isolate them, the movement and the fighters from the people.

However, slowly, as the unilateral civil war was turning into a two-sided civil war, the CPG finally came to the realization that, according to Peiov: "NOF was a real factor without which the Macedonian people could not imagine fighting in a common struggle against a common enemy - the Greek counterrevolution and the foreign interventionists..." (Ibid. p. 146.) On November 21, 1946, after some preparatory work, a meeting was held between the NOF Central Council Secretariat (of which I, Pavle Rakovski, was a member) and representatives of the CPG. After a lot of discussion, an agreement was reached to unify our military forces and transfer NOF directly under the CPG leadership.

It is well-known that Zahariadis and the people around him (those who were collaborating with Siantos) turned out to be insincere and inconsistent with the Macedonian people and NOF. And as Naum Peiov rightly pointed out: “Since the first moment of the unification, the CPG leaders wanted to completely behead the Macedonian national liberation movement... From the very first moment to the withdrawal of DAG from the battlefields, and to the end of the armed struggle in Greece, the CPG leadership worked systematically to undermine NOF... The Macedonian people were not treated as “allies” in a common struggle but rather as unpaid mercenaries... The Macedonian partisans in DAG’s ranks were oppressed and discriminated against. All Macedonians and members of NOF, who disagreed with the CPG, were singled out and removed from their positions in NOF...” (Ibid. p.150.)

Even though this matter is in fact the main subject of Peiov’s work, he did not go far enough or beyond some superficial accounts. In other words he did not expose Zahariadis’s actions against the Macedonian people or even register all the ins and outs of his measures. As I have already stated, the registration of events alone is not enough to properly explain and evaluate the situation for the reader. Peiov should have analyzed and explained each action to see what it meant and to understand why, when the CPG proclaimed “equality”, it actually applied a policy of “inequality and discrimination”, and even committed crimes against the Macedonian people.

When all this is expanded on and properly explained in detail one can see the true sacrifices the Macedonian people made during this struggle and their contribution to the civil war in Greece. Peiov did not do this which is a serious omission on his part. On the other hand, Peiov took a different approach here and tried to explain this as “some alleged contradiction between the CPG and NOF”. According to Peiov: “It was the attitude taken: to have an ‘armed struggle’ or a ‘political-parliamentary struggle’ that formed the basis for the dispute between NOF and the CPG. This attitude led to a series of consequences and contributed to NOF’s hesitation, of whether to step up the armed struggle or not, etc.” (Ibid. p. 141.)

The question of liberating Greece from the foreign interventionists and from the domestic reactionaries was an issue only for the Greek people and for their avant-garde the CPG. It was their right and duty to decide when and how they would act to resolve the issue. It is not true that the Macedonian people, about twenty-five times less in number than the Greek people, were in a position to question or oppose the CPG on when to start the armed struggle. Peiov said that: “NOF took a standstill on a number of issues to see how the CPG leadership would act...” (Ibid. p. 141.) This was correct, however inevitable. It is absurd to think that the Macedonian people could do something in Greece, even about their own position, in disregard of the CPG, the Greek people and the workers movement. It is even more absurd to believe that the Macedonian people could, on their own, exercise or act on something that contradicted the CPG line. If at any given moment or situation the Macedonian armed resistance took intense action, it was exclusively because of specific circumstances like the intense terror perpetrated against them, and not because of some supposed special plans or attitudes towards the armed struggle. The disagreements between the CPG and NOF were not caused by this, but by something completely different. It is true as Peiov correctly stated that: “There was a gap between NOF and the CPG leadership on the Macedonian national question which was created during the people’s liberation movement...” (Ibid. p. 133.) But, as usual, Peiov only stated a fact without an explanation. If you were to explore that gap, which Peiov missed out on, you would be intimidated by its wild nature and our people have the right to know the nature of that gap.

All in all, this part of Naum Peiov’s work is the least well-processed and looks poor...

Let us recall: The CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum, held in June 1945, was the first plenum directly managed by Zahariadis who had just returned from Dachau to London and from London to Athens. The CPG’s adopted line in full was Zahariadis’s doing.

As I stated earlier, Zahariadis (and the Twelfth Plenum) decided that “as a realistic foreign policy... Greece should be positioned on an axis between two basic poles: the European-Balkan pole with Russia as the centre and the Mediterranean pole with England as the

centre... and this ‘Greek axis’ would bind these two poles in a way that would best serve Greek interests...”

We have already seen how this “Greek axis” began to function and serve “Greek interests”. Fearing Tito and NOF and not having much confidence in Russia, Zahariadis and the CPG resolutely turned to the Middle East with England as the centre, declaring England’s “friendly presence and support” as a primary necessity to secure the “peaceful development” of the country, while “preserving Greece’s territorial integrity”. This was proclaimed as the CPG’s primary task.

And as we know, Zahariadis’s leadership voted in favour of the “Greek Axis” during the CPG’s Seventh Congress, held in October 1945.

So the question is, in view of the “Greek Axis” what kind of policy did Zahariadis apply towards NOF and the Macedonian people?

Let us have a closer look at the CPG documents from that time:

- Not a word was said about the Macedonian people. At the Twelfth Plenum Zahariadis refused to speak about the Macedonians and about NOF. He even refused to admit that Macedonians were fighting in a national rebellion. The resolution adopted during the plenum simply ignored not only the Macedonian people’s democratic rights in the Greek state, but also their actual existence.

- About four months later, the CPG, at its Seventh Congress, said: “The CPG condemns, as a crime against national interests, the persecution committed by post-December Greece against the Slavo-Macedonian minority...” (“CPG from 1931 to 1952”, p. 126.) That’s all it said. And it was just a verbal condemnation, with no consequences. The CPG did not organize any protests against this. It did not involve any writers, scientists, artists or other prominent figures to protest against the Macedonians being persecuted. The CPG did not organize work interruption in factories, not even for an hour, the closing of shops, not even in Macedonia, in protest of this. In other words the CPG took no practical measures to protest the persecution committed by post-December Greece against the

Macedonian people. On the contrary: The CPG itself initiated open hostilities against the Macedonian movement, even during the fascist occupation, and continued them with unabated intensity.

- About two months following the Seventh Congress, during a meeting of the CPG Central Committee on Macedonia and Thrace, held in Solun in December 1945, Zahariadis said: “NOF is a democratic political organization of the Slavo-Macedonians” and that “every Greek, and true democrat, should cooperate with it...” (See: “Λαϊκή φωνή”, December 18, 1945.) So, this was the first time that Zahariadis publicly took a stand in support of the Macedonian movement. However, the CPG press in Macedonia continued to fight against NOF and against its activists and leaders. At first glance this seemed contradictory and incomprehensible. But in time, as we shall see, it became clear and comprehensible why it was done this way.

- During the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum, held in February 1946, the CPG said: “The CPG condemns the persecutions and acts of official Greece against the Slavophone Macedonian population... and declares that it will fight to recognize the rights and equality of the Slavophones living in Greek Macedonia in the lands of the Greek state...” (“CPG from 1931 to 1952”, p. 149-150.)

So, according to the CPG, the Macedonian people are no longer part of the Macedonian nation, no longer part of a Macedonian national minority, but a nationally unformed, amorphous mass of “Slavophone speakers living in the lands of the Greek state”.

It would appear that the Plenum did not recognize the national existence of the Macedonian people in general. It did not recognize the existence of the Macedonian national question inside or outside of Greece. Therefore, the CPG did not recognize and would not accept the fact that Yugoslavia recognized the Macedonian state and nation or the fact that now there was a Macedonian state, the People’s Republic of Macedonia. In other words Zahariadis reacted indirectly to both the latest turn of events in Yugoslavia as well as to events in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia. By not recognizing the existence of the Macedonian nation outside of Greece in effect the CPG did not recognize NOF. This is clearly

indicated by the reaction of the party press. Hostilities by the party press against NOF and its leaders continued uninterrupted even after Zahariadis spoke in favour of the Macedonians and even after the decisions made at the Second Plenum.

Now we know, and it should be clear, why Zahariadis said what he said. Namely, Zahariadis spoke of NOF, not as a political revolutionary organization of the Macedonian people, that is, of the Macedonian national minority in the Greek state, but of a different NOF, which would appear as a “political organization” of the “Slavic speakers living in the Greek state”, as was expressed in the Second Plenum. This “imagined” NOF, of which Zahariadis spoke, would obviously include the “rights and equality of the Slavic speakers” in the CPG program requirements but they would be without national characteristics and aspirations, something like the rights and equality of some, so to speak, Slavic Gypsies living in Greece.

This “imagined” NOF did not yet exist. But when it is created its ideological content and characteristics would be based on Zahariadis’s statement and on the decision made during the Second Plenum.

And so, the Macedonian people went from being an “enslaved nation” with corresponding “rights to self-determination to secession from Greece”, as recognized by the CPG in 1924, to a “national minority” in their own homeland as recognized by Zahariadis and the CPG in 1935. Now, again under Zahariadis’s leadership, the Macedonian people became an amorphous mass of Slavic speakers, with unclear national characteristics and aspirations. All this was done at a time when the Macedonian people in the Yugoslav part of Macedonia were gaining their rights by fighting for them. But, even though the Macedonian people in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia were organized by NOF from the youngest to the oldest and tirelessly struggled to gain their democratic rights in the Greek state, the CPG persistently stood in their way fighting against them.

It was the second time Macedonian people and their democratic rights were attacked by the CPG during Zahariadis’s leadership.

As I mentioned earlier, the first major attack, organized and implemented by Zahariadis and the CPG, was ten years ago. This was a general attack against the Greek reactionaries which led to the abolition of the Greek people's democratic rights and freedoms with the rise of the Fourth of August dictatorship which cracked down on the CPG itself.

This new large-scale attack on the Macedonian people and on their democratic rights, backed by Zahariadis and the CPG, was again a sure sign of a general offensive by the Greek reactionaries who were openly supported from the outside. This was also a bad harbinger for the Greek people and for the CPG itself. When a communist party gives up on the soul of the labour movement and on the consistency of democracy, then life becomes very difficult not only for sustaining democracy and the workers movement but also for the avant-garde, the CPG itself. And since then, we have witnessed Greece sliding towards a reactionary regime. The labour movement began to weaken from within, experiencing failure after failure, and in the end, its avant-garde, the CPG, finally fell apart. Even the late Giannoulis, an unpopular CPG activist in Macedonia, surprised by the decision of his DAG superiors to have him shot, managed to leave his communist comrades a message: "Fight to cleanse the CPG from its class enemy agents, and do this as soon as possible..." (This was passed on as an anecdote in the DAG and NOF ranks). In the meantime the CPG broke up into several independent groups that fought each other while the reactionaries grew stronger and did their job.

The new CPG attitude towards the Macedonian national question, i.e. "not wanting to know about the national characteristics and aspirations of the Macedonian movement", led Zahariadis to formulate his new policy towards the Macedonian people. The unification of military forces and NOF's direct transfer under the CPG leadership did not in fact mean that NOF was recognized as a bearer of the national characteristics and aspirations of the Macedonian people. In practice there was no such recognition. Judging by the events that followed, one can conclude that the unification was in fact only a CPG front for attacking NOF, and the beginning of new struggle tactics from within.

Here are some of the more characteristic events of that time in this relationship:

Soon after the unification, the Macedonian military forces, that until then had their bases on the Paiak, Kaimakchalan and Vicho massifs, were taken from Macedonia and sent south to central and southern Greece (spring-summer 1947). However, during the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum, held February 1946, it was concluded that: "In order to cover their real plans and deceive and divide the people, the Monarcho-Fascists reactionaries, the united plutocracy and their foreign leaders, constantly and relentlessly spread propaganda that the CPG wants autonomy for Macedonia. They persisted in spreading rumours that the CPG wants to give Macedonia away and insisted that Pan-Slavism was a mortal danger to Hellenism..." ("CPG 1931-1952," p. 149.) In the meantime, the appearance of the Slav speaking Macedonian units in the Greek villages in central and southern Greece, for local people who until then had never heard of any "Slavs" living anywhere in the Greek state, was confirmation of these claims against the CPG. And as I have already said, these local Greeks and EAM supporters flew into a panic when they saw the Macedonian units, thinking that they were a Bulgarian army or some kind of legion of foreigners, despite the fact that their command was made up exclusively of Greeks. In other words the local Greek people were made to believe that Greek communists were leading a "Slav" invasion into Greece. As a result many of these local people were driven into the enemy camp where they became reserves and were used to fight against the revolution. After that, Eighth Division DAG command in Epirus was forced to order the Macedonians fighters to stop speaking Macedonian and singing Macedonian songs and to present themselves as Greeks in order to stop the panic.

Of course, anyone who knew anything about the situation in Greece would have easily predicted the consequences of this. Therefore, one cannot discount the fact that the Macedonians were sent to the Greek south to intensify the people's revolution there and provide credibility to the theory that a "Slav danger" from the north was imminent. The CPG naturally should have known that this was going to happen and did this anyway. Why? Was it to show that a "Slav" invasion was taking place? Or was it for another reason?

The Macedonian units in Macedonia were formed and armed immediately after the Varkiza Agreement was signed. They were composed of prominent first-class Macedonian fighters and fought against the terror directed against them in the spring and summer of 1945. These units were composed of young elite Macedonian revolutionary fighters who were the most conscious and most active factor of the Macedonian national revolutionary movement. The Greeks feared them and did not want them in Macedonia. They especially did not want them to influence events in Macedonia and have more Macedonian people join them. So, in order to isolate them from the Macedonian people the CPG sent them south deep into Greece.

The fact that their presence and activities in southern Greece, which forced many Greeks to join the opponent, did not bother Zahariadis a bit, but quite the opposite, the stronger the opponent was the easier it would be to liquidate the Macedonian units. And as it turned out, the well-armed Monarcho-Fascists slowly liquidated the elite Macedonian units in difficult and uneven battles.

It is a fact that no reactionary Athenian government had ever succeeded in liquidating an elite Macedonian unit. The Athenian success this time can only be attributed to Zahariadis and the CPG leadership who set the right conditions for this to happen.

Here is another fact, no less characteristic in this relationship:

In early July 1947, at the same time the Macedonian elite units were falling victim to the Athens government in the far Greek south, due to Zahariadis's treachery, the NOF Central Council Secretariat received a telegram from the CPG Central Committee Politburo signed by Zahariadis. According to this telegram, the full NOF Secretariat, as well as the agitation and propaganda department staff, were ordered to meet with Zahariadis at DAG headquarters in Gramos, located near the village Likorahi in Epirus. The predetermined route they were expected to take was as follows: Pass through the villages Prekopana, Kostarazi, Pesiak, via the church on the hill, etc. to Likorahi. As it turned out, because of some kind of meeting that had just ended, the people invited to the meeting with

Zahariadis ran into another group of people who were headed the same way. Then, around 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning the mixed group reached the village Pesiak. There were no dogs barking in the dead of night and the village, composed of Macedonians and Asia Minor colonists, seemed to be abandoned so the group decided to enter the village and take a break.

While sitting around and having conversations, an old man, who overheard them speaking Macedonian, came out of his house and told them about the presence of a large Greek military unit in the area. He told them that the unit had arrived in the village four days ago and at the moment was watching the road as if waiting to ambush someone. So, had the group continued to follow the road, it would have fallen into the unit's hands...

Since Zahariadis himself chose the time, place and route to take to the meeting, one can only speculate that this was an attempt by Zahariadis to get rid of the NOF leadership and behead the Macedonian liberation movement. Since there is no direct evidence to prove this, it remains an open question which undeniably links to Zahariadis's characteristic behaviour towards the Macedonian people and their liberation movement. What gives this theory more credibility is Dzhodzho's death. Dzhodzho was a NOF representative at DAG Headquarters for Central and Western Macedonia. He was executed at the same time (summer 1947) when the NOF leadership was set up for an ambush. While he was sent on an errand by the CPG he was surrounded and ambushed on the way by a hostile army unit. Dzhodzho used his last bullet on himself to avoid capture.

Vangel Shamardanov, battalion commissar and former NOF Board president for Voden Region, was killed, shot in the back. Months before he was killed, during a meeting he secretly admitted to me that he was afraid of being killed by his Greek comrades around him. Many other prominent Macedonian fighters were killed in various ways. This included Lazo Koroveshov who was a gun repair technician and had a shop in Lerin before the war started. He was a good person and influential among the Macedonian DAG fighters. He was killed while having his meal by the soup cauldron. A

supposedly “stray bullet” left him dead on the spot. The killer, of course, was never found.

No one really knows exactly how many Macedonians patriots were killed this way.

This new CPG application against the Macedonian fighters, i.e. the extermination of prominent Macedonians and bearers of the Macedonian national ideal, was carried out more intensely during the first year after the unification in 1947. Attempts were even made to take my (Pavle Rakovski) life. One time on August 24, 1949, through Major Hrisostomos, commander of DAG Tenth Division heavy weapons battalion in Gramos at Arapades Sector, and again on August 31, 1949, through Micho Sariovski, second lieutenant of the same battalion.

The First NOF Congress was organized by the CPG and held in January followed by the NOF Central Council First Plenum held seven months later, in August of the same year. The purpose for convening these bodies was to remove the NOF leaders, in a rather unscrupulous and rigid manner, and replace them with leaders who were “loyal to the Greek cause” and who, until yesterday happened to be anti-NOF people. And so, in the spirit of the new CPG attitude, much grafting was done to the top of NOF. So, the new top NOF leadership which was expected to lead the Macedonians people’s national revolutionary organization, turned into a “democratic political organization of the Slavophones” in the Greek state.

While the Macedonian cadres and fighters, bearers of the Macedonian national ideal, were being “eliminated” in various ways, dissemination of the Macedonian press was suppressed by all means possible. In May 1947, six months after the unification, for example, the NOF agitation and propaganda department was ordered by the CPG (Petris) to relocate to a village called Likorahi on Mount Voios in Epirus. This was so far away from any of the NOF organizations that the move made no sense to the staff of the agitation and propaganda department. But the department was told that it had to move if it wanted the CPG to support it. And while moving to its new location it was unable to issue any printed material at all. Then, on May 1, 1947, when it finally was set up and

ready to publish its first edition of the newspaper “Nepokoren”, it was only able to print 100 copies consisting of four small pages. This was because, according to the CPG, there was no paper available.

The second issue of “Nepokoren”, which carried the resolution of the First NOF Conference, held on May 20, 1947, printed only 70 copies, again because of a shortage of paper. Twenty copies were sent to the NOF District Committee in Voden Region. Unfortunately Tasios Gushopoulos-Makis, secretary of the CPG City Committee for the city Voden, destroyed the newspapers and arrested the courier who delivered them.

All in all, during the entire year in 1947, a terrible year for the many Macedonian patriots who lost their lives, “Nepokoren” managed to come out with only five publications with a circulation of about 200 copies each on average. This, without exaggeration, was almost nothing to what actually could have been done if the CPG had not imposed restrictions.

Further restrictions followed in 1948, with the reduction of agitation and propaganda staff. Only three people were left to work in the department, the rest were deployed to fight at the fronts. Eventually the department was reduced to one person, myself (Pavle Rakovski). Given the circumstances, it was no surprise that the Macedonian press was unable to produce much especially articles and information on the progress made in the liberated part of Macedonia, the People’s Republic of Macedonia, within the framework of the Yugoslav federation...

Zahariadis’s “new” attitude towards the Macedonian people came to the fore once again with the liquidation of the Macedonian amateur cultural and artistic group (KUG), founded in 1947 by NOF’s agitation and propaganda department. The group consisted of 12 girls from Macedonia ages 14-16. They were employed by the agitation and propaganda department to sing songs in a choir and perform for general audiences including the troops. They sang mostly folk songs and songs about the struggle in both Macedonian and Greek. As a folk group, the girls always wore their native folk dress and danced native folk dances. As a theatrical group, they

performed episodes on stage portraying battles at the front and revolutionary life behind the scenes in the face of the enemy. They also performed opera depicting the struggle. Their performances in the Macedonian villages and for the DAG units resembled an exceptionally beautiful manifestation of the folk culture of a nation being reborn in the flames of its liberation struggle, bringing deep satisfaction to civilians and soldiers alike. The group had a huge influence in mobilizing people to the war effort.

Ordinary logic dictated that groups such as these could greatly benefit the struggle and should be expanded to all the districts. Each district should have had at least one such group. But, of course, having such groups was contrary to the “new” CPG position with regard to the Macedonian national question. As a result the only group available was disbanded.

The initial reason given for disbanding the group was “DAG needed more fighters”. As a result, Foti Ilkovski, the group’s artistic director, was mobilized and sent to the front to fight. Later, the group was accused of allegedly spreading “nationalist” propaganda and “undermining” the CPG and DAG... accusations that held no water...

By the second half of 1948, the aforementioned acts committed by Zahariadis’s CPG became well-known to the Macedonian people. As the Macedonian people and the Macedonian DAG fighters became aware of these acts, especially of the executions, they became suspicious of the sincerity of Zahariadis’s leadership. The Macedonian struggle began to appear increasingly hopeless and pointless, especially after NOF’s leadership was replaced. Hundreds of fighters, among them prominent ones, began to desert. Little by little the atmosphere became tense and the new NOF leadership was left hanging in isolation. This unfavourable condition was turning NOF into an impotent organization. In other words Zahariadis’s “new” attitude did not allow NOF to “blossom” as a political organization. Moreover, NOF’s new leadership did not have the necessary support from the people in order for it to grow. So NOF began to shrivel. The new NOF to the Macedonian people was alien because its ideological content regarding the Macedonian people’s struggle did not support the Macedonian people’s ideals.

That is why it did not work.

So, in order to bolster the “new” NOF’s popularity, the CPG introduced some new and revolutionary tactics... which, in the end, did not work.

A new Macedonian printing house and a new and larger format were introduced to publish the already existing Macedonian newspapers “Nepokoren”, “Nova Makedonka” and “Bilten”, published regularly with circulations of two thousand copies each. This, however, did not help and neither did the words contained in the CPG Central Committee Fourth Plenum Resolution spoken on July 28-29, 1948, which preceded the creation of the new NOF leadership only by ten days. The resolution, among other things, said: “The Slavo-Macedonian people with their struggle are firmly building their free and equitable life. They strengthen and secure their rights with the blood of their sons and daughters in their national democratic future...” (“CPG from 1931 to 1952”, p. 175.)

All the things done however did not help. The situation still remained tense, dangerous and full of uncertainty. To stop the situation from getting worse, the CPG leadership, during its CPG Central Committee Fifth Plenum, held in January 1949, resolutely reverted back to its 1924 position with regards to the Macedonian national question. The Macedonian people were again recognized as a unique nation and their rights to self-determination were reinstated. “The Slavo-Macedonian people in northern Greece have given their all in the struggle and are fighting heroically with such self-sacrifice that it arouses admiration. There should be no doubt that, as a result of DAG’s victory in the people’s revolution, the Macedonian people will fully gain their national establishment, as they themselves want, for which they are shedding their blood today...” (“CPC from 1931 to 1952”, p. 195.)

To add more credence to his “verbal policy”, a few days later, during the NOF Central Council Second Plenum, held on February 3 and 4, 1949, Zahariadis personally suggested that some of the old NOF leaders be re-elected by vote to the NOF Secretariat, that is, to the Presidency that was elected during the NOF First Congress then

known as the NOF Central Committee Executive. Among those nominated were myself (Pavle Rakovski) and Paskal Mitrevski. Outside of that, the CPG's anti-Macedonian policy, in essence, remained unchanged. At the same NOF Central Council Second Plenum, for example, even before he nominated me and Mitrevski's for reelection, Zahariadis had already committed to what the NOF program would look like without any input from NOF. In other words everything was decided by Zahariadis alone even before the voting for new NOF personnel took place. This is what Zahariadis proposed:

“The Second NOF Congress will proclaim the new NOF programming principles that represent the century-long pursuit of our people. The Second Congress will declare the unification of the Macedonian people in one independent Macedonian state within the Balkan People's Federation of Republics...” (“Nepokoren”, February 15, 1949.)

The above-mentioned CPG attitude was adopted during the time when the Bulgarian democratic people denied the national existence of the Macedonian people. Albania, Bulgaria, and Romania, at that time, were running hostile propaganda campaigns against Yugoslavia. This was done in the spirit of the well-known Informburo resolution. And since DAG was far from achieving a victory in Greece, the CPG itself had not yet taken a position on this issue. Thus, this attitude had been taken quite independently from the Balkan reality and was an absurdity.

Things were not what they seemed however.

It is unreasonable to believe that the CPG, with this act, could have wanted Bulgaria to recognize the national existence of the Macedonian people when the CPG itself would not recognize them.

So, it must have been something else.

The attitude the CPG took was directed internally. Without a commitment such as this from Yugoslavia it would have been inconceivable for the Macedonian people in the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to have won their national and social freedom under

the circumstances of those times, regardless of what the Informburo said and did. There is no doubt that the Yugoslav commitment guaranteed the Macedonian people's freedom and the preservation of the People's Republic of Macedonia. The real power behind this was Macedonian brotherhood and unity with the other Yugoslav nations, the most precious benefit derived from the common liberation struggle. The CPG recognized the strength behind such a commitment and by recognizing the Macedonian people's right to self-determination, it was trying to force the Macedonian people to give up on the brotherhood and unity with the other Yugoslav nations, and seek their own "unification" in some sort of a non-existent utopian Balkan people's federation.

It is obvious that this, in essence, was an anti-Macedonian move on Zahariadis's part. Why would Zahariadis propose the Macedonian people give up something real, something guaranteed, for something that did not exist? Yet Zahariadis took that road. This was simply done to undermine the Macedonian people's political unity, an attempt to create a stir in the Macedonian people's political demands and split them up.

The anti-Yugoslav stand was taken for the same reason. It openly called on the Macedonian people in the People's Republic of Macedonia to disassociate themselves from the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia...

However, as Peiov has correctly noted: "In the then state of Balkans affairs, this NOF decision caused vivid public interest and a sharp reaction from the Athens government..." ("Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece", p. 160.) But, only five weeks after making the statement, Zahariadis, for some reason, decided to deny it. By publishing a special personal announcement on behalf of the NOF Central Committee Executive Council, Zahariadis denied making such a statement and blamed it all on NOF. He insisted that NOF had made this decision on its own...

But by then Zahariadis had already prepared a new move.

The day after NOF held its Second Congress, (March 25-26, 1949), on March 27, 1949, KOEM (Communist organization of Aegean

Macedonia) was founded. KOEM was the only communist organization in the world that had not emerged as an avant-garde organization in charge of organizing and mobilizing the working people in their struggle for rights and freedom. Eventually, after all the Macedonian people, or the “Slavophone” people, as Zahariadis called them, were mobilized to the last one, KOEM’s aim was to influence them from inside NOF. KOEM was created to lead the Macedonian national liberation movement in the spirit of Zahariadis’s new attitude.

Compared to Zahariadis’s rigidly implemented NOF policies and with his above-mentioned anti-Macedonian and anti-Yugoslav moves, creating KOEM was undoubtedly a more mature and therefore a more dangerous move.

But it was made too late. The People’s Revolution in Greece was about to be defeated.

But as we know, at the basis of this anti-Macedonian policy, implemented by Zahariadis and his associates, was the basic contradiction between the “Macedonian national and democratic rights and interests”, on the one hand, and the “Greek national interests” on the other. The Macedonian national liberation movement was opposed to the spirit of this “new position” adopted at the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum because it knew there was no place for it in the “Greek Axis”. The very spirit of this “new CPG attitude”, imposed on the Macedonian people, caused new hostilities. This was another way of striking at NOF. In other words, the CPG open frontal attacks against NOF were now camouflaged with revolutionary phraseology and strikes from within...

The CPG betrayal against the Macedonian people, naturally, was only one symptom of the high treason that Zahariadis committed against the people and the people’s revolution in Greece. It is well-known that:

- By calling England a “great friend” of Greece, and its “friendly presence and support” being a primary necessity for securing Greece’s “peaceful development”, Zahariadis actually abused the

CPG's immense authority to justify England's presence in Greece and to allow it to interfere in Greece's internal affairs, thereby weakening the people's resistance. England's presence and interference in Greek affairs facilitated the strengthening of bourgeoisie power.

- In April 1947, when DAG was delivering heavy blows against the Athens regime and against the English interventionists, the Greek bourgeoisie was forced to retreat its troops into the cities. Unprotected their morale fell and the regime began to experience a bad crisis. In August 1947, Greece was without a government for almost two weeks. But, instead of ordering a general offensive during a time when he could have won the war, Zahariadis did his best to facilitate his opponent. He could have had DAG strike the military bases and have the civilians participate in massive strikes and demonstrations, and easily finished his opponent, but he didn't. On top of that Zahariadis also withdrew the Macedonian military forces out of Macedonia and sent them down south to Epirus, Thessaly and Rumeli, away from the Macedonian people to stop them from mobilizing more Macedonians and influencing events in Macedonia. Zahariadis was afraid that, unchecked, the Macedonians could have amassed a large military force that could have threatened the Athens regime.

- On top of all else, by moving the Macedonian forces to western, central and southern Greece, Zahariadis intentionally discredited and compromised the struggle. The CPG and DAG did not inform the Greek people in those regions that these forces were friendly and local, i.e. Macedonian, and since these people did not know that Macedonians existed in Greece, they naturally assumed the forces were invaders from the north, led by the CPG to occupy their lands. To save themselves a multitude of them rushed to join the opponent's camp where they were mobilized and turned into reservist counterrevolutionaries. If that was not enough, Zahariadis then ordered these Macedonian elite fighter and carriers of the Macedonian ideal, to fight against, numerically, a much superior force in uneven battles until they were all liquidated.

- The Democratic Army of Greece (DAG), born and intensified out of necessity to protect the people from the bloody terror perpetrated

against them by the Greek bourgeoisie, was taken over by Zahariadis and by the CPG leadership and used to remedy the “Greek Axis” implementation. In other words DAG was constantly controlled by the CPG limiting its growth and combat activities eventually condemning it to fail and be destroyed.

So, once again it turned out that behind the betrayal committed against the small oppressed Macedonian population hid the great betrayal of the entire Greek democratic population.

Occurrences in a given situation, like the unknowns in mathematical problems, are not always obvious. That is why there are people even today, including many Macedonians, who still trust and follow Zahariadis. But I am sure that future historians will certainly put things in their place. They will find out where Zahariadis belongs and will put him in his place where he really deserves to be. The Macedonian people too will give him his “properly deserved recognition” for his role, for his “greatness” and for his contribution to the so-called Greek Civil War. Naum Peiovs’ work, despite its shortcomings, in this respect, will be a good foundation to build on. There are many recorded discussions and articles written by Peiov’s contemporaries on the Greek Civil War, including my own that will help in this regard. It is necessary to demand that this be done in order to break the silence and reveal what truly happened. Blaming the Macedonian people without any proof and continuing to harass them for something they “may or may not have done” is not the answer...

(August 1968)

IV. ABOUT THE BOOK “EGEISKI BURI” (AEGEAN STORMS) BY VANGEL AIANOVSKI - OCHE

(Critical Remarks)

1. A joyous event

In the fall of 1975, Vangel Aianovski's book "Aegean Storms" was published by the Institute of National History in Skopje. The book was about the Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonian people's participation in the national liberation war. In any case, the appearance of the book was a joyous event. The book came out six to seven decades after the war started and, above all, it was about the tens of thousands of our people who lost their lives and became separated from their friends and loved ones. It was about the young Macedonian people who wasted their youth fighting in a disastrous war and not to mention the tens of thousands of Macedonians who lost their homes and properties.

Of course, every new book about our people's struggle in that war is an addition to our accumulated knowledge. And it must be said that, so many years later, our knowledge of that war is still inadequately poor at best...

2. Good reviews

According to its reviews, the most valuable thing about Aianovski's book was its stunningly rich material, its ability to capture many things that had to do with the many activities in our ranks, and even with those in the enemy camp. So, like I said, its publishing was a joyous event. So, with joy in my heart, I began to read it.

According to Aianovski, the CPG disbanded the Macedonian anti-fascist organization (MAO) and closed down its organ, the Macedonian newspaper “Tsrvena Zvezda” (Red Star) in October 1943. It then reorganized Voden District and appointed Dzhodzhov Urdov as CPG District Committee organizational secretary for the city Voden, while Vangel Aianovski, Risto Kordalov, etc., followed by the names of about fifty other activists and communists, both men and women, were given various party and other functions in the resistance movement... (“Aegean Storms”, p. 99.)

The above appointments were made for the city Voden. But, according to Aianovski, there were also many Macedonian activists and communists who worked in Voden Region outside of the city, such as Trifun Shindev and Risto Bukovalov from Teovo, Lena Dumova and Dimitar Limbov from Vladovo, Tomo Mihailov from Gugovo... followed by a long list of people’s names and villages, which ended with Risto and Lazo Camchev from Subotsko... (Ibid. p. 100.)

Aianovski invested a great deal of effort compiling these lists, yet, at the same time, neglected to mention other and more important activities... For example he failed to mention that a few months later, in the summer of 1944, activists Georgi Atanasovski-Blazhe and Pavle Rakovski-Gotse, both members of the CPG regional committee for the Macedonian Tresino and Meglen Regions, on their own initiative and, of course following a decision made by the regional committee, conducted mobilization activities in the surrounding Macedonian villages and created the ELAS Macedonian Voden battalion. Aianovski himself was mobilized in that battalion yet he failed to provide any details. The very creation of this first purely Macedonian battalion composed of Macedonian volunteers consisting of six armed rebel units with about 750 fighters had and will have a great historical and political significance which appears to be the most significant revolutionary action ever taken in Voden Region. Yet, here we have Aianovski scarcely saying anything about it...

As for the involvement of the Macedonian youth in the struggle in Voden Region, Aianovski wrote:

Among the Macedonian youth who took action in the anti-fascist struggle, mentioned by Aianovski, included were Tashko Hadzhiiyanov, Lambro Urdov, Georgi Tsironkov... and about twenty other names of young people from the city Voden. These were followed by the names of young Macedonians from Voden Region including Mirka Ginova from the village Rosilovo, Panaiot Bozhinov and Vani Indinakov from the village Mesimer and so on. Other young people mentioned included Todor Simovski-Laki from the village Izvor, who worked in Voden Region as EPON organizational secretary... (Ibid. p. 101.)

Naturally, this was a good overview that covered the Macedonian activists and bearers of the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement at the end of 1943...

3. The reactionaries and NOF

Regarding the capitulatory Varkiza agreement, made between the CPG-EAM on one side and the Plastiras Greek government on the other, on February 12, 1945, Aianovski wrote: An English army unit composed of 364 soldiers, among whom were many blacks, carrying the symbols “ES-E”, arrived in Voden on March 4, 1945. Among other things, the unit had 13 tanks and 24 transport trucks. The soldiers were housed in the barracks of the former Greek army Thirteenth Regiment, located in the western part of the city... A gendarmerie force of about 100 people was pulled out of Solun to join the English force. Leading the gendarmes was Ioannis Bafas, Dictator Metaxas’s former personal bodyguard... As per their agreement, various pro-fascist elements including collaborators of the occupier, who had earlier fled and hid in the south in Greece, began to return to Voden. Included among them was Hristos Ioanou, Greek Army Colonel and PAO leader, Athanasios Pegios, a Monarcho-fascist MP, etc. The list contained the names of several merchants, Monarchists, a major, a lawyer, a colonel and so on...

Soon after that, a number of Monarcho-fascist organizations were formed in Voden, such as EPEN, VEN and others, and were joined by the worst reactionaries and occupier collaborators including the likes of Hristos Vazdaris, Ioanis Prichimlis, etc. (Ibid. p. 204.)

He did a good job with the reporting. The political committee's decision to send him to Voden in December 1944 to report on what was happening on the ground was quite correct. Aianovski was a truly pedant worker. It was not surprising that his book was packed with so much detail.

But, despite the strong opposition from the reactionaries in Voden and Voden Region, NOF was still struggling successfully. Aianovski wrote:

A number of NOF prisoners were helped by members of NOF to escape from a Greek prison during the night of November 3, 1945. The task to organize and carry out the escape was entrusted to Atanas Papa-Atanasov, who at the time was in prison. With help from Vangel Goglev, a hole was punched through the prison wall through which all fifteen NOF members escaped. They were later transferred to Kaimakchalan, where they joined a NOF Partisan unit... (Ibid. p. 181.)

This unit was composed mainly of fighters from the former ELAS Macedonian Voden Battalion which, as is well-known, was part of the Aegean Brigade and was disbanded later when the brigade was disbanded. Aianovski wrote:

The NOF unit was composed of the following comrades: Risto Kordalov, commander of the squad, his deputy Tushi Keramitchiev, and unit commissar Risto Shorev. Active fighters in the unit were: Aleko Tsrvenkov, Nushi Kolkotronov, Geli Kordalov, Goni Lisichkov... etc., a total of twenty-two, all from the city Voden. The remaining, up to seventy-one, were from the villages Baovo, Strupino, Kronzlevo, etc., followed by the names of several villages in Voden Region.

Every fighter, to the last one, was meticulously cited by name, surname, and village of origin. And when the unit grew into a battalion, Aianovski was pedant with the same kind of detail. Aianovski wrote:

We named the battalion “Macedonian battalion”. It consisted of complete units. The battalion’s leadership consisted of Risto Kordalov, Tushi Keramitchiev and Risto Shorev. The unit commanders were Atanas Papa-Atanasov, Vangel Goglev and Kolio Baovcheto (Kolio Proshev). Included among the active fighters were Aleko Tsrvenkov, Goni Lisichkov, and so on, a total of twenty-nine from the city Voden. The rest, up to 123 fighters, were also listed by name, surname and village of origin. On top of that Aianovski added that this list was not complete, there were probably “many who were not mentioned” because “part of these comrades were already in the Battalion at the time of its formation (i.e. when Aianovski wrote his report), and part of them joined later, which made it difficult for him to fully cover the entire battalion’s formation... (Ibid. p, 188.)

Of course, this was a good overview for the 1945 Macedonian fighting force as well as for the reactionaries and the Macedonian People’s Democratic Liberation Movement in Voden and Voden Region...

4. Significant meaning

Milan Vuiaklia, in his lexicon of foreign words and expressions said that the words pedant, pedantry, pedantine (French: pedant, Italian: pedante) refer to people who exaggerate with their accuracy, who turn unimportant and insignificant things into significant ones of great importance.

Naturally everyone knew that all these people, be they Geli, Goni, Nushi, Tushi, Tomo, Tsano... were our people from Voden, Sobotsko, Sarakinovo, Ostrovo Regions, and so on, who had joined the struggle to fight. Apparently by citing all these details such as name, surname and village, Aianovski considered it to be a mark of something important. Otherwise, why do it? It looked like he exaggerated a bit so I decided to look over his lists.

I became tired after looking over the first thirty pages and gave up. Aianovski had marked the names of the same people fifteen times for various reasons.

Well, however, one cannot deny that these details have some sort of meaning and weight.

5. Autobiography

Everyone who knew Aianovski knew that he did not write the book himself. The material was his but it was written by an intellectual who followed his instructions and wishes.

The impressions however were Aianovski's because no one else would have presented them the way that they were not.

Aianovski also took charge in the manner in which events were described. He exercised his unlimited freedom to manipulate events to fit his agenda and that's how Aianovski compiled his beautiful autobiography; by throwing mud on others...

With help from documents of that time and by looking at events in which I directly participated, I will try to bring light to the weak side of Aianovski's interesting work...

6. Irresponsible manipulation of events

All throughout 1942 and 1943 I worked undercover in Voden, Voden Region as well as in the Meglen and Ostrovo Regions near the Voden Region borders. All that time this region was completely isolated and no information or news, not even from the Party, EAM, EPON, ELAS reserve, etc., was reaching us and neither was any information filtering outwards in any of the party and other newspapers. In other words information-wise MAO did not exist beyond the confines of Voden Region. The Greek leaders strictly confined it to Voden and soon after it was formed they decided to dissolve it. Aianovski wrote:

It was incomprehensible to the Germans how the Bulgarian court, through its emissaries the likes of Kalchev, was able to attract part of the Macedonian population in Kostur Region and throw it to fight against ELAS, and that this could not be achieved in the Macedonian population in Voden Region. In Kostur Region, in March 1943, for example, a number of villages were already armed

and operating under the directives of Italian lieutenant Raval and Bulgarian lieutenant Kalchev... (Ibid. p. 123.)

Of course, this comparison, which casts a shadow over the work of the Macedonians communists in Kostur Region, is completely wrong and unacceptable. The truth however is different: In September-October 1944, the Germans had left Greece. The railway and the road Solun-Voden-Bitola were important arteries for their withdrawal. In order to protect them while they were leaving, as early as May-June 1944, they formed and armed the “Ohrana” organization in Voden and then tried to arm the surrounding Macedonian villages, as a protection zone for the Voden junction and the Muarem pass, a very dangerous section on those roads. Indeed the Germans had great difficulties during that time and it was quite normal. At the same time however, the Macedonian communists in Kostur Region had already disarmed the counter-band units which voluntarily surrendered their arms. In short, Germans affairs were starting to go downhill in Kostur Region. However, and as Aianovski has pointed out, the Germans did succeed in arming several villages which dominated the military aspect over the Voden: iavoreni, Oshliani, Gugovo, Nisia, Teovo railway and road lines...

Why didn't the Germans try to do this before?

Well, people do things if and when they are needed...

And as we said earlier, the Greek leaders made sure that the existence of MAO was limited to Voden, and was not allowed to develop any serious activities. Simply put, they made sure it remained a fictitious organization (as they did with IMRO (United) and as they had tried to do with SNOF in the past). In any case, they soon dissolved it. The newspapers “Red Star”, an organ of MAO, and “Bulletin” managed to come out several times in small circulations before they too were abolished...

How freely Aianovski manipulated events can be seen from this: As a former secretary of MAO, he did not fail to point out that: “It was the first Macedonian organization in Aegean Macedonia that called for a national liberation struggle...” (Ibid. p. 94.)

While before that, on page 46, he said: “In October 1932, EMEO (IMRO (United)) developed extremely lively activities in Voden Region. People were constantly dispersing revolutionary content calling on the Macedonian people to rise up and fight for the realization of their national rights, to unite and form a single independent Macedonian state...”

But he was wrong again. Namely, the founding conference for the establishment of IMRO (United) was convened in Voden in March 1934, immediately after the CPG had its Fifth CPG congress. (See: History of the Macedonian people, p. 3 and p. 266.)

Aianovski wrote: The “Red Star” was the first newspaper written in the (Macedonian) mother tongue... (“Aegean Storms”, p. 94), with Greek letters, which also does not correspond to the truth. Namely, in its time, much earlier, in the early thirties, from time to time “Rizospasis” printed correspondence material from Macedonia in the Macedonian language. Additionally, in 1930, the Lerin Party Organization, as an inserted issue (until the seventh issue), printed the Macedonian daily “Agricultural Flag”, while in Nestrom the newspaper “Nestorion”, a kind of amateur publication, published Macedonian folk songs and stories, riddles and other folk art... (See: History of the Macedonian people, book 3, p. 267.)

7. Incorrectness

Aianovski began the second part of his book with the conclusion that: NOF was formed in Voden Region and in other Macedonian regions in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia in October 1946, as a massive political organization with strongly armed partisan units and became the bearer and leader of the Macedonian people’s entire political and military activities in the fight against the Monarcho-fascists. It was under these circumstances that the CPG leadership, faced by the pressure of reality, was forced not only to recognize NOF, but to actively cooperate with it... (Ibid. p. 231.)

Immediately after that Aianovski wrote:

However, Dzhodzho Urdov and Pavle Rakovski arrived on the scene... with news of a so-called agreement between NOF and the CPG, a very unclear and discretely reached agreement on cooperation and joint action between NOF and the CPG but under CPG and DAG directives.... Without consulting the Voden Region NOF District Committee, they immediately started negotiating with the CPG partisan leadership regarding the implementation of this agreement... The negotiations, however, failed because the CPG leadership in that district did not have any directives from its Centre, and Urdov and Rakovski were unable to explain and convey anything more specific about the details of the agreement, because they themselves were not directed to do this. Simply put, they were only tasked to bring the NOF partisan units to the CPG-DAG units... (Ibid. p. 232.)

And here Aianovski underlined:

As mentioned above, NOF in Voden Region (under Vangel Aianovski-Oche's leadership) had established good cooperation with the CPG. Our partisan units closely worked with the CPG partisan units, and the headquarters of these units conducted all the actions and operations with previous consultations and coordinated interaction, so that the movement, in terms of our cooperation, developed without any difficulty... (Ibid. p. 232.)

However, all this was destroyed:

“When Dzhodzho Urdov and Pavle Rakovski proposed to the CPG leaders that the NOF partisan units join the CPG units, they gladly accepted and immediately implemented the proposal. But despite the fact that the NOF units were much larger, the merger was carried out in such a way that the NOF units were broken up and attached to the CPG units. Facing responses from the NOF military cadres, who found themselves oppressed by the CPG fighters, Urdov and Rakovski then ordered the NOF military leaders to separate themselves from the CPG units and re-create their own units...”

Aianovski then concluded:

“This Urdov and Rakovski move caused a great disturbance and many compromises on both NOF and the CPG...” (Ibid. p. 232.)

There should be some documentation about what Aianovski said about this insolent and irresponsible act in the CPG files (Κεντρική καθοδήγηση), or in the NOF central leadership files. Unfortunately, this and the emphasis on... Urdov and Rakovski’s clumsiness, which Aianovski described, does not correspond to the truth. Things were somewhat different:

a) “After the last negotiations and cooperation I had with Comrade Zahariadis and with the other responsible CPG comrades, a common position on which the cooperation and merging with the CPG would be built, was determined... Zahariadis completely agreed to keep the Macedonian groups entirely separated... Only the headquarters in each area was to be combined...”

This was documented in one original document of that time, dated September 13, 1946. Paskal Mitrevski, who at the time was at the helm of the NOF central leadership, wrote the document. (See: “Aegean Macedonia at the National Liberation War”, volume 3, document number 171, p. 380.)

b) “...We found ourselves with Comrade Panos from the Macedonian Bureau (CPG). We created a headquarters for Paiak-Kaimakchalan with 6 members led by Stathis, consisting of three Macedonians and three Greeks. Our comrades were Kordalov, Kosta Gechev, and Kosta Uchitelot (the teacher)...

We also created a Party Commission at Paiak-Kaimakchalan consisting of seven people. Only two were Macedonians. They were Tasho Aianov and Kosta Getsev. If we had another person we would have appointed him or her as well...

We had three units at the two mountains with an equally shared command. Each unit was to have Macedonian groups and one or two Greek groups. We formed a mixed group of Macedonians and Greeks in Kaimakchalan...”

The above information was obtained from another source document from that time. It was included in a report written by Dzhodzho Urdov and Pavle Rakovski, dated August 31, 1946, addressed to Paskal Mitrevski. (See: "Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war", Vol. 3, Doc 164, p. 366.)

Mitrevski confirmed receipt of the above report when he wrote: "The four comrades from the main leadership are located at four different points. Comrade Dzhodzho is located at Kaimakchalan, Comrade Pavle Rakovski is located at Paik, Comrade Keramitchiev is located at Vicho and Comrade Mina is located at Gramos, Epirus. I received reports from all four..." (Ibid. p. 378.)

c) Published under number 168, on p. 372-375 in the collection "Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war", volume 3, was a letter from Pavle Rakovski to Paskal Mitrevski, informing him that CPG officials do not respect the principles under which the Macedonian and Greek Partisan units were united in Kaimakchalan and Paik Mountains. Among other things the report said:

"...At Kaimakchalan, Panos... from the CPG Macedonian Bureau, while writing a report said that - seeing the correct ideological-psychological position of the Macedonian masses and acting dialectically... let us see what we can do... that would best help the general struggle. And we did the thing about which we already wrote you. It is understandable, this act was in line with the CPG's "attitude", as it was presented by Comrade Panos regarding the problems of arranging co-operation and the formation of groups. After that, the three of us came to Paik Mountain to arrange things there too. We were surprised to find out that the CPG here wanted to break up the Macedonian units so that they could enter the Greek units... Considering the attitude of the Party as it had been put forward to you, this was unacceptable. We did not recognize that there was a question about the dissolution of the Macedonian units. But Panos insisted. He was pressuring us as much as he could, speaking solely about the discipline of the Party and its "responsibilities". Finally, he agreed to do what we did in Kaimakchalan... We will inform you of what we did another day, as soon as our cadres arrive and join us at our office. There was another surprise the next day. In his attempt to inform them,

Comrade Panos told our cadres to disperse our units completely... We did not interrupt him to express our disagreement while he spoke. When he finished we took him aside and told him: This is not what we agreed to yesterday... He got upset and in a high tone of voice yelled out “unacceptable”. I noticed in particular the tone of voice with which he spoke to us... He sounded like a victor speaking to the vanquished or a master speaking to his servants! He did not show even a drop of respect for us, the same people who a minute ago he had called comrades....

While Dzhodzho looked concerned, I bitterly but courteously said to Panos that being angry was not a sign of strength but of weakness, that he should speak with some courtesy to us and to our secretary who represents all the people, and that this harshness is unnecessary and harmful and does not help our situation...

He did not seem to care and looked like nothing would come of it. But a few hours later he came back and told us that he agreed with what we asked but we could do nothing more...”

Further on in the letter, it was said that, after the appropriate orders were given to both Macedonian and Greek activists, the Greeks left. Panos and Dzhodzho were also preparing to leave. Panos was headed for Karaorman and Dzhodzho for Kaimakchalan. The next day Rakovski found himself at the central dispatch office. Rakovski wrote:

“The next day I found myself at the central dispatch office. The units were also there. I reported to Paskal Mitrevski the moment I found out that Stathis wanted to completely break up our units. I tried hard to explain to him how things led up to this. Mitrevski said: “I don’t know anything about this but when I asked Panos, after you had your quarrel with him, he told me what to do, so I will act according to his instructions. That is how I will act.” I said to him I am sorry but I cannot allow you to do anything more than what we decided with Comrade Panos! He then frantically said: “I am going to do what he instructed me...” I then left. As I was going away he yelled: “I am going to report you for knowingly sabotaging the situation!” The man, of course, was not guilty of anything and acted smartly. Only later I found out that he meant what he said...

especially when he began to call our people traitors, etc. At the end the position remained as it was. We fed them and they gave us all kinds of weapons that they could not use because they were defective. I did what was needed to be done and - quickly...”

The letter Pavle Rakovski wrote to Paskal Mitrevski, described above, was dated September 1, 1946, and sent from Paiak Mountain. This was how things were unfolding in Paiak. Of course, when Dzhodzho arrived in Kaimakchalan and saw that the agreement was not respected by the Greek side, he did not allow the Macedonian units to be dismantled. It doesn't matter when Aianovski says these events took place, be it in October, the end of August or early September, what matters is that they are mentioned for the record. Unfortunately, as is the case with other events, like those involving the Macedonian activists in Kostur Region, Aianovski publicly belittles these NOF people, especially NOF's direct leadership, and casts a negative shadow over their work.

8. Falsification

On pages 167 to 170 of his book “Aegean Storms”, Aianovski talked about TOMO's (Secret Macedonian Liberation Organization) First District Conference which was attended by delegates from the city Voden and from the surrounding villages. According to Aianovski, the Conference was convened on April 28, 1945, and was personally opened by himself (Vangel Aianovski), and was presided over by Petre Popov (who died later) from Dolno Rodovo. Security for the Conference was provided for by a partisan unit. The Conference chairman presented the agenda as follows:

1. TOMO activity report.
2. Change of TOMO's name to People's Liberation Front (NOF).
3. Election of a NOF District Board for Voden Region.

For the first point, Aianovski spoke beautifully about the ideological aspects of our struggle, as a continuation of the Ilinden struggle, etc. He also referred to the CPG capitulation with the signing of the Varkiza Agreement, the split that occurred between the Greeks and Macedonians, and so on...

For the second point, Pavle Rakovski, representative of the Macedonians under Greece Political Committee, spoke. He welcomed the delegates and conveyed the Political Committee's decision to form a single People's Liberation Front (the text reads: National Liberation Front) in Aegean Macedonia and the need to change the name TOMO to NOF, which was accepted.

For the third point, Risto Kordalov spoke. He presented a proposed list of people for the first NOF District Board. The list was accepted.

These were the main topics discussed at the Voden Region first regional conference as described in Aianovski's book "Aegean Storms". In general, things had been set up in such a way as to look like Rakovski was a delegate of the political committee and a guest at this first district conference in Voden Region. Things were also set up so that the conference would appear to be organized, convened and implemented by Aianovski and Kordalov.

This is not how things went however:

First, it is well-known that the Political Committee terminated its fictitious existence in the middle of April 1945. The NOF central leadership was constituted on April 23, 1945, and was led by Paskal Mitrevski. The NOF leadership consisted of Mitrevski, Urdov, Keramitchiev, Koroveshovski and Rakovski. NOF was yet to be created, so everyone was sent to the field to start building NOF's foundations. Rakovski was in charge and was sent to Voden Region. It was decided to work in the field until May 25, 1945 and after that to return for a new meeting...

Second, it is well-known that before that, from January to mid-April 1945, Rakovski stayed at the base in the village Staravina. On his own time he visited Meglen Region (Karadzhova) several times to recruit fighters from the villages for the ELAS Voden Macedonian battalion. Rakovski wanted to find out for himself the mood of the people and to personally speak with the fighters in the battalion (which he later led to Vardar Macedonia). Even though it was expected, he was surprised at what he discovered. Namely, with all its might, the CPG was trying to hide the fact that the Macedonian people had their own movement, their own struggle, their own

military and their own political sense. On top of that, the CPG was telling the Macedonian people that Dzhodzho and Rakovski were renegades and what they were doing was dangerous. Later, after the battalion left for Yugoslavia, the CPG carried out a defamatory campaign telling the people that:

- Dzhodzho and Rakovski “sold out” the battalion for large amounts of money... They sold out your children! They are filthy traitors...! And so on...

A response was need urgently. We needed to respond to this defamatory propaganda and defend our political character as well as to explain to the people why we had to move the battalion. TOMO was born precisely because of this urgency.

We were urgently in need of a political organization right here where the battalion was born, in order to fight against the CPG’s defamatory and vitriolic propaganda. We needed to stop the attacks against us at the source before they spread to other areas and affected the struggle and the movement elsewhere. If we didn’t do that the propaganda would have expanded and deepened. Without a clear explanation from our side as to why the battalion was moved, the entire outcome would have been seen as a meaningless and dangerous adventure...

As an initiation to forming this new organization (TOMO), Rakovski inducted Dzhodzho as a member of TOMO’s political committee secretariat. No one else knew about it. And with NOF’s founding, Dzhodzho decided to keep silent about TOMO and carry on his work under NOF. Rakovski did the same. Indeed, this is how it was...

Third, sometime in late May 1945, as was previously decided, the NOF central leadership gathered for its next meeting. According to a written report, dated May 27, 1945, Rakovski, among other things, wrote: “We have decided to hold a district conference in June, next month, for the purpose of choosing a district board and to report on our progress...” (See: “Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War”, documents about the history of the Macedonian people, volume 2, document number 25, p. 56.)

In the next report, dated June 27, 1945, Rakovski, among other things, wrote: “On June 20, 1945, I called and held an on-site Conference, a few kilometres away from Voden. We did not have the success we were expecting. The invited delegates from Voden and Meglen Pole were absent. They did not make it to the meeting. Those from Voden were blocked, and those from Meglen Pole got their invitations too late because the courier had problems delivering them. However, 28 villages or 125 delegates were present. The groups held their key positions. The Conference went well. It was chaired by a white-haired old man from the Ilinden era. Here is the meeting agenda:

1. The international situation in general. - Hristo Andonovski. (Aianovski does not mention him or his presentation.)
2. Ideological content of our struggle, its leadership, and organizational issues. – Gotse (Rakovski). (Aianovski expropriated a good part of Rakovski’s presentation, as well as his role, and attributed them to himself.)
3. Economic issues. – Gele (Aianovski). (Not a word about this either.)
4. NOF District Board election. (This was done on Rakovski’s recommendation and not on Kordalov’s proposal as indicated by Aianovski. Kardalov at the time was not there.)
5. Miscellaneous.

The next morning everyone left to get back to their jobs, full of faith in the justice of our struggle, etc. (See: “Aegean Macedonia in the Second World War”, volume two, document number 47, page 91.)

Rakovski did not know the activists from the city Voden and always consulted with Dzhodzho about personnel issues relating to them. It was Rakovski who invited Aianovski to attend the conference and, on Dzhodzho’s recommendation, he was appointed first president of the NOF district committee for Voden Region. Dzhodzho made this

suggestion because he figured “it would make it easier for him to work in the field...”

If we are to believe Rakovski’s reports filed at that time, and there is no reason not to believe it, then we can see that there was no district conference held in Voden Region on April 28, 1945, about which Aianovski wrote. Therefore we can conclude that Rakovski never attended such a conference as a delegate and Aianovski made a mistake...

Fourth, among other things, two new bulletins authored by Aianovski were placed in the collection of archival materials “Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War” (volume 2), and in the “Macedonian Archives” by editors Risto Kiriazovski and Todor Simovski. One was placed under order number 39 (page 75), and the other under order number 54 (pages 101-104). Both documents have no signature, but by the way they were received we know who sent them. Besides that the handwriting on the manuscripts is recognizable and belongs to Aianovski.

The first manuscript was entitled “Military Informant Bulletin of June 16, 1945”. The second was entitled “Newsletter”. Both were written on June 16, 1945, and were probably sent to various places.

The editors described the first manuscript as “information from Vangel Aianovski-Oche about the military-political situation in Voden Region”. The second, as “Informational bulletin about the organization TOMO and the situation in Voden Region”. In other words these two manuscripts contained documentation that was unverified and arbitrary.

And here is why: Among other things it was written: “Economic bulletin, 16.6.45. In the morning the Napoleon cost 12, and in the afternoon 9,000. Food items continue to be abundant. Goods are not hidden. The people are satisfied. I am sending you a series of newspapers with measures from Varvaresos, Minister of Finance, where you will see the economic situation of the entire country...” (Ibid. p. 102.)

Naturally this was Aianovski's pedantic handywork written in those reports. TOMO had absolutely no reason to send a "series" of newspapers, with Varvaresos's measures", to anyone. Or for Aianovski to write things like this: "...there are good young men among our soldiers, from whom it is expected that many will be connected with our organization TOMO..." (Ibid. p. 103.) Or like this: "The number of Grkomani (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause) in those villages is very small and efforts are being made to attract them into TOMO..." (Ibid. p. 104.)

However, these quotations generated from Aianovski's written documents and from other documents of that time, also show something else: They show that Aianovski was a member of TOMO and, more interestingly, that Aianovski then knew nothing about the TOMO District Conferences held on April 28, 1945, when the name TOMO was replaced with the name NOF, as was "later" described by Aianovski in his book "Aegean Storms" with fixed dates and a lot of participant names and the like. The then Aianovski, even on June 16, 1945, wrote about "our organization TOMO", but knew nothing about NOF. As long as, of course, Rakovski, a few days later would invite him to the June 20, 1945, district conference and appoint him the first president of NOF for Voden Region.

9. Conspiracy

And so it would appear that Aianovski, according to what he wrote in his book "Aegean Storms", remained silent on the first NOF district conferences, held on June 20, 1945, in which he participated and was elected district president, and invented another, non-existent meeting, which he calls TOMO District Conference, held on April 28, 1945.

But that's not all. This is just one element of a wider undertaking. Namely, Aianovski somehow, through frequent contacts with Kiriazovski and Simovski, reviewers of "Aegean Storms", and editors of the above-mentioned extensive collection of archival materials, learned that there is no information as to how and who founded TOMO in Voden Region, so under his own initiative, or someone else suggested to him, to appoint himself founder and leader of TOMO, founded on January 20, 1945.

And he did exactly that...

In his book “Aegean Storms” Aianovski painted a really beautiful picture of TOMO’s activities under his leadership...

It is interesting to note at this point that even the composer - editor of the famous trial edition “Chronology” (published by the National Board of the Union of Fighters from the National Liberation War), has written the same fictional thing: Vangel Aianovski-Oche, on January 20, 1945, formed the political organization TOMO... A district conference of TOMO was convened on April 28, 1945, and so on...

Of course, if the then Aianovski of thirty years ago, who is so pedantic that he had to mention every small thing, founded a political organization under the name TOMO, he would certainly have left at least one written document about this great event. There are no dilemmas here. In the pile of archival material – Aianovski’s documents of that time, there should be such documents; reports, newsletters, meeting minutes... it was a very important event after all. Kiriazovski and Simovski would have found these documents and would have placed them in a comprehensive collection of archival materials and added them to the history of the Macedonian people.

But, Kiriazovski and Simovski, found no such significant documents in Aianovski’s archival material from the first half of 1945, other than the newsletters mentioned earlier...

And so we come to the conclusion that: The events surrounding TOMO and its establishment, as referred to in “Aegean Storms” and “Chronology”, have been redone and readjusted. Clearly, this was purposely done. But this was not the first time. Such a phenomenon has been observed many times over the years in our historiography of the national liberation movement in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia. This is about boosting one’s own contribution to the struggle. It is a fact that some of our people who, of course, were deserving participants of the movement, have become bitter about their own destiny which, by their own or someone else’s doing, for

one reason or another, were unable to fully participate in the movement, and found themselves pushed aside and finally dropped out of the movement. Some of them are now making a systematic effort through books, like “Aegean Storms” and “Chronology” to convince people that they were indeed the “soul of the Macedonian movement”. Unfortunately, by doing this, they are throwing mud on their comrades whose fate (in terms of a kind of natural selection) brought them to the front lines of the movement. There are no stories about their contributions in these books, not even of those who lost their lives for our cause. In fact many of them are even proclaimed “traitors”, as we will see further on in Aianovski’s book “Aegean Storms”... Even Naum Peiov, in his book “Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece” has left many of them out.

10. Throwing mud on others

Aianovski wrote: In Voden Region there were accusations made that the NOF leadership, with the NOF-CPG agreement, betrayed the expectations of the Macedonian people, and that this act was “a second Varkiza for the Macedonian people”... The Voden Region activists pointed out that it was a wrong move which would negatively reflect on the development of both the Macedonian liberation movement and the struggle against the Monarcho-fascists in Greece.” (Ibid. p. 233.)

However, it is a commonly known secret that the treaty was not NOF’s doing, it was a directive that came from above. The NOF leadership was informed after the fact and without discussion. Later, just after the establishment of unity, the Macedonian liberation movement received new forces and spread nationwide. This is how it was and was commonly understood. Aianovski knew this but decided to distort things and throw mud on others...

11. He was that which he was not

After the NOF-CPG agreement was signed, NOF was reorganized and consisted of a narrower leadership. Mitrevski was appointed co-member of the CPG Provincial Bureau. Dzhodzho Urdov was sent to DAG headquarters for Central and Western Macedonia. Young Mincho Fotev was appointed co-member of EPON Bureau for

Macedonia. The NOF Secretariat was reduced to three members, Kermadzhiev, Rakovski, and Vera, with Keramitchiev as the leader. At the same time all NOF district offices were reorganized. All previous presidents, almost without exception (among them Aianovski), were appointed instructors in their districts...

Aianovski however gave a different account about this. He wrote:

The new NOF leadership consisted of Paskal Mitrevski, former leader of NOF and, after the agreement, co-member of the CPG Provincial Committee for Macedonia, Mihail Keramitchiev, NOF political secretary, Vangel Ajanovski-Oche, etc., members of the leadership... (Ibid. p. 234.)

Here, as we can clearly see, Aianovski is making attempts to represent himself as something he was not. In fact it was Rakovski who, half a year later on May 20, 1947, approached the NOF asset, and took the initiative and responsibility to propose that Aianovski be elected as a new member of the NOF's narrow leadership, which was then accepted.

Aianovski apparently said nothing about that... he was silent.

And yet, somehow indirectly, further down in his text, he denied himself. Namely, he slipped up and acknowledged that... "He was only an instructor in Voden Region..." (Ibid. p. 239.)

12. Inventions

In June 1947, Paskal Mitrevski, then member of the CPG Provincial Bureau, arrived with a directive from this bureau to immediately suspend Aianovski from the NOF leadership.

For his part for recommending Aianovski, Rakovski received a party reprimand. "You do not know him..." among other things, Rakovski was told. Aianovski was in question because of something he had done somewhere else...

Aianovski was again reduced to an instructor in Voden Region.

Therefore, since then, none of the leadership documents bear his signature.

Later, during NOF's First Congress, held in January 13, 1948, Aianovski was not considered and did not even enter the list of candidates for the NOF leadership.

In September 1948, Aianovski abandoned the movement and fled to the People's Republic of Macedonia...

Aianovski however said nothing about that... he was again silent. He was silent about "real" events but very loud about imagined and insignificant events... He wrote: "At the CPG's pre-congressional central leadership meeting, the CPG... through its representatives Ioanidis and Stringos, members of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, demanded that Vangel Aianovski-Oche be removed, who at the time was NOF organizing secretary for Aegean Macedonia... This request... encountered a negative response from all present at the meeting, with the exception of Paskal Mitrevski, who fully supported the CPG Central Committee's decision. CPG representatives Ioanidis and Stringos did not allow any further discussion on the issue, setting a party veto. But, despite the controversy that arose, the CPG decision was accepted..." (Ibid. p. 253.)

Here Aianovski exaggerated by redrawing (inventing) events, exaggerated for his own benefit. He did not participate in any such meeting. Here is what really happened:

Mitrevski, then representative of the CPG Provincial Bureau for Macedonia, had two or three pre-meeting meetings with the NOF Secretariat Keramitchiev, Rakovski and Vera. He expressed his opinion and put forward a proposal to expand the NOF Secretariat to five members, to include Mitrevski, Keramitchiev, Rakovski, Vera plus Stavo Kochopoulos. Mitrevski later suggested to the Executive Council that another five to six people with their names ending with "opoulos" be admitted to the secretariat. The three existing members of the secretariat however expressed their opinion and told Mitrevski that they did not want NOF's enemies to become NOF's leaders overnight. It looked like a betrayal. It was acceptable for them to

enter NOF, but first as workers in the district boards, and only later the best of them would be picked to serve in the Executive Council and the Secretariat.

Mitrevski however was persistent and demanded that his proposal be adopted. There was a very sharp quarrel. Finally, Mitrevski said this was ordered by the Party...

Keramdzhev and Vera reluctantly gave in. Rakovski said that, if this was ordered by the party, then they should have been informed right at the very beginning of the meeting, then there would have been no quarrels. He was hoping that Mitrevski was bluffing but he still persisted...

The absence of elasticity in Rakovski's attitude was paid by the fact that his place in the Secretariat remained vacant. Namely, at the last moment, before the Congress voted, Rakovski was dropped off.

That was all. There was no dispute, no party veto and no request from the Communist Party of Greece through its Politburo Ioanidis and Strindos, to remove Aianovski, then "NOF organizing secretary for Aegean Macedonia".

There were no pre-meeting meetings held at all at that time. Aianovski was removed about seven to eight months before he claims he was removed. It would appear he took the opportunity to insert himself into these later events so that he could write himself "a beautiful autobiography..."

13. Co-authors

I think it is of particular interest to also mention this: Aianovski's biography is not just his own work and concern. There are also co-authors. Namely, on p. 117, volume 2, in the extensive collection of archival documents on the history of the Macedonian people - "Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war", among other biographical data about Aianovski, the following was also mentioned:

- “Aianovski was a communist from before the war...” (The fact is, before the war he had signed a police declaration condemning all Communists and communist activities as treasonous... He is silent about this too...)

- “When the Aegean Brigade was in the process of being formed Aianovski was appointed deputy to the Brigade’s political commissar...” (This is not true. In fact, he only participated in the brigade’s parade when it marched in front of the Political Commission on November 18, 1944, after which he was immediately withdrawn and sent to the field to do other types of work.)

- “Since the spring of 1945, he worked in Voden Region as TOMO secretary...” (This also is not true. His own reports from that time disprove him. Besides that, there is not a single document showing that Aianovski was a secretary to TOMO.)

- “He was secretary of the NOF Main Board for Aegean Macedonia for some time...” (He failed to become a secretary because immediately after the election he was suspended.)

There is no doubt that Aianovski deserves to be one of the sons of our people. But his friendly affection and tendency to beautify his own biography are obvious here...

This same tendency was shown, even more clearly, in “Chronology”, the trial edition of the National Board of Fighters. Here, the editor-in-chief of “Chronology” follows Aianovski’s every step in Voden Region. He lists everything including in which village he attended meetings... Everything is emphasized as if it was an important event, and not just ordinary routine work. This was done not only for Voden Region... but for other places as well. (On page 174 and 182, the authors of “Chronology” (The national liberation war in the Aegean part of Macedonia), make mention as if Aianovski was the “NOF organizing secretary for Aegean Macedonia”, whose was allegedly removed by requests first in November 1947, by the party assets of the CPG Macedonian Bureau, and second in January 1948, at a NOF Central Council pre-Congressional meeting.

These fabrications coincide and mutually reinforce Aianovski's allegations about himself written on p. 253 in "Aegean Storms." I will use this opportunity to remind you of a commonly known fact: Aianovski never crossed the Voden Region boundaries as "NOF organizing secretary", that is, he never worked elsewhere, except as a regional activist in Voden Region...)

Naum Peiov, in his book "Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece" (published by INI in 1968) wrote extensively about Aianovski's activities in Voden Region emphasizing him as "the soul of the movement" altogether ignoring the real activities of the central NOF leadership...

But Aianovski's boasting about himself, while ignoring others, did not gain its full culmination until "Aegean Storms" was published...

14. The real Macedonian cadres

Aianovski wrote: The CPG managed to break the unity of the Macedonian leadership thanks to the fact that the real Macedonian cadres, fiercely defamed and persecuted, were forced to leave the movement and cross into the People's Republic of Macedonia... Unfortunately, one part of the old NOF cadres found no strength and succumbed to pressures from the CPG and DAG leaders, thus becoming their organs and performing tasks that were often against the interests of the Macedonian people... (Ibid. p. 339.)

Let us recall: From all the more important political cadres, activists of NOF, only Keramitchiev and Aianovski left for the People's Republic of Macedonia. It is also well-known that, Keramitchiev left by permission, with an appropriate document in his hands.

So, when Aianovski talks about "the real Macedonian 'cadres' who were forced to leave the movement" he was not only talking about himself being important but also conceals the fact that he was the only one to flee without permission... meaning he deserted...

He was attempting to strongly emphasize his own importance when he said “the CPG managed to break the Macedonian leadership”, after his departure of course...

Yes, there is also Steriana Vangelova-Slavianka. She had no reason to leave the movement but Aianovski convinced her to go with him... The fact that Vangelova left without permission was verified by a letter she received from Vera, then AFZH president, in which Vera calls Vangelova a deserter. (Ibid. p. 320.)

It was also characteristic of Aianovski to say that the “best” of NOF fled and the “worst” of NOF, i.e. “one part of the old NOF cadres”, proved to be weak and “did not find the strength to resist... and succumbed to pressure”.

Indeed, it is amazing what he thought of himself and of others... He withdrew himself from the pressure and sees himself as a hero while he cast mud on all those who remained to work under pressure. Aianovski then goes on to blame the others accusing them of: “being organs of the CPG and DAG leaderships and performing tasks that were often against the interests of the Macedonian people.” And, as the most drastic example in this sense, he implicates NOF with the signing of the “criminal document, the so-called KOEM Resolution, which in fact was nothing more than a resolution drawn-up by the CPG Central Committee Politburo...” (Ibid. p. 382.)

“We have to keep in mind,” Aianovski wrote, “that that part of the NOF leadership (except Aianovski) which signed this resolution, was subjected to strong pressure and terrible threats. But it should also be understood that these people were prominent fighters who with their lives were able to resist the various reactionary regimes, the fascist occupiers and Monarcho-fascist persecutions. Unfortunately, at the most critical time, they succumbed to a counterfeiting game and took a position that was contrary to the interests of the people and their struggle...” (Ibid. p. 383.)

But that’s not all. When Aianovski later needed to say that the central NOF activists were arrested and sentenced to long sentences, he would only say: “They were arrested and subjected to lengthy interrogations...,” adding that:

“Treachery is loved by everyone and a traitor by none...” (Ibid. p. 406), by which he proclaims them all traitors...

Of course, with such an understanding and interpretation of events, one cannot help but wonder: is it possible that all those fierce fighters, who in Aianovski’s own words were not afraid and fought against the various reactionary regimes in Greece, the fascist occupiers, the domestic Monarcho-fascists, and now, suddenly, “at the most critical moment”, become cowards and traitors? How can he make such claims against the entire Macedonian military and political management assets? Maybe there is something else in the centre of all this?

These are logical questions which Aianovski has not asked and has downright ignored...

This is how the book “Aegean Storms”, full of insults, was launched by INI and allowed to circulate in public with Aianovski showing himself to be the most important bearer of the previously mentioned tendency to scorn and disqualify the leaders from that part of Macedonia.

15. Insufficient endeavors

So, according to Aianovski, everyone is a traitor except those “true Macedonian cadres” who abandoned the movement. This glimpse, of course, is too simplistic and excessively biased. Political activities are a complex matter. How a political worker behaves at any given moment is dependent on many factors...

In October 1943, the Greek leaders ordered the desolation of MAO, the Macedonian anti-fascist organization in Voden, and the abolishment of its Macedonian newspapers the “Red Star” and the information Bulletin. But, it was the Macedonian Communists, cadres and members of the CPG, among them Aianovski, MAO secretary, who carried out these orders. According to Aianovski himself such orders were carried out many times before. It was part of the discipline to execute CPG orders and carry out its decisions.

This time too a CPG order was carried out to dissolve MAO, and abolish its newspapers... (Ibid. p. 99.)

Does this mean that these Macedonians too did not find the strength to resist the CPG and succumbed to its pressure?

According to Aianovski, in this case, it was not about being weak at all. It was about the following: “Any opposition would have meant a split in the People’s Liberation Movement...” (Ibid. p. 99.) Again, according to Aianovski, it was well-known that it was a betrayal for anyone to cause cleavages...

One can choose to agree with Aianovski and accept his explanation, but he himself took part in the evacuation of the ELAS Voden Macedonian battalion in October 1944, which caused a cleavage. He caused another cleavage in December 1944, when he returned to the field and began to organize the resistance (TOMO-NOF) movement against the anti-Macedonian politics of the CPG Greek leadership...

And here is Aianovski telling us, on the one hand, that he was fully aware that everyone had to follow Party discipline so as not to cause cleavages, and on the other hand, he personally participated in causing cleavages, and on top of that he called himself a principled Macedonian revolutionary. This is how he represented things in his autobiography. The truth is, no one can always do what they want, but, at the same time, we cannot allow Aianovski to make wild accusations that the Macedonian Communists carried out “deliberate” anti-Macedonian acts based strictly on decisions made by the Greek leaders. Confrontation with the CPG at the time when we were weak was not possible... But in the second case, the conditions for an active resistance against the opportunist, hegemonic-nationalistic anti-Macedonian policies the Greek CPG leaders carried out, were right and we were strong and opposition was possible...

The so-called NOF-CPG agreement, submitted to the NOF leadership was clearly a CPG order not open for discussion. Sometime at the end of December 1946, in a conversation with Tsvetko Uzunovski-Abas, Rakovski said that he believed the Greek leaders were not honest. Rakovski believed that the Greek

leadership was attempting to replace the current NOF leadership with Grkomani (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause).

In a reply to this, Abas said: “Do not address us no matter what happens because you will be disciplined. You will follow your orders, even as common soldiers, wherever they send you...”

The so-called KOEM resolution was proposed by CPG Secretary Zahariadis himself in the form of a Party decree. In attendance were Partsalidis, member of the Politburo and President of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, and Pariklis, head of the Second Bureau. We were asked by the KOEM active to adopt the decree and signed it. Everyone had to sign it...

There was no discussion or chance for a confrontation...

Not only because we were placed under the CPG... and discipline was expected from us...

Not only because any opposition to this would have led directly to a split; or to the disintegration of DAG units; or that some unit might fall under NOF leadership...

But above all, the NOF leadership should not have been held responsible for DAG's defeat and the tragic end to the revolution in Greece. NOF should not have taken responsibility for that...

However, later, the NOF leadership was arrested under charges of being “agents working for the CPY and Tito in Greece”. Today no wisdom is required to see that convening KOEM “five minutes before the twelfth hour at midnight”, i.e. just before DAG's catastrophic defeat, was just a provocation, a trap set for the NOF leadership, that is, a concrete practical expression of the intention to finally and physically liquidate NOF, and (in the spirit of the well-known Informburo resolution), blame Tito and the CPY and let them be seen by the communist public and the world in general, as the culprits, or triggers for the defeat of the democratic forces in Greece...

It was precisely the failure of this KOEM trick that pushed Zahariadis to invent another trick – the “stab in the back”.

If that is not perceived today – there is no benevolence.

Aianovski said a lot of unkind things in his book “Aegean Storms”. Namely, he kept quiet on some events, modified others, some he invented and garnished with something real to serve his purpose. In doing so, he not only threw mud on others but took credit for things he did not do. The uninformed in the general public, for whom he wrote, will admire him. Those informed, historians above all, with reservations, will have to carefully examine his work, despite everything interesting that it offers, and reach their own conclusions.

Otherwise, “Aegean Storms”, will be the most concrete practical expression and proof of the tendency: To disguise and disqualify the Macedonian leaders from that part of Macedonia.

Of course, it’s an ugly and undeserving job. Its bearers and perpetrators will have to understand one day that what they did was humiliating.

May the good gods help them understand this...

V. PROTEST LETTER SENT TO THE SKM CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Skopje, March 1976

To the SKM Central Committee
(Appeals Commission Department)
SKOPJE

The attached text represents a protest and request to do something to remove an absolutely unacceptable phenomenon.

Not too long ago, the Institute of National History (INI) in Skopje published a well-formed book under the title “Aegean Storms”, in which it was declared that former members of the Communist Party Aegean Macedonia (KOEM) leadership, i.e. the People’s Liberation Front (NOF) in the Aegean part of Macedonia, were traitors who worked against the interests of the Macedonian people.

Some time later, I submitted a 30 page article to the Directorate of INI. By looking at already published original documents of that time, there is undeniably and clearly something not right with this book. It is an undeniable fact that the author of the book “Aegean Storms” has invented many of the things he claimed. His claims are based on superficial logic that miss the truth, cast mud on others, and bury the Macedonian KOEM-NOF leaders politically. Moreover, he alluded to the fact and made claims that the KOEM-NOF leaders be declared traitors, as they were declared by their opponents and then sentenced to long jail terms. On top of that he has insulted the leaders by asking that the following phrase be placed on their tombstones:

“Treachery is loved by everyone, and traitors are loved by no one...” (Ibid. p. 406.)

It is always a joyous event to see a new book come out about the liberation struggle of our people in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia. It deservingly honours our people's huge human and material sacrifices. In doing so, it is understandable that sometimes the author's weaknesses appear in that book, as was the case with the book "Aegean Storms". But what is disappointing and difficult to understand is why would the publisher not want to remove or correct these proven, discovered injustices and untruths? Specifically, here's what happened. Corrections to the above-mentioned text were made and submitted to the directorate of INI. After the corrections were examined and presumably accepted, they asked that they be left at their disposal, which was done. Unfortunately they did not publish any of the material. Almost two years have passed since the corrections were submitted and nothing has been done.

That is why I wrote this letter and here is my reason:

Lidia Simovska's book "Macedonian periodical journalism in Aegean Macedonia during the national liberation war and the Greek Civil War, 1941-1949", is expected to be published soon. On December 26, 1977, Radio Skopje did a broadcast with one part of the book where Simovska herself read a dozen pages, during the "Lights of the Past" program. It should be pointed out that this was a wonderful thing, especially since it was part of her dissertation. In her work, while she quoted information from original documents, newspapers, magazines, etc., she also added her own brief comments which created a unique, beautiful and rich image of the full heroic and self-sacrificing liberation struggle of our people from this part of Macedonia in the mentioned period.

However, according to the subject matter, this new book also follows the same line as the book "Aegean Storms" claiming that the leading KOEM-NOF Macedonian activists in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia were traitors.

(In both books, especially in the second book, I personally have been attacked and publicly offended.)

Our wide democracy is great here especially with our freedom of speech. But in this case, that freedom is being abused. Case and point: While the KOEM-NOF leaders, by Decree from Josip Broz Tito, President of the SFRY, were awarded high praise for their work in the battlefield, there are people here who have publicly accused them of being traitors for doing the same work.

Please, do whatever you can to stop this. The law requires you to correct publicly committed injustices...

Skopje, December 26, 1977

With much respect,
(Pavle Rakovski)

CRITICAL REMARKS

Our subject is Lidia Simovska's work: "Macedonian periodical journalism in Aegean Macedonia during the national liberation war and the Greek Civil War, 1941-1949".

She has done a great job in her graduate work which is expected to come out in print soon. With her quotations of numerous original texts (newspapers, magazines, etc.), as well as with her own brief comments, she has created a uniquely beautiful and rich image of the Macedonian people's liberation struggle and captured their heroism and self-sacrifice...

I will now go through the text and make a few critical remarks pointing out some of what I believe are weaknesses in her work.

I. Lidia has started her text by expressing her gratitude to the people in the Macedonian archives "for the assistance and insight they provided her and for allowing her to access the archival collection 'Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war 1941-1949' and the 'revolutionary Macedonian press for Aegean Macedonia' for the same period". She then went to especially thank the two doctors F. Breg and B. Iskrov for their advice...

All of this is okay.

However, Lidia said nothing about all the other documents she received that were crucial for her work. Namely, she was silent about receiving the document “Macedonian Journalism and Press in Aegean Macedonia”, and my (Pavle Rakovski’s) other two manuscripts and a collection of important first-hand information. If we are to judge by what Lidia said in her statements of gratitude, then how much of the information I gave her was used in her work, compared to the information taken from the other sources? Lidia unfortunately has kept silent on this. Perhaps she was not happy with the “first-hand” information...? This is not worth talking about, of course, but it will help us understand the characteristics that follow.

II. In one of my articles, in the above-mentioned manuscripts, I (Pavle Rakovski) began with three quotes from the well-known “theses for the Macedonian national question” by Velko Vlahovich. All three were taken together in a certain order and in a certain way and placed outside and before my basic text.

Lidia (and this is not surprising) did exactly the same thing in her work, with exactly the same quotes. Simply put, she copied the same quotes to the comma, in the same order and in the same way placed them outside and before her basic text. Her work is soon expected to come out in print, and since my articles have not been published, I have no choice but to “give up”, not only these three quotes, but many other important quotes I have made that were used in her text...

(These first two remarks (I and II above) were omitted from the letter sent to the SKM Central Committee Appeals Commission...)

III. On page 59 of her manuscript (which was made available to me) Lidia wrote:

“With the newly formed NOF leadership (at the NOF Central Council I Plenum on August 8, 1948) made up predominantly of so-called Grkomani (Macedonians loyal to Greece), who exclusively now and before served the Greek cause and the CPG on the one hand, and by applying strong pressure and the threat of death on the remaining NOF staff and on the editorial board of “Nepokoren”, on

the other, Zahariadis was able to succeed in carrying out his anti-Macedonian policy in a practical way. It (NOF) has increasingly popularized the CPG, its leadership and itself, while concealing its true motives, because it needed to further mobilize Macedonian fighters with its hypocritical views and slogans about the Macedonian national struggle, and by claiming that: “The CPG is a protector of the Macedonian people in Greece.”

And immediately after that, Lidia informs the reader that:

“This came to the fore in the first of its kind article written by Pavle Rakovski, editor of ‘Nepokoren’, known until then as a supporter of full rights for the Macedonian people. In the article entitled ‘The Macedonian National Liberation Movement expresses its real needs for the development of the Macedonian people’, he struggles to express NOF’s political line in a correct sense. At the beginning of the article he wrote: ‘The Macedonian National Liberation Movement is a reality...’ Organizationally this was formed in NOF: His political goals have become NOF’s political program...”

Further down in his presentation he becomes confused because, due to the newly emerged situation and control over him, he is unable to bring to an end his earlier known attitudes which were NOF’s views...”

Meaning, because of this “first of its kind article” of Rakovski’s, in which he is “confused”, and as Lidia puts it, Zahariadis’s anti-Macedonian practical line “came to the fore”, one can conclude that Rakovski too is anti-Macedonian.

This is a very important conclusion, especially since it refers to the activities of a former NOF leader, and it seems Lidia was the first to publicly formulate it. This is perhaps believable to readers who are not familiar with the events of the struggle and pay no attention to details. There is, however, something missing in this conclusion, namely, Lidia has not cited or quoted a single word from this article or from any other of Rakovski’s articles, to substantiate her conclusion. She should have cited or quoted at least something, a phrase or two about what was ambiguous, confusing or anti-

Macedonian. Therefore this kind of conclusion is without foundation and will remain floating in the air, as arbitrary and incorrect...

IV. On page 60 Lidia wrote:

“From now on ‘NEPOKOREN’ will carry loud titles ‘FOR THE GREAT GREEK COMMUNIST PARTY WHICH LURKS OVER THE MACEDONIAN PEOPLE LIKE IT IS THEIR PROTECTOR AND SAVIOUR.’

IN THAT SPIRIT, on December 10, 1948, under number 17, NEPOKOREN carried the following articles entitled:

‘THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE (CPG) - ORGANIZER, GIVER AND LEADER OF THE PEOPLE’S STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL AND NATIONAL FREEDOM’.

‘CPG – INITIATOR OF SOCIAL AND NATIONAL FREEDOM’, ‘NIKOS ZAHARIADIS’, ‘CPG – PROTECTOR OF THE MACEDONIAN PEOPLE IN GREECE’, ‘CPG ASSISTING OUR PEOPLE’, ‘CPG POINTING TO THE ROAD OF SALVATION’, ‘CPG POLICY - PRINCIPLED POLITICS’...”

I decided to capitalize the above titles because they do not correspond to the truth. Namely, no such alleged titles of any such “articles” appeared in the December 10, 1948 issue of “Nepokoren”. All this is invented and untrue. The only article about the CPG that I (Rakovski) wrote was the article about the CPG’s 30th anniversary jubilee - 30 years since the CPG’s inception. It would appear that the title of this article and the subtitles in the text were consciously altered to look like “titles of many articles”. Unfortunately by doing this and by not taking care to make the appropriate corrections, and necessary adjustments, Lidia damaged her own reputation and principles. In other words she made claims about things that do not exist...

V. But in order for Lidia to show how things were done “in that spirit”, i.e. in the anti-Macedonian spirit, she used quotes from another of Rakovski’s articles. This is what she wrote:

“The Macedonian people, writes Rakovski, enjoy full social, political and national equality with the Greek people in the free territories. He is fighting organized in these people’s national organizations. Our political organizations NOF and AFZH are already renowned and have Macedonian newspapers and magazines. NEPOKOREN – is an organ of NOF, NOVA MAKEDONKA – a magazine, is an organ of AFZH and BILTEN – is a NOF newspaper. All these are printed by the thousands in the same printing house where the Greek newspapers are printed...” (page 60.)

This was written and published in December 1948.

As is well-known, Zahariadis refused to accept the Macedonian reality - the emergence and existence of the People’s Republic of Macedonia as a nation state of the Macedonian people in the Yugoslav composition and - the emergence and existence of a strong Macedonian Liberation Movement (NOF) here, in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia. This was made obvious during the CPG Central Committee II Plenum, held in February 1946, during which Zahariadis pronounced and treated the Macedonian people like they were some kind of nationally incomplete “Slavophone population” and like some “Slavophone Macedonians who lived in Greek Macedonia on the territory of the Greek state”.

After this Plenum, all previous CPG hostilities against NOF looked like a picnic. The new hostilities were more like a real war against the Macedonian national ideal, that is, against the active bearers of the Macedonian national ideal. In Siantos’s time, during the national liberation war against the fascist occupation, the “Slavophone Macedonians” (this is what they were first called during the CPG Central Committee VIII Plenum resolution in February 1942) were treated like “Slavophone Greeks”. Zahariadis, however, was a bit more cautious and, without using such expressions, continued to use the same kind of anti-Macedonian policy. Namely, he continued Siantos’s hostilities with much less intensity.

But his open frontal struggle proved to be unsuccessful. Instead of weakening it, he amplified NOF. Eventually Zahariadis was forced to use different tactics. As is well-known, with a declarative acknowledgment of NOF, he succeeded in getting his hands on it

and on its military formations - the NOF Macedonian battalions (November 21, 1946).

On top of the well-known heavy political crimes perpetrated against the Macedonian people, the CPG began to eliminate the more important and active bearers of the Macedonian national ideal. More precisely:

It ordered the Macedonian battalions to withdraw to the southern part of Greece and, after their commanders were replaced by Greeks, ordered their destruction.

It then ordered the physical liquidation of many individuals, mostly prominent Macedonian activists like Dzhodzho, Shamardanov, Koroveshovski, Tanurov, Kalkov, etc.

At the same time it dissolved and disbanded the NOF central agitation and propaganda department. Rakovski and the other members were individually inducted into DAG's ranks as simple fighters and sent to join the various DAG units in the front.

The Macedonian teachers' school and seminars were abolished.

The NOF cultural and art groups were dissolved.

The Macedonian national brass band was also disbanded and its leader, folk musician Timo, was later killed. This was a remarkable band whose Macedonian folk melody echoed in the mountains wherever it played.

But the worst thing the CPG did in all this was that it beheaded NOF of its founding leadership. Zahariadis and the CPG leaders, through the NOF I Congress (January 1948) and through the NOF Central Council I Plenum (August 1948), prepared and executed the removal of the NOF leadership, that is, they "neutralized" three out of the initial five NOF founding members - Mitrevski, Keramitchiev, and Rakovski. The other two Dzhodzho and Koroveshovski were killed. The NOF founding leadership was replaced with a "new leadership" (the tandem Kotsopoulos-Koitsis), and NOF gradually began to turn into an anti-Macedonian

organization. In other words, it began to lose its Macedonian national spirit, its Macedonian national colours, and to reorient itself towards Athens and, in the spirit of the Greek cause, promote the idea that “we are part of Greece... we are part of the Greek people...”

A tense, electrified and dangerous situation began to develop that was followed by a wave of Macedonians deserting DAG’s ranks. Rakovski was brought back from the army followed by Mitrevski and, after the NOF Central Council II plenum was held, at Zahariadis’s request, they were both reinstated in the NOF leadership. By then Keramitchiev had left Greece and gone to seek medical treatment in the Republic of Macedonia. He remained and worked in Skopje. NOF regional activists and leaders had also fled the war and withdrawn to the Republic of Macedonia...

It was under these conditions, i.e. Zahariadis’s chauvinistic anti-Macedonian politics, that Rakovski was returned from the army in order to help consolidate the “new NOF leadership”. And, according to “Nepokoren”, to consolidate NOF-AFZH, the central organs, as a Macedonian people’s organization... as a distinct people, as a self-serving people, as a non-Greek nation that enjoys (should enjoy) full equality with the Greek people who are struggling (should be struggling) organized in their own Macedonian national organizations as they are (must be). NOF and AFZH have (should have) their own Macedonian (not Greek) newspapers and magazines...

Because of this Rakovski was later suspended and sent to DAG as an ordinary fighter and dispatched to the Gramos front (Arapades Sector) where he fought and was later arrested and jailed for being a dangerous Macedonian “nationalist”...

This, in its essence, is what happened...

But then we have people like Lidia who would not hesitate to use this information in any way possible to achieve their objectives. Their intentions are quite clear. They want Rakovski to look like a person who popularized the CPG and as a result of that to label him as anti-Macedonian...

But Lidia's witch-hunt did not end with Rakovski. She had reached similar conclusions about NOF itself. The NOF leadership and the "Nepokoren" editorial board were also negatively presented in her writing. This is what Lidia wrote about them:

"Gradually they lost their independence and turned into tools and apologists for Zahariadis and for CPG policies..." (p. 57.)

This is how our historiography, whose main bearers are the INI researchers, who work on the "historical material and problems" that have to do with Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia, treat our KOEM-NOF leaders and our people who fought in that struggle in general. Sadly they are seen as nothing more than traitors...

Let us now have a look at some things more closely, basic moments in history that should be analyzed and discussed, but instead our main bearers have chosen to hide them by being silent...

1) It was believed that the Greek Communist Movement and the CPG, in principle, were not and could not be enemies of the Macedonian people. This was because CPG members and cadres were persecuted, arrested, sentenced, and sent to prison because they publicly defended the rights of the Macedonian people in the Greek state. The most famous of these trials was the one in Solun, where fifteen Greek CPG activists were convicted and sentenced to a total of eighty (80) years of hard labour.

This, of course, was not and could not be "anti-Macedonian politics" - to tell the Macedonian people about this and propagate solidarity between the two nations...

2) It is a historical fact that exponents of the domestic bourgeoisie and the international anti-communist movement took over the CPG leadership. Included among them were Stavridis, Puliopoulos, Maximos, Sargogolos, etc., then Siantos, followed by Zahariadis. They were eventually exposed, some completely, some partially, and expelled from the party. But not before they damaged the general communist movement and the people's revolution in Greece. Because of them the people's interests, rights and freedom

suffered, not only the interests of the Macedonian but also those of the Greek people. The abnormal number of crisis situations inside the CPG, the break in its ranks, open treachery, the devastating defeats of the people's revolution in 1936, 1944, 1949... they are all indications of this.

Naturally they keep silent because they are not willing and will not blame the communist movement and the CPG for this...

3) The Macedonian liberation movement, in all its phases (such as MAO, SOF, SNOF, TOMO, NOF, KOEM) never stopped, not even for a moment, to express to the Macedonian people the needs for change and development. By their very existence, they highlighted the Macedonian national question in front of the Greek and world public (asking for a practical solution), affirming the struggle and legitimate rights of the Macedonian people in the Greek state.

And this is how it was...

4) The Macedonian national liberation movement was a subject of controversy, discussion, and cooperation between the CPM (CPY) and the CPG. Tempo was sent to Greece and Abas to Solun. There were also other contacts made over time. The various stages of the Macedonian liberation movement did not occur spontaneously. They were reflections in the course of activities carried out by the CPG and the CPM/CPY. After NOF was formed in Skopje it worked for a year and a half under the influence, assistance, and leadership of the CPM/CPY, and not "independently". Similarly NOF was transferred from CPM/CPY hands to the hands of the CPG under a CPM/CPY directive. This is how it happened. NOF was informed of this transfer in the CPM Central Committee building in which I had the privilege to express my opinion and to inform everyone present that "Zahariadis was not honest in his convictions". Namely, I was certain that he would remove the NOF leadership and replace it with his own people – Grkomani (Macedonian supremacists loyal to the Greek cause). What, then? How are we to act under these conditions...?

The answer to that was: “Whatever happens don’t return to us... You will be disciplined. You will go as simple fighters wherever they send you...”

The Macedonian communists, leaders and members of NOF accepted their role and generally led the Macedonian national liberation movement, but it was always done under the leadership of the CPG or the CPM/CPY.

This is exactly how it was and it would be misinformation and mere demagoguery to write and speak about any sort of “independence” NOF had and that it lost it when it was handed over to the CPG leadership...

5) After NOF was handed over to the CPG on November 21, 1946, it was completely cut off and isolated from the CPM/CPY. “Nepokoren” had no opportunity to receive or publish information about life and progress in the People’s Republic of Macedonia and in Yugoslavia. But there was more to it than that. Before “unity” was established, anti-Macedonian acts had dramatically escalated and, as I mentioned earlier, they had led to severe political crimes perpetrated against the Macedonian people. Then it became clear to us that “there was no return for us no matter what happened”, which in fact meant “don’t wait for support from the CPM/CPY, no matter what happens...” Obviously, by doing this the CPM/CPY, in fact, not only surrendered NOF to Zahariadis, but literally destroyed all bridges, preventing any and all CPM/CPY interventions in support of NOF.

Just because the CPM/CPY remained silent on the issue, did not mean that it approved of Zahariadis’s anti-Macedonian-anti-Yugoslav policy. But, regardless of that, it was hard for the Macedonian communists and NOF leaders not to feel abandoned. It was hard for them to have sentimental views of things given the harsh reality they were under...

6) Zahariadis founded KOEM on March 27, 1949, under which he collected all Macedonian military and political cadres. Less than three months later, on June 20, 1949, he called a KOEM meeting. He attended the meeting in person during which he outlined, in the

form of a party document, his famous resolution against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and against Tito, that is, against the CPM and the political leadership of the People's Republic of Macedonia. He then demanded that it be adopted and individually signed by everyone.

The CPG itself, however, never did publish, under its own name, such a document supporting the Informburo and condemning the CPY. The small regional KOEM organization, however, was in no position to act on behalf of the CPG in this matter so why ask it to do this? It is likely that there was another purpose for this. According to logic and the actual facts, it was a provocation, a trap set to trap:

a) The Macedonian military and political cadres.

If the KOEM leaders were to refuse to sign the document, because of sympathies for the CPM/CPY, then they would come into collision with the CPG. Of course they could not have taken into account, and perhaps did not even know about the Tito-Stalin collision. A collision between KOEM and the CPG would certainly cause cleavage and confrontation within the CPG and DAG leaderships. This would inevitably lead to the disintegration of DAG units which would be catastrophic for DAG. Then Zahariadis could blame KOEM as being the main and public triggers for the defeat of the people's revolution and for the downfall of the Macedonian liberation movement. As an integral part, the KOEM leadership would then be labeled traitorous to both the Greek and the Macedonian people. And that, of course, would be enough to earn it its liquidation.

If, on the other hand, the KOEM leaders decided to sign the document against the CPY/CPM and against the leadership of the People's Republic of Macedonia, they would discredit themselves in the eyes of the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY. And that, it seems, was most important and most acceptable to Zahariadis...

b) This was also a provocation and a trap against the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY.

Namely, if the KOEM leaders signed the document (and that's what happened) against the CPM/CPY and against the People's Republic of Macedonia's leadership then, perhaps in response (this is what Zahariadis was certainly hoping for), the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY would declare the KOEM leaders traitors and would anathematize them. That, of course, would be a brilliant move on Zahariadis's part. By doing so the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY would not only remove themselves from the game but would abandon the so-called "Slavophones" altogether for at least one generation. Then, led by enthusiastic anti-Macedonian leaders, these "Slavophones" would have nowhere to turn except to remain as an internal Greek phenomenon - as a "Slavophone" speaking part of the Greek people...

After everyone signed Zahariadis said:

How many of them are honest...?

One month passed. A second and a third month passed... and no anathema from Skopje. Then, on October 3, 1949, in a dangerous and insincere tone of voice, Zahariadis publicly proclaimed them traitors and "agents of the CPY and Tito", who allegedly worked to undermine the CPG and DAG. He then accused them of working against the Greek and Macedonian people's common struggle. This was done in the spirit of Zahariadis's famous fabrication of the "attack from behind".

Zahariadis even popularized the slogan "Death to the Traitors!"

However, because of Beria's interest in these "CPY and Tito agents" they were plucked from Zahariadis's hands, because Zahariadis would have liquidated them out of anger and sent them away to the USSR. In Moscow, ten of these Macedonians received jail terms for a total of ninety-six (96) years of hard labour. Although not as planned, Zahariadis did get rid of them.

Furthermore, Zahariadis dissolved NOF and replaced it with a new organization tailor-made for the "Slavophones" and staffed it with his choice of Macedonian Janissary's, "Slavophone Greeks". Fearing a dangerous reaction from the Macedonian masses and the

Macedonian fighters, he named it “Ilinden” as a preventive measure. And while using the name “Ilinden” he tried to kill the spirit of Ilinden. Namely, the Macedonian alphabet was thrown out and a new alphabet was hastily created based on the Russian alphabet. The Macedonian literary language and Macedonian grammar were also removed from use. The spoken language was replaced with a crippled Macedonian language based on the one spoken by Kotsopoulos, Koichis and others. A new grammar and new literary language were then compiled especially for the “Slavophones”. The “Ilinden” publishing department was tasked with promoting all the works, publishing new school textbooks and upholding the literary values of this new so-called literary language.

So now, on top of having the Macedonian territories divided, on top of having the Macedonian people living under different economies which were achieved by the Macedonian people’s neighbouring monarchies through the Balkan wars, Zahariadis tried to break the Macedonian language and culture in order to prove to the world that the “Slavophones” living in the Greek state are just a Greek internal problem... They are a “Slavophone” part of the Greek people... and in that, as is well-known, a huge number of Macedonians were ruined...

“Treachery is loved by everyone, and traitors are loved by no one...”

And, as I said earlier, the above phrase has been used as a kind of political epitaph for the KOEM-NOF leaders and activists who were declared traitors and politically buried in the book “Aegean Storms”.

Both the author of the book “Aegean Storms” and the INI reviewers and collaborators, mentioned earlier, who allowed this book to be published, are prominent people and known for their efforts and attempts to politically bury the KOEM-NOF leadership. They are the political grave diggers who want to politically destroy the KOEM-NOF people who Zahariadis proclaimed as traitors, just because in a “moment of weakness”, because of their lack of faith, they succumbed, and out of fear committed treason and signed Zahariadis’s document which spoke against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and against Tito, and respectively against the CPM and

the political leadership of the People's Republic of Macedonia. They were then arrested because of their treachery and yes, no one likes traitors...

This, of course, is just formal and superficial logic. Since every animal has four legs it does not mean that everything that has four legs in an animal. Is my desk an animal because it has four legs? Anyone today who is interested in the history of that time knows that Zahariadis's expert maneuver with the KOEM resolution missed its mark. Namely, the military and political leaders of the Macedonian national liberation movement did not follow the line of open confrontation with the CPG and DAG leaderships. They did not cause a new split in DAG. DAG did not disintegrate on the eve of the last and decisive battle with the enemy. The KOEM leaders did not betray the joint struggle and were not traitors to the Macedonian and Greek people.

Zahariadis even failed in his other alternative. His idea to get the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY caught up in his scheme to anathematize the KOEM-NOF leaders did not work either. On the contrary! As I have mentioned before, everyone that is here today, as many as there are left and settled in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, was decorated for their activities in the then struggle by the President of the Republic with appropriate high decorations.

But, as you can see, there is someone who doesn't agree with this. And, in a rather lame and irresponsible manner, is publicly declaring them traitors.

And who gave them this right...? Who needs these sandstorms and why? It is not a joke to publicly call someone a traitor! But this exactly what is happening to the former leaders of the Macedonian liberation movement in Greek occupied Macedonia...! What evil god or demon skillfully pitted Macedonian against Macedonian like it did during the time when Macedonians were killed on the streets of Sofia...? Skopje, however, is not Sofia and this must not be allowed to happen here. Moreover, all these people are Communists... Unfortunately the Party is absent in all this. The authorities are silent and are standing on the sidelines, as if waiting for the "Aegeans" to eliminate each other. Why is that...?

What is happening here is absolutely unacceptable and must not be allowed to happen.

Young Lidia, as well as the author of “Aegean Storms”, is mistaken to have accepted the role in this sad story to denigrate the leaders from that part of Macedonia...

Skopje, January 1978.

VI. ACTUALITIES FROM A NEWER HISTORY

1.

In one of my previous entries I wrote:

There was never and of course there never will be a government in Belgrade, Athens, or Sofia in the future which would agree and would sign an agreement to divide its own national territory with its neighbours.

However, it is a historic fact that governments in Belgrade, Athens, and Sofia have agreed and have signed agreements to divide Macedonia among themselves. Macedonia's history is full of contenders and self-proclaimed "compatriots". Many documents have been written, signed and stamped with state seals that, on the one hand show hypocrisy, and on the other, emphasizes historical truth:

- Macedonia is not Serbia, Greece or Bulgaria. And the Macedonian people, as the primary population living in Macedonia, are a unique and separate people.

Neither Serbia, Greece nor Bulgaria have treated Macedonia and the Macedonian people as their own which explains why they decided to divide Macedonia between themselves, behaving more like conquerors than kinsmen.

- They mercilessly torn Macedonia and its people apart, cutting them off from each other and from their traditional routes and Aegean ports, destroying their political, economic and cultural development, robbing them of their wealth and dignity and condemning them to stumble and decay.

They fought over Macedonia for many years with their propaganda campaigns, their armed gangs, and with "scientific theories" to

fabricate Serbs, Bulgarians, and Greeks out of the Macedonians with one goal in mind: to annex all of Macedonia for themselves.

And, as we well know, it came to this:

The government in Athens made claims that “Macedonia is Greek” and the “Macedonian people are Greeks.”

The government in Belgrade made claims that “Macedonia is Serbian” and the “Macedonian people are Serbians.”

The government in Sofia made claims that “Macedonia is Bulgarian” and the “Macedonian people are Bulgarians.”

And then decided and agreed to partition Macedonia and its people and annex them for themselves.

And here we have Stoian Danev, then president of the Bulgarian National Assembly, who with a bitter tone of voice, said: “We all know why Bulgaria entered the (First Balkan) war... because for Bulgaria the ‘Macedonian Bulgarians’ were lost... and ‘went their own way’...” (Dr. P. Stoianov, Triple division of Macedonia, p. 8.)

In other words the Bulgarians knew they were defeated in Macedonia.

The Bulgarian army, Greek and Serbian priests, teachers, “bought” agitators, armed gangs, “scientific theories”... all failed to stop the national awakening of the Macedonian people. They all failed to stifle the Macedonian national liberation movement. On the contrary:

In the newly created “favourable” conditions, shaped by the Young Turk Uprising, the Macedonian national liberation movement took on a momentum of its own and would have thrown the Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians out of Macedonia, had the Macedonians allied themselves with the Ottomans like they were planning to.

The Young Turks proposed autonomy for Macedonia but the Macedonian people wanted “liberation”. Had the Macedonians

accepted autonomy then Macedonia would have become not only an Ottoman protectorate but also an Ottoman ally. This meant that it would have been harder for the three, Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, to acquire Macedonia. Fear of an Ottoman-Macedonian alliance forced the three to ally themselves militarily and to accelerate their invasion of Macedonia under the pretence of “liberation”.

But, as we all know, Macedonia was only “liberated” so that it could be reoccupied. With the Macedonian people’s help the three invaded Macedonia, drove the Ottomans out and then occupied it. Then the three “allies” started a second war where they fought against one another for a bigger piece of Macedonia...

2.

Tsarist Russia fought against the Ottoman Empire for its own aspirations to gain access to the Mediterranean Sea. In 1878, in San Stefano (at the gates of Istanbul), the defeated Sultan was forced to accept the creation of then - Ottoman provinces in the Balkans - “Great Bulgaria”, a satellite state of the Russian emperor and “liberator”.

Contained in this “Greater Bulgarian” composition were many non-Bulgarian countries including Macedonia with its Aegean ports. The “Great Russian dream”, it seemed, finally came true... but lasted only briefly.

Soon afterwards however, the Western Powers convened a Conference in Berlin and pressured Russia to give up its dream. The San Stefano Treaty was annulled and “Great Bulgaria” ceased to exist, except as a fictional place on paper.

The only thing that the Russian emperor and “liberator” accomplished, it seems, was to plant his dream of accessing the Mediterranean Sea (through the Aegean) into the minds of Bulgarian leaders which has remained there to this day.

This Bulgarian ambition for dominating the Balkans and for hegemony over the neighbouring countries and peoples, has become a “cancer in the Bulgarian living body” (Dimitrov’s famous

expression) which cost the Bulgarian people a lot of blood and Bulgaria endured true national catastrophes when generations of Bulgarian people were massacred in the Balkan Wars and in World War I.

Unfortunately Dimitrov, the great revolutionary, died before he could save the Bulgarian people from this chauvinistic illusion. And so this Bulgarian ambition still lives in Bulgaria in forces and carriers that pursue this illusion. This is why today there can be no honest understanding between the Bulgarian people and the people of the neighbouring states.

Just recently, last March in fact (1978), Sofia celebrated the 100th anniversary of the signing of the San Stefano Treaty and the birth of “San Stefano Bulgaria”. During the celebration a number of non-Bulgarian countries, including Macedonia, were openly declared Bulgarian national territories. The national uniqueness and autonomy of the Macedonian people has been completely rejected and Bulgaria has officially waged open war against Macedonian national ideals. The “San Stefano Bulgaria” dream of gaining access to the Aegean Sea is still being accepted by today’s Bulgarian ruling circles. This “national” ideology has been carried and is still being carried forward with open hostilities against Bulgaria’s neighbours and especially against the Macedonian people...

3.

Not long ago the Greek Parliament opened a debate over the issue of allowing people who had fled Greece illegally as war refugees to return home. Included among those people were Macedonians or “Slavo-Macedonians”, as the Greek communists often liked to call them.

As is well-known, Minister Konstantinos Stephanopoulos, the most responsible body for this issue in the Greek Parliament, decided to exclude the “Slavo-Macedonians” from returning to their homes in Greece. Among other things he said: “Simply put, we do not want them and we will not let them return...”

I would like to point out that I (Pavle Rakovski) too am one of those people who fled Greece illegally as a war refugee. I too am a member of the Greek political refugees. I was born in Lerin Region or Florina Region as the Greeks call it, and am a Macedonian or “Slavo-Macedonian” according to the Greek communists. I grew up in Greece and received a Greek education exactly as if I was a real Greek. I adopted the Greek language like it was my own. Even more than that, I began to express myself in the Greek language more than I did in my own native Macedonian language. I even began to think and dream in Greek. I have always believed the Greek people living among us were good people and loved and respected them. I served in the Greek military and was promoted to the rank of sub-lieutenant. I was sent to the Albanian front the first day the Italian fascists showed aggression towards Greece and fought until April 24, 1941, when this defensive war ended. There were many thousands of Macedonians who defended Greece, not only at the Albanian front but also in the ranks of ELAS. Macedonians fought alongside their Greek comrades to protect Greece from the foreign invaders and to bring democracy to the country...

So, why should I be excluded from the right to return home?

The “Nea Demokratia” party, the ruling party in the Greek government of which Mr. Stephanopoulos is a member, appears to be more democratic than all previous Greek governments, because it tackled the issue of allowing the refugees to return home. Unfortunately it is not democratic enough to allow the Macedonians from Greece to return home. This government has permanently shut the door on a significant number of Greek political refugees simply because they are Macedonians.

No wonder the newspaper “Avgi” correctly wrote: “The Slavo-Macedonians are good when they are called upon to serve in the Greek army, to pay taxes and in general to fulfill their obligations as Greek citizens but they are undesirable when they want to be repatriated...” (“Nova Makedonija”, February 9, 1978.)

Why should Macedonians who fulfilled all their obligations as Greek citizens be treated like they are guilty of something, just because they were born Macedonian?

Why are Greek citizens considered guilty and undesirable, just because they were not born as Greeks and their language, the language of their parents and ancestors, is not Greek...?

They should be allowed to go back to their villages and cities, to their properties and homes where their ancestors have lived and died for centuries, where their roots are...

Why should they be torn away from their ancestral homes?

4.

There was never a “Greek Empire” with Constantinople as its capital... it never existed. Yet here were books intended for children in which the Mother of God is incredulously crying for fourteen decades because... the Greeks lost Constantinople and the temple of St. Sophia to the Turks. And the young Greek bourgeois comfort the infamous Mother of God with the words:

“Μην κλαις, Κυρα Δεσποινα, παλυ με χρονια, με καιρους, παλυ δικα μας θα εινα!” . (“Min Kles, Kira Despina...! Pali me xronia, me kerous, pali thika mas tha ine!”) (Don’t cry Mrs Despina...! After years, in time, they will be ours again!)

This, of course, is treated like it was a folk song.

The “Megali Idea” (Great Idea) is a modern Greek ambition to create a Greek Empire in place of the old Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. This has been Greece’s distant and final goal, both internally and as a foreign policy of the Bourgeois, since the time Greece became a state for the first time in 1830.

Intoxicated by the easy success they had in the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) when Greece expanded to the north, occupying and annexing the larger and richest part of Macedonia, immediately after the First World War, the Greek bourgeoisie decisively turned their attention to the near east. The Greek army began its Asia Minor campaign (1919-1922) with high hopes that it would finally realize the “Megali Idea”. But this very ambitious Greek dream quickly turned

into a catastrophe. The campaign failed miserably and revealed that the “Megali Idea” was nothing more than an illusion. But did the bourgeoisie learn anything from this? No! The Mother of God is still crying... to this day...

Let us now have a quick glance at one of the many Greek propaganda books written in the spirit of the “Megali Idea”. This particular book, entitled “I blame the Greek Communist Party as its own witness”, was written by Georgios Kanelakis and published in Athens in 1953.

Kanelakis did everything possible to prove that in principle the CPG recognized the democratic rights of the Macedonian people and by doing so it committed national treason against the Greek nation. And according to Ahilas Kirou, head of the Athens newspaper “Estia”, in a letter he sent to Kanelakis which Kanelakis included in his book, this was “the biggest betrayal that Greek history can reveal...”

Among other things, the book claims that the Slavs created their states in the Balkans on top of “Greek territories” (see: Volume 1, p. 33), and at the end of the book, “instead of an epilogue”, he has included two maps of the European part of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. One depicted the middle of the 6th century AD and the other depicted the second half of the 7th century AD, with the map titles “The Greek state in 527-565” and “The Greek state in 668-685”. In the first map it also says “Our borders then extended to the Danube River and the Black Sea!” On the second map it says “the white plains between the Danube River and Mount Emos (Stara Planina) represent the first Bulgarian state that was founded on our soil and then expanded through annexing Greek territories.” (See: Volume 1, p. 155.)

Kanelakis very clearly identified the borders of Greater Greece. The northern borders started at the Black Sea in the east, followed the Danube River across, right through Belgrade, and ended at the Adriatic Sea in the west.

This book was officially approved for publication by the Ministry of Public Order under Act number E. 1021 F.D. on April 14, 1950 (signed by A. Vahliotis, Minister) and by the Greek army general

staff Act number 60316/848793 OAM (3rd Bureau) dated November 23, 1949 (signed by G. Bairaktaris, OAM General Staff Director General). These acts were also included in Kanelakis's book.

According to Zahariadis: "Cultivated for decades, the 'Megali Idea' became so strong that it prevailed everywhere and, with its tortuous and monopolistic hegemony over all the minds, forced every other movement to be placed under its wing..." (Nikos Zahariadis: "Thesis on the history of the CPG", CPG Central Committee edition, 1944, p. 22.)

Of course, Zahariadis also said that this was only until the CPG was established in November 1918, and not later. History however says otherwise. The CPG with its many dramas and abnormal crisis situations, with its breaks in its ranks, with its open treacheries such as those of Stavridis, Puliopoulos, Maximos, Sargologos, etc., as well as with all the first CPG Central Committee secretaries, the catastrophic defeat of the People's Revolution in 1936 (Zahariadis), in 1944 (Siantos), in 1949 (Zahariadis), undoubtedly show that the CPG leadership topped the domestic bourgeoisie exponents who worked in favour of the bourgeois "Greek national interests" in the shadow of the "Megali idea". And that, of course, explains their policy towards the Macedonians, a policy that was extremely anti-Macedonian and anti-national, which often took the form of serious political crimes...

5.

"In November 21, 1926, the Greek government, official gazette "Efimeris tis Kivernesios", number 332, published a law on compulsory name changes in all settlements in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia. All Macedonian and, to a lesser extent, most Turkish toponyms were changed to Greek. Then, in number 346 of "Efimeris tis Kivernesios", the Greek government published a long list of settlements with non-Greek names (about nine hundred villages and cities) and their new Greek names.

The Greek government, of course, made it look like the people that created these settlements and gave them non-Greek names were "naturally" Greek. However the truth is these non-Greek settlements

were created naturally and over long periods of time by non-Greek people who then named their places with non-Greek names. These non-Greek settlements were not created or named by administrative orders, or under the control of national propaganda like the modern Greek place names. They were named by the people who created them.

With its administrative orders the Greek government not only changed the names of these places but also forged history.

It eliminated the fact that Macedonians had lived on those lands for centuries and made it look like these had always been Greek villages and towns...

Since the Balkan Wars started the Greek rulers who occupied and annexed Macedonian lands have intensely and systematically continued to apply the Greek Church's (Patriarchate) patriotism from Ottoman times to resolutely and ruthlessly Hellenize the Macedonian terrain by persecuting, evicting and exterminating the Macedonian and Muslim populations in order to change the national composition of the population in this part of Macedonia.

On top of all this, the Greek rulers have not only managed to hide their motives and application of this harsh Hellenization, but have also convinced their own people that only Greeks live in Greece and anyone who claims to be not-Greek is an enemy agent looking to do harm to Greece.

“This became very evident to us when we (Macedonian partisans), serving in DAG, were sent to Epirus, Thessaly, and even further south into Greece and caused panic among the local population by simply talking in the Macedonian language and singing Macedonian songs. No one in Greece, not even the CPG had informed these people that Macedonians lived in Greece and that we were those Macedonians. These people were told to fear all strangers. The Greek rulers, including the CPG leadership, had filled their heads with all kinds of fear so naturally they were suspicious of non-Greeks. They were afraid of us because they thought we were there to cause them harm and hated us because they were told that the CPG leadership, with help from NOF, was going to carve out

Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia and hand it over to Tito to join it with Yugoslavia... (To KKE απο το 1931-1952, pp. 271 and 205.) This was the situation in Greece at that time.

But, despite what the Greek rulers said and did, despite their devastating policies against the Macedonians, we managed to preserve our culture and identity...” (Pavle Rakovski, About the Roots of Evil, “History” 1/1977, p. 95.)

6.

Subjugated people who succeeded in preserving their language succeed in retaining the key to their liberation in their own hands. Spread of the printed word in their native language, simultaneously dispersing everywhere is the most efficient way to motivate people to mobilize in a struggle for their liberation.

This has been the experience of nations, fixed by history.

By taking the Macedonian language away from the Macedonian people, its own citizens, the ruling circles in Greece attempted to strip the Macedonians of the key to their liberation, that is, to overcoming the terribly humiliating position of being a completely oppressed and subjugated nation.

Today ruling circles in Greece are unscrupulously claiming that Macedonians do not exist in this part of (Greek occupied) Macedonia, not even as a national minority, forgetting what official Greece was saying yesterday.

They are forgetting that only yesterday they changed all the Macedonian names. They are forgetting that everything Greek in Macedonia has been artificially created. On top of that, let us not forget the “Abecedar”, the Macedonian primer published by official Greece to teach Macedonian children their Macedonian language. Allow me to say again: “It was prepared by the Greek government! It was printed in 1925 in Athens by the P. D. Sakellariou printing house.” The text was neither Serbian nor Bulgarian. The text was written in the Macedonian language using the Lerin-Bitola dialect but not with Cyrillic letters. The text was written using the Latin

alphabet. The primer was called “Abecedar”. Here is a sample from its text:

“FAMILY

I am a little boy. You are a big girl. That boy is playing with a ball. We are little boys. You are big girls. These are old women. I have a father, mother, one brother and one sister. My father, mother and the children make up a family...” (Abecedar, p. 38.)

This is my mother tongue, the language of the people from the Lerin-Bitola area. By publishing the “Abecedar” the Greek Government recognized our existence, the existence of Macedonian people in Greece. However, the governments in Sofia and Belgrade intervened protesting and demanding that the Bulgarian, or Serbian language, be used in the Macedonian schools in Greece. These protests were good for the ruling powers in Athens, which immediately withdrew the “Abecedar” and destroyed it making sure it never reached the Macedonian children and no Macedonian schools were ever opened. The Greek government did not publish the “Abecedar” on its own territory because it was forced to by foreign propaganda... The “Abecedar” appeared because Macedonians do exist on its territory. In other words, the appearance of the “Abecedar” was quite justifiable. Ironically, now Greece says that Macedonians do not exist... How hypocritical is that?

But, no matter what it says now, the Greek government did recognize the existence of Macedonians in this part of Macedonia...

There was another way the Greek government recognized the existence of Macedonians living in its territory and that was through the treaties it signed for the various population exchanges. How can we forget the November 27, 1919, Neuilly Accord, or the September 29, 1924, “Kalkof-Politis” Geneva Protocol, that Greece signed with Bulgaria for the “voluntary” exchange of populations?

There was still another way the Greek government recognized the existence of Macedonians living in its territory and that was through the Convention, signed on August 17, 1926, between Greece and the

Kingdom of Yugoslavia, where Greece recognized the Macedonians living in Greece as a “Serbian national minority”.

And now, of course, we have Minister Stephanopoulos recognizing that “Macedonians do exist in Greece”. By declaring to the Greek Parliament that he does not want the Macedonians to come back to Greece he, in effect, recognized the existence of Macedonians...

7.

On top of that we have the respected Athens newspaper “To Vima”, referring to the debate in the Greek Parliament mentioned earlier, arguing that there is no Macedonian national minority in the Greek state but acknowledges that previously there was one. This is what “To Vima” wrote: “In the context where there truly existed a group that could be characterized as a Slavo-Macedonian minority, it should be said that that group left the country during internal disorders in Greece... Therefore the question of Slavo-Macedonians as a minority group in the Greek state is closed...” In other words, according to “To Vima”, Macedonians did exist in Greece at some point in time... but not any more.

In March of this year, the world witnessed over two hundred thousand people fleeing Southern Lebanon, leaving their homes and properties, because Israel invaded their territory.

We also know that over two hundred thousand Greek Cypriots abandoned their homes and properties, the hearths of their ancestors, because the Turks invaded their territory.

Even though it is a clear case of people fleeing to save their lives, “To Vima” cannot help itself but blur the situation and conceal the fact that these Macedonians were Greek citizens who fought side by side with their Greek comrades in DAG’s ranks, and were forced to flee after DAG was defeated in order to save their lives. Namely, they did not freely flee the country... They were forced to flee because they were driven out...

Further on “To Vima” wrote: “This minority just established its nationality and settled in the Federal Republic of Macedonia.”

Meaning, the Macedonian people from Greece just determined the place where they were going to relocate and live.

This is the same as saying that over two hundred thousand people from Southern Lebanon, or over two hundred thousand Greek Cypriots, decided to leave their homes on their own, without being forced, and found a new place to rebuild their homes... This is not only absurd but crude and unconvincing.

“To Vima” went on to accuse Skopje of exercising chauvinism and “operating with categories from the old antagonism of supremacy over Macedonia and the Balkans” by which it aroused the “Aegean dream” (Slavs gaining access to the Mediterranean Sea).

But that was not true. The opposite is true: the Macedonians were victims and are still victims of Serbian chauvinism (being referred to as “South Serbians”), Greek imperialism (the “Megali Idea” (Greater Greece)) and Bulgarian megalomania - the Aegean dream... (“San Stefano Bulgaria”).

Yugoslavia, under the right conditions became a multinational state and with its strong and well-organized Communist Party, which did not “deviate” on the national question, created the necessary conditions for the emergence and survival of national freedom and statehood for each of its nations. Yugoslavia, as an established multinational centre, guaranteed the existence and survival of the Macedonian nation and state. With the disappearance of the Serbian chauvinist, the chauvinistic danger from that side disappeared for the Macedonian people. As a result, the Macedonian people initiated a process of affirming themselves and spreading their culture worldwide.

This, however, has not stopped the pursuit of the “Megali Idea” in Greece, or that of a “San Stefano Bulgaria” in Bulgaria which clearly mutually deny each other and direct their ambitions against the Macedonian people in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia and Yugoslavia in general. Both Greece and Bulgaria are striving not only to deny the existence of a Macedonian people in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia but also have aims to continue to deny the

Macedonian people's existence and to erase their national and democratic rights and freedoms in Greece and Bulgaria. Namely:

The Macedonians in Bulgaria are completely disadvantaged as Bulgarian citizens. They have no right to identify as Macedonians and are obliged to call themselves Bulgarian.

The Macedonians in Greece are also completely disadvantaged as Greek citizens. They have no right to identify as Macedonians and are obliged to "pretend" to be Greeks and call themselves Greek. And those who were forced into exile have no right to return home...

At the end of its long text, "To Vima" proposes to "certain Yugoslav circles" that they forget about the "Slavo-Macedonians" and, "in the interest of Greek-Yugoslav relations", give up their position with regards to the "Macedonian national minority" in Greece.

According to this Greek "suggestion" Yugoslavia was expected to give up on the Macedonian people, a component of the Yugoslav federation which, according to the Yugoslav constitution, it was expected to support and protect. Yugoslavia was not looking for "border changes"; all it was looking for from Greece was for Greece to show respect and understanding towards its minorities. It was Yugoslavia's duty to show an interest in their fate as a legitimate right and obligation.

Nature brought all these people to the Balkans and over time created the space for them to live together and next to one another, that is, until the Great Powers and other outsiders began to meddle in their affairs. Not only were these people divided, but they were made to believe that the Balkans belonged to them and exclusively to them. We now have the Bulgarians, fueled by their "San Stefano" illusions, who, not once but twice, joined the German imperialists because they promised them Macedonian and other peoples' lands. We now also have the Greeks who have forgotten who they are and now believe they have directly descended from the ancient people who lived on the same lands some two thousand years ago, but are convinced that they belong to the West, forgetting the fact that they are also Balkan people and cannot escape from it.

But of course, as long as there are anti-historical and anti-Balkan manifestations of behaviour, aided by outsiders like the Great Powers, there will never be sincere friendship and close cooperation between the Balkan people.

The absence of respect and understanding for the Macedonian people in Greece is the core reason why official Greece claims that there are no Macedonians in Greece.

However, just because Greece does not want Macedonians to exist, does not mean that Macedonians don't exist. They do exist!

In the subdivision of my village each smaller part or area has its own Macedonian name: Lakite, Shirokopat, Sviokot, etc. It's the same everywhere in all the villages and even cities in Greek occupied Macedonia. In 1968, the military regime of the Athens junta enacted its own decree obliging the local Greek authorities to replace all these Macedonian names with appropriate Greek names and impose them on the population.

The junta, however, is now gone but the Macedonian names remain and exist to this day.

In fact after the junta was ousted the grip on the country began to loosen and people began to breathe easier. They began to move freely and speak freely. The Macedonian language began to resurface and was spoken again, especially in the markets. Besides Macedonian, one could hear Vlach, Albanian and Turkish spoken everywhere. This situation was similar throughout the entire Balkan region. People speaking different languages were ready and destined to live together and next to each other. But, it seems, those who divided the Balkan people in the first place, were not happy with the way events were progressing and made sure that that did not happen...

The idea of the Balkan people living in sincere friendship and peace did not please some of those who divided the Balkans in the first place so they made sure new "turmoil" was introduced and things were put back where each country and nation competed to dominate the others.

VII. ON THE GROUNDS OF ONE DOCUMENT

We are talking about a text document written for INI by Theodoros Papa-Panaiotou (Alekos) former Commissar of DAG Kaimakchalan Headquarters and now a CPG official. The text has been circulating for six years in the work and reading rooms of the INI archives in Macedonia. The text was a critique of my (Pavle Rakovski) work “In the Deep Night Dawn Is Born” purchased by INI. Anyone reading Aleko’s document would be left deeply surprised by the author’s anger mixed with gross untruths and distortions of events...

Of course, this is yet another unscrupulous effort to misinform the uninformed reader...

Another moment:

Here is a quote from Aleko’s document: “According to Rakovski’s work the CPG is not only not a revolutionary communist party, but rather an avant-garde of the Greek bourgeoisie that defends its interests among the working people and minorities and, therefore, not the bourgeois class, but the CPG is the main enemy of the Macedonians and their national liberation movement, and that there cannot be a Macedonian revolutionary movement in Greece unless it turns its attacks against the ‘Greek’ communist movement...”

Alekos here clings to these general and naked accusations with unfinished phrases. It is not by chance that he omits the facts. The facts will show that all this does not at all fit the truth. Human-cadres made the decisions to be carried out and are responsible for them. Human-cadres come and go, and in no case is the working-class movement at fault, that is, for what the leaders of its vanguard, the party and its Marxist principles have done.

Here we have Siantos and those patriots around and behind him calling for and committing to “national unity” with the bourgeoisie in the “national liberation front” for the country’s “national

liberation” and “strategic” security at its borders, as was declared by the CPG in January 1944 during the CPG Central Committee’s plenum. (See: Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, CPG Central Committee Edition 1958, p. 505. Or: Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, Χρονικον της εθνικης αντιστασης, 1940-1944, εκδοσης ΠΛΕ. Chronicle of the national resistance 1940-1944, PLE edition, 1967, 21.) One cannot deny that committing to a partnership with the bourgeoisie, the enemy of the people, was not a war against the people and against the CPG itself. Here, in general, was how that special war was carried out:

The CPG did not force an armed struggle for the first two-and-a-half years during the fascist occupation. In its famous capital edition “Sta armata, sta armata” (To arms, to arms), the Party, in connection with this, concluded that: “One cannot fail to notice that the armed struggle was neglected. It was insufficiently organized and promoted, even though there were many opportunities and favourable conditions available...” (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα ..., p. 24.)

The people were directed to focus their anger against the foreign occupiers in countless ways and actions like strikes, demonstrations and uneven street struggles... actions that were harmless to the Greek bourgeoisie and to British interests. But as we now know, no matter how large the crowds were it would have been impossible for them to overcome the occupying forces on their own and take power in the country. Liberating the country still remained in the hands of the allied armies... And when the allied armies came from the West and from the South the Greek government fell into the hands of the bourgeoisie...

People were forced to flee to the mountains because of the unbearable terror that was constantly perpetrated against them. The people who fled to the mountains organized themselves into resistance units eventually creating a people’s resistance army (ELAS). Partisan units began to see action as early as mid-1943 and ELAS grew rapidly both in numbers and in combat actions... Just as ELAS was becoming the dominant force in Greece, the CPG placed it under English command and control. Before that, the people’s revolution movements around Greece (Greece’s neighbours) had

offered the CPG close political and military cooperation, but the CPG rejected those offers. (In June 1943, Tilemahos Ververis, representative of the CPG, and Andreas Tzimas, representative of ELAS Headquarters, contacted representatives from the Yugoslav and Albanian Communist Parties and reached an agreement to cooperate politically and militarily in the liberation war. See document, in French, located in the Macedonian Archives in Skopje.) In a letter, dated July 25, 1943, Svetozar Vukmanovich-Tempo, the Yugoslav representative, wrote a letter addressed to the Communist Party of Macedonia in which he said: "I am writing to inform you that the delegates of the main headquarters of Greece, Albania and Yugoslavia have reached an agreement on the creation of a Balkan headquarters..." However, soon afterwards Tempo wrote another letter, dated August 25, 1943, in which he said: "I met with the secretary of the Greek party and I discussed with him the overall situation regarding the decisions made... They voided all agreements regarding the creation of the Balkan Headquarters and the cooperation between our parties, especially in relation to Macedonia..." (See: Sources of the Liberation War and the Revolution in Macedonia 1941-1945, Volume I, Book II, Skopje 1968, p. 169 and 236.) All ELAS headquarters were staffed with English liaison officers. This is what Vasilis Bardzhotas, member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, said about that: "Large units, divisions and groups of divisions were put in the hands of the Intelligence Service..." (Βασίλης Μπαρτζιώτας, Η πολιτική μας στελεχών του ΚΚΕ στον καιρο της Εθνικής αντιστασης Νεος Κοσμος αρ. 9/1950, Neos cosmos, 9/1950.) Stefanos Sarafis, supreme commander of ELAS, in his famous book "Ο ELAS" (1945) wrote: "ELAS as an allied army is under the command of Middle East English General Staff. All operation ELAS undertakes must be ordered by general staff..." (Ibid. p. 120.)

This is what Christopher Montague Woodhouse (Chris), then intelligence agent, deputy chief and head of the British military mission in Greece, said: "If there were no British officers as part of the resistance movement in Greece, not only Greek, but also European history would have gone in a completely different direction... The presence of the British military mission in Greece prevented the Communists from putting their absolute control over Greece in 1943-1944. If the Communists took power in September

1944, when the Germans were withdrawing, it would have been very difficult for us to take that power away in the eyes of the then world public..." (See: Secret Wehrmacht Archives, "To Vima", July 11, 1963 Or: Hristo Andonovski, "Macedonians under Greece in the struggle against fascism", 1943-1944, p. 214.)

These significant historical outcomes were a direct result of Siantos's maneuvers - putting ELAS under English control and rejecting an alliance with the Balkan people's revolutions.

There is no doubt that the EAM coalition, i.e. the political left led by the CPG, managed to unite the Greek people under the widest national unity ever achieved. Never in their long history have the Greek people been so united and unanimous as they were under the political left's leadership... Unfortunately the same political left leadership persistently and systematically demanded "national unity" with the bourgeois government in exile which was created and financed by the English. The CPG even took steps to make sure the English were popularized in Greece and their authority was accepted by the Greek people...

The political left managed to attract and mobilize millions of people with its numerous strikes and demonstrations in the cities and all throughout Greece. According to a German report, 90 percent of the Greek people were hostile to the occupiers and were ready for an armed uprising. (*Στα αρματα, στα αρματα*, p. 27.) Under these conditions the CPG had the opportunity to create a huge revolutionary army and inflict heavy blows on the occupying forces. If this were to happen, the English would not have dared to invade Greece and enter an exhaustive, long and dangerous war. Unfortunately the CPG decided not to take advantage of the situation. I wonder why? Had the CPG taken advantage of the situation it would have amassed millions of soldiers instead of the seven to eight tens of thousands of ELAS fighters. With this kind of force the CPG could have repelled the English invasion. But instead, the CPG surrendered ELAS to the English who then dissolved it. According to Sarafis, page 276 in his book "ELAS" (1945), at the very moment of liberation, ELAS numbered 48,940 fighters, of whom 5,240 were officers. "These numbers did not include the ELAS forces in Athens and those serving in the islands of Crete,

Mitilini and Samos.” According to Hugas, ELAS had around 80,000 fighters in total. A similar account was given by E. Fotiadis and K. Dzholakas... (See: Andrikopoulos: “1944 κρησιμη χρονια”, volume II, pp. 715-716.)

By the Lebanon Agreement, signed in May 1944, the CPG recognized the bourgeois government in exile as the legitimate national government of Greece. But there was more to it than that. The CPG accepted that ELAS would not be Greece’s national army, and that a new “non-party” army needed to be created. In the meantime ELAS and its dissolution were left to the authority of the government in exile and to its patrons the English. Imagine that!

The Caserta Agreement, signed in September 1944, which brought all resistance forces under the control of the Greek government in exile, opened the way for the English to invade Greece unconstrained. As the Germans were leaving the English entered Athens unimpeded because Germany and England had made a prior agreement to stay out of each other’s way. An official German archival document was published in Greece which revealed that Churchill and Hitler had agreed to the free withdrawal of German forces from Greece. The Athens newspaper “Ta Nea” wrote: “The British fox scored twice as much - strengthened the German forces against the Russians (and against Yugoslavia) and seized Greece unhindered!” (See: “Ta νεα”, January 14, 1978, p. 12.) ELAS, on the other hand, was placed under English control to prevent it from taking important strategic positions, such as Athens, for example. General Skobi, a British general, was accepted and proclaimed Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces in Greece to make sure ELAS was restrained. In this way ELAS could not make any moves on its own, except as ordered by Skobi... (The following was written in the document “Theses for the 40th CPG anniversary”, adopted in August 1958, during the CPG Central Committee Ninth Plenum: “The Caserta Agreement called for the Greek armed forces to be placed under the command of English General Skobi. ELAS was excluded from penetrating into the big cities and the most important strategic regions such as Athens, Central and Eastern Macedonia, Epirus, and so on. These regions were assigned to EDES, PAO, and so on.” (See: Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, 1918-1958, p. 715.)

The provoked armed conflict in Athens in December 1944 was a well timed and tested occasion for disarming, dissolving and liquidating ELAS. This was the great work of Georgios Siantos, CPG Central Committee first secretary, and Mitsos Partsalidis, member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo. They signed the Varkiza Agreement on February 12, 1945, which surrendered all ELAS units throughout Greece except for a few reserve units stationed in Athens which were defeated by a combined force of English and domestic reactionaries. This is what the party edition “Chronicles of the struggle 1878-1951”, had to say: “Georgios Siantos and Mitsos Partsalidis, then representatives of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, signed the Varkiza Agreement which violated the requirement for a general unconditional amnesty that was set by the Politburo to protect the democratic forces ...” (“Chronicle of the struggle, 1878-1951”, Party Edition, p. 49.) In other words, the two signed the agreement behind the Politburo’s back. They signed an agreement for which they were not authorized because the English government needed them to. This allowed the terrible pogrom that followed against the ELAS fighters and members of the party who were persecuted and killed as criminals, to be conducted legally...

The CPG implemented a policy of general abandonment in regards to the Macedonian people living in Greece. It flagrantly violated its own official party line on the national question of “full equality for minorities”. Namely, the CPG Central Committee held five plenums as well as its Second CPG Conference during the fascist occupation and during the national liberation war. The Macedonian people, the CPG’s natural ally in the people’s revolution in Greece, were never once mentioned in any of the adopted documents. The only mention of Macedonians made was in the January 1942 resolution taken during the CPG Central Committee’s Eighth Plenum where the plenum spoke about some sort of “Slavophone Macedonians”... (Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, p. 147.)

Who are these Slavophone Macedonians?

Let us not forget the time the party newspaper “Laiki foni”, published the well-known interview given by ELAS general Evripidis Bakirdzis, who told the world that the Macedonians were

“Bulgarophone” Greeks... (“Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war”, vol. I, Skopje 1971, document number 191, p. 522.) Let us also not forget about General Stefanos Sarafis, Supreme Commander of ELAS, who wrote in his famous book “O ELAS”, that the Macedonians fighters and the Macedonian people in general were “Slavophone” Greeks. (Stefanos Sarafis, “O ELAS”, Athens 1945, p. 331.) Let us not forget what “KOMEF” (abbreviation of Communism epithets - Communist review), the CPG’s central theoretical authority, implied about Macedonia when it wrote: “Greek Macedonia became as Greek as any other Greek region of old Greece...” (KOMEF magazine, CPG central theoretical authority, number 16, August 1943, p. 333.) This was then followed by “Rizospastis”, the CPG central newspaper, which wrote: “After the exchange of populations, Macedonia became as Greek as the Athens district of Attica!” In other words no one could even possibly imagine that any other people outside of Greeks could exist in Attica, never mind Macedonians. That is why, in the spirit of all this, no rights or freedoms for the Macedonian people were foreseen in the EAM and ELAS program documents. Simply put, for them, no such people existed in the Greek state. Even the National Council of Democratic Greece, which convened in May 1944 in the Koreshades liberated area, ignored the Macedonian people and treated them like they were Greeks, especially after it proclaimed the “Greek character” of Macedonia. (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, p. 328. Or: Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war, vol. I, Skopje 1971, document number 104, p. 407.)

Accordingly, Siantos and all those who stood behind and around him, that is, the leaders of the CPG, EAM, ELAS, PEEA... firmly stood in line with the domestic bourgeoisie in regards to the Macedonian national question: There are no Macedonians in Macedonia, and therefore there cannot be a Macedonian national question for Greece.

However, declaring the “Greek character” of Macedonia was no guarantee that there would be no unpleasant surprises. The presence of the Macedonian national liberation movement was felt everywhere among the Macedonian people, and it was smoldering... The need to defend the “Greek character”, i.e. the need to give the appearance that there were no Macedonians in (Greek occupied)

Macedonia, imperatively required undertaking a number of various preventive and suppressive measures at all costs to prevent the initiation of a Macedonian national liberation movement, that is, to prevent the creation of Macedonian political organizations and partisan units. I presented specific facts about these measures in an article which was published in the Skopje magazine VIEWS 8/1980 (p. 161-178). Here I will point out the very nature and purpose of these measures which led to a Greek armed attack against the ELAS Macedonian partisans...

Who was Siantos, the very person who managed all this?

As we now know, Siantos had a heart attack and died on May 20, 1947. Zahariadis however said that Siantos was liquidated by the intelligence service because they feared that, had he been arrested, he would have talked and revealed that he was one of their agents. (Xenocracy - *Επικαιρα*, p. 103.) Three years later, during its Third CPG Conference, the CPG analyzed Siantos's policies carried out during the fascist occupation and decided to declare him a traitor. (Neos Cosmos, number 10/1950, or: To KKE AΠ TO 1931-1952, basic documents, CPG Central Committee Edition 1952, p. 219.) On April 3, 1973, Dimitrios Vlantas, a DAG general and member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, brought the case to Solun when it was discovered that Coporal Siantos was a spy and a whistleblower during his military service. This is what Vlantas said: "Siantos was a traitor... He had a long history since 1932. I was then secretary of the Communist Youth of Macedonia and member of the CPG District Committee. One day the District Committee secretary asked me to find a house in which to hold a secret meeting. For various similar occasions, I used the house of a craftsman - a bartender in Solun whom I could trust. I asked him if we could have a meeting with seven people. "Do you know them?" he asked me. I said "Yes I know them". At one point after we started to get together I looked at him and he looked upset. I asked him what was wrong and he said: "Did you bring comrades to my home or traitors?" "What traitors are you talking about?" I asked. "That one there!" he replied pointing at Siantos. "We were together in the same company serving as corporals. He was a spy and a whistle blower!" he added. Siantos was always a provocateur and, in my opinion, an agent of the Intelligence Service. Thus he managed to play his part - to

suppress the national resistance movement during and after the occupation, and after that during the December events! (Xenocracy, p. 105.) It is also worthy to note one more important fact: The Metaxas fascist dictatorship with help from its people inside the ranks of the CPG managed to catch all the leading CPG activists. This statement was made during the CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, held on July 1, 1941. This is what was said: "... By bribing the people with a tainted conscience and by infiltrating its own agents in the governing bodies, the dictatorship (referring to the Metaxas fascist dictatorship 1936-1941) delivered heavy blows to the party." And as is well-known, the two hundred most prominent CPG activists were instantly shot in Athens ten at a time. (To KKE απο το 1931-1952, p. 104.) As is also well-known, the Asfalia (Greek security service) held these communists in small and large groups at various different camps and prisons and were handed over to the Gestapo for liquidation after the Germans arrived. The Asfalia however allowed a certain number of CPG activists to escape. The most important among them was Siantos who led the CPG during the fascist occupation and during the people's liberation war.

Let us not forget the patriotic "Greek Axis" adopted in June 1945 by the CPG Central Committee at its 12th Plenum, which called for Greece to turn towards the Mediterranean pole with England at its centre and called England Greece's "great friend" whose presence in Greece was proclaimed indispensable "to ensure our borders and our positions in the north are secure..." (As per Zahariadis's introductory speech at the CPG Central Committee 12th Plenum adopted in June 1945. The above quote was taken from: Αποφαση της 12-ης ολομελειας και του ΚΚΕ, Εισηγη ση και τελεικός λογος του Νικου Ζαχαριαδη (Decisions made during CPG Central Committee 12th Plenum, Nikos Zahariadis's introductory and final speech, 1946 Athens, p. 21. Or: Saranta hronia, p. 645.) Let us also not forget the actual CPG line adopted which stifled the revolutionary movement and systematically suppressed the popular uprising as well as DAG, and eventually brought about their destruction. CPG Secretary General Nikos Zahariadis was punished for doing all this and was thrown out of the party. After all Zahariadis was the person who justified the English presence in Greece which weakened the people's resistance and undermined DAG's victory. Because of this Zahariadis was despised and died a

lonely man in 1973. (Xenocracy. p. 259.) At the same time, this same CPG line suppressed and destroyed the Macedonian people's movement...

There is also the fact that no Athens bourgeois government ever managed to liquidate so many Macedonian people en masse and destroy so many Macedonian villages as Zahariadis and his comrades did in the defense of the "Greek character" of Macedonia. On p. 174-175 and 179-184 in the famous INI edition "Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece" by Naum Peiov, all these villages were identified by name and region and by the number of inhabitants who remained or disappeared. So, according to a population census from 1951, 46 Macedonian villages completely disappeared, the residents left without leaving a single soul behind. While in another 179 Macedonian villages the population was halved or significantly reduced. Soon after DAG was destroyed, obviously not by chance and not without reason and foundation, the slogan: "We lost the war but that is why we did not lose Macedonia!" was coined... From this slogan alone it should be clear that the real CPG and DAG leadership objective was to safeguard the integrity of Greece at any cost including suppressing and destroying the Macedonian liberation movement. In other words DAG had to "lose the war" so that Greece could keep Macedonia...

These were the events and facts on which my book "In the deep night the dawn is born", were based. In his "review" of my work, Alekos decided to ignore all this and literally turned things upside down. He made it sound like it was impossible for the workers movement and for its vanguard, the CPG, to have served the domestic bourgeoisie despite the fact that some of the CPG leaders acted as ideological exponents and official agents of the bourgeoisie. The future undoubtedly belongs to the working class. Through suffering and anguish, through rises, betrayals and defeats, the working class will defeat the bourgeoisie. The Macedonian national liberation movement did not clash with the "Greek" communist movement, but was attacked by the anti-Macedonian politics of those in the CPG who overstepped the official party line "full equality for minorities" and, instead, implemented an ultimately chauvinist-liquidation policy against the Macedonian people... This

is the historical truth, highlighted and argued in my book “In the deep night the dawn is born”.

Further on, in his review of my book, Alekos completely missed the mark. Instead of talking about the book itself, which he was asked to review, he talked about me, inflicting upon me a series of disgusting untruths. In general the entire “review” was nothing more than pure untruths which, by mistake, ended up in INI...

* *

*

In connection with Pavle Rakovski’s work: “IN THE DEEP NIGHT THE DAWN IS BORN”

I only read one part of Pavle Rakovski’s book “In the deep night the dawn is born” up to page 147. I am talking about an incredibly anti-communist creation of the lowest level. No one deserves to be engaged in this type of writing. Unfortunately INI, appreciating the author as “very original” and his writings as “very useful”, registered his materials in its documentation. And by doing so, without realizing and without wanting to, it gave our opponents fodder to feed their famous propaganda with new data. In fact, this obliges us to take a more responsible attitude towards the author and his work.

1) Pavle Rakovski’s main idea here is that the CPG is not only not a revolutionary communist party, but rather it is an agency of the Greek bourgeoisie, which aims to defend its interests among the working people and the national minorities, and therefore not the bourgeois class, but the CPG is the main enemy of the Macedonian people and their national liberation movement. Pavle Rakovski’s idea is that there cannot be a Macedonian revolutionary movement in Greece, if that movement does not turn its attack against the “Greek” communist movement. Pavle Rakovski uses every means possible to persuade the reader that things are the way he portrays them. If he were to write about the Union of Communists in Serbia for example, he will quote a single Serbian communist who does not “recognize” the Macedonian nation, (one such person can be easily be found today among the hundreds of thousands) and will “prove”

that the entire Serbian Communist Party policy in connection with the Macedonian question is fraudulent and full of betrayals.

Many books have been written against the CPG by many more refined anti-communists and renegades. Pavle Rakovski knows this and even knows very well that no “Greek” communist cares about his writing. Then why does he write these things? It is very clear to me that Pavle Rakovski actually wants to attack and has attacked not the CPG, but rather the CPY, (SKY and the SKM) about which he wrote that in 1944 it prepared a military intervention in order to liberate and join Aegean Macedonia to Yugoslavia, turn NOF into a branch of OZNA and the military intelligence service, and did everything after Varkiza to sustain the Civil War in Greece. It is also clear to me that Pavle Rakovski, if he finds himself in Greece, he will reveal his anti-Communist passion and write the most incredible things against SKY and SKM...

2) Pavle Rakovski started out as a Grkoman (Macedonian loyal to the Greek cause) and learned that he was a Macedonian in the ranks of the CPG. He then learned how to be a true Macedonian and a revolutionary in the ranks of the CPY and CPM. The main task of that “true Macedonian and revolutionary” was to liquidate the Aegean Macedonians who followed CPG policies and got in the way of the “revolutionary awakening” of the Aegean Macedonians and their “true Macedonian ideals”. All these things are written by Pavle Rakovski and repeated on every occasion. One thing he avoids to be clear on though is: What are those “true Macedonian ideals” that he keeps in his head? But it is not difficult for the reader to understand which direction Pavle Rakovski wants to take and what he actually wants to do publicly: Of course, I can categorically argue that I see more hesitations towards his old Grkoman (reactionary) feelings, and less towards his Vancho Mihailov sentiments. A more careful look at his book gives us many elements in that direction.

I stopped on these two main questions (or simply put, on these two sides of the same problem). An older text such as this is a useful tool to understand what is happening with Pavle Rakovski today and with his letter writing of a six page mutilated letter he wrote to the CPG Politburo demanding that, on October 3, 1949, he be given the opportunity to actively participate in the “front lines in the struggle

against the clique of the Belgrade fraudsters”, with articles such as “Tito’s traitorous cliques and the Macedonian People”. He also expressed his regret that he had not done this before. Further down the letter he wrote: “You may not believe me, but that is true. Despite all the things that happened, I was never calm when I was across the border (in Skopje-Bitola). I have always felt like a water frog in a dry place. I always had the feeling that I was out of my element, I was worried. But, influenced by the international reputation and the majesty of Tito’s clique, I thought that the remnants of my Greek-ness certainly did not allow me to feel comfortable among the Yugoslav leaders. But there was also a different reason. It was my dissatisfaction and the strong indignation I felt in many cases. I will mention only a few:

1) They deceived me and the late Dzhodzhov to take the Macedonian battalion from Kaimakchalan across the border into Yugoslavia... I always felt like they did not appreciate me, neither me nor the others. They treated us like ordinary organs that needed to listen and obey. They called on us and we were there in our homeland, as if passing from one room of the house to another. And yet, they were the hosts, and we were the ‘refugees’ who lived with their ‘help’ and at their ‘mercy’. Without admiration, I was thinking of the great Yugoslav thesis: ‘The Macedonian people will receive full affirmation only within the framework of the Yugoslav federation. And yet I worked in the spirit of this line’...” Pavle Rakovski is actually deeply disappointed and indignant not at the CPG, which he raised and kept in the highest possible position, but at SKY and SKM, because his painful passions and unlimited ambitions completely and definitely collapsed here at the Socialist Republic of Macedonia. Pavle Rakovski was ill for a long time and not only bodily. Of course, no one can forbid him from writing at home. But I do not think that permission should be given to him to circulate his writing, because it is very harmful primarily politically as well as for SKY and SKM.

I also think that INI has a greater responsibility to purchase Pavle Rakovski’s material and register it in its documentation. His colleague Toshov Simovski, who recommended him to INI, has almost the same views as Pavle Rakovski, and is too far away to grasp such problems, since personal passions prevent him from coming closer to the real problems with regards to the revolutionary

movement in Greece and Aegean Macedonia. If INI, which knows what we are dealing with here, asked for an opinion from us, we would be very careful when we give it. This example poses the need to re-examine all the memoir materials for Aegean Macedonia, purchased by INI. I think this will help us to learn more useful lessons and better orient our work toward the direction of collecting memoirs from the fighters...

15. XI. 1976

(S.P.)

T. Papa-Panaiotou.

VIII PROBLEMS FROM THE NEWEST MACEDONIAN HISTORY

(Recognizing the historical truth)

No doubt, the issue here is:

- The CPG leadership's attitude and approach towards the Macedonian national question and the Macedonian movement in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia, a matter of our most recent history. (This was the title of an unpublished text by Risto Kiriazovski, historian at the Institute for National History in Skopje).

However, I must say that for some reason or another, our historiography has not been paid much attention because no work has been published about any critical review of the CPG leadership's attitudes and approach to the Macedonian people in the Greek state and to the Macedonian national question in general since the founding of the CPG. The several works that have already been published do not cover the entire issue as a whole. Namely, they only cover events from the 1940s, i.e. the National Liberation War against the fascist occupation and the Greek Civil War (1941-1949).

On the other hand, I must also say that there is a widely accepted view among our activists (some of them historians) that the CPG line with regards to the Macedonian national question, that is, with the Macedonian national movement, was basically correct. However, some unintentional errors were made and weaknesses and failures experienced in that regard. Those weaknesses and errors that the CPG made are discussed in the following:

- History of the Macedonian people, book three, part 13.
- Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece, by Naum Peiov.
- The truth about Aegean Macedonia, by Hristo Andonovski.
- Macedonians under Greece in the struggle against fascism, by Hristo Andonovski.

- Paskal Mitrevski's presentation at the MANU symposium on the occasion of ASNOM's 30th anniversary.
- The Macedonian national question through CPG politics during the national liberation war, by Todor Simovski....

Recently, I had the opportunity to read Risto Kiriazovski's unpublished text, which I mentioned earlier, in which, among other things, Kiriazovski said that: The Greek leaders never officially contested that the Macedonians are a separate nation (p. 1). A recently published article in INI's "Glasnik" in which Paskal Mitrevski, former NOF secretary in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia, praised the Greek leaders for their "close and constructive cooperation" between them and the NOF leadership. ("Glasnik", No. 2-3 / 1977, p. 203.)

Even though those views are unfounded and contrary to what really happened, those are the views that are widely accepted and persistently cultivated among the Macedonian activists and people in this (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia. These are also the views that the Greek leaders promote in order to:

- Blur and conceal the truth about their direct involvement in the difficult and dramatic "fate" of the Macedonian people.

Unfortunately we are still struggling to clarify this important and crucial part of our recent history...

There is a lot of illusion and self-deception. That is why it is necessary to disperse the smoke screen of "beautiful words" and see the truth, most importantly, identify the true historical events and facts. By carefully looking at the facts we will be able to determine that:

1. During the first six years since the CPG's founding in November 1918, there was not a word about the Macedonians in its programs and official documents. The Macedonians were referred to as "Greek people".
2. The CPG recognized the Macedonian people as an occupied and oppressed people who had the right to self-determination until

secession from Greece. This was requested by Comintern representatives and by the Balkan Communist Federation. The CPG recognized the Macedonians during its Third Extraordinary Congress in December 1924. (ΚΚΕ, *επισημα κειμενα*, v. 1, p. 597.)

But then, during the next parliamentary elections in Greece, held on November 7, 1926, the CPG came out with its pre-election campaign and official program in which there was not a single word about any Macedonians, not even to seek their votes. Again, they were referred to as “Greek people”...

3. Not being able to formally and publicly reject the Comintern and Balkan Communist Federation request mentioned earlier, the Greek leaders accepted the 1924 initiative to create a minority revolutionary organization (IMRO (United)) in the three parts of Macedonia.

But, over a decade later, the Greek side undertook no action to create such an organization in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia.

4. After some criticism and pressure from the Comintern and Balkan Communist Federation, the CPG leaders were forced to approach the problem and create a Macedonian organization (IMRO (United)) in Greece.

Unfortunately the organization, formed in 1934 in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia, was an imaginary and fictitious organization and remained that way. The stillborn IMRO (United) Central Committee, based in Solun, remained inactive and left nothing behind to mark its existence...

5. At the CPG Central Committee Third Plenum, held in March 1935, the CPG Greek leaders spoke openly against the democratic rights of the Macedonian people. In their party program they removed the Macedonian people’s right to self-determination until secession from Greece and replaced it with minority rights. At the CPG Sixth Congress, held in December 1935, they confirmed the above change by declaring that:

“This kind of change does not mean abandoning the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination of nations... The population in the Greek part of Macedonia today is Greek in its majority, and the Marxist-Leninist principle of self-determination requires that the old slogan and line be replaced in today’s conditions...” (To KKE από το 1931-1952, p. 74.) And this, of course, was done in the interests of the workers movement and in the interest of the revolution, which according to the CPG’s official interpretation means:

a) The CPG did not give up on the principle of self-determination to secession for the occupied and oppressed peoples. They simply recognized the rights of the settlers and colonists recently deposited in Greece from Asia Minor and other places and awarded them greater rights, making them the indigenous peoples in this country and allowing them to seek the principle of self-determination to be applied in their favour. In other words the colonists, that is, the oppressors received the rights that were due to the oppressed Macedonians.

b) Even though this part of Macedonia and the Macedonian people were occupied and annexed by Greece, a foreign country, their rights as Macedonians were stripped and they were treated like Greeks belonging to the Greek homeland, an alien world... In other words, the CPG refused to recognize the historical reality of the Macedonian situation in Greece...

c) Above that, the CPG also ignored the historical reality that Macedonia was an ethnic whole and was the Macedonian people’s homeland. The CPG leadership ignored the fact that Macedonia, as an ethnic whole, was occupied, partitioned and annexed by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, and that the Macedonian people had no rights and were not recognized as Macedonians. On top of that the CPG leadership accepted well-known imperialist policies and the Balkan bourgeoisie thesis that : Macedonia was a geographical term, that is, a space on which all neighbours have the right to fill with some other national content except Macedonians.

d) The CPG leadership went from openly and unequivocally condemning the domestic bourgeoisie imperialist policy which

proclaimed that the Greek occupied part of Macedonia was an absolute part of the Greek homeland, which allowed for the continual persecution of the Macedonian people and which allowed for the placement of Greek colonists to be carried out in hopes of artificially altering the national composition of the population in favour of a Greek element, to openly and unequivocally accepting and establishing the same domestic bourgeoisie imperialist policy as part of its practices in the interest of the workers movement and in favour of the revolution in Greece. And, on top of that, calling it a “success”...

6. Early on in the fascist occupation of Greece, the CPG leadership, during its CPG Central Committee Sixth Plenum, held in July 1941, called on all the “Greek people” and all their parties and organizations to join one national front against the occupiers. (Το ΚΚΕ απο το, βασικά ντοκουμέντα, p. 105.) There was not a single word about any Macedonians in that call (official document)... The CPG referred to everyone as a “Greek people”.

No Macedonians were mentioned in any of the CPG official documents compiled during the CPG Central Committee Seventh Plenum, not even as a minority even though they were the largest minority in the Greek state. Again the CPG referred to them as a “Greek people”.

But when the conditions were right and the neighbouring nations rose up in a struggle for their own freedom, the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement became inevitable.

This was when the Greek CPG leaders resolutely opened a frontal attack against the Macedonian leaders, that is, against the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement in order to discredit and stifle it by slandering and destroying its leaders. And as we now know, the armed clash between Greek and Macedonian ELAS fighters became inevitable...

7. This, among other things, is what the newspaper “Rizospastis”, the CPG central authority published on July 20, 1943: “After the exchange of populations Macedonia became as Greek as the Athens district of Attica...” Well, of course, no one can even imagine that

Macedonians, and even other non-Greeks, could possibly exist in Attica, never mind allowing them to develop any kind of anti-fascist liberation movement there.

Three days earlier, on July 17, 1943, the EAM official newspaper “Elenieri Elada”, somewhat threateningly, wrote: “Macedonia is and will remain Greek.” The CPG Central Committee’s, theoretical organ “KOMEF”, in August 1943 claimed that allegedly: “The Slavic minority in Western Macedonia is insignificant...” (p. 332.)

This may be unbelievable but it is true: The EAM coalition, meaning the political left headed by the Communist Party of Greece, feared that Greece would lose Macedonia and did everything in its power to stifle the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement. The CPG did everything it could to cover up everything about the Macedonian anti-fascist movement...

8. When the CPG leaders could no longer keep the Macedonian “phenomenon” under wraps, mainly due to pressure from events, they took the first bold step and declared the Macedonians “Slavophone Macedonians”. This happened for the first time and with very few words during the 1942 CPG Central Committee Plenum... (Σαραντα χρόνια του ΚΚΕ, p. 147.) And who were these “Slavophone Macedonians”? According to Stefanos Sarafis, ELAS Supreme Commander, they are the “Slavophone Greeks” who live in Macedonia. Stefanos Sarafis, in his famous book “O ELAS”, wrote that when he went to inspect the ELAS Second Battalion of the ELAS Twenty-Sixth Brigade he found that the entire battalion was composed of “Slavophone Greeks”... (p. 331.) He was talking about the Macedonian battalion led by Ilia Dimovski-Gotse.

Similarly, in the spirit of “Rizospastis” mentioned in part 7 above, General Bakirzhis, commander of the Greek ELAS divisions in Macedonia, in his well-known interview with the party newspaper “Laiki Foni”, an organ of the CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace, said: The ELAS Macedonian fighters and the Macedonian people in general are “Bulgarophone Greeks”. (Aegean Macedonia and the national liberation war, 1944-1945, pp. 522-523, doc. no. 191.)

In other words there are no Macedonians in Macedonia but only “Slavophone Greeks”, a Slav speaking part of the Greek people. And as “Rizospastis” proclaimed, Macedonia is as Greek as Attica.

But, as is well-known, these claims are not only unbelievable and absurd but also add to the actual line the CPG-EAM-ELAS practiced, confirmed by their actions:

I. The Macedonian people were not mentioned as separate non-Greek people in any of the EAM and ELAS program documents. Therefore no democratic rights and freedoms are foreseen for them in the new democratic Greece.

II. Instead of allowing the Macedonian organizations to exist in the Macedonian villages and cities, The CPG imposed its own Greek national organizations such as EMA, ELAS and EPOEA, which urged the Macedonian people to join their ranks and fight for the national liberation of Greece.

III. In fact, even those Macedonians who joined the Greek organization were not recognized as Macedonians. Even though they fought for Greece’s liberation they were denied the right to have their own revolutionary organizations, that is, the right to their own anti-fascist liberation struggle for their own freedom, as an equal ally of the Greek people.

IV. After the Macedonian liberation movement broke out, no means were made available for it to become the bearer of its Macedonian national distinctiveness. Instead, everything possible was done to stifle it. And:

V. Even the national council from the democratic nation (“Εθνικον συμβουλιον”) ignored the Macedonian people when it convened in May 1944 somewhere in the liberated territory. It too treated and welcomed the Macedonian people like they were Greek people, when it proclaimed the “Greek character” of Macedonia. (Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, Χρονικον της εθνικης αντιστασης, 1944-1945, second edition, 1967, p. 328.)

9. Nothing was said, not even a single word, about any Macedonians at the CPG Central Committee Eleventh and Twelfth Plenums held in April and June 1945, respectively. The CPG made no mention of any Macedonians in any of its adopted positions and official documents... Not a dot on the question of democratic rights and freedoms for the Macedonians. They were completely ignored even though they participated in the struggle en masse and even though they organized themselves in the People's Liberation Front (NOF). They were treated like they did not exist, like the Macedonians in Attica.

But, despite every effort the CPG made to stifle the Macedonian movement, NOF rapidly developed its own military formations and soon became a force that could not be ignored. So, during its Seventh Congress, held in October 1945, the CPG said: "The CPG condemns the persecution of the "Slavo-Macedonian" minority by official Greece as a crime against national interests..." (KKE Apto 1931-1952, p. 126.)

That was all. Not a word after that. The CPG warned official Greece (the government in Athens) that the violence it committed against the Macedonians made them organize themselves and fight, which in no way was in Greece's "national interests" in Macedonia.

Two months later the CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace convened a meeting, held on December 26-27, 1945, in Solun during which Zahariadis acknowledged NOF as an anti-fascist organization with which the CPG would cooperate... but without its leaders... (Λαϊκή φωνή, December 28, 1945.) As a result the CPG press in Macedonia continued with its hostile campaign against the NOF leadership and against the most conscious and active bearers of the Macedonian national ideal...

10. During its CPG Central Committee Second Plenum, held in February 1946, the CPG openly and officially treated the Macedonian people not as part of a certain nation, but rather as a disfigured and deformed nationality consisting of "Slavophones" who just happen to live on Greek soil. (To KKE apto 1931-1952, pp. 149-150.) During its Second Plenum the CPG proclaimed that it will fight "to recognize the rights and equality" of the Slavophone

population, but again without its Macedonian leadership. After this plenum ended the party press in Macedonia continued with its hostilities against the NOF leadership...

11. After “Unity” was established, on November 21, 1946, the attacks against the Macedonian leaders and active bearers of the Macedonian national ideal were shifted from frontal and open, which were unsuccessful until then, to internal. The attacks coming from inside the ranks of the Macedonian leadership were more devastating, persistent, systematic and efficient.

a) In the ranks of DAG:

The Macedonian battalions were made up exclusively of dedicated elite Macedonian revolutionary fighters. Their presence, political and military activities in (Greek occupied) Macedonia stirred up the revolutionary character of the Macedonian people. This prompted more Macedonians to join DAG and the rebellion. This, however, aggravated the Greeks and clashed with the “Greek character” of Macedonia which was heavily promoted by the Greeks. So, in order to remove their influence on the Macedonian people and to destroy them, the Greek leadership ordered the battalions to go south into Greece proper. Then, as soon as they arrived on Greek terrain, they were “reorganized”. Their Macedonian commanders were removed and replaced with Greek commanders. There was, of course, resistance but it was quickly quelled by killing those who resisted, which happened to be the more important carriers of the Macedonian ideal. (Among those killed was journalist Hristo Andonovski’s relative). There was also a NOF directive to submit to the Greek commanders. After that command of all DAG units was taken over by the Greeks. As a result the Macedonian battalions which were led by Greek commanders were pitted against superior enemy forces in tough and uneven battles. As a result the Macedonian battalions were overpowered and destroyed leaving NOF terribly weakened. On top of that, at the same time, the Greeks conducted mass murders and killed many of the most prominent Macedonian leaders and activists. Included among those who were killed were Dzhodzho, Shamardanov, Tanurov and Koroveshkovski.

In parallel with all this, the identity of the Macedonian fighters, who heroically fought “to their last breath” (like Mirka Ginova for example, who was referred to as Irina Gini by the party press), was concealed and they were presented as “Greeks” fighting in the “Greek struggle”.

In other words, as a preventive measure, the Greeks made sure nothing Macedonian was heard or printed. On top of that anyone who expressed Macedonian sentiments was heavily discriminated against. Namely:

- A large majority of them were ordinary fighters, corporals, sergeants.
- Few of them were commanders of a unit.
- Rarely any of them were battalion commanders.
- Only one had a higher rank (Vainas) - commander of a division - and he was a Grkoman (Macedonian loyal to the Greek cause).

The CPG carried on with its well-known scandalous and open anti-Macedonian attacks against NOF. The NOF leaders protested and made all sorts of demands, but without success. So, in the name of unity, the NOF leaders submitted themselves to the wishes of the Greek leaders...

b) In the ranks of NOF:

Sometime in July 1947, the NOF top leadership and members of the central agitation and propaganda department were summoned to meet with Zahariadis, then CPG Secretary General, somewhere above the village Likorahi in Epirus. The summons specified which route they were to take. With that, the leadership was sent into the hands of the enemy. An enemy military unit had been waiting for them for three days in a row. Only by a lucky coincidence did they manage to avoid its trap. This was yet another Greek attempt to behead NOF.

But this was not the only time and means by which the Greeks tried to behead NOF. Their next attempt was to infiltrate NOF and bring it down from within. Preparations for this were made before the First NOF Congress, held in January 1948, and before the First NOF

Central Council Plenum, held in August 1948. The Greek leaders made careful preparations to infiltrate the top NOF leadership with Grkomani (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause) and to remove and neutralize the real Macedonian leaders. In other words the CPG selected a number of NOF enemies and put them in charge of NOF with hopes that they would fool the Macedonian people and reorient their liberation movement to look to Athens and not Skopje as its national centre. This new reorientation had aims to convince the Macedonian people to accept that they were part of Greece and the Greek people.

The NOF central agitation and propaganda department was dissolved and its core members were mobilized as fighters in various DAG units. At the same time, the Macedonian teacher's school was closed and replaced with a newly founded Greek teacher's school under the motto "Macedonians are part of the Greek people". A little later that school too was closed... along with its motto.

The NOF cultural and artistic group and the Macedonian national orchestra were also dissolved. The NOF organization itself was attacked and paralyzed. Most of its regional leaders and activists were mobilized into DAG as common fighters and sent to fight at the fronts. According to Risto Kiriazovski's unpublished works "The CPG leadership's attitude and approach towards the Macedonian national question and the Macedonian movement in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia" mentioned earlier, on page 34, Kiriazovski said that a total of 91 activists were sent to various DAG units. (According to Mihailo Keramitchiev, then NOF president, over three hundred activists were mobilized.)

After Zahariadis's CPG leadership decided to convert DAG, a small hit and run army without tanks, heavy artillery or military aviation, into a stationary army and placed it in a "defensive position" to fight against an enormously large enemy military machine, this war turned into a catastrophe. After DAG was torn apart remnants of its broken up units and civilians near the battle zone began to flee across Greece's northern borders. While fighters and civilians alike were fleeing for their lives, the CPG wasted no time to again attack NOF. Instead of attacking covertly as an expression of the

Macedonian national uniqueness, without embarrassment, the CPG began to openly attack by telling the fleeing refugees that NOF was a “crypto-fascist” organization which (allegedly) tried “to turn the Macedonian liberation movement from a revolution into a counterrevolution! “(See To KKE ap to 1931-1952, p. 272.)

Soon after that NOF was quickly dissolved and all its leaders were prosecuted and convicted to death. In other words, all the original NOF leaders who were still alive were destroyed.

After NOF was destroyed Zahariadis created a new organization for the “Slavophones” and named it “Ilinden”. He used the Macedonian sacred name “Ilinden” in order to hide his true intentions to weaken and destroy the Macedonian resistance movement. “Ilinden” was staffed with carefully selected and trained Grkomani (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause). These Grkomani or “Slavophone Greeks” were given the task to kill the spirit of Ilinden with help from the name “Ilinden”...

And this is what the Grkomani did:

- They threw out the Macedonian alphabet because, according to them, it was a “foreign” alphabet. Instead, they introduced a new alphabet based on the Russian and Bulgarian alphabets.
- They threw out the Macedonian literary language and Macedonian grammar because, according to them, they were allegedly imposed on the Macedonian people by “sold adventurers”. In their place the Grkomani introduced a mutilated Macedonian language, based on how the “Kotsopouloses” spoke, and a new Macedonian literary language and grammar were compiled. The Grkomani then published new Macedonian textbooks and literary works in that language through the “Ilinden” publishing department and tried to promote them as Macedonian language works...

This was in line with the well-known bourgeois (and non-bourgeois) anti-Macedonian thesis of non-recognition, that is, of denying the existence of a unique Macedonian nation, language and culture in general (in the three parts of partitioned Macedonia and beyond).

This was yet another attempt to break down the Macedonian nation, culture and language. In addition to breaking down the Macedonian territory through its invasion, occupation, division and annexation by the neighbouring monarchies through the Balkan wars, the CPG's aim here was to break down the Macedonian people's language and culture in order to prove to the world that the vocabulary used inside the Greek state is really only an internal Greek phenomenon, only an eloquent part of the Greek people, the bilingual Greeks, who have nothing to do with the Macedonians in the Republic of Macedonia in Federal Yugoslavia... According to the logic of this crude anti-Macedonian act, the Macedonians who survived the Greek-bourgeois genocide, that is, the Greek denationalization and assimilation policy, cannot and must not exist except as a complimentary addition to the Greek people, and as a people's sacrifice... In time they are destined to disappear... As for the rest, because they work against Greek national interests, they must be viewed as actors working for foreign interests...! Of course, it was not an easy job to destroy a people like us Macedonians. The CPG's final goal was obvious:

- To consolidate and, if possible, to perpetuate the disintegration of Macedonia and the Macedonian people in order to preserve and strengthen the Greek position in Macedonia.

Unfortunately for the Greeks, our primordial forces that keep us going are well hidden, like they are in every healthy and strong nation, and with every chance we get we replace the lost and heal the wounds of the injured. But, like all others before them, this time too our Greek comrades, the CPG leaders, tried everything in their power to destroy us but they proved to be unable. They failed to change the character and nature of the Macedonian phenomenon. They tried this inside our homeland and they tried it outside but it did not work. They called us "Slavophone Greeks" meaning Greeks who spoke a Slavic language but we did not buy it... They formed an organization called "Ilinden", something near and dear to our hearts, but that too we did not buy... But not only did we not buy it..., it backfired on the Greeks...

As the number of "Slavophone Greeks" grew under heavy Greek influence, so did their anti-Macedonian sentiments to which the

Macedonian people caught on and began to openly rebel against. In this way, “Ilinden” the organization began to increasingly receive its colour as the national Macedonian organization in the spirit of Ilinden, and became more and more the material force of the Macedonian national ideal. Because of this, it did not take long for our Greek comrades to dissolve it. The “Ilinden” organization and its Macedonian pages in the Greek newspapers were abolished in almost every centre among the Macedonians including among the Macedonian émigrés. By doing so, the Greeks, yet again, robbed the Macedonian people from Greek occupied Macedonia of all their rights. They robbed them of their opportunity to organize, develop and continue their struggle for elementary human rights. They robbed them of their struggle to survive as Macedonians and, on top of that, ended their chances of creating a decent life in the Greek state as Macedonians, or as a non-Greek nation...

* * *

In a nutshell, here in front of us we have a series of historical events which actually show exactly what the Greek CPG leadership did against the Macedonian people from the CPG’s founding congress to this day. This was the real attitude of the Greek CPG leaders in contrast to their claims made with beautiful words.

Unfortunately, there are people in our ranks and among our activists who don’t know or don’t want to know about all of this. Paskal Mitrevski, former NOF secretary, is among these people. According to “Glasnik”, Mitrevski said:

“There were irregularities and mistakes... in the activities of the CPG central and regional leaderships and in DAG command in relation to the Macedonians...” (p. 204.)

But where does life exist without errors? According to Mitrevski, the Macedonian people did realize their equality in Greece and his proof of that was in the fact that: “many Macedonian cadres rose up and took up senior management positions in the movement...” (p. 203.)

But what “Macedonian cadres” was he talking about? The only Macedonian cadre that rose to become minister of the provisional government of Greece and to be appointed member of the CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace, was himself. By making this statement to “Glasnik” Mitrevski not only left a false record for our historiography but came in defense of the same Greek leaders who abused the Macedonians... On top of that Mitrevski forgot to say that his appointments were made only several months before DAG was defeated. The other possible appointments Mitrevski could have been thinking of were those of Kotsopoulos and Koitsis, both Grkomani. These two were appointed by Zahariadis during NOF’s Central Council First Plenum, held in August 1949. Kotsopoulos was appointed NOF secretary, and Koitsis was appointed NOF Central Council president. One cannot say that these two were Macedonians considering that until yesterday they were public enemies of the Macedonian movement and NOF. Mitrevski could also have been thinking of these too given that Kotsopoulos was also appointed “chief director of the general directorate for national minorities in Greece” and Koitsis was appointed “member of DAG’s military council”.

That was all. Even if we include the Grkomani in his assertion “that many Macedonian cadres have risen and taken up senior management positions in the movement” we are talking about three people. Therefore Mitrevski’s assertion is unfounded and has no legs to stand on.

Mitrevski also asserted that: “Macedonian commanders and political commissars were placed in DAG’s leadership structures in battalions, brigades and other large military formations...” (p. 204.)

As proof of that Mitrevski mentioned the following names:

- Pando Vaina, also known as Pantelis Vainas, appointed commander of the DAG Eighteenth Brigade and after that commander of the DAG Eleventh Division.

- Liako Papadimitriou, appointed commander of the DAG Tenth Division.

- Giorgi Vasilko, appointed political commissar of the DAG Eleventh Division.
- Ahilea Papaioanou, appointed commander of the Hundred and Third Brigade.
- Paskal Mitrevski, appointed political commissar of the Fourteenth Brigade.
- Anestas Gushevski, a Vlach also known as Thasios Gusiopoulos-Makis, appointed political commissar of the DAG Eighteenth Brigade. And...
- Dim. Prikos, appointed commander of the DAG Eighteenth Brigade. (p. 204.)

As we can see from all the above-mentioned appointments, only Mitrevski was a Macedonian activist, the rest were Grkomani, that is, “Greek patriots”. One has to wonder why Mitrevski took his place among these Grkomani? Why did Mitrevski, soon after the establishment of “unity” in November 1946, accept the role to “clean out” the nationalists in NOF’s immediate leadership? Why did Mitrevski, in a letter to Zahariadis, initiate and secretly ask:

- To clean up NOF from its “nationalist” element, and,
- To add “fresh blood” to NOF. (Historian Kiriazovski mentioned this in his INI unpublished text, quoting a good part of Mitrevski’s letter.)

And as was well-known then... And as we all know today, that so-called “fresh blood” did not belong to the Macedonians from the ranks of the Macedonian national liberation front (NOF). This “fresh blood” came from the opposite side of the barricade, that is, from NOF’s opponents.

But Mitrevski did not want to know this and consciously ignored it when he was interviewed by “Glasnik”, and publicly defamed many of the prominent figures from the Macedonian national liberation movement... (p. 204.)

Mitreviski did exactly what the Greek leaders were doing, and are still doing to this day...

I knew Mitrevski well and I think it will not be a sin if I were to say that Mitrevski was a person that the CPG Greek leaders could count on for his support... The Greek leaders have their own people among us even in INI...

As for my general assessment, the Greek leaders never officially denied that the Macedonian people were a separate nation. But then words are cheap and everyone is entitled to their own opinion... Words without actions can be beautiful... In our case however, what was said and what was done were two different things. Some people tend to believe what was said... and are blind as to what was done. As for the Greek CPG leadership, it must be judged not by what it said in its programs, but by what it did to the Macedonian people. We cannot just talk about their verbal policies and perceive them as “real” and be silent about their “real” practices... This means that we cannot just sit back and allow the Greek leaders to hide and their anti-Macedonian endeavours and serious political crimes to be covered up with “beautiful words” and not be exposed to the world public...

* * *

Naturally events carry their own logic and no single event can be taken in isolation to explain what had taken place. Every event is dependent on and influenced by other events. The entire story cannot be understood from a single event and without connecting it to a series of other events that occurred before and after it, as a practical expression of some particular policy.

During its CPG Central Committee Fifth Plenum, held on January 30-31, 1949, for example, the CPG again recognized the Macedonian people’s right to self-determination. On its own this event can be seen as a gift, a kind act on the part of the Greek leaders and cause for great appreciation on the part of the Macedonian people.

But, if we look at the Fifth Plenum in connection with the previous CPG Central Committee Plenums during which the CPG denied this right to the Macedonian people, especially during and immediately after the national liberation war, a decisively critical period, and if we add to it the series of anti-Macedonian acts the CPG perpetrated against the Macedonian people, it becomes clear that it was yet another CPG tactical maneuver to mobilize the Macedonian population in the war effort.

The Fifth Plenum, the NOF Central Council Second Plenum, the NOF Second Congress, the establishment of KOEM, a separate communist organization for the Macedonians in Greece, the Acts of the Provisional Democratic Government, the creation of a separate “Macedonian Battalion”, which was demobilized after a month-long intensified propaganda in the Macedonian villages, the establishment of the Directorate for Minorities in the Provisional Democratic Government, the appointment of NOF representatives in the provisional democratic government, the appointments at DAG Supreme Command, etc., were all CPG acts to influence certain events. And so was the recognition of the right to self-determination up to secession from Greece... These were all tactical maneuvers, absolutely required so that the CPG could manipulate certain events.

So, recognizing the Macedonian people’s right to self-determination during the Fifth Plenum was another timely CPG tactical maneuver to:

Succeed in the “total mobilization” of the Macedonian population especially in the free territory located around the border zone. To succeed in emptying the Macedonian villages in that zone!

It is important at this point to note that when DAG was breaking up and remnants of DAG units were fleeing across the border in August 1949, the CPG ordered everyone to flee their villages, including the oldest and youngest. All the people, including the thousands of very young children left behind in the Macedonian villages were collected and escorted to the border. According to a Greek census taken in 1951, forty-six Macedonian villages were completely emptied of their population and another one hundred seventy-nine had half the population. For more information on this see

“Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece” by Naum Peiov. Peiov has provided a list of all these villages by name and district.

As we now know, after the CPG Greek leaders had their way with the Macedonian villagers, they left the rest for the Athens government to deal with. Most of the empty Macedonian villages were burned down and completely destroyed, and in the rest Athens deposited colonists, settlers and loyal Greek families from nearby Epirus and the Greek south.

This political crime, as far as I know, has been left in the shadows to this day. Our historiography did not even try to understand or draw attention to it. According to Mitrevski, based on the comments he made to “Glasnik”, it must be concluded that the “total Macedonian mobilization” at the border zone was carried out within the framework of “close and constructive cooperation” which Mitrevski managed to establish with the Greek leaders as an imperative need to find reserves for DAG. According to Kiriazovski, INI historian in Skopje, who has also accepted the position of the Greek leadership, wrote: The total mobilization was carried out to solve the DAG reserves issue. In other words, an attempt was made to resolve the DAG reserve issue by mobilizing “only the Macedonian population” in its entirety (page 30). According to Kiriazovski: “To that end the Macedonian villagers had taken part in many events (demonstrations, rallies, conferences, meetings) and the central question was total mobilization of the Macedonian people in the decisive battles that were soon expected to take place at Vicho and Gramos...” (p. 51.)

So, a single act, all on its own, seemed like a positive thing for the Macedonian people, but by examining a series of acts in sequence, and understanding why they were enacted, can bring us closer to the truth. Because this act is an element of Zahariadis’s policy, it is important to also examine it in its proper context. The CPG’s general line for this period was determined after Zahariadis gave his introductory address at the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum, held in June 1945, during which he declared that England was Greece’s “great friend”. In doing so he opened the door for an English military presence in Greece which, according to Zahariadis, was necessary: “In order to ensure our position and our borders to

the north...” (Apofasis tis 12ti Olomelias..., p. 21. Also: Σαραντα χρόνια του ΚΚΕ, p. 645.)

Zahariadis did this about two months after NOF was founded in the Republic of Macedonia. Greece’s position and territorial integrity on its northern borders were seen as weak and English presence and support was necessary to strengthen them... The Twelfth Plenum also emphasized that: “The CPG resolutely opposes all territorial claims against Greece from all parties... Preservation of the Greek territorial integrity is the first task of every Greek patriot...” (Το ΚΚΕ από το 1931-1952, βασικαν ντκουμента, p. 110.)

This, of course, was justified by the fear that danger was looming from the north... Stemming from the belief that Tito had plans to invade and occupy Greek (occupied) Macedonia and, with help from the Macedonian liberation movement, join it to Yugoslavia. (Ibid, p. 205 and p. 271.)

This “fear from the north”, obviously created the reason for our Greek “patriots” in the CPG leadership to want the English to help Greece... to the end.

And this is why the CPG leadership proclaimed England Greece’s “great friend” and justified its presence in Greece. But that was not all the CPG did. The CPG leadership opened the door for England to interfere in Greece’s internal affairs, to organize and finance the reactionaries, and in the end to hand them over their victory. As a consequence of its actions the CPG organized its own destruction as well as the destruction of the democratic forces and, above all, the annihilation of the Macedonian nation in Greece.

Why did these CPG “patriotic Greeks” speculate that the Greek position and borders in the north would be weak without England’s presence and support?

Why was DAG not allowed to grow? Why was its growth limited by the CPG? Was it because if DAG was allowed to grow to its natural strength it would have threatened the English-installed Greek government and England’s interests in Greece?

Why were the huge organized masses, which served as DAG's reserves, kept passive? Why were they left for the opponent to collect, place them in the larger centres and use them as its own reserves?

Why was the CPG leadership persistently trying to break and destroy the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement, its natural ally and DAG's reserves?

Why did the CPG leadership allow its opponent to smash and destroy DAG, by converting it from a partisan hit and run army into a stationary army? Why did the CPG leadership turn DAG into a stationary target for the opponent's huge military machinery to destroy?

The answer to all these questions is quite obvious. The CPG leadership was afraid that if DAG won the war, and because the main DAG force in the northern part of Greece was Macedonian, Greece's position and northern borders could be threatened.

So, in order to avoid this danger, the CPG enacted a number of "seemingly noble acts" to mobilize the entire Macedonian population en masse and remove it from the border zone. Once the border zone villages were emptied and DAG was defeated, the danger from the north passed. These, unfortunately were anti-Macedonians acts and political crimes against the Macedonian people.

Unfortunately, to this day, there are Macedonians, including former activists from that era, who still refuse to see the truth for what it is. They are still blinded by the eloquence of Zahariadis's brilliantly spoken words delivered during various critical moments when more Macedonian blood was needed to be spilled...

"The Slavo-Macedonian people in northern Greece have given their all for the struggle. They are fighting with such heroism and self-sacrifice that it would arouse admiration. So, there should be no doubt that as a result of DAG's victory and the people's revolution, the Macedonian people will completely accomplish their sacred national establishment, the way they want to. They are shedding

their blood today to accomplish this tomorrow...” (CPG Central Committee Fifth Plenum Resolution. See: Το ΚΚΕ απο το 1931-1952, βασικά ντοκουμέντα, p. 195.) Unfortunately many of those who heard these eloquently spoken words refuse to see the application of the CPG leadership’s practical policies or the physical extermination of the Macedonian population in the border zone.

By not speaking out about the CPG’s “real” and “genocidal” policies the way they were applied against the Macedonian people, and by only paying attention to the strictly verbal policies which the CPG Greek leadership claims to be “their genuine policies”, we allow the shameful anti-Macedonian criminal acts to be blurred and hidden...

* * *

Despite the fact that we now know that the Macedonian battalions were sent south into Greece intentionally so that they could be destroyed, the CPG leadership’s position still remains the same: It was done to incite the uprising there...

And then we have Paskal Mitrevski, quoted by “Glasnik”, saying: “The thesis that the Macedonians should fight only in Macedonia, was long rejected and condemned because it was contrary to the vital and real interests of “unity” and the very principle of the inseparability of combat units in the overall movement in the country...” (p. 202.)

Mitrevski however did not specify when and who rejected this thesis. He only said that such a decision was made and the Macedonian fighters were destined to fight “in the interior of Greece” in the Greek south, to stir up the uprising there. And, according to Mitrevski: “To widen the struggle and strengthen the position of the uprising”. In other words it was decided that Greek DAG units will fight in Macedonia and Macedonian DAG units will fight in the Greek south. And in Mitrevski’s words: “To continue their resistance against the Monarcho-fascist reactionaries in those terrains...”

Mitrevski confirmed that he himself made the decision to send the Macedonian battalions south. He made this decision during a meeting with the Greek leaders in November 1946, when he was NOF secretary and in charge of the Macedonian NOF leadership (p. 201). It is well-known what happened after that:

The Greek units in Macedonia, especially those stationed in Kostur, Lerin, Voden, Meglen, and Enidzhe-Vardar Regions, where the Macedonian people were a compact majority, did not at all attract new recruits into DAG's ranks, the way the Macedonian battalions did. But, it would appear that, the Greek units were not sent there to protect the Macedonian people and flare up the revolution, they were sent there for preventive measures. They were sent to Macedonia in order to control the situation and suppress the revolutionary character of the Macedonian people.

This arrangement, of course, worked against the joint struggle's vital and real interests and was a blow against the Macedonian national liberation movement, against DAG and against the uprising.

As for the Macedonian battalions sent to the Greek south, in no way were they sent there to fuel the uprising. And it does not take a genius to figure that out. The appearance of the Macedonian battalions in the deep south caused panic in hundreds of thousands of local people who thought they were some kind of international Slavic army that had penetrated Greece from the northern neighbouring territory, as was claimed by Greek propaganda. The Macedonian presence there drove these local people to flee to the cities to save themselves. By doing so they fell into the hands of the enemy where they were turned into enemy reserves. There were thousands of people who witnessed this, some are still alive today. And as is well-known, DAG Eighth Division command in Epirus was forced to ask the Macedonian fighters not to speak Macedonian, sing Macedonian songs or dance Macedonian dances and to represent themselves as Greeks to the locals...

This too, of course, worked against the joint struggle's vital and real interests and was a blow against DAG and against the uprising.

As I mentioned earlier, the Macedonian battalions in the Greek south were gradually liquidated in tough and uneven battles fighting against a superior opponent. To facilitate and secure their liquidation, the Macedonian battalions were reorganized the moment they arrived in the deep south of Greece. All the Macedonian commanders were removed and replaced with Greeks. Those Macedonians who objected and protested against the reorganization were immediately shot and killed. Obviously, this was the first step taken to cleanse the Macedonian battalion of their patriots. The second step was to destroy entire battalions because the Greeks did not want them around. These battalions were composed of exclusively Macedonian elite fighters and bearers of the Macedonian national ideal who were proud to publicly proclaim that they were Macedonian.

However, these political crimes against the Macedonian people were not just hurting the Macedonians but were also hurting the vital interests of the joint struggle, DAG and the uprising.

Unfortunately, some Macedonians do not seem to see things for what they are. Defending Mitrevski and the Greek leadership's position as to why the Macedonian battalions were sent to the deep south of Greece, Kiriazovski claims that: The uprising also existed in the Greek south and all this was merely and unarguably necessary... (p. 24.)

In his book "The Truth about Aegean Macedonia", Hristo Andonovski wrote: "DAG headquarters ordered the DAG battalions stationed in Paiak, Kaimakchalan, Karakamen and Vicho Mountains to relocate to Thessaly and southern Greece. This departure towards the south was aimed at escalating the guerrilla movement in southern Greece, which in this respect was lagging far behind the one in Macedonia. However, all these operations were performed without preparing the Macedonian fighters or the local population in these areas, all of which created negative circumstances with regards to DAG's intentions and the CPG leadership's intention in relation to the Macedonians..." (p. 218 and 219.)

Unfortunately that was not it. The real Greek intention here was to cleanse the Macedonian national liberation movement (NOF) of its Macedonian “patriots”.

As I have shown, DAG had to be cleansed of the “nationalists” in its ranks as described by Mitrevski himself in “Glasnik”... (No. 2-3/1977, p. 203-204.) This could not have been done in Macedonia so the Macedonian battalions had to be moved south into Greece so that they could be destroyed.

The Macedonian commanders were replaced with Greeks as soon as the battalions arrived on a purely Greek terrain. The Macedonians who protested were then shot to death, followed by the destruction of the battalions themselves...

This was the sequence of events that took place and the political crimes that were committed against the Macedonian people. There is no doubt what the real intention of the Greek CPG leadership was in this scenario. This was indeed a political crime carried out by the CPG leadership under its general anti-Macedonian policy. A policy that needs to be looked at more closely and understood for what it truly was.

It is perfectly clear that, by defending the position of the Greek leaders and that of Mitrevski who asserted that the Macedonian battalions were sent to the Greek south and “reorganized” and “destroyed” in the interest of the joint struggle, we, like it or not, are aiding the Greek criminal acts perpetrated against the Macedonian people and are allowing them to remain hidden...

* * *

As I mentioned several times before, the Greek Asfalia (security service) handed Zahariadis to the Gestapo in May 1941, and the English intelligence service took him back in May 1945. Even though he was a communist serving a death sentence in Dachau, Zahariadis not only survived but was kept in a dry, warm and clean cell, working as an interpreter. After a three week stay in London, English intelligence brought him to Athens in a special aircraft. He arrived in Athens on May 29, 1945.

Zahariadis remained in their debt forever. Namely:

The English had a need for a well-executed propaganda offensive in Greece, a country that was vastly well-organized by democratic forces led by the CPG. The English needed “someone” inside the CPG to execute that propaganda offensive...

In other words, they needed Zahariadis to mitigate the consequences of an open English military intervention against ELAS.

They needed Zahariadis to strengthen English relations in Greece.

They needed Zahariadis to provide them with a more comfortable stay and to minimize their military forces and costs as much as possible...

This huge scale propaganda offensive and its long duration were aided, and this needs to be recognized, by Zahariadis’s great skill through the CPG and on behalf of the CPG. By waving the Greek-bourgeois fictional scarecrow, the “Slavic danger” in Greece, Zahariadis effectively:

- Justified the English military presence as a “national requirement” in Greece.
- Suppressed and weakened the people’s resistance movement. And,
- Undermined the uprising and DAG’s victory which led to the defeat of the democratic forces.

All these maneuvers Zahariadis employed during his service as CPG Secretary General were discovered and voiced during the CPG Central Committee Sixth Extended Plenum resulting in his removal from the Party leadership in March 1956, and later he was completely erased from the Party...

Following are some of the comments that were made during the CPG Central Committee Seventh Plenum, held in April 1957, as

published in the party magazine “Neos Cosmos”, number 4 and 5, in April and May, 1957.

Leonidas Stringos, member of the Politburo, said:

- If our party had decided on a district struggle in 1946-1947, with a decisive mobilization policy to increase DAG’s military effectiveness, the issue of reserves, one of the most basic issues, would have been successfully and timely resolved. But then, Zahariadis made it clear to us at the Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace that: “Our forces in Macedonia will not number more than two thousand fighters!”

Panaiotis Mavromatis, member of the CPG Central Committee and CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace, said:

- “When the Bureau informed Zahariadis that we in Macedonia can mobilize up to 25,000 volunteer fighters within a month, Zahariadis told us to stop recruiting because the armed struggle was only a bluff!” This was said after the Central Committee Second Plenum, held in February 1946.

Twenty years later, General Markos Vafiadis said the same thing during an interview with the Zagreb weekly *Vus*: “A few weeks after the CPG Central Committee Second Plenum, held in February 1946, our Macedonia and Thrace District Bureau informed the CPG Central Committee Politburo that we would be ready to go to war with 25,000 armed and organized fighters. We, however, did not find understanding and support for that action. Secretary General Zahariadis said: “Stop making such proposals because it’s all a bluff calculated to intimidate the government so that we can get some concessions...!” (See: *Vus*, 1290, January 29, 1977.)

During the CPG Central Committee Seventh Plenum, General Markos Vafiadis, DAG supreme commander, among other things, said:

“The period from 1946 to 1947 was the most favourable time for the development of the armed struggle, even for the seizure of power... Throughout almost the entire 1946, the Party leadership was

characterized by apathy towards the drama survived by ordinary former ELAS fighters and now members of the party. When activists from field party committees raised the issue of seizing power, during the first months of 1947, Zahariadis's position was: "We are not going to take power for the time being. We will see... perhaps in 1948!" The Party leadership, during this entire time, invested its effort dealing primarily with economic problems... ELAS fighters were forbidden from joining the partisans. Those who broke the rules, because of the unbearable terror the Monarcho-Fascists unleashed on them, were accused of being scoundrels, suspicious people and provocateurs!"

DAG General Headquarters:

In January 1947, DAG General Headquarters sent a letter to the CPG Central Committee Politburo requesting to be supplied with fighters, military and other material so that DAG could be prepared to successfully oppose and repel the opponent's planned general offensive... The request was rejected with an explanation that: "The tactic of the party is not to take power by an armed struggle..." (See: Chronology, Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war, p. 141.)

* * *

The examples shown above, as well as many other examples published by the party press and other publications, quite clearly and indisputably indicate that the CPG leadership's decisions, made in February 1946, not to build up the democratic forces and not to engage the Monarcho-fascist regime, actually gave the English and domestic reactionaries the time they needed to prepare for the offensives that followed. But all this is being ignored...

Not ignored however is a statement made by Zahariadis in Solun when he recognized NOF as an anti-fascist organization. (See: Laiki Foni, December 29, 1945.) Here is what some of the Macedonian authors had to say:

"This change in the CPG's views on NOF is due... to the new views and tendencies for revising the former attitude of the 'political

struggle' in the cities and for preparing the membership for the new armed struggle..." (Andonovski, *The Truth about Aegean Macedonia*, p. 188.)

"They (the Greek leaders) saw the need to settle their differences and unite with NOF in the armed struggle that was increasingly flaring up. But precisely because this became a necessity, which could not be avoided, they demanded that NOF be unconditionally placed under CPG leadership..." (Naum Peiov, *the Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece*, p. 147.)

"This kind of turn in the CPG attitude towards NOF was due to the orientation for an armed confrontation with the right that, without NOF's participation, could not be imagined..." (Risto Kiriazovski, unpublished work, p. 11.)

Clearly these statements do not correspond to the truth.

First, to claim that Zahariadis had been orienting the CPG towards an armed struggle with the political right as early as 1945, is ungrounded and far from the truth. That is not what happened.

Second, there was no turning point in the CPG's attitude towards NOF, just nice words spoken by Zahariadis, nice words about NOF which were later accepted as the thesis for an attitude reversal. This however is unfounded and contrary to what actually happened. Even after Zahariadis uttered those "nice words" nothing changed. The hostilities against the NOF leadership and activists that were there before continued to be there even after Zahariadis made his "good word" statement. Zahariadis's statement was made to aid the establishment of "unity," and not to aid the armed struggle or for the necessity to reinforce the armed struggle...

Allow me to clarify a few things:

It was Zahariadis himself who said: "Stop with that..." to the CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace, in March 1946, when the Bureau suggested that about 25,000 fighters could be recruited... It was Zahariadis himself who said: "There should not be more than 2,000 fighters in Macedonia." It was Zahariadis himself who said: "The

armed struggle is just a bluff!” Markos Vafiadis, then under Zahariadis’s command, said: “The period 1946-1947 was the most favourable time for the development of the armed struggle, even for the seizure of power... But... ELAS fighters were forbidden from joining the partisans. And those who did... were declared provocateurs...” And let us not forget the aforementioned letter from DAG Headquarters, sent in January 1947, to which Zahariadis replied: “The tactics of the party are not to take power with an armed struggle!”

But because all these frontal attacks against the Macedonian national liberation movement had little effect, NOF was getting stronger with time! With Zahariadis’s statement and with the establishment of “unity,” the right conditions were created to carry on the anti-Macedonian struggle from within, that is from within the ranks of the Macedonian national liberation movement. And this was used systematically and persistently. And like I said earlier, the Greek CPG leadership exacted heavy blows on the Macedonian national liberation movement and on the Macedonian people who were a natural ally and a pool for DAG reserves in the uprising in general. This is what actually happened... There was no “reversal” or any other kind of change in the CPG’s attitude towards the Macedonian people or NOF.

But by accepting this thesis that, because Zahariadis made this statement, the CPG’s attitude towards the Macedonian people had somehow changed for the better, we accept to conceal the deep anti-Macedonian politics of the Greek leaders...

* * *

The first half of the 1930’s was characterized by the general rise of the labour movement and the mass revolutionary struggle all throughout Europe. The ruling bourgeoisie was forced to give up its favourite bourgeois democracy and establish an open dictatorship where it was most dangerous for it, as it did in Germany, Spain and Greece for example.

The main causal factor for this development in the Greek state was Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia. The Macedonian people

living in Greek occupied Macedonia were survivors of Greek bourgeois extermination policies who, regardless of the provocative and treacherous CPG leadership maneuvers, instinctively strove to attach themselves to the party that supported the oppressed and exploited people, and that was the CPG. For anyone who does not know this, it may sound unconvincing and amazing.

And, as we now know, in order to save capitalist Greece intact with Greek occupied Macedonia attached to it, DAG and the revolution had to fail. But this was proving difficult even with the forces of the domestic bourgeoisie and their fifth column in the CPG and DAG leadership apparatus, and even with English engagement... American intervention proved to be necessary...

But, even though the causal factor for the revolution in Greece was Aegean Macedonia, the Macedonian people themselves were consistently ignored. They were ignored during the November 7, 1926 Greek parliamentary elections when the CPG became involved in the pre-election campaign, in which not one word was mentioned about the “completely disadvantaged Macedonian people” in Greece. When the renowned Renegade Eleftherios Stavridis was leader of the party the Greek leaders deferred the struggle for the democratic rights of Macedonian people. However, out of the ten Communist MPs elected, six were elected in Macedonia, and the other four in all of Greece. In other words, even after being ignored, the Macedonian people still gave the CPG their support.

Then, after Venizelos’s anti-Communist law was set aside, in the September 25, 1930, parliamentary elections, the CPG received about sixty thousand votes and ten more seats, while the Agricultural Left Party received seventy thousand votes and 11 seats, for a total of about 130,000 votes and 21 seats.

Most of these votes were cast in Macedonia.

In the upcoming elections, held on July 9, 1935, the number of votes the CPG received increased to about one hundred thousand, or about 10% of the total vote in the Greek state.

Again, most of these votes were cast in Macedonia. (See: History of the Macedonian people, book 3, p. 263.)

We are talking about one hundred thousand members and supporters, adult men, women and young people who had never voted before. This was a real army whose ranks were densest in Macedonia. Influenced by the CPG, this kind of growing force and under these conditions represented a mortal danger for the domestic bourgeoisie. There was no question that Macedonia was going to become the main focus of the revolution...

This proved to be the main hallmark of the time which decisively influenced and determined the practical politics of the Greek “patriots” in the CPG leadership and in the domestic bourgeoisie.

Generally, this is what happened:

The bourgeoisie camp resolutely went on intensive preparations for organizing a coup. They established an open dictatorship in order to abolish the people’s democratic rights and freedoms in order to prevent the existence and growth of revolutionary forces in the country.

Through the Third Plenum and the Sixth Congress, held in March and December 1935, for their part, the “Greek patriots” in the CPG leadership led by Zahariadis, demonstratively attacked the democratic rights of the Macedonian people, proclaiming Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia to be a constituent part of the old Greek homeland. They also proclaimed that the Macedonian people, as a nation in the Greek homeland, had no right to self-determination and secession from Greece. Naturally this was a blow to the Macedonian people, the CPG’s natural ally and reserve for the workers movement and for the revolution in Greece. But, why did the CPG do this? It did this to break the Macedonian people’s sympathy and their adherence to the CPG and turn them against the CPG. In other words, to isolate and weaken the CPG in Macedonia...

But, as it turned out, this was not possible because the Macedonians could not lose something that they never had. The Macedonians never had any rights from the day Greece occupied Macedonian

territories. This anti-Macedonian decision at the Sixth Congress did practically nothing to the Macedonian people because nothing has changed...

In the meantime the reactionary dark forces led by Glieksburg and Metaxas, in their persistent effort to organize a coup and establish a dictatorship, quite unexpectedly, realized they did not have the funds to do it and turned to the capitalists for help. As it turned out the then capitalist leaders did not understand why there was need for an open dictatorship and showed no willingness to finance it, especially when they did not foresee any returns from it. The modern press (especially the party press) often wrote about it, warning the public about a coup being prepared by the reactionaries.

But, as Metaxas explained, it was wise to “invest a little now in order to save a lot later”. (As a contemporary, I remember reading about this in the press.)

Unfortunately things did not go as expected...

Then, suddenly, something completely unexpected and incredible happened. In a parliamentary debate on April 27, 1936, Sklavenas, then leader of the CPG group in the Greek parliament and member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, in the name of the CPG, declared that the CPG would fight for the recognition of the Macedonian nation in Greece and for its self-determination.

In particular, he said:

“Another issue this government has ignored in its declarations is the issue of giving minorities living in Greece full equality with the Greek population...”

He was referring mainly to the Macedonian people when he said this. He then went on to say:

“Anyone who has passed through (Greek occupied) Macedonia, especially in those areas where the Macedonians were a compact mass, would have certainly noticed the extraordinary oppression they were experiencing. They have no right to have Macedonian

schools to speak the Macedonian language or to practice their own customs... This kind of situation would certainly make the Macedonian population organize and fight to win those rights...

The victors of the Great War and the League of Nations proclaimed the right of the oppressed nations to self-determination. We fully acknowledge this right for the Macedonian nation..." (History of the Macedonian people, book 3, p. 268.)

This "theatrical" performance in the Greek parliament was characterized by the principle of revolutionary consistency and, without a doubt, was one of the most glaring moments in the declarative politics of the Greek CPG leaders... in regards to the Macedonian national question.

There is an attachment in the three-volume edition of "The History of the Macedonian People", which assesses the Macedonian people's demands for national equality in this (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia (book 3, p. 268.)

Andonovski, in his book "The Truth about Aegean Macedonia", has also provided a similar assessment about Sklavenas's "theatrical" performance in the Greek parliament with regards to Macedonian rights... (p. 73.)

In his article "The Macedonian national question through the Politics of the CPG during the National Liberation Struggle", Todor Simovski, historian at the Institute of National History in Skopje, wrote: "The CPG should be honoured... the fact that after the Sixth Congress and the change of the CPG's stance on the Macedonian national question, just before the Metaxas dictatorship, Stilianos Sklavenas, communist people's representative of the Solun electoral district, on April 27, 1936, in the Greek People's Assembly, defended the Macedonian people under Greek rule from terror and denationalization..." (See: "Glasnik", No. 2-3/1970, p. 26.)

As far as I know, Sklavenas's "theatrical" performance in the Greek parliament is generally accepted as a positive thing in our historiography.

However, it is necessary to mention that, accidentally or not, some things were left in the dark. Namely:

No one was eager to mention the fact that the Macedonian people, just four months ago, lost their rights when, during the CPG Sixth Congress, Macedonia was referred to as part of the old Greek homeland and the Macedonian people officially lost their right to self-determination. Accordingly, the CPG declaration in the Greek Parliament which fully recognized and supported the right of the Macedonian nation to self-determination, did not result from the CPG's official line on the Macedonian national question and did not represent the application of that line. Quite the opposite...

As we know, the CPG line adopted during the Sixth Congress never changed for a long time, until the beginning of 1949. Accordingly, the declaration in the Greek parliament was not intended to bring change to that line.

Most importantly, after the declaration was made in parliament, nothing was done organizationally, technically or any other practical measures taken to “support the Macedonian nation” to organize and fight, and as Skavenas put it, “fight for elementary civil, national and democratic rights...’ On the contrary:

If the Greek CPG leadership wanted to grant rights to the Macedonian people why did they not create IMRO (United)? And exactly through Sklavenas, why did the Greek CPG leaders not follow up on the “famous initiative” to create this organization after having accepted to do it for a whole decade? Why did they ignore this? Why did they only act after being criticized and pressured from the outside? And after all that no functioning IMRO (United) came to exist in Greek occupied Macedonia?

Even after being pressured by outside forces, the Greek CPG leadership still managed to avoid creating a functional Macedonian IMRO (United) organization. This initiative disappeared without a trace in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia like water in sand. Namely, the IMRO (United) that was “formed” remained nominal and fictitious without a statute and program, without a political line or political activities. The stillborn IMRO (United) Central

Committee, based in Solun, managed nothing. Nothing depended on it and nothing was left of it. The people of whom the organization was composed did everything they could but were unsuccessful. In their endeavours to communicate with the Macedonian people and broadly affirm the Macedonian movement, they acquired a typewriter with Cyrillic letters and set up their office in an antique shop belonging to a Jew in Solun, with the intention of starting a revolutionary press in the Macedonian native language intended to directly touch the hearts of Macedonian people. (INI, Book 3, p. 267.) Even after all that, they remained without a voice. The Greek CPG leaders, headed by Zahariadis, did not allow the publication of a Macedonian newspaper, did not allow the affirmation of the Macedonian people amidst the Greek people, and did not allow the affirmation of elementary democratic rights and freedoms for the Macedonian people in the Greek state.

After their newspaper was shut down, the people of IMRO (United) decided to purchase and disseminate other Macedonian revolutionary newspapers printed abroad (“Balkan Federation” and “Macedonian Work”). At first, the Greek leaders seemed to tolerate them but soon afterwards they banned them. Georgi Krontsedchev from Voden, the person responsible for receiving the newspapers in Solun and distributing them, was detained and immediately liquidated by the police.

There is barely any historical information available about the creation and existence of IMRO (United) in the Greek (occupied) part of Macedonia both before and after Sklavenas’s “theatrical” performance in the Greek parliament.

When all this is taken into consideration, one will inevitably have to conclude that Sklavenas’s performance was just another verbal and declarative maneuver well-placed by Zahariadis and his comrades from the CPG leadership. Only empty words with nothing to back them...

Obviously, there was another reason why Sklavenas voiced this issue in the Greek parliament and it is not because the CPG Greek leadership cared about the fate of the Macedonian people, their struggle or their democratic rights. Given how the CPG leaders

treated the Macedonian people in practice in general, it would be foolish to believe that Sklavenas did what he did in parliament for the good of the Macedonian people.

It is also foolish to think that Sklavenas did this in front of the Greek parliament for nothing... just throwing words in the wind. This was not just a meaningless gesture on the part of Zahariadis and his CPG leadership comrades. We know that thirteen years later, during the CPG Central Committee Fifth Plenum, held in January 1949, Zahariadis and the CPG leadership also came out before the Greek public with a similar declaration. This is what Zahariadis said: “As a result of DAG’s victory and the people’s revolution, the Macedonian people under Greece will accomplish their complete national establishment according to their will. They will be self-determined...” It was a well-timed classic Zahariadis maneuver in order to mass mobilize the Macedonian population around the border zone and bring it to its physical destruction. At the same time it was a well-planned maneuver to provoke the political right into action and into blaming the CPG for its treacherous anti-Greek politics. As a result huge masses of Greek people were mobilized to fight against DAG and against the revolution to save Greece and to hold onto Macedonia.

This is not my own or someone else’s guess. It is not a “rash” interpretation of events. Unfortunately it is exactly what happened. It is a fact...

In the given case, Sklavenas’s appearance in parliament was also a provocative maneuver that gave the bourgeois a timely pressing opportunity to begin a real storm against the CPG, anathematizing it as the bearer of the “Slavic danger” against Greece. At the same time, the CPG’s tremendous power and influence forced the capitalist leaders to rethink their choice if they made a mistake not financing the fascist coup.

Zahariadis helped the capitalists finally decide right at this critical moment. Namely: Immediately after Sklavenas spoke in parliament, the CPG organized a wave of strikes and demonstrations all across Greece. The situation amplified itself with each passing day until it reached its peak in Solun on May 8-9, 1936. The army that was sent

to quell the riots then joined the demonstrators and took control of the city. Solun was the second largest city in the Greek state, after Athens. Here the Greek police was forced to retreat and barricade itself in the police stations.

But immediately afterwards, this people's victory and that of the army was destroyed and converted into a reactionary triumph.

Zahariadis sent K. Theos, a member of the Politburo, to "negotiate" and sign the capitulation of the uprising with the Metaxas government (allegedly without any reprisals from the government). The rebel leaders and other CPG activists were then ordered to send the people to their homes and jobs and the soldiers back to their barracks.

After that Zahariadis said that he handed the city back to the reactionaries because at the very moment the Party did not have the organizational and technical ability to take power. In other words the Party was not "ready" to take power.

The inevitable question that arises from this then is:

Why did Zahariadis start these demonstrations and take over Solun in the first place, and then so easily hand it back to the enemy?

Also, if the party did not intend to change its line on the Macedonian national question adopted during the Sixth Congress, then why did Sklavenas contradict the CPG line in the Greek parliament when he declared that the CPG recognizes and supports the right of the Macedonian nation to self-determination (and secession from the Greek state)?

Elevterios Stavridis, former "general secretary" (as he called himself) and CPG deputy in the Greek parliament, after leaving the CPG and returning to the bourgeois camp, wrote: "It is quite clear that the May 9, 1936, Solun events, were one of Metaxas's strategic maneuvers to better justify the establishment of his dictatorship. He used the CPG strikingly well... He allowed the CPG to lead and pull the masses, so that Solun, the capital of Northern Greece, would appear like it had fallen into communist hands. Then, when the

anticipated strategic maneuver fulfilled its objective and reached its culminating point there was a counterattack... As a political strategy, the maneuver Metaxas pulled was marvelous...” (Στα παρασκήνια του ΚΚΕ, Αθήνα, 1953, p. 493-494.)

Stavridis argued that, while these large demonstrations in Solun were taking place and were deliberately left to grow until the army and the people achieved victory over the police, there were other major military forces stationed somewhere outside of the city ready to intervene at any moment.

If this were true then the surrender would have been completely normal. But no such military forces intervened. The people’s victory was destroyed and turned into a reactionary triumph for nothing and in a much more efficient way.

In other words, the Greek CPG leadership pushed the party organization activists onto the streets and then handed them over to Metaxas’s *asfalia* (secret service) and police.

A massive hunt for communists followed. Many of the party organizations in Solun and all throughout Macedonia were completely uprooted. The Metaxas counterattack, of which Stavridis spoke, was successful thanks to the betrayal of people the likes of Stavridis (exponents of the domestic bourgeoisie) and many others like him who served at the top of the CPG leadership.

The fascist coup was implemented right after these events and the so-called Fourth of August dictatorial Glieksburg-Metaxas regime came to power. The necessary funds they needed were found in abundance.

All these, of course, are not my own assumptions. They are not a “rash and unreasonable” interpretation of events. This is exactly what happened. These are the facts...

Unfortunately, there are those among our people who were called upon to write our history in this (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia, who are of the opinion that: Sklavenas’s “theatrical” performance in the Greek parliament was a reflection, that is, a

consequence of the famous April 1934, Comintern decision on the Macedonian national question. This view of Sklavenas's performance however is incorrect because it does not explain:

- a) Why the Comintern decision did not affect the official CPG line with regards to the Macedonian national question, which remained anti-Macedonian?
- b) Why the Comintern decision, not in the least, was upheld or reflected in a practical sense in any of the party organizations, in the Party's political programs or in any of the Party's political actions? Why the publication and dissemination of Macedonian revolutionary materials was prohibited?
- c) Why did it take two years, from April 1934, when the Comintern decision was made, until April 1936, when Sklavenas brought it up in the Greek parliament, for the Macedonian national question to be mentioned in public in the Greek bourgeois parliament instead of a CPG Central Committee sitting? Why suddenly and precisely at a certain particular moment exactly when Metaxas was in need to justify a coup and the establishment of a dictatorship?

One can also reason the act this way: "Using his parliamentary immunity, Sklavenas decided to tell the parliament what he could not tell them outside of it..."

One can also interpret Sklavenas's performance in the way he himself later portrayed it: "That he was a daring revolutionary who risked everything for the Macedonians..." One can almost say that he was a hero.

There are many ways Sklavenas's performance can be interpreted but there is only one truth and it is quite different. Namely, the CPG then was a legal organization and Sklavenas's performance was published by "Rizospastis", a CPG organ, on April 28, 1936, along with the brochure with the text of what was discussed in the Greek Parliament. (T. Simovski, "Glasnik" No. 2-3 / 1970, p. 27, also see: H. Andonovski, *The Truth about Aegean Macedonia*, p. 81.) Before that, during the CPG Sixth Congress, the Macedonian national question was freely discussed.

I decided at this point to mention this arbitrary and irresponsible interpretation because it is still supported by some of our people who consider these events to be part of our history. In other words there are those among us who are bearers and distributors of this erroneous belief...

* * *

There are many examples that show the Greek CPG leadership's attitude taken towards the Macedonian people where the Greeks have said one thing and done another. The good words expressed in such moments, together with the general thesis that the Greek leaders never officially contested that the Macedonian people are a separate nation, cannot have another purpose but to:

- Twist the historical truth. Hide, blur and throw fog and smoke on their profound anti-Macedonian practices.

This is a refined combination of pro-minority verbal principles verses anti-Macedonian practices. The first façade always stands out and the second remains hidden behind the first.

As I mentioned earlier, it is usually the façade or nice words that are accepted and any anomalies are explained as omissions, weaknesses, mistakes... supposedly inevitable in dealing with Macedonian issues... There cannot be life without mistakes, right? This is how the Greek CPG leadership has been hiding behind the anti-Macedonian acts it has committed. Now let us have a look at the official CPG line with regards to "Full Equality for Minorities"...

Even though the CPG officially supported in principle "full equality for minorities" in Greece, in practice it acted as if no Macedonians existed in Greece, not even in Greek occupied Macedonia, their ancestral home.

The Greek leaders in principle never officially contested that the Macedonian people are a separate nation, but in practice they maintained that:

- Macedonia is as Greek as Attica! Meaning no Macedonians existed in Macedonia.
- The Macedonians are “Slavophone Greeks”!
- The Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement must be suppressed!
- The bearers of the Macedonian ideals must be “cleansed”!
- The Macedonian people must be deprived of their own literacy. Literacy, created by order of the Greek CPG leaders, must be imposed on them.
- The Macedonian people must be deprived of their literary language and grammar and a different language and grammar must be imposed on them, created by the wishes and orders of the CPG Greek leaders who very much care for their “Slavophone Greeks”!

These practices that the CPG imposed on the Macedonian people were never part of the CPG official line and to this day have remained a classified secret. These anomalies, explained as omissions, weaknesses, mistakes... supposedly inevitable in dealing with Macedonian issues, are not random but actual and intentional CPG practices.

There are a lot of illusions and self-deceptions in our history. That is why it is necessary for our historiography to come out of its fake and tragic position as soon as possible. It is time to leave the façade, or nice words, out of our main basic subject for research and become engaged in the analysis of the real politics - the Greek CPG leadership anti-Macedonian practices...

* * *

The Macedonian liberation movement, until the fascist occupation, existed mainly in the form of passive resistance. It was smoldering...

Under the conditions created by the neighbouring nations, during the fascist occupation, where each nation was struggling for its own rights and freedom, the outbreak of the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement was inevitable. It broke out in the form of an active organized resistance.

The Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement developed not only without CPG help but quite the opposite. It had to fight to protect itself from Greek hostilities including those perpetrated by the Greek CPG leadership, which cost it both human and material losses.

In the end, it was Zahariadis and his cronies, and not the reactionaries from Athens, who managed to destroy the Macedonian movement. Included in the destruction were the most elite Macedonian fighters and many dozens of Macedonian patriotic villages around the border zone.

And before that, after DAG was transformed from a partisan hit and run army into a stationary army, a target for the opponent's military machinery, the CPG and DAG leaderships made heavy allegations against the Macedonian anti-fascist liberation movement accusing it of being a "counterrevolutionary movement which was helping the reactionary regime in Athens to turn the Greek people against DAG and help the antirevolutionary forces defeat DAG and the revolution".

According to Minister Averov, a friend of Prime Minister Karamanlis and a well-known member and representative of the governing bourgeois circles in Greece, who wrote about the period after the interim democratic government of Greece was reorganized somewhere on the "free territory", when Mitrevski, Kotsopoulos and Koitsis were appointed into "senior management positions" in the interim government and in DAG's military council, sometime in March 1949, the CPG thus was implementing a new line in regards to the Macedonian national question. Minister Averov alleged that the CPG intended to carve out part of Greece's territory, above all the Greek region of Macedonia... At this point Averov called for the complete isolation of the CPG in Greece... and for strengthening the

will of the Greek people to break the rebels... (Αβερωφ, Φοτια και τσεκουρι , Greek edition 2, p. 435.)

* * *

As we can see, the management circles of both opposing camps have equally looked at this issue.

It is true that the CPG eventually found itself completely isolated in Greece and that the regime in Athens managed to turn the Greek people against DAG and against the revolution and, in the end, defeat them. It is also true that the opponent, in order to succeed in this, among other things, used the Macedonian organized struggle and NOF in its propaganda campaign.

However, it is not true that the Macedonian people were guilty of all of this just because they were organized in a struggle.

Above all the Macedonian struggle was a sacred struggle just like the struggle of any conquered people who fight for their survival and dignity. It is a crime to suppress such a struggle...

We also have to consider that no uprising ever erupts because it is given consent, or allowed to... The outbreak of the Macedonian national liberation movement was a historic event of inevitability. It was a natural consequence of general historical changes in all of Macedonia and not just in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part. It was a result of changes in the Balkans and generally changes brought about by the Second World War. The outbreak was unstoppable like any other occurrence in nature. If a rainstorm erupts and flood waters cause damage in the field of politics, only those who manage the field are at fault.

There were hundreds of thousands of Greek people in the “Greek interior”, who fled to save themselves when they came face to face with the Macedonian battalions. Why? The Macedonians posed no threat to them. They fled because they were misinformed as to who the Macedonians were. As a result these fleeing people found themselves in the cities which were controlled by the CPG’s enemy and collected and turned into reserves for the enemy. First, knowing

the situation in southern Greece, why did the CPG send Macedonians there and not Greeks? Second, why did the CPG not inform the local people that these “Slavic speaking” soldiers were Macedonians and friends of the local people? The CPG sent the Macedonian battalions south because it wanted to discredit and compromised both itself (CPG) and DAG. It wanted to prove to the Greek people that it had allied itself with the Slavs, that is, it allied itself with the bearers of the “Slavic danger” against Greece. This is precisely why DAG units with Macedonian soldiers were sent to the interior of Greece!

This did not happen by accident! The Macedonian battalions were sent there by order from the top CPG leadership. As a result this CPG act helped its enemy in two ways. One, it forced the local people to join the enemy camp and strengthen its opponent. And two, the CPG managed to destroy the Macedonian battalions which it feared were posing a danger to Greece. It should be obvious from all this that the CPG had no intention of allowing the Macedonian liberation movement to exist and grow or to develop a strong revolutionary force in Greece.

Namely, the CPG never planned in their practical policy to develop and affirm the struggle of the Macedonian people for their elementary freedoms and rights in the Greek state, but on the contrary:

As I said earlier, the CPG systematically suppressed the Macedonian struggle and prevented it from affirming itself in Greece. It did everything in its power to prevent the Macedonian people from developing revolutionary activities, Macedonian national organizations, Macedonian revolutionary publications, etc...

There was more to it than that: When the Macedonian national liberation movement erupted and began to organize and actively resist, the CPG tried to stifle it... but failed. It then, through CPG appointed leaders attempted to convert it into a Greek-supremacist movement, by representing the Macedonians as “Slavophone Greeks”, that is, a Slavophone part of the Greek people...

Here is another sequence of events:

- About two months after NOF for the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia was formed, the Greek CPG leaders, through the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum, declared that the Greek position and the northern Greek borders were uncertain and threatened.

- At the same time the CPG declared England as “a great friend” of Greece which allowed for English political and military presence in Greece. The CPG justified the English interference in Greek internal affairs as necessary “in order to secure our position in the north and to safeguard our northern borders...” (Zahariadis) At the same time England organized and financed the breakdown of the left democratic forces and, above all, the breakdown of the CPG itself.

- The CPG leadership refused to take advantage of the large masses of organized people and available reserves for DAG, because, according to Zahariadis, the armed struggle was only a bluff. The revolution reserves waited passively and in anticipation of the armed struggle... However, the CPG had no plans to take power with an armed struggle. And as it turned out, the CPG had no plans at all to take power in Greece.

- Even though DAG could have grown into a massive force, as was expected, and could have reached past the critical point of winning the war, it was held back because it posed a danger to the English presence in Greece. In other words, DAG and the revolution were condemned to fail well in advance... by none other than the CPG leadership itself.

- The years went by, and still DAG was held back. It was never allowed to grow to its natural limit or start an offensive against the enemy. It just stood back and absorbed attack after attack until the English finally lost their breath and could no longer continue to finance this endless war. But, instead of taking advantage of its real enemy, the CPG created the right conditions for the Americans to intervene.

- DAG, under Markos Vafiadis's guidance, was doing well fighting a guerilla war based on hit and run tactics. But then Zahariadis

removed him and turned DAG into a sitting duck by converting it into a stationary army. DAG had no weapons to fight a fronted war, yet Zahariadis made it stand still so that it could be pounded by its massive opponent who possessed not only a huge army but also tanks, artillery and aviation. Thanks to Zahariadis DAG was forced to stand still so that the enemy could smash it.

- DAG was robbed of its real power when it was converted from a moving to a stationary army. Vafiadis insisted that DAG remain a partisan hit and run army but Zahariadis used his power to veto him, a result of which Vafiadis almost lost his head. It is not that Zahariadis did not know what he was doing, but rather Zahariadis chose to bring treachery to his own forces in order to give his opponent the opportunity to win.

When all this is taken into consideration, it is impossible to believe that the Macedonian people and their movement were somehow guilty of causing DAG's destruction and bringing defeat to the revolution. On the contrary, the Macedonian fighters and people were the main driving force behind DAG and the revolution in the northern part of Greece... where these betrayals took place. The Macedonian people were the ones who were betrayed and fell victim to this war...

About a decade later, in a special interview with the Athens newspaper "TA NEA" and with the Solun newspaper "ELINIKOS VORAS", General Markos Vafiadis finally said: "Zahariadis loved that catastrophe... He worked for it with a plan... We were betrayed by the Party leadership!" (See ELINIKOS VORAS, August 3, 1978.) Vafiadis also said: "At the time I still had not come to the conclusion that Zahariadis was a provocateur... Zahariadis played the English and American game..." D. Gusidis, a correspondent asked Vafiadis: "What evidence do you have for all the accusations you made today? Are there any documents...?" Vafiadis's reply was: "I have documents... And the events speak for themselves...!" (See TA NEA, August 22, 1978)...

As a contemporary and participant in that war, I cannot forget the comment one of the enemy generals made soon after DAG was defeated. He said: The good god of Greece (the bourgeoisie of

Greece) wanted Zahariadis to defeat Markos! Otherwise, today Greece (bourgeois rule in Greece) would not exist!

That is correct. It is easy to recognize the many known alien dark forces under the good god of the bourgeoisie...

(1978/79)

IX. MATERIALS ON THE HISTORY OF THE MACEDONIAN NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT IN THE AEGEAN PART OF MACEDONIA

To the editorial board of the magazine “History”
Skopje

I am submitting the enclosed text “Problems from our recent history” in exchange for the text “CPG, EAM, ELAS and the Macedonian people”, which I delivered to you on February 14th this year (1983), and now I am withdrawing...

In its time the famous book “Aegean Storms”, written by Vangel Aianovski-Oche, picked up a lot of dust. On the “History” editorial board’s suggestion I wrote a critical review of that book which was then published in “History”, number 1. 1978.

A few years later, Dr. Risto Kiriazovski responded with his own remarks which were then published in “History”, number 2. 1981. On that occasion, I reacted with the text that I am now withdrawing, and I am withdrawing it exclusively because I limit myself and I am only highlighting one of the issues in Kiriazovski’s “remarks”.

Common acquaintances and friends (his and mine) have said to me: You have nothing to say? Or do you agree with Kiriazovski? In other words they are telling me to engage in clarifying all the issues brought up by Kiriazovski. So the text that I am submitting to you now deals with all the issues...

In his “response”, incomprehensible to me as to why, Dr. Risto Kiriazovski started out by throwing personal insults at me. Even more than that, he publicly blames me of being an anti-party element that “harshly attacks and slanders the CPM and CPY in general...” (History, 2/81, p. 295.) However, it is a fact that he is opening a lot of questions from our recent history. And with the publication of this text, he has practically put all these questions in “History” on the agenda before historians and the wider public. That’s perfectly normal, of course. The magazine itself is there for that purpose: to contribute to the clarification of issues in our history and to sharpen the truth...

But, what I particularly don’t care about are Kiriazovski’s personal insults and accusations made in public. My aim is to only deal with clarifying events and establishing the truth. I am doing this with help from well-known source documents of that time. By doing so, I am firmly convinced that I am most effectively defending myself by defending the truth...

Please do not reject my attached text by succumbing to pressures. I know from my own personal experience that people will say something like this: “Stop all discussions on this subject, because these things are not for the public to know”. Please allow me to assure you that there is nothing new in the accompanying text that has not been previously published. I operate exclusively with already known documents from that time. People may even say something like this: “Do not reply to Rakovski, he is an anti-party element, suspicious, and so on...” These comments, of course, are similar to the accusations made by Kiriazovski and some of his comrades who, with or without him, usually act in such a manner...

I rarely write and only a little bit at a time. Having said that, I have written a brochure entitled “The Macedonian national question through the politics of the CPG” which was then published in its entirety in “Glasnik” (number 3/1968). I have written a similar text on the same topic which was then published in two parts in the Macedonian edition “Communist” in May 1971. Our magazine “History” has also published some of my texts including my critical review of the article “On the roots of evil”. The Skopje magazine

“Pogledi” number 8/1980 has also published my article “Toward the perception of historical truth”. I previously offered this article to the “Glasnik” editorial board but it was rejected at Kiriazovski’s insistence...

In the end I have one more suggestion: I have over two hundred printed pages of historical material which could prove to be useful to the multi volume “History of the Macedonian people” being currently prepared. If you are interested call me at 261-750...

Skopje, 20.IV.1983

Sincerely, yours

Pavle Rakovski

PROBLEMS FROM OUR MOST RECENT HISTORY (Materials about the history of the Macedonian National Liberation Movement in the Aegean part of Macedonia)

An article written by Dr. Risto Kiriazovski was recently published in the journal "History" (number 2/1981) entitled "Response to Pavle Rakovski's critical review of the book 'Aegean Storms' by Vangel Aianovski-Oche." (History edition, number 1/1978.)

In the interest of truth all facts must be revealed.

1.

a) "Pavel Rakovski", wrote Kiriazovski, "has introduced misinformation about the formation of the ELAS Macedonian Voden Battalion in June 1944. According to original documents preserved from that time, regarding the formation of the ELAS Macedonian Battalion, as well as the formation of the Kostur and Lerin Region battalion, there were discussions that took place in the CPG Macedonian Bureau, in the ELAS group headquarters in Macedonia, in ELAS General Headquarters... during which a final decision was made to form the battalion. This resolution was passed by the CPG Central Committee Politburo. The task for forming the battalion was entrusted to the Voden Region CPG District Committee, and its practical implementation was entrusted to Dzhodzho Urdov, then district committee organizing secretary, and to activist Kole Pop-Sermitchiev. Pavel Rakovski, as well as some of the other activists, was involved in the action as reserve ELAS regional activist, and not as a member of the CPG regional committee, as he claims!" (Page 289.)

Accordingly, the Macedonian people were able to have these two separate battalions within ELAS thanks to the CPG, EAM and ELAS leaders...

b) In connection with this, Vangel Aianovski-Oche, then activist in Voden, in his book "Aegean storms", published by INI, testified that:

“Around July 20, 1944, news reached the District Committee that many Macedonian anti-fascists from Meglen Region had massively moved to Kaimakchalan with a desire to join the partisan units. This move, of Macedonians going to the mountains, the District Committee estimated was due to Yugoslav partisan influence. There were Yugoslav partisans at the time stationed on Kozhuv Mountain. The District Committee ordered them to stop their activities. Dzhodzho Urdov, then CPG organizing secretary for Voden, together with Risto Kordalov, Tushi Keramitchiev and several members of the diversionary group were ordered to go to Kaimakchalan and disband the newly formed partisan units. They were ordered to use force if they encountered resistance.

As it turned out the people from Meglen Region armed themselves and took to the mountains on their own initiative. They decided on their own that they wanted to fight against the occupier and in no way were influenced or directed by the Yugoslav partisans!” (p. 135-136.)

c) Rakovski, one of the direct participants in the creation of the ELAS Macedonian Voden Battalion, said:

“At its June 1, 1944 session, the Macedonian CPG-EAM Regional Committee for the Macedonian region based in the village Tresino in Meglen Region, decided to immediately carry out mobilization in the Macedonian villages. Secretary Barba Traiko (Nikos Papasermidzis) who agreed with the decision, set off to look for the secret place where the CPG Regional Committee headquarters was located in order to obtain further clarification and direct approval.

The starting point for making this decision began with my introductory statement that I made at the session, as follows:

- For many years with their cruelty and inhumanity, the Greek bourgeois authorities forced many Macedonian people to leave their hearths and move around the world outside of the Greek state. Those who could not leave were punished and their attachment to the Greek state was repeatedly destroyed, which imposed the need for resistance.

- The Bulgarian-fascist autonomist movement with its slogan forward for a “Free Autonomous Macedonia” (within “brotherly Bulgaria”, or “mother Bulgaria”) was spreading dangerously and in the absence of attachment to the Greek state, was strong motivation for freedom from Greek slavery.

- The Party line was “full equality of minorities”. The situation created in our country imperatively demanded and required a consistent change of that line - a transition from just words to action... A Macedonian military unit appeared in Kaimakchalan and presented itself as a Macedonian national military unit with a political centre which attracted the revolutionary minded Macedonian youth from Voden Region and beyond. The formation of the Macedonian military units was a direct response to the autonomist movement and “Ohrana”, its military wing, as well as to the hated Greek police, both of which were receiving weapons from the Germans and Bulgarians and abusing the Macedonians...

- Even though the creation of a separate ELAS Macedonian unit in Voden Region was consistent with the Party line application of “equality” there was still the matter for which we did not have a special directive. However, our regional committee was precisely there to raise the people in an armed struggle against the fascist occupiers... No one should be asking for cutting our heads off because we were consistent and successful with the implementation of the party line, both for equality and for mobilizing the people in the armed struggle.

- One should pay particular attention to the fight against the autonomist movement which was not based on old divisions: patriarchates versus exarchates. No, the partisan units were not “Grkomani” (Macedonians loyal to the Greek cause) fighting against “Bugaromani” (Macedonians loyal to the Bulgarian cause). That would have been a tragedy. Our Macedonian military units must be the material force of the Macedonian national ideal!

We acted in that spirit. We started the mobilization together with Giorgi Atanasov-Blazhe in the village Dolno Pozharsko (known as an Exarchate village), and continued in the village Baovo (known as a Patriarchate village). The mobilization was a success. And as is

well-known, the ELAS Voden Macedonian Battalion recruited most of its volunteer fighters from these two villages. There was no trace of any division between the old Grkomani and Bugaromani. It turned out that the carriers of the old divisions were completely gone as if they had never existed. In fact, those who supported the foreign causes were mainly activists and paid propagandists who could not survive the strength of the new Macedonian movement and disappeared.

On June 16, 1944, the next day after its sitting, the ELAS Macedonian Battalion in Voden Region became a reality. One month later, Renos Mihaleas created the ELAS Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion. This battalion too was welcomed by our comrades in the CPG, EAM and ELAS leaderships. It was understandable that this would ease the tension in the Macedonians due to SNOF's dissolution, and due to the pressure created by Vancho Mihailov's "Ohrana" with its 700 well-armed autonomists, that is, the Bulgarians who could seriously jeopardize the Greek position and interests in this part of (Greek occupied) Macedonia. They had to be smashed, and that was the easiest and most painless way to do it... with the Macedonian battalions! (Pavle Rakovski.)

d) This is what happened when the ELAS Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion was created: Renos Mihaleas, then representative of the ELAS IX Division, instead of following the famous CPG and ELAS order to create a separate Macedonian unit on Ilinden (August 2, 1944), he created the ELAS Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion. He was harshly criticized for doing that. When he was asked by the secretary (Leonidas Stringos, Secretary of the CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace): "Why did you create an entire battalion when your orders were to create only one unit...?"

Renos replied: "What would have been the damage if even divisions were created...?"

To which the secretary said: "You are so naïve... If the Macedonians had divisions, we Greeks would not be in Macedonia!" (Letter from Renaos Mihaleas to D. Radosavlievich, handwritten in Greek, INI archives, Skopje.)

Conclusion: Both the Voden and Kostur-Lerin Macedonian battalions were created contrary to CPG, EAM and ELAS leadership plans. That is why their life was cut short. As we now know, the Macedonian battalions were attacked so that they could be totally smashed, disarmed and liquidated. And that is why they were forced to retreat to the Yugoslav part of Macedonia... This is the truth about what happened. And this reveals the true attitude of our Greek friends in the CPG, EAM and ELAS leaderships, towards the Macedonian national liberation movement and towards the Macedonian people in general...

2.

Kiriazovski wrote: “At the beginning of his review, with aims of confronting Aianovski with the entire NOF leadership, Pavle Rakovski unfoundedly and tendentiously asserted that Aianovski was the one who allegedly attacked the NOF leaders for signing the KOEM resolution against the CPY on June 20, 1949. However, the truth is completely different. Aianovski sharply criticized only those NOF-KOEM leaders who not only signed it, but expressed themselves in practice and implemented the KOEM resolution!” (Page 288.)

Rakovski wrote: On page 406 in his book “Aegean Storms”, Vangel Ajanovski wrote that the overall KOEM-NOF leadership, all those, without exception, who then fought on the ground and constituted the “managing asset of KOEM-NOF” (among whom he is not) were traitors. He then went on to name each one specifically by name and surname! (p. 383-389.)

This is the truth. I (Rakovski) have neither “unfoundedly” nor “tendentiously” pointed out any of this in my review, especially to confront Aianovski with the KOEM-NOF leadership. Aianovski himself did this on his own.

In fact, the way Aianovski has written his book “Aegean Storms”, one would think that the revolution in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia began and ended with Vangel Aianovski as the main character of the plot. His book is a work of fiction designed to

disqualify and politically bury the entire KOEM-NOF managing asset. Again this is the truth...

3.

Kiriazovski wrote: “With aims at minimizing Aianovski’s revolutionary activities, or for some other purpose, Rakovski is insinuating that Aianovski and the Political Commission of the Macedonians under Greece was dealing with some kind of informational, and not organizational and political activities. By spreading this kind of dubious misinformation Pavle Rakovski, very clearly, was serving those who were on the side of the Informburo!” (p. 289.)

Rakovski wrote: There is no “insinuation” at all in Rakovski’s critical remarks about the Political Committee, of which Rakovski was a member, “dealing with some kind of informational, and not organizational and political activities”.

There is no such opinion in Rakovski’s review.

Accordingly, the accusations made against Rakovski that he allegedly was spreading “dubious misinformation” that supposedly served “those who were on the side of the Informburo” were false. Simply put, this was blind desire to make Rakovski look like he was on the side of the Informburo... Having accomplished that then Aianovski would be the foremost journalist of the Macedonian national liberation movement in the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia. His numerous transplanted reports and newsletters would be the main content in the separate volumes of the “Aegean Macedonia and the National Liberation War” edition. This is the truth...

4.

Kiriovski wrote: “In order to challenge or downplay the activities of MAO, the Macedonian anti-fascist organization, Pavle Rakovski said that in Meglen and Ostrovo Regions around Voden, where he allegedly worked as an illegal in 1942 and 1943, there was no news or information coming in. Here Pavle Rakovski serves us with more

misinformation. Namely, in 1943 he did not work as an illegal because there was no need for illegal work given the fact that these regions were liberated!” (Page 289.)

Rakovski wrote: The island area through which the Solun-Voden-Bitola railway passed remained under German occupation until the last day of the German withdrawal from Greece. Rakovski, along with young Todor Simovski-Laki and a few other illegal people, worked there from about November 1943 until May 1944, for a total of about seven months. Simovski, however, only found out about the existence of MAO many years later, here in Skopje, from the people of Voden Region. Rakovski learned about MAO from Simovski. Neither Rakovski nor Simovski knew anything about MAO while they were working in the field in Voden. So, to say that Rakovski’s “goal” was to challenge or downplay MAO’s activities is not only wrong but an attempt to divert attention from the main issue pointed out by Rakovski: The Greek CPG, EAM and ELAS leadership’s anti-Macedonian practices against MAO in the city of Voden. In other words, MAO’s short existence was kept a secret until it was completely liquidated. That is precisely the main issue: The Greek leadership’s real attitude towards the Macedonian national liberation movement, i.e. MAO, and not the embarrassing false question of whether Rakovski was an illegal worker or not?!

5.

Kiriazovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski is also contesting Aianovski’s claim that MAO was the first Macedonian organization in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia during the Second World War. And in this case he is not well-intentioned because Aianovski believes that MAO was the first Macedonian organization belonging to the Macedonian people from Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia during the occupation... The same is true of Rakovski in connection with the newspaper “Red Star” which was published in 1942-1943. In order to deny Aianovski’s claims, Rakovski said that “Rizospastis”, the CPG Central Committee’s newspaper, from time to time published a Macedonian language periodical in the early 1930s. This claim, made by Rakovski, is also not true!” (P. 289-290.)

Rakovski wrote: In his book “Aegean Storms” Aianovski wrote about the “revolutionary movement in Voden Region and about NOF in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia”. In the first part of his book Aianovski speaks in general about the “Voden proletariat struggle and the anti-fascist resistance movement from 1919 to 1945”. Then, on page 94 of the same book he claims that MAO was the first Macedonian organization in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia, which called for a national liberation struggle”. This is not true because, as impotent as it was, IMRO (United) existed for a short while in the mid-1930s. Here too Aianovski claims that the newspaper “Red Star” was the first Macedonian newspaper. This, however, does not correspond to the historical truth. As we well know the newspaper “Agricultural flag” appeared in Lerin Region in the early 1930s and managed to reach its seventh issue. Edited by Andrea Chipov, this newspaper was printed in the Macedonian language.

The expressions “during the Second World War” and “during the occupation” are not in Aianovski’s book, they were added by Kiriazovski... And the case with Rizospastis is quite another thing. Namely, soon after IMRO (United) was formed, letters from Macedonians sent to Rizospastis were published in their original form, i.e. in the Macedonian language but with Greek letters, such as those in Rizospastis number 203/7141 of 3 .X 1934 or ten days later in number 213/7151 of 1.X 1934. The reason why Rizospastis printed these letters in the Macedonian language is because it was pressured by the “slavophone” communists with their demands to have their own revolutionary press.

6.

Kiriazovski wrote: “In order to compromise and discredit Aianovski, i.e. make him look like an opportunist, Pavle Rakovski has abused the fact that, at the insistence of the CPG leadership, Aianovski was not elected to the organization’s secretariat at the NOF First Congress held in January 1948. Rakovski claims Aianovski fled to the People’s Republic of Macedonia in September 1948 and the reason for fleeing was allegedly career motivated. In order to put an end to the speculation about Aianovski’s alleged “desertion” and “abandonment of the movement”, and that of a few others, we are

obliged to present some undeniable facts. Vangel Koichev, then NOF Secretary, elected during the First NOF Plenum held in August 1948, informed the CPG Central Committee Politburo by letter that the NOF Executive Board had decided, in addition to Mihailo Keramitchiev, to send Ilia Dimovski-Goche to Yugoslavia to recruit fighters for DAG. Dimovski proposed, said the letter, that Vangel Aianovski-Oche be appointed assistant, to which the NOF Executive Board agreed. This fact, as well as the fact that Aianovski disagreed with Informburo's politics and joined Keramitchiev and Dimovski in their mission to recruit Macedonian fighters for DAG, rejects Rakovski's claim that Aianovski "voluntarily abandoned the movement"... (Page 292.)

Pavle Rakovski wrote: Sometime in mid-February 1949, at a meeting in Skopje, Keramitchiev said: "As you well know, I came here on October 12, 1948, on orders from the CPG Central Committee... I came here for two reasons: a) to receive medical treatment and b) to recruit new fighters for creating Macedonian units as comrade Dimovski's first assistant..." (Vangel Aianovski, p. 315, Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war 1949, vol. VI, p. 71.)

From the NOF Executive Council decision, mentioned earlier, "in addition to Mihailo Keramitchiev sending Ilia Dimovski-Goche to Yugoslavia in order to recruit fighters for DAG", it follows that these two were sent across the border at approximately the same time.

Sometime in the first half of September 1948, Vangel Aianovski and Slavianka stationed in Kaimakchalan, Voden Region, were invited by directive to attend a meeting in Prespa. Probably fearing difficulties from the enemy, instead of going to Prespa, Aianovski and Slavianka left Kaimakchalan, went to Bitola and did not return. Aianovski, in his book "Aegean Storms", wrote:

"The real Macedonian cadres, brutally defamed and persecuted, were forced to leave the movement and move to the People's Republic of Macedonia!" (Page 339)

Slavianka said: “I received a letter from my friend Vera, in which she called me a deserter!” (Vangel Aianovski, p. 320, Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War 1949, vol. VI, p. 74.)

Aianovski and Slavianka should have been declared deserters but they found a way to avoid it. They were assigned to Dimovski and Keramitchiev as assistants and so their crime of desertion was removed from the agenda...

This is how it was; the rest was muddied water and had nothing to do with Aianovski’s desertion...

7.

Kiriovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski reacted sharply to Aianovski’s assessment that “a part of NOF’s old cadres did not find the strength to resist and succumbed to pressure, becoming obedient CPG-DAG leadership organs and performing tasks that were often against the interests of the Macedonian people.” Aianovski’s assessment of this is fully suited to part of the NOF leadership. That part of the NOF leadership not only signed the criminal “KOEM resolution” and implemented it in practice, but directly, indirectly and actively took part in the persecution of the Macedonian people, assaulting those who did not accept the Informburo anti-Yugoslav policy. Is there another way to accuse those who were personally responsible for the execution of innocent Macedonians? How else can those NOF leaders escape their own crimes except to blame Yugoslavia as the alleged culprit for the defeat of the Greek liberation movement? The NOF leaders used informational camouflage and intrigues in order to hide their own actions. Therefore, this is not about “Aianovski’s unfounded tendency to tarnish and disqualify the NOF leadership”, but for the objective presentation of historical facts that should serve as a lesson!” (p. 292-293)

Rakovski wrote: It is true that Aianovski in his book “Aegean Storms” on page 339 wrote: “Unfortunately, some of NOF’s old cadres did not find the strength to resist and succumbed to pressure from the CPG and DAG leaderships and they became their organs performing tasks that were often against the interests of the Macedonian people!”

And Rakovski's "strong reaction" was: "It is amazing indeed. He withdrew himself from the pressure and then threw mud on everyone else who remained in the struggle under the same pressure conditions...!"

Why blame only "one part of the old NOF cadres" and this should not be ignored, when the entire KOEM-NOF leadership was placed under the same scrutiny? The entire group was placed under the same pressure and "did not find the strength to oppose the CPG-DAG leaders and thus succumbed to their pressure" and signed the KOEM resolution. This took place in Prespa in an area called "Africa", inside a large cave, where the seat of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece and DAG General Headquarters were located. There were several queues of benches for sitting and the cave was lit by electric lighting. We gathered in the cave, the entire KOEM-NOF military-political leadership, without knowing where we were going to meet with Zahariadis. Then Zahariadis appeared along with Mitsos Partselidis, member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo and President of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, and Periklis head of the 2nd Bureau espionage-counter-espionage department. Zahariadis pulled out a piece of paper from his pocket and read it aloud. He then explained that this was part of the Party line and asked everyone to accept it and sign it individually. Zahariadis then took the piece of paper with two-column signatures and looked at it carefully. He then folded it, put it in his pocket and, with a treacherous tone of voice, said: "Posi arages ine ilikrinis...?" (How many here are honest...?) If the original piece of paper is ever found my signature sits somewhere between the 15th and the 20th line while Urania Rakovski's signature is not there at all. Urania Rakovski herself, on the way back, confessed that she did not sign the piece of paper. I criticized her for it in front of everyone. I said: "This is not the time for open confrontation and new divisions...! You should have signed it...!" Mitrevski said: "Ask to sign it later! Tell them you were busy with your three-month-old baby...! They will kill us all...!" Vainas said: "I did not expect that from you..." Vangel Koichev was also there and began to yell at her. He was also annoyed... The piece of paper Aianovski used in his publication, obviously, was not the same as the one I remember. A Greek hand must have re-worked it and

released it. I know that because the names on the “re-worked” piece of paper were Greek, whereas the names on the original document were Macedonian. For example Tane Naumov never called himself “Tanas” and I did not sign the document as “Pavlos”. I signed it as Pavle. There were other similar examples, which prove that the document Aianovski possessed was not a copy of the original document we signed that day...

I was sitting several rows from the front and signed the piece of paper after the people who were sitting in front of me. The list Aianovski had showed me, I was the first to sign the piece of paper. But, despite everyone else having signed the piece of paper, I was the only person accused of being in contact with “Tito’s agents” in Skopje and Sofia. I was the only one being suspended from the NOF secretariat. So, the entire thing was made to look like I was the first to sign the piece of paper and generally accept the resolution, and therefore I deserved a unique punishment.

Urania did not sign the piece of paper at all but appeared on the list as “Urania Rakovski” because, supposedly, that is what she was called. Urania, however, went by the name “Urania Alilomova”. A year or two later, while in emigration, and after a court decision, because she had a child, she received the surname “Rakovska” (and not Rakovski as indicated in the list) and ceased to appear as unmarried with a child...

I know that Mitrevski and some of the others did not admit to signing the KOEM resolution probably because they were afraid of being charged and called to account. But we signed a Party document. Similar documents have been signed, adopted and published by many well-known, great and celebrated Communist Parties in the world. When our comrades found out about this, that is, it was not a crime to have signed such a document and in fact signing a “Party” document was a great privilege, they admitted to it and became friendly and cooperative with the CPY. What did we know and who were we to defend and save the CPY? We were a small regional organization located in the northern border areas of the Greek state. We were an organization founded by the CPY/CPM, led by several of us and placed under the leadership and membership of the CPG by the CPY... A delicate situation, right?

What should we have done? Formally, yes, we had to do what we did as members of the CPG. But what were we supposed to do as ex-members of the CPY? Were we to follow the line of open confrontation with the leadership of the CPG? To start new rifts? We were in a cave surrounded by a multitude of armed soldiers, armed with automatic weapons. They could have had our heads shot off. A new rift would have triggered DAG's disintegration... the units in Kaimakchalan, Vicho and Gramos would have been torn apart. This was the basis for Zahariadis's accusations of the CPY undermining DAG and the revolution. DAG's weakening would have made an easy Monarcho-fascist victory in neighbouring Greece...!

Of course, I did not want any trouble and I did not want DAG to fall apart or the revolution to fail. All I could think of were the words: "You have to do what you have to do! Under certain circumstances, you may need to act against your own will and conscience... But remain who you really are - the son of an enslaved people... If circumstances were different we would have struggled and resisted differently." Zahariadis wanted to attribute DAG's unavoidable defeat, which by the way he himself caused, to the CPY and Yugoslavia. In the KOEM resolution, which he himself wrote, in point 6 he openly accuses the CPY of "creating an internal rift for the purpose of undermining the CPG and DAG..." According to Zahariadis there were three main operations: "The first was the political operation managed by the CPM and personally by Kolishevski, its secretary. The second operation was led by OZNA, and the third by the Yugoslav Army II Bureau. The first oversaw the other two whose work was purely to spy and conduct subversive and self-serving operations in the CPG, NOF and generally in Greek occupied Macedonia, with its own special organizations and triads, agents, contact points, etc., each striving for the same goal - to undermine the CPG, and especially NOF!"

The truth is Zahariadis tried to conceal his own betrayal of DAG and the revolution by accusing the CPY and Yugoslavia of "betrayal". It is an undeniable fact that after Zahariadis failed to show "Yugoslav betrayal" through the KOEM "trick", he was forced to invent a new "trick", the famous "attack from behind". He tried to convince everyone that Yugoslavia attacked DAG from behind. But, as it

turned out, there was no such attack and Yugoslavia had nothing to do with DAG's defeat. I have no doubt that anyone researching this subject based on the events that took place and based on the documents left behind, will easily find the truth; convening the KOEM meeting "five minutes to twelve" on the eve of DAG's defeat was nothing more than a provocative act with an obvious goal to provoke a new split in the leadership in order to accelerate DAG's defeat...

Zahariadis had me personally in mind when he wrote item 18 of the resolution in which he said: "KOEM decisively condemns any crypto-Titoist subversion in the ranks of NOF, AFZH and DAG. This is the last warning for Comrade Rakovski and his like-minded comrades who, as they did in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, made contact with Tito's agents and are now here in Free Greece spreading propaganda in favour of Tito and his betrayal. I am suspending Rakovski from every function and deploying him to DAG where, with a rifle in hand, he will have to wash his mistakes that led him to treason!"

A day or two later, I left for Gramos to join the front in the Arapades sector as an ordinary fighter. And here, fighting on the first line in battle, besides facing danger from the enemy ahead, I twice happily avoided death from behind. I will talk about this in detail later...

Now the question is who were those "other" NOF Macedonian leaders and cadres about whom Aianovski wrote in "Aegean Storms" and Kiriazovski in "Istoria", who "did not accept the anti-Yugoslavian politics of the Informburo..."

I believe they were talking about those NOF leaders and cadres who were not in the country, the likes of Goche and Keramitchiev and their assistants Aianovski and Slavianka. They must have been the ones to "find the strength to resist" from afar, from outside the country. Perhaps that is why they refused to return to the field because they were going to find harassment? Obviously it was not a "betrayal" for Aianovski to have fled the battlefield and to have abandoned the struggle... They could do no wrong... But we, on the other hand, who remained behind and fought, were placed in the same category as the "Grkomani" (Macedonians loyal to the Greek

cause) who infiltrated the NOF-KOEM leadership, and were accused of having committed crimes against the Macedonian national liberation movement and against the Macedonian people. Naturally, the Macedonian cadres resisted and fought under these difficult conditions as much as they could and the fact that they became “organs” of the CPG shows convincingly the duress they were under. It is a fact that they were arrested, severely mistreated and almost executed. They only remained alive because the Albanian authorities refused to allow the Greeks to execute them on Albanian soil. They were tried and found guilty of being “Tito’s agents”, for which they served long sentences. But what does Aianovski have to say about that? Here is what he wrote: “Treachery is loved by all, and traitors by none...”

8.

Kiriazovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski irresponsibly and loudly stated (in the above-mentioned review) that in “Aegean Storms” and “Chronology” issued by the Union of the Associations of Fighters from the National Liberation Army of Macedonia in 1973, that is, in our historiography of the Macedonian national liberation movement in the Aegean part of Macedonia, events were supposedly rewritten and adjusted. Rakovski utterly and irresponsibly said: ‘This was done by some people who are bitter about their own fate because they were unable to participate in the movement, that is, they were thrown out and eventually dropped out of the movement, and now they are making an effort, through such publications, to convince the public that they were the soul of the movement. And those who stayed at the front lines of the movement (because of some kind of natural selection) are nowhere to be found in these publications, or mud has been thrown at them, or they are proclaimed traitors...’ Rakovski here is extremely biased and malicious. According to him, his ‘comrades who have fallen from the movement’ are those Macedonians and leadership cadres from the Aegean part of Macedonia who in the angry CPG anti-Yugoslav campaign in early 1949 came into conflict with the leadership of the CPG, both in terms of defamation against the CPY, and in relation to the Macedonian National Question. (The truth is that the CPG initiated this campaign in October 1949, during the CPG Central Committee VI Plenum.) All of these comrades took up various functions in the

People's Republic of Macedonia and with their efforts contributed to the reconstruction of our homeland and, in bad times, proved to be consistent fighters and sons of the people and the Party in the struggle against the Informburo. (Apparently Goche, Keramitchiev and their assistants Aianovski and Slavianka were not mentioned here.) And here Pavle Rakovski dares to call these comrades 'outcasts of the movement!...' (p. 290-291.)

Rakovski wrote: As we can see they are having problems explaining things. The Macedonian leaders who remained and fought in the front of the movement and in the battlefields are either not mentioned in our national history, or mud is thrown at them... Some, like myself, were even declared traitors... This, it appears, was one way of skipping the scandalous fact that they were denying it all by putting the "ultimate irresponsibility" on Rakovski. Rakovski was a liar and he lied about everything. They were certain that no one was going to check! And to emphasize this: "The comrades taking various functions in the People's Republic of Macedonia and with their labour contributing to the reconstruction of our country... and in very difficult times proved themselves to be consistent fighters and sons of their people and the Party in the struggle against the Informburo", and to impose it as "the only healthy driving force, as the soul of the movement at that difficult time in Greek occupied Macedonia..." is truly rich indeed!

Of course this is historical injustice! The struggle in which our comrades in the Republic of Macedonia participated was done from their offices where they were clean and warm, nicely dressed and well fed. This is not and cannot be the same as fighting in the armed struggle fighting on two fronts on Paiak, Vicho, Kaimakchalan and Gramos mountains. Sitting in the office is not the same as fighting against the Athens regime forces, against the Greek "patriots" in the CPG and DAG ranks, and against their obedient, robotic "Grkomani". It was their duty to do whatever they needed to do as officials in the People's Republic of Macedonia, but let us face facts, they were absent from the decisive battles that took place during the last year of the armed struggle from the fall of 1948 to the fall of 1949. There is nothing they can say to change that...! And to underline: "These same comrades... who in very difficult times proved themselves to be consistent fighters and sons of their people

and the Party in the fight against the Informburo...” who Pavle Rakovski dares to call “outcasts of the movement”... is obviously another attempt to inflict another hard blow below my belt...

9.

Here is something else that happened to me. I submitted my review of the book “Aegean Storms” in which I spoke about Aianovski’s endeavours, which was then published in “Istoria” number 1/1978. Then, a few years later, this was published in “Istoria” (2/81): “In order to confront Aianovski with the entire NOF managerial asset, Rakovski, in his review, groundlessly and stubbornly argues that Aianovski is the one who allegedly attacked the entire NOF leadership because it signed the KOEM resolution against the CPY on June 20, 1949. However, the truth is different altogether. Aianovski sharply criticized only those NOF-KOEM leaders who not only signed the KOEM resolution, but rather pronounced it, and in practice, implemented it...” (p. 288.)

In the critical review, Rakovski wrote:

“For anyone who knew Aianovski they would be able to see that the book “Aegean storms” was not written by Aianovski himself. The material used, of course, is his but it was someone else’s intellectual process that put it together the way Aianovski wanted it. The book contains Aianovski’s impression exactly the way he wanted them presented to the public... Aianovski wrote a beautiful autobiography in which he threw mud on others, and at the same time highly praised himself with someone else’s effort...”

Rakovski wrote: Rakovski did the same. The documents quoted in the article, published in the collection of documents “Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War”, refer to events in which he himself directly participated and showed that events were re-written and adjusted in the book “Aegean Storms” in order to “throw mud on others”. (Paskal Mitrevski, volume III, doc 171, p.38; III, Doc 164, 366; Rakovski’s report, volume III, doc. 168, p. 372-373.) Rakovski wrote: “According to Aianovski’s accounts (Aegean Storms, p. 231-232), members of the “Kendriki Kataditisi”, that is, Urdov and Rakovski from the NOF central leadership, acted rather

clumsily and irresponsibly... Aianovski re-wrote and redressed events to publicly belittle the NOF activists and cast a shadow over their work!" In fact if we compare the mentioned source documents of that time against the text in Aianovski's book "Aegean Storms" we will find that they are different and that Aianovski's accounts are wrong. As for the assertion that Rakovski, in his critical review, not only does not point to Aianovski's arguments, but makes major mistakes, misinforms and makes false and tendentious conclusions... this is obviously based only on trust that none of the readers will actually read Rakovski's review published in 1978 and check to see what is true...

10.

Kiriazovski wrote: "In order to attach himself to the importance of playing a major role in NOF, Pavle Rakovski claims that Aianovski was elected 'MEMBER OF THE NOF NARROW LEADERSHIP' during the NOF meeting held in May 20, 1947. Rakovski claims that this allegedly took place at Rakovski's own initiative and responsibility. Does Pavle Rakovski truly believe he can convince anyone with such an assertion? The question of which comrades made up the NOF leadership was not and could not have been an individual's task, at least not Pavle Rakovski's task, but of the CPG and NOF leaderships. Rakovski's non-objectivity was also expressed through his statement that Aianovski was elected "member of the leadership" but is silent about the fact that Aianovski was elected organizational secretary, which means that he was the second top man in the organization!" (p. 291.)

Rakovski wrote: At that time, in 1947, NOF was led by a three-member secretariat which consisted of Keramitchiev, Rakovski and Vera. But due to his ambitious plans to expand the agitation and propaganda department, i.e. to develop a cultural and educational plan, Rakovski, on behalf of the Secretariat, brought out and explained this proposal which was then accepted by the asset. Because of his plans, Rakovski suggested and persuaded Keramitchiev and Vera to convene a new NOF asset. Among other things, Rakovski proposed that Aianovski be allowed to join the asset as member of the Secretariat. Rakovski considered Aianovski to be the most promising among the regional activists as his

replacement. Keramitchiev tried to convince Rakovski not to promote anyone above himself but Rakovski insisted, and claimed he was doing this for the sake of the struggle. Among those present in the meeting was Petris, organizing secretary of the CPG Provincial Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace. Petris, a guest at this meeting, welcomed the new asset and made no remarks about Aianovski's appointment. But, even though Rakovski left the asset the low blows against him continue...

11.

Kiriazovski wrote: "Continuing with disinformation and fabrication, Rakovski claims that soon after the asset meeting in June 1947, Paskal Mitrevski, member of the Macedonian CPG bureau, arrived with a directive from the Bureau to: Immediately suspend Aianovski and remove him from the NOF Secretariat, and punish Pavle Rakovski with a party reprimand. According to Rakovski, Aianovski was suspended because of "that other informative function" while Rakovski provided no reasons for his punishment... None of this however answers to the truth! Mitrevski did indeed arrive in June 1947, but not from the Macedonian bureau, but from Yugoslavia, after months of absence from the movement. Paskal Mitrevski submitted his proposal to the Macedonian bureau for removing Aianovski and other NOF managers in August 1947 but it was not accepted by this bureau. There was no other meeting or forum held until NOF's First Congress, held in January 1948, when personnel changes to NOF were made. Moreover, the organizational report for the NOF First Congress was prepared by Aianovski himself, which proves that he was an organizational secretary at the Congress!" (P. 291-292.)

In connection with this Rakovski wrote:

"Soon after the asset meeting, held in June 1947, Paskal Mitrevski, member of the CPG Provincial Bureau, arrived with a directive from this Bureau: To immediately suspend Aianovski as member of the Secretariat. And Rakovski received a party reprimand. Rakovski was also told: "You do not know him...!" It was probably Aianovski's "other function" that was in question! (Due to the nature of the issue, nothing was published in the press)... Aianovski

remained an instructor in Voden Region. The documents compiled by the secretariat however do not bear his signature and it cannot be proven that Aianovski was the one who prepared them.

Later, at the NOF First Congress, held in January 1948, Aianovski was not considered a candidate for the NOF leadership. His name was not on the list.

Even later, in September 1948, Aianovski fled to the People's Republic of Macedonia and abandoned the movement and the struggle.

Accordingly, even though Aianovski was elected into NOF's narrow leadership, he never participated in any of the NOF Secretariat working meetings (neither then, nor before, nor after).

But then again, after he was removed from his appointment, Aianovski continued to appear in the field as "NOF organizing secretary"! This was probably because those who did not know that he was removed and suspended from his position continued to address him as "NOF organizing secretary". It would appear that Aianovski carefully collected and guarded these letters just as he did the correspondence from the entire Macedonian national liberation movement apparatus, both during ELAS and DAG. These documents, which writers like Kiriazovski are compiling in the "Aegean Macedonia at the National Liberation War" edition today, are now used to boost Aianovski's role in the struggle as "the second man in NOF".

12.

Kiriazovski wrote: "Pavle Rakovski was spreading disinformation regarding the question of who founded TOMO, the Secret Macedonian Liberation Organization, in 1945 in Voden Region. Rakovski claims that Vangel Aianovski-Oche was not the founder of TOMO, and that he has proclaimed himself to be the founder of this organization. It is true that documents from TOMO's establishment and activities have not been preserved, which is understandable given the time and conditions under which it was formed and active. However, while Aianovski has a document from that time which

mentions TOMO and its activities, no such thing is mentioned in Pavle Rakovski's many reports. His explanation that the political committee for Macedonia under Greece, and the NOF leadership, kept TOMO's establishment a secret is not convincing. How is it possible to organize and run so many branches in a network and, at the same time, keep such an organization a secret, especially from its own leadership? If for some reason Rakovski needed to keep this organization a secret in 1945, there was no reason for him to keep it secret later. And another thing, while Aianovski details the entire organizational structure in his works (referring to the book 'Aegean Storms') showing a list of people who worked as activists or as members of the organization, Pavle Rakovski only states that he went to Voden, formed TOMO and nothing more!" (p. 290)

Rakovski, in his critical review, wrote: "First, it is well-known that the political commission terminated its fictitious existence in the beginning of April 1945. Constituted in its place on April 23, 1945, was the Central Management of the new organization (NOF), headed by Paskal Mitrevski with members Urdov, Keramitchiev, Koroveshovski, and Rakovski. NOF had yet to be created. Then immediately after the May Day celebrations, everyone was sent to the field to establish NOF's foundations. Rakovski was sent to Voden Region. It was decided that the members of the central management would work in the field until May 25, 1945, and then return for a new meeting...

Second, it is well-known that before that, from January to mid-April 1945, Rakovski stayed at the base in the village Staravina. He went down to Meglen Region (Karadzhova) several times to visit some of the villages where, under his own initiative, he had recruited fighters for the ELAS Voden Macedonian battalion. Rakovski wanted to see for himself what the mood of the people was and to personally speak with the friends and relatives of the fighters of the battalion whom he had earlier taken to Vardar Macedonia... Even though he expected it, what he saw there surprised him. Namely, the CPG, with all its might, tried to blur and conceal the true significance of why the battalion was forced to cross the border and defect. In order to gain political points with the people, the CPG referred to the incident as dangerous adventurism on the part of the battalion's

leaders Dzhodzho and Rakovski. Namely, the CPG carried out a defamatory campaign claiming that:

- Dzhodzho and Rakovski sold the battalion for huge amounts of money... They sold out your children... They are filthy traitors...!

It was obvious: without a political organization on the ground, the withdrawal of the battalion seemed like an adventurous move. The very formation of a political organization (bringing our people together) would not only correct the isolated action taken by the battalion, but it would also give us political substance and an ultimate goal. So, it was necessary to do this... the sooner the better.

Then, on the other hand, we had our CPG comrades who fiercely attacked the battalion's leadership, especially me and Dzhodzho. They accused us of being "adventurers", "sellouts to alien agents", "scoundrels", "traitors" and so on and so forth... and that we would bring "ruin" to our people's children...! In other words, they called the battalion's withdrawal a savage adventure and a betrayal. So, it was necessary for us to dismantle these accusations and put things right. And that was only possible with the formation of a political and revolutionary organization.

So, instead of waiting for a directive from above, I decided to act alone in accordance with the imperative from below. I formed a political organization under the name: Secret Macedonian Liberation Organization - TOMO. Because I defied responsibility and decided on my own to transfer the battalion over the border to save it from being disarmed, dissolved and liquidated, I was now obligated to make a correction and take responsibility for establishing TOMO, in order to defend and justify this transfer. TOMO's existence would confirm in the consciousness of our people that the transfer of the battalion was done to save it and that what they were hearing from the other side was lies...

Before noon the same day (February 22, 1945) I sent some of my trusted people to the surrounding villages to make contact with the most trusted people there and ask them to come and see me...

One by one they gathered until late night. Fifteen in total came to see me. I appointed each TOMO board president of the TOMO organization in their village. In total of thirteen villages joined TOMO. They were Pozharsko, Strupino, Baovo, Tsakoni, Tresino, Gorno Rodovo, Dolno Rodovo, Sarakinovo, Krontselevo, Teovo, Nisia and two more whose names I don't remember. After that I visited the terrain twice more, once during March and again during the first half of April 1945. At that time ELAS had not yet surrendered its arms. There was a garrison stationed in the town Supotsko and a two-unit detachment in the village Tresino. One moonlit night I went to Tresino and visited the villages Dolno Rodovo and Sarakinovo. I stayed in Sarakinovo one day. Director Todor Anastasov and three fighters stayed with me. After that I went to the flatlands outside the village Tsakoni and met with Hristo Andonovski. At that time TOMO was spreading rapidly and approaching the city Voden...

Third, sometime near the end of May 1945, as was decided earlier, our bureau gathered for another meeting. In my notepad, dated May 27, 1945, among other things I wrote: "Last month we decided to hold a district meeting next month for the purpose of choosing a district board and to discuss other issues." ("Aegean Macedonia at the national liberation war", Volume II, Document No. 25, p. 56.) And in a note dated June 27, 1945, among other things, I wrote: "On June 20, 1945, I convened and held a district meeting a few kilometres outside of Voden. However, we did not get the desired attendance we expected. No delegates from Voden and Meglen Pole attended. Those from Voden could not attend because the city was blockaded. Those from Meglen Pole did not get the invitations on time because the courier had an incident along the road and was delayed. However, 125 delegates from 28 separate villages did attend. The meeting went well and took a serious and splendid tone being chaired by an old grey-haired man from the Ilinden era..." "Because I didn't know any of the activists from the city Voden, I always had to consult with Dzhodzho regarding their personnel issues." "Aianovski was sent to Voden in December 1944 to monitor the situation and report on events. I made a point of inviting him to this meeting and, on Dzhodzho's suggestion he was appointed first president of NOF (TOMO) for Voden Region. I figured this would make his job easier for which he was sent to the field!"

This was what Rakovski wrote in his reports from that time, which means he knew nothing about a district conference taking place on April 28, 1945.

A few decades later, in his book “Aegean Storms” (INI, 1975, pp. 167-170), Aianovski wrote that on April 28, 1945, he convened the first TOMO district conference in Voden Region. It was attended by delegates from the city Voden and the surrounding villages. He wrote that he personally opened the meeting which was then chaired by Petre Popov (who died later) from Dolno Rodovo. According to Aianovski this was the agenda:

1. TOMO activity report.
2. Change the name TOMO to NOF (People’s Liberation Front).
3. Elect NOF district board for Voden...

Aianovski took the floor for the first agenda item. “Pavle Rakovski, representative of the political committee for the Macedonians under Greece, then took the floor for the second agenda item, and after welcoming the delegates, presented the political committee’s decision to create NOF by renaming TOMO to NOF, which was then accepted...”

That is what Aianovski writes, a few decades later. Naturally Aianovski invented all this because:

- The political committee at that time, on April 28, 1945, did not exist so I could not have been its delegate or its representative.
- During the founding of NOF for Aegean Macedonia and the appointment of its bureau, on April 23, 1945, in Skopje, it was decided that all members of this bureau would remain in Skopje for the May 1st, 1945 holiday, and then everyone would leave and report to their assigned districts. So, on April 28, 1945, I was not in Voden Region.
- Let us now have a look at Aianovski’s notes preserved from that time, in which, according to “Istoria” number 2/1981, “TOMO and its activities were mentioned”. Firstly Aionovski’s document is not

unique. There is also a second document from that time, i.e. from the first half of 1945. Both documents were published in a collection of documents entitled “Aegean Macedonia in the Second World War”, second volume. The first document was published under line number 39, p. 75, and the second under line number 54, p. 101-104. They were not signed, but based on the channel by which they were obtained it is known who sent them. Apart from that, based on the handwriting on the photocopied manuscripts, contained in the collection, the same person wrote both of them (Aianovski). (“Aegean Macedonia at the National Liberation War”, vol. II, doc, No. 47, p. 91.)

The first manuscript is entitled. “Military Information Bulletin from June 16, 1945”. The second manuscript is entitled “Information Bulletin”. Both were written on June 16, 1945, so they were probably sent to various different addresses. About the first manuscript editors, Dr. Risto Kiriazovki and Tosho Simovski wrote that this information was authored by Vangel Aianovski-Oche who reported on the military and political situation in Voden Region.” Here is the content of that report:

“Military Information Bulletin from June 16, 1945.

It is certain. Special movements of English mechanized forces have been observed. Every day armoured cars are sent to inspect the border, especially in the regions around Meglen and Ostrovo. They also inspect the border watch towers and guard houses. It has not been determined to which battalion they belong and who their commander is. Several officers and a number of soldiers have arrived in the city Voden to reinforce the 303 battalion. Lively and nervous activities have been observed in the Greek-English intelligence bureau. The Greek authorities in Voden have compiled lists of Macedonians by name but we have not yet learned why they have compiled them. The political and military world and most of the population in our district is nervous because of the published news that three mechanized Russian divisions have arrived at the Greek-Bulgarian border. The Macedonian people are thrilled with this news. The Greek government through the press has advised that the arrival of the Russians at the Greek-Bulgarian border has nothing to do with Greece, and that this is an internal Bulgarian

matter. On May 26, 1945, a gendarmerie with four officers arrived in our city. One of them is a major and commander of the gendarmerie. In the next report we will inform you about the number and names of the commanders as well as their purpose...”

Aianovski was sent to Voden in December 1944 to monitor the situation and report on events. I made a point of inviting him to this meeting and, on Dzhodzho’s suggestion he was appointed first president of NOF (TOMO) for Voden Region. I figured this would make his job easier for which he was sent to the field!

As we can see, it is completely unfounded to argue that “TOMO and its activities” have been mentioned anywhere in Aianovski’s first document. There is not a word about it at all. Perhaps someone made a mistake with the accounts in this document. Perhaps they were referring to the second document. Perhaps they incorrectly considered it to be a document of TOMO.

Regarding the second document the editorial board consisting of Kiriazovski and Simovski said that it was a “TOMO Information Bulletin reporting on the situation in Voden Region”, which is completely arbitrary and unfounded... Here is what, among other things, was written in that document: “Economics, newsletter 16.06.1945. This morning the Napoleon was worth 12, and in the afternoon it jumped to 9,000. Food items continue to be in abundance. No goods have been hidden. The people are generally satisfied. I am sending you a series of newspapers outlining measures taken by Varvaresos, Minister of Finance, where you will learn more about the economic situation in the entire country...” (p. 10.)

Of course, this was typical of Aianovski who, as always, was a nit-picker while doing the job for which he was sent here to do. In fact, the photocopied manuscript, mentioned earlier, undoubtedly confirms that Aianovski was the author of this document. But besides that, TOMO had no reason to send a series of newspapers outlining Varvaresos’s economic measures.

Aianovski however does mention TOMO twice in this document:

a) "...The entire army is not fascist; there are good men among the soldiers... who are expected to connect with our organization TOMO..." (p. 103)

b) "The number of Grkomani (Macedonians loyal to Greece) in those villages is very small and efforts are being made to attract them into TOMO..." (p. 104)

As we can see, there was no mention made in Aianovski's documents from that time, about a district conference taking place in Voden Region on April 28, 1945, when TOMO was supposedly renamed and replaced by NOF. Aianovski knew nothing about this, and when he wrote these documents on June 16, 1945, as per "a" and "b" above, he was talking about TOMO, he knew nothing about NOF.

In his book "Aegean Storms" Aianovski seems to be silent about the June 20, 1945, NOF (TOMO) meeting in which he personally participated and was elected district president. Did he forget about it? Did he get the dates mixed up? I could not tell you what he did, all I can say is that three decades later, he invented the April 28, 1945 NOF-TOMO district conference... But that's not all. Namely, after making frequent contacts with his friends Kiriazovski and Simovski, reviewers of his book "Aegean Storms" and editors of an extensive collection of archival materials about "Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war", Aianovski somehow learned that there was no information on this, as well as on who founded TOMO in Voden Region. So, either by his own initiative or at the suggestion of someone else, he solved his problem by associating his say 5 or 6, 10 or 15 or even 20 or 26 auxiliary reporters in Voden and Voden Region, with the political organization TOMO and portrayed himself as the initiator, founder and secretary-general of TOMO which he claims to have founded on January 20, 1945. In his book "Aegean Storms" Aianovski paints a beautiful picture of TOMO and its activities under his leadership. One of those activities, that allegedly crowned his achievements, was convening the first district conference held on April 28, 1945. But where are Aianovski's documents that directly confirm this? Apparently after he found out that he had no such documents he went ahead to confirm his claims indirectly. Five years before his book "Aegean

Storms” was published, Aianovski published a number of articles on the life and struggle of Mirka Ginova in the Skopje daily “Nova Makedonija” printed on August 5 to 10, 1970, XXVI, no. 8455-8460. In one article, entitled “Mirka was helping the fighters”, among other things, Aianovski wrote: “The first TOMO regional conference was held in June 1945, when the name was changed from TOMO to NOF, an organized military-political force for the Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia. Mirka Ginova was at the conference and was elected member of the NOF regulatory board secretariat for Voden Region...” which, of course, was correct. Aianovski was elected first president and Mirka was elected member of the secretariat and AFZH president for Voden Region...

It is interesting to note that Aianovski’s fictional date from “Aegean Storms” also appeared in the famous pilot “Chronology” edition sponsored by the “Association of Fighters from the National Liberation War”. Here it was said that Vangel Aianovski-Oche formed the political organization TOMO on January 20, 1945 and convened a regional TOMO conference on April 28, 1945...

Of course, if the same nit-picking Aianovski, who was so pedantic with his notes about minor things such as how much a Napoleon was worth in the market in Voden in a single day, and how many villagers participated in a meeting, surely he would have left tangible evidence if he had founded a political organization such as TOMO. He would certainly have left some written documentation about a great event such as this. And of course, there would be no dilemma about it here and now. Surely there would have been something written in the many “newsletters” from that time if such an event had taken place. The editors and researchers would have found it if such a document existed and had been placed in the multi-volume collection of archival documents in the history of the Macedonian people. But such a document had not been found because it does not exist at all! The researchers found nothing about the first half of 1945 in the pile of Aianovski’s archival documents. Neither did the researchers find anything of significance in the bulletins they were placing in the second volume of the collection of archival materials...

And so we come to the conclusion that: New items had been added to the book “Aegean Storms” and to the pilot “Chronology” which have been created, rewritten and adjusted to fit a history created for one’s own measures and tastes...

13.

Kiriazovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski has disputed Aianovski’s claim that a pre-Congress meeting was held in 1947 between NOF and CPG representatives to come up with a list of NOF leaders to be appointed during the 1st NOF Congress. Pavle Rakovski truly has no measure of objectivity. He very well knew that, not one, but two such meetings were held through which the CPG actually infiltrated NOF with its own people. It also removed some of the old NOF cadres among whom was Aianovski, who Pavle Rakovski himself then opposed...!” (p. 202.)

Pavle Rakovski wrote: The truth is, I participated in those meetings and, although we did not keep a record, I should know what happened. And now we have Aianovski and Kiriazovski, who were not even there and did not take part in those meetings, telling me what happened. This is a classic move of tactlessness. But no, it is not about tact, it’s about something else. Let us see what Aianovski said... In his book “Aegean Storms” he said: “At the CPG Central Committee pre-Congress meeting... through its representatives Ioanidis and Stringos, members of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, the CPG demanded the removal of Vangel Aianovski-Oche, NOF organizing secretary for Aegean Macedonia... This request encountered opposition from those present, with the exception of Paskal Mitrevski who fully supported the CPG Central Committee decision. Ioanidis and Stringos did not allow any further discussion on the issue by setting a Party veto. Despite the controversy the CPG decision was accepted...!” (p. 253)

“Pavle Rakovski has disputed Aianovski’s claim that a pre-Congress meeting was held in 1947 between NOF and CPG representatives to come up with a list of NOF leaders to be appointed during the 1st NOF Congress. Pavle Rakovski truly has no measure of objectivity. He very well knew that, not one, but two such meetings were held through which the CPG actually infiltrated NOF with its own

people. It also removed some of the old NOF cadres among whom was Aianovski, who Pavle Rakovski himself then opposed...!”

And here is what really happened: Rakovski participated in those meetings and, although they did not keep a record, he should know what happened. And now we have Aianovski and Kiriazovski, who were not even there and did not take part in those meetings, telling me what happened. This is a classic move of tactlessness. But no, it is not about tact, it’s about something else. Let us see what Aianovski said... In his book “Aegean Storms” he said: “At the CPG Central Committee pre-Congress meeting... through its representatives Ioanidis and Stringos, members of the CPG Central Committee Politburo, the CPG demanded the removal of Vangel Aianovski-Oche, NOF organizing secretary for Aegean Macedonia... This request encountered opposition from those present, with the exception of Paskal Mitrevski who fully supported the CPG Central Committee decision. Ioanidis and Stringos did not allow any further discussion on the issue by setting a Party veto. Despite the controversy the CPG decision was accepted...!” (p. 253)

It is characteristic of “NOF organizing secretary” Aianovski and Dr. Kiriazovski to provide “different” information. The first part, on page 253 above, stated that the pre-Congress meeting was held in the village Rula on January 12, 1948, while the second part stated that not one, but two meetings were held in early 1947.

As I have already stated earlier, Aianovski, in his book “Aegean Storms”, claims that with the implementation of the agreement, the CPG, on November 21, 1946, reorganized the “NOF central leadership” appointing Paskal Mitrevski member of the CPG Provincial Committee for Macedonia, Mihail Keramitchiev NOF Secretary, and Vangel Aianovski-Oche, etc., members of the leadership... (p. 234.)

Mitrevski, who wanted to expand the NOF leadership to include Grkomani, was persistent and demanded that his proposal be adopted by a rather sharp argument... Finally, Mitrevski said that he was following the Party line... Keramitchiev and Vera reluctantly gave in. Rakovski said that, if this was ordered by the party then they should have been informed right at the very beginning of the

meeting, then there would have been no quarrels. He was hoping that Mitrevski was bluffing but he still persisted...

The absence of elasticity in Rakovski's attitude was paid by the fact that his place in the Secretariat remained vacant. Namely, at the last moment, before the Congress voted on January 13, 1948, on Mitrevski's objection while his case was being reviewed, Rakovski dropped out of the candidate list for NOF Secretariat. That was all. There was no dispute, no party veto and no request from the Communist Party of Greece through its Politburo Ioanidis and Stringos, to remove Aianovski, then "NOF organizing secretary for Aegean Macedonia".

There were no pre-meeting meetings held at all at that time. Aianovski was removed about seven to eight months before he claims he was removed. It would appear he took the opportunity to insert himself into these later events so that he could write himself "a beautiful autobiography..."

This is a good example of how one can sit at their desk and create history...

14.

Kiriazovski wrote: "Pavle Rakovski stated that on the 1st NOF Plenum held on August 1948, he, among other NOF leaders, was removed, which is not true. According to the publication "Nepokoren" an organ of NOF, which announced the decision to suspend Mihail Keramitchiev (NOF president), and Paskal Mitrevski (NOF secretary), delivering a massive blow to the organization, Pavle Rakovski provocatively published an article in which he praised the CPG and its leader Nikos Zahariadis of being the most consistent friend, protector and ally of the Macedonian people...!" (P. 294.)

Rakovski wrote: Rakovski did not say that he was removed during the NOF Central Committee First Plenum, held in August 1948, and did not announce anything about any decision to suspend Mitrevski and Keramitchiev. As we have seen in the previous paragraph, Rakovski's text regarding his removal said: "...on Mitrevski's

objection while his case was being reviewed, Rakovski dropped out of the January 13, 1948, candidate list for NOF Secretariat.” Which means that he was removed in January 1948, during the First NOF Congress...

Regarding the so-called “provocative” article, this is what happened: The article was published on the occasion of the 30th jubilee since the founding of the CPG. It was published in “Nepokoren” number 17 in December 1948; five months after the NOF Central Council I Plenum took place!

As is well-known, our Greek “patriots” at the top CPG and DAG leadership consistently defied the Macedonian reality even after the People’s Republic of Macedonia emerged as a national state of the Macedonian people in the Yugoslav federation. They defied the Macedonian reality even with the existence of a strong Macedonian national Movement in Greek occupied Macedonia. Our Greek comrades at the top of the CPG and DAG planned and carried out a general offensive against the Macedonian national ideal and physically destroyed a huge percentage of its active bearers, “the Macedonian nationalists” and Macedonian patriots.

Proof of this was delivered in February 1946, during the CPG Central Committee II Plenum. Despite the “nice things” the CPG press was publishing about the Macedonian people in general, the CPG officially treated the Macedonians NOT AS PART OF ANOTHER AND UNIQUE NATION, but as a “mass of people”, a “Slavophone population” which lived in Greek occupied Macedonia on the lands of the Greek state. During the II Plenum the CPG proclaimed that it will fight for “the recognition of rights and equality” as a Slavophone population, but without NOF’s leadership. And so the Party regional press (local) in Macedonia continued its hostilities against the NOF leadership, even after the II Plenum.

But because all these frontal attacks against the Macedonian national liberation movement had little effect, NOF was getting stronger with time!

Zahariadis had no choice but to change tactics. By a declaratory recognition of NOF, he managed to snap into his hands both NOF itself and its military formations - the Macedonian battalions. The famous heavy political crimes against the Macedonian people then followed... He destroyed the most active and significant carriers of the Macedonian national ideal... Namely, as I said earlier, Zahariadis moved Macedonian battalions to the Greek south, replaced their Macedonian commanders with “more experienced” Greek commanders, and destroyed them.

He then ordered the physical liquidation of many individuals, mostly prominent Macedonian activists like Dzhodzho, Shamardanov, Koroveshovski, Tanurov, Kalkov, etc.

At the same time it dissolved and disbanded the NOF central agitation and propaganda department. Rakovski and the other members were individually inducted into DAG’s ranks as simple fighters and sent to join the various DAG units in the front.

The Macedonian teachers’ school and seminars were abolished.

The NOF cultural and art groups were dissolved. (The Macedonian theatre, choir, Macedonian folklore - folk dancers and singers).

The Macedonian national brass band was also disbanded and its leader, folk musician Timio, was later killed. This was a remarkable band whose Macedonian folk melody echoed in the mountains wherever it played.

And most importantly:

The worst thing the CPG did in all this was that it beheaded NOF of its founding leadership. Zahariadis and the CPG leaders, through the NOF First Congress, held in January 1948, and through the NOF Central Council First Plenum, held in August 1948, prepared and executed the removal of the NOF leadership, that is, they “neutralized” three of the initial five NOF founding members - Mitrevski, Keramitchiev, and Rakovski. The other two Dzhodzho and Koroveshovski were killed. The NOF founding leadership was replaced with a “new leadership” (the tandem Kotsopoulos-Koitsis),

and NOF gradually began to turn into an anti-Macedonian organization. In other words, it began to lose its Macedonian national spirit, its Macedonian national colours, and to reorient itself towards Athens and, in the spirit of the Greek cause, promote the idea that “we are part of Greece... we are part of the Greek people...”

A tense, electrified and dangerous situation began to develop that was followed by a wave of Macedonians deserting DAG’s ranks. Rakovski was brought back from the army followed by Mitrevski and, after the NOF Central Council II plenum was held, at Zahariadis’s request, they were both reinstated in the NOF leadership. By then Keramitchiev had left Greece and gone to seek medical treatment in the Republic of Macedonia. He remained and worked in Skopje. NOF regional activists and leaders had also fled the war and withdrawn to the Republic of Macedonia... The secretariat was expanded from three to five members, with an obvious goal – for the infiltrators Kotsopoulos and Koichis to hold onto power...

It was under these conditions, i.e. Zahariadis’s chauvinistic anti-Macedonian politics, that Rakovski was returned from the army in order to help consolidate the “new NOF leadership”. And, according to “Nepokoren”, to consolidate NOF-AFZH, the central organs, as a Macedonian people’s organization... as a distinct people, as a self-serving people, as a non-Greek nation that enjoys (should enjoy) full equality with the Greek people who are struggling (should be struggling) organized in their own Macedonian national organizations as they are (must be). NOF and AFZH have (should have) their own Macedonian (not Greek) newspapers and magazines...

Here is the title of the article: “The Communist Party of Greece (CPG) - the organizer, leader and enthusiast of the people’s struggle for social and national freedom.”

Here are the sub-titles: “CPG - Liberator for Social and National Freedom”, “Nikos Zahariadis”, “CPG - defender of the Macedonian people in Hellas”, “The CPG in the help of our people”, “The CPG shows the road to salvation”, “CPG Policy - Principled Policy”.

Unfortunately Kiriazovski calls the article a “glorification”... His bias and non-objectivity does not allow him to see it for what it is... “Not a glorification”... This was an article written on the occasion of the CPG’s 30th anniversary and expressed how we the Macedonians perceived, expected and demanded of the Party and its leadership...

What I did, of course, did not please Zahariadis and our Greek friends at the top of the CPG and DAG leaderships, and soon I was booted out. Once again I was suspended from the secretariat and sent to the Gramos front to fight as an ordinary DAG fighter. After that I was sent to prison under accusations that I was a dangerous and active “Macedonian nationalist”...

These were the facts...

15.

Kiriazovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski has argued that the NOF central agitation and propaganda department was liquidated by the CPG, which is not true...! It was not liquidated. Zahariadis made personnel changes and removed the people who were suspected of being influenced by Yugoslavia... The department was not only not liquidated, it was expanded and its publishing activities were increased, as Rakovski himself claimed elsewhere.

“Furthermore, Rakovski has stated that the Macedonian school for teachers was abolished. This was another of Rakovski’s fabrications. The teacher’s course was abolished because the children were evacuated to neighbouring democracies in March 1948, where similar courses and seminars were organized...!” (Page 294.)

Rakovski claimed and claims:

That the Macedonian central agitation and propaganda department was dissolved or liquidated in order to be replaced with a new Greek chauvinistic and supremacist agitation and propaganda department that would work and publish material relevant to Greek interests...

The Macedonian school for teachers was abolished, liquidated, in order to be replaced by a Greek supremacist Macedonian look-alike school...

It is true that after the evacuation of the Macedonian children similar schools were established in the Eastern European countries where Macedonian children were sent. But the way things were actually done undoubtedly shows that:

Even outside of Greece, the Greek communists, like all other Greeks, made sure that the Macedonian people were not represented for who they were. In fact the 28,000 Macedonian refugee children, the Macedonian fighters and the Macedonian people in general were represented as “Greek political emigrants” with Greek names when they arrived in the Eastern European countries. The CPG leaders went as far as creating a special alphabet, different from the Macedonian alphabet, for their “Slavophone Greeks”... What this means should be very clear and does not need a comment.

The MACEDONIAN side and the GREEK-SUPREMICIST (Grkoman) side are two diametrically opposed concepts and realities, mutually exclusive from one another. One is a negation of the other. The Grkomani cannot be Macedonians and vice versa. Naturally without knowing the “hard reality” about this, it is better for a person to keep quiet and not engage in discussions about these things...

16.

Kiriazovski wrote: “In regard to the reaction of the Macedonians in Voden Region... against the NOF-CPG merging agreement as was carried out in November 1946, Rakovski simply and without much thought argued that the agreement was not NOF’s work, but that the leadership was allegedly given a directive from above. Rakovski alluded to the fact that the directive allegedly came from the CPY. Here Pavle Rakovski was playing with very dangerous misinformation. The most cruel misinformation is that the Yugoslav leadership gave the NOF leadership a directive, with no discussion, to unite with the CPG (of course, this is arbitrary, a fabrication, with no evidence to confirm it). But the truth is completely different. The

Communist Party of Yugoslavia's leadership, in the interests of the struggle, suggested to NOF that it settle with the CPG and unite its forces under conditions acceptable to both sides. In fact, Pavle Rakovski himself and other NOF leaders have written in their reports about the CPG's failure to comply with the agreement. What this means is that if there was a direct order and not an agreement, then there could not have been a place for negotiations and an agreement..." (p. 291)

Rakovski wrote: It is hard for me to understand why they would want to distort history. Namely, the truth is exactly that... the truth. The agreement was not "negotiated" by NOF's leadership. It was communicated down to the NOF leadership (to the secretariat) as a directive from above, both from the CPM, CPY and from the CPG. The "agreement" and other relevant issues were worked out between the two Communist Parties (Tempo-Ververis-Zimas, Tempo-Siantos, Tsvetko Uzunovski-Leonidas Stringos, Mitrevski-Zahariadis, etc.) and openly published, so it makes no sense in this case to make it a secret. It is well-known that Mitrevski followed the CPY/CPM Central Committee's direction and instructions when he was negotiating the establishment of the disrupted combat unity between the Greek and Macedonian revolutionary movements with the Greek side, i.e. between the CPG and NOF. Here is one of those published reports by Mitrevski on how the negotiations and the difficulties that were encountered took place:

REPORT

"The four comrades from the main leadership were located in four different places. Comrade Dzhodzho was located in Kaimakchalan, Comrade Pavle Rakovski in Paiak, Comrade Keramitchiev in Vicho and Comrade Mincho (Fotev) in Gramos in Epirus. I took statements from all four who were characteristically in agreement with the points as they applied to each of their areas separately..."

Other than that, Mitrevski has also long and widely spoken about the above-mentioned basic points. In the fourth point, among other things, he wrote:

“4) After the last negotiations and cooperation that I had with Comrade Zahariadis and other CPG comrades, it was jointly determined as to how we would cooperate in our merging with the CPG. All points were well-covered. Had these points been genuinely accepted by the CPG, the problem would have been solved, and we would have been back to work in our respective areas.

The points on which our work basically collapsed were:

a) The military question. There is no doubt that Comrade Zahariadis was in complete agreement with the preservation of the Macedonian groups as completely separate units, without any thought of merging them with the Greek units. Each area, however, would share a common Headquarters for both groups. Zahariadis clearly said to me that both Macedonian and Greek units would exist in the first phase so that we could establish a Macedonian army with its own headquarters. Now the CPG comrades, who hold Party positions in various areas, endeavour to dismantle the Macedonian groups, and they demand that the Macedonian partisans join the Greek units. In other words, there would be no Macedonian groups...” (Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war, vol. III, doc 171, pp. 378, 380 and 381.)

In the fifth point, among other things, Mitrevski wrote:

“5) Another issue with which our people did not agree was the way the Party set up the NOB (National Liberation War) paramilitary cadres in the common CPG party leaderships and other political organizations... They expressed aspirations for changing the party and in general NOF’s managerial staff with their own people who care very little for NOF. They are striving, not for NOF’s empowerment, but for its weakening, so that tomorrow it may de facto disperse, as was the case with the old SNOF...”

On November 21, 1946, at the extraordinary meeting of the Secretariat, i.e. of NOF’s Presidency, held in the village Turie, Lerin Region, Mitrevski together with Skotidas, CPG representative and DAG general, delivered the final agreement point by point as issued by a directive from above.

According to what was agreed:

Mitrevski was co-opted member of the CPG Provincial Bureau for Macedonia-Thrace, and made an instructor of NOF.

Dzhodzho was co-opted member of DAG Headquarters for Central and Western Macedonia and a representative of NOF.

Mincho Fotev was co-opted member of the EPON Provincial Bureau, and a representative of NOMS.

Keramitchiev, Rakovski and Vera were co-opted to lead the NOF secretariat.

The NOF Presidents at the district boards were to assume the functions of instructors in their districts, and others would be selected to take their place.

NOF was to be placed under the CPG leadership, which would be realized directly and through Mitrevski.

The NOF military units were to be placed under DAG command as separate Macedonian units...

This agreement, as it was well-known, was well played by the Greek side. The Macedonian military formations were withdrawn from Macedonia and sent deep into the Greek south, where they were destroyed... The NOF leadership itself was also destroyed through the NOF Congress and via the NOF Central Council 1st Plenum, when NOF's current leadership was replaced with a "new anti-Macedonian leadership" consisting mainly of Greek Supremacists.

It is true that "Rakovski himself, as well as other NOF leaders, wrote about the CPG defaulting on this agreement in their reports". But there is more. It was said that: "If the agreement was given only as a directive, then it means that there could not have been a place for objections!" But all this is a kind of verbal acrobatics that supports a false claim. What were these often talked about objections...? Condemning the act "of being played" means asking

for consistency in the application of the agreement, i.e. supporting it, and not objecting to it.

17.

Kiriazovski wrote: “The change in Pavle Rakovski’s attitude towards the CPG is very indicative. While in his previous articles he blames the CPG for pursuing a genocidal policy against the Macedonian people, in this article (referring to the “Aegean Storms” critical review) he says quite the opposite - that the CPG cannot, in principle, be an enemy of the Macedonian people!” (p. 293)

“On the one hand, Pavle Rakovski argues that the CPG could not be an adversary of the Macedonians, and on the other hand he claims that the CPG liquidated the more prominent Macedonian activists. To substantiate this, he says the CPG, among others, liquidated the following: Giorgi Kalkov, Dzhodzho Urdiv, Atanas Koroveshov... The examples he gives are arbitrary, since the said comrades died heroically in battle fighting the Monarcho-fascists!” (p. 294.)

Rakovski wrote: The Greek Communist Movement, i.e. the CPG is not and cannot, in principle, be an enemy of the Macedonian people. CPG members and cadres have been persecuted, arrested and sent to prison because they publicly defended the Macedonian people’s democratic rights and freedoms in the Greek state... The CPG and ELAS functionaries, who according to their orders were tasked to create a Macedonian unit on Ilinden, created a Macedonian battalion and could have created divisions... They cannot be an enemy of the Macedonian people...

However, it is a well-known historical fact that exponents of the domestic bourgeoisie and international anti-communism camps, the likes of Stavridis, Sargologos, Maximos, as well as Siantos and Zahariadis who stood at the head of the CPG were eventually exposed and expelled from the party. It is also well-known that they damaged the general Communist movement and the people’s revolution in Greece. The Macedonian and the Greek people’s interests, rights and freedoms suffered because of them. There are many abnormal and crisis situations in the CPG that attest to this. Discord in its ranks, divisions in its central leadership, open

betrayals, catastrophic defeats; the people's revolution in Solun and in Macedonia in 1936, the defeat in Athens and in Greece in 1944, the defeat in Vicho and Gramos and in the rest of Greece in 1949...

The Macedonian people suffered immensely during ELAS and DAG because of these "Greek patriots". The Macedonian political organizations MAO, SOF and SNOF were disbanded, NOF and its institutions the central agitation and propaganda department, the Macedonian theatre, choir, folk song and dance ensemble, brass band, teacher's school, seminar... were all closed down. On top of that the Macedonian military formations consisting of the most elite Macedonian revolutionaries were eliminated and an unknown number of prominent individuals like Trpovski and Dzhodzho were killed by ambush. Shamardanov and Kalkov were killed in battle fighting heroically against the Monarcho-fascists, but from a bullet in the back. Petre Tanurov was shot in a court farce. Lazo Koroveshov and Tanas Markovski were killed by snipers. The first when he went to get his food from the cauldron and the second got a bullet in the head leading a Macedonian dance. Vasko Karadzha was captured in the CPG Provincial Bureau central branch in Solun. Instead of being welcomed by a Bureau official, he was welcomed by agents of the Asfalia. He was caught, handed over to the Gestapo and shot, Tanas Koroveshov died as a result of betrayal, etc. etc...

The communist movement, that is, the CPG, of course, is not and cannot be guilty of all of this. This is what I, Rakovski, believe and have expressed in my review...

18.

Kiriazovski wrote: "In order to put himself in the spotlight and cover up the real motives for his return from DAG to NOF, Pavle Rakovski said that this was done in order to remedy, as he said, the famous electrified situation that caused a wave of Macedonian fighters to "desert" from DAG because the top NOF leaders were oppressed. Rakovski argued that his influence was supposedly so strong that it caused the desertions at the time when the Macedonians were revolting because their leaders were suspended. As a result, Nikos Zahariadis was forced to accept him back into the NOF leadership. Rakovski said nothing about what kind of

“deserting” this was and when it took place. If he thinks of those who fled to Yugoslavia after his return to NOF, it doesn’t count; they deserted for other reasons. They did not flee to Yugoslavia like Rakovski insinuated, they fled because they did not agree with the CPG leadership’s policies with regards to the Macedonian question and with regards to Yugoslavia!” (P. 294-295.)

Rakovski wrote: It was March 1947. A group of NOF and AFZH activists were traveling towards Preval in Prespa not from the side of the river Bistritsa where the hill was long and quite steep, but from the Prespa plateau, where the uphill was flatter and easier to navigate. We were traveling straight up on foot and away from the road. When we arrived at Preval I passed out and fell unconscious. My comrades brought me back to consciousness by rubbing my face, neck and chest with snow...

On June 20, 1949, the KOEM resolution was adopted. I was again suspended from the NOF secretariat and sent to the Gramos front as an ordinary fighter. During the night of June 21 and 22, I left Prespa with a small group of fighters and set off for Gramos. Mincho Fotev was part of the same group. He was on his way to Gramos and, as a representative of KOEM-NOF, was expected to visit a number of units in Gramos. Along the way Fotev gave me his horse to ride and we alternately walked together. I happened to be riding the horse through a dangerous part of the road near “Helona” locality. Like everyone else, I too began to climb up the hill but not on top of the horse, it was too dangerous, on foot, running uphill, holding the horse by the reins. But soon I got very tired so I lay down and watched the flashing bullets flying over the horse and getting lost somewhere above us. The enemy was attempting to close off this passage because it led to the border with Albania (an escape route)... When I got to the top of the hill, I said to Fotev: “I had to sit down and rest because I almost fainted...!” Fotev said: “I saw you...!”

This was the only necessary introduction. But here is the main thing I want to say:

As I mentioned earlier, when, in April 1948, the Macedonian central NOF agitation and propaganda department was stripped of its Macedonian staff and replaced with Grkomans (Greek-

Supremacists), I found myself at DAG Headquarters for Central and Western Macedonia, located in the village of Pevkofito, where I was appointed member of the Kamarila. A month to a month and a half later, after nothing had happened except for boredom and anticipation... I sat down and wrote a letter to DAG General Dimitrios Vlantas, then member of the CPG Central Committee Politburo. This same letter was taken out of context when it was published in Volume V of the edition “Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War”. In the letter I wrote that because I had heart problems and was prone to fainting spells, I didn’t think I would do well as a fighter with a rifle in my hand. There was danger that I would disappoint my fellow fighters and I would fail in my mission as a leading activist in the Macedonian national liberation movement. I begged Vlantas not to do this to me...

I was prepared to carry the rifle as well as be given the chance to work on the side of the Headquarters newspaper intended for Macedonian fighters, published in the Macedonian language, which would have enabled me to “shoot at the enemy with all the guns of the Macedonian fighters...”

Vlantas did not reply and neither did he take me back to NOF...

As I said, this letter was published... The first part of the letter, where I speak about my weakness and my BEGGING, it appears, was not touched at all... But the second part, in which I made my request, was redone... According to what was published, they claim that “Rakovski, in order to avoid the rifle, asked to ‘edit a single column’... But they avoided mentioning the one thing that angered, and perhaps frightened, the Greek “patriot” Vlandas, what I said about “convincing the entire Macedonian army” which, at the time was a majority, through the Macedonian language side of the newspaper, to fight with all its might, which prompted Vlandas to expel me...

But things were different than they seemed. Here is a sequence of events:

When Vlantas expelled me (Rakovski) I was not an official, but a simple editor, after which time I continued to work on the

Macedonian publications under the supervision of Kotsopoulos but only for a short time. After I had a few unpleasant run-ins with him I left.

A little later Mitrevski was returned from DAG. And:

On Zahariadis's recommendation, during the NOF Central Council II Plenum, we were both re-appointed members of the NOF Central Council (then - Presidency).

It should be clear to anyone as to why Zahariadis did this given the circumstances...

As for those who "deserted", I mean those who fled to Yugoslavia... there is nothing more to be said. It is well-known which leaders they were and how and why they found themselves in Yugoslavia where they remained...

19.

Kiriazovski wrote: "Pavle Rakovski blames the editors of the collections "Aegean Macedonia and the national liberation struggle" for a friendly twist and tendency to "beautify" Aianovski's biography. As one of the editors, with full moral and professional responsibility, I stand behind everything written about Aianovski's revolutionary activities and I think that the editors fulfilled their obligation to the man who remained faithful to his people..." (29).

Rakovski wrote: When considering the question of who and how TOMO was established, what happened at the convening of the first regional conference in Voden Region, as well as the recently mentioned removal of the "NOF organizing secretary" allegedly by a "Party Veto" at the pre-Congress meeting, we have to conclude that, from what was said in Aianovski's "Aegean Storms" and in Kiriazovski's "Chronology" ("Aegean Macedonia and the national liberation struggle"), that events have been invented and history has been re-written in order to satisfy one's actions and tastes. It was not unusual to refer to Aianovski as the "NOF organizing secretary" in "Chronology" (p. 174 and 182), which also alleges that "requests" were made to remove him the first time by the "CPG Macedonian

Bureau” in November 1947, and the second time during the “NOF Central Council” pre-Congress meeting in January 1948. These so-called “requests”, however, are total fabrications. Vangel Aianovski was “suspended” shortly after the NOF asset was selected in May 1947, and afterwards, like I said before, continued to work as an instructor. Kiriazovski, however, insisted that it was not like that, as if he were there, and has used every opportunity to elevate Aianovski as the most important person in the Macedonian national liberation movement in Greek occupied Macedonia. In a recently published series of articles in the newspaper “Nova Makedonija”, about the struggle of the Macedonian people in Greek occupied Macedonia, as part of an educational and cultural plan, for example, Kiriazovski did not fail to mention that: “MAO, the Macedonian anti-fascist organization in Voden Region, after requests were made by the Macedonian people, and after the CPG District Committee for Voden Region approved it, was formed in April 1942. The founder and leader of MAO was Vangel Aianovski-Oche. The goal of the organization was, in addition to fighting for the expulsion of the occupiers, to fight for the acquisition of national rights for the Macedonian people. MAO developed a wide range of activities and achieved major successes in involving the Macedonian people in the struggle. MAO also issued its own newspaper called ‘Tsrvena Dzevzda’ (Red Star)...” The truth, however, is that MAO was established by the Greek leaders, exactly the same way MRO (United) was established. When the Greeks saw that MAO functioned well, unlike the stillborn fictional MRO (United), and was being transformed into a dynamic revolutionary organization (despite being constrained in Voden) the Greeks liquidated it... This is proof that MAO was yet another “Greek project” that had served its useful purpose before it was killed... But, contrary to the evidence provided, Kiriazovski continued to insist that “Aianovski was one of the most important leaders of NOF”. He said this in his “Chronology” three times as well as twice in Aianovski’s biographical data (p. 59 and 85) and once at the end of the book, together with the biographies of CPG and NOF leaders. He did not do this for anyone else. It was a conscious effort to impose Aianovski into the consciousness of the uninformed readers, especially in the CPM, and more widely, as an important, and most precisely, as the most important leader of all, a true revolutionary in Greek occupied Macedonia. This friendly affection has come to the

fore by the fact that Kiriazovski tried to “beautify” Aianovski’s biography at the cost of violating the dignity of his own profession as a historian. He did this in volume V, volume VI and other volumes of “Aegean Macedonia and the national liberation struggle”.

Written on p. 117, Volume II, in the extensive collection of original documents on the history of the Macedonian people “Aegean Macedonia in the national liberation war”, among other things about Aianovski’s biographical information, was:

“He was a communist from the pre-war period...” But the truth is, about which Aianovski wrote in his book “Aegean Storms”, that he signed a police declaration and became a renegade. He condemned all communist activities as treasonous... Unfortunately Kiriazovski is silent on that.

It was also said that: “Aianovski was appointed Assistant Commissar of the Aegean Brigade in November 1944!” But what was not said is that, as a result, he only participated in the brigade’s parade in front of the Political Committee on November 18, 1944. After that he was withdrawn and sent to Voden to monitor and report on the situation there. This explains why Aianovski was not in the Headquarters’ composition when the Brigade entered into action against the Balisti. But, of course, nothing was said about that either.

It was said that: “TOMO, the ‘Secret Macedonian Liberation Organization’, was formed in Voden Region in January 1945, and led by Aianovski until the First District Conference, held on April 28, 1945...” But nothing was said about Aianovski’s own reports contradicting that... This information too was consciously ignored...

It was said that: “Aianovski became secretary of the NOF District Committee for Voden Region in the spring of 1945, after that he became member of the Executive Board and organizational secretary of the NOF Main Board for Aegean Macedonia...!”

It is true that Aianovski, at my recommendation, was appointed first president, i.e. Secretary of the first TOMO District Committee, at

the TOMO-NOF district conference on June 20, 1945. It is also true that during the reorganization of the NOF staff structure as per the Agreement with the CPG, in November 1946, Aianovski became member of the NOF Executive Board with the position of instructor in Voden Region. But it is not true that he became an organizing secretary of NOF because after the election he was suspended and continued to work as an instructor. This explains why Aianovski never took part in any of the Secretariat working meetings, and his signature did not appear in any of the Secretariat documents.

20.

Kiriazovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski not once, and by no accident, has emphasized that NOF has never been independent and was influenced and managed by the CPM (CPY)... What is the goal and in whose interest is this misinformation being spread by him..?” The above statement was quoted in the journal “Istoria” on page 293.

Simply unbelievable! “O kosmos tohi timbano, ke mis krifo kamari!” (A drum beats to the world, and we make a secret of it!) This is how the neighbouring people around Greece are expressing themselves as to what was happening... Let us now list a few more important facts:

The withdrawal of the ELAS Macedonian battalions to the People’s Republic of Macedonia, with the consent of the CPM (CPY) of course, was no secret to anyone...

The creation of the Political Commission for Aegean Macedonia in Bitola, led by representatives of the CPM Central Committee, cannot be a secret. It happened publicly in front of the people of Bitola and in front of the world, and a program declaration was published...

The political commission organized protest rallies with the Macedonians in Bitola who had fled Greek occupied Macedonia. I was there with them.

On November 18, 1944, a representative from NOV and POJ General Headquarters for Macedonia gave the then newly formed

Aegean Brigade a battle flag. The flag was presented in front of the Political Committee and a large number of spectators. The event ended with the battalions and the brigade parading in front of the Political Committee and in front of the people of Bitola...

In April 1945, the Political Committee ceased to exist and was replaced by the NOF Central Executive Board for Aegean Macedonia, which was constituted on April 23, 1945 by the CPM Central Committee. NOF's activities were managed by the CPM Central Committee through its representatives (Pekar and Minchev). Almost every report generated by this leadership regarding the situation in Greek occupied Macedonia was published in the edition "Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War". Sadly the editorial board did not specify to whom these NOF reports were directed. Were they naively making an attempt to hide something that was commonly known? Everyone knew about our frequent visits to the field and about our returning to Skopje for meetings with members of the main leadership. By that I am saying everyone who was interested in all of Skopje and Bitola knew about us, including the CPG representatives who resided in Skopje. Even the report content itself unambiguously showed to whom those reports were directed...

According to published documents, as early as June 1943, Tempo took a trip to central Greece in order to reach a military and political alliance agreement for a joint Balkan Headquarters with the CPG and ELAS, which apparently was achieved. But the Greek side abandoned this agreement in August 1943... only because of Macedonia...

Also, according to published documents of that time, in September 1943, a representative of the CPM Central Committee met with a representative of the CPG and managed to reach an agreement in which, among other things, the Greek side was to issue a Macedonian newspaper, in the Macedonian language, and create separate Macedonian partisan units. But this agreement too was not implemented by the Greek side...

The fact that Macedonian people, at different times and in different places, had to fight in order to create various organizations against

the will of the CPG, tells us that our Greek friends took extraordinary preventive measures to stifle the Macedonian anti-fascist revolutionary forces to keep them divided and isolated in their districts and from other districts, so that they could be easily controlled and suppressed.

The fact that, due to the rapid spread of Macedonian organizations and due to the Greek side dismantling them is irrefutable proof of the CPG leadership's chauvinistic attitude towards the Macedonian national liberation movement and towards the Macedonian people in general...

This can also be seen from the fact that, Greek "party officials", i.e. "Greek patriots" were placed in charge of the Macedonian districts where they worked to develop anti-Macedonian activities to which the CPG Central Committee Politburo was later forced to admit. In its explanation the CPG admitted that these people were "adventurous and chauvinistic greater-Greece elements!"

The CPG Central Committee Politburo sent a confidential letter addressed to the ELAS 28th Brigade Commissar ordering him to order the ELAS Macedonian battalion to travel south and ultimately be attacked and disarmed because it posed a danger... And that is exactly what happened. While the Macedonian battalion was fighting against the Germans on Bigla Mountain it was attacked by partisan units from the ELAS 28th Brigade...

The battalion did not fight back. It disengaged from the battle against the Germans and, in order to avoid bloodshed, withdrew from Greek occupied Macedonia and crossed over the border into the now Republic of Macedonia. As soon as the battalion crossed the border its command wrote a letter explaining its departure and rejected Greek claims as to why it was attacked and what had happened.

Being unable to defeat NOF despite all its efforts, the Greek side took a different approach. At a CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace meeting, held on December 26 and 27, 1945, for the first time Zahariadis spoke about the Macedonian national liberation movement and publicly said that NOF was a people's democratic

organization with which he needed to co-operate. According to LAIKI FONI from December 28, 1945, Zahariadis said: “We go shoulder to shoulder with the Slavo-Macedonians against the domestic Monarcho-fascists and against the counter-band autonomists and their foreign backers who encourage and finance them both...”

At the same time our Greek comrades and Party leaders led this new and different campaign in the press, a campaign of friendship and solidarity with the Macedonian people, they continued with their hostile campaign against leading Macedonian Communists, the most conscious people and most active bearers of the Macedonian national ideals. The goal here was obvious. While pretending they were all for the Macedonian cause, they compromised, slandered and destroyed the most valuable Macedonian people, the leaders of the movement. And with their destruction they aimed to behead and defile the Macedonian national liberation movement until it was destroyed.

Proof of this was delivered in February 1946, during the CPG Central Committee II Plenum. Despite the “nice things” the CPG press was publishing about the Macedonian people in general, the CPG officially treated the Macedonians NOT AS PART OF ANOTHER AND UNIQUE NATION, but as a “mass of people”, a “Slavophone population” which lived in Greek occupied Macedonia on the lands of the Greek state. During the II Plenum the CPG proclaimed that it will fight for “the recognition of rights and equality” as a Slavophone population, but without NOF’s leadership. And so the Party regional press (local) in Macedonia continued its hostilities against the NOF leadership, even after the II Plenum.

Zahariadis again turned to the Party press and began to promote his new tactics. Using the Macedonian people’s natural aspiration for freedom, he called on the Macedonian fighters to join the Greek revolutionary forces in a “unified struggle” led by the CPG. With his declarations, which turned out to be just empty words, Zahariadis recognized NOF and, like a kind of Trojan horse entering the wide door of a fortress, managed to take possession of it.

And as NOF fell into his hands, so did its military formations. They too fell into Zahariadis's hands...!

This is not misinformation! This is our history... full of pain. It is not fair to blur and conceal the truth from the reader. Don't let these false historians deceive you.

This is how things stand today regarding this problem...

21.

Kiriazovski wrote: "The claim that Oche (Aianovski) made that NOF was independent, and according to Pavle Rakovski that it was losing its independence because its leadership was at fault, is simple demagoguery... It shows that Pavle Rakovski had given up on the very thing for which he himself had always advocated. The fact is that NOF, despite having been put under the leadership of the CPG in November 1946, managed to preserve its autonomy until its First Congress in January 1948. NOF's autonomy was lost when Zahariadis managed to infiltrate NOF and place his own people in it, who then opposed the NOF leadership." (p. 293.)

Rakovski wrote: It may look like that from the distance. This is the opinion of those people who were not participants in the events themselves and tend to think superficially. Saying that: "The NOF leadership is at fault for NOF losing its independence" strikes at the heart of all those who constituted that leadership. Otherwise, how can one talk about NOF's independence at all. As a reminder: NOF was a mass Macedonian organization first led by communists and members of the CPM/CPY and then by the CPG. This means that NOF was never a separate and independent organization outside the two communist parties. NOF, in this (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia was always the subject of controversy between the CPG and the CPM/CPY, proof of which can be found in a number of published source documents of that time. NOF for certain periods was managed by one or the other communist parties. This says it all...

However, let us have a closer look at the newly made claim that “NOF managed to preserve its autonomy until its First Congress. Here are some specific events.

After establishing “unity” Paskal Mitrevski, then NOF National Bureau instructor, went to Skopje and stayed there for half a year while maintaining contact with the Greek CPG representatives at home. I have no idea what he was doing all that time. However, Mitrevski did not break his connections with the field.

While executing a “party directive” Rakovski and NOF’s central agitation and propaganda department, remained isolated for half a year, far from the NOF organizations, in Kotili or on the road through the liberated territories. All this time was wasted waiting to be told where to establish the department’s headquarters and start working. (Which turned out to be outside of Macedonia in Likorahi, Epirus...)

At the same time Keramitchiev and Vera were left alone for half a year and it is unknown under what kind of party directive they were working, i.e. where they were and what they were doing. Perhaps Keramitchiev will write about this in his memoirs...

Historically, this was the last check of the correctness of the famous Greek chauvinistic “theory” that claims that: “There is no Macedonian nation and therefore there can be no genuine Macedonian movement!” According to the same Greeks, these NOF people were not Macedonians but “adventurous elements” who were out there sowing seeds of discontentment in the peaceful ‘Slavophone’ villages. Remove them, neutralize them and everything will be fine and peaceful again. At the time of the unity agreement, the goal was to open a frontal attack, instigated by the leaders of the “split”, under the influence and pressure from the huge party authority... But that was not achieved... It did not come true. So now, immediately after the agreement, they tried to isolate the leaders to see what would happen... whether the NOF movement would fail or not...

As was said earlier, according to the “unity” agreement, the immediate secretariat of NOF was reduced to Keramitchiev,

Rakovski and Vera. This was their new assignment. They were tasked by the Party to carry out their assignments in a way that suited the Party. But even after six months of isolation, members of this secretariat still managed to come together for a meeting and, as we know, decided to choose Vangel Aianovski-Oche member of the secretariat responsible for organizational matters... which was done. But nothing became of Aianovski. The Party intervened and reversed the decision... Aianovski was then immediately dismissed...

According to the “unity” agreement, NOF and its agitation and propaganda department was to act in accordance with party guidelines, working closely with the Party leadership and party organizations in Greek occupied Macedonia. The NOF agitation and propaganda department was to closely cooperate with the other corresponding party agitation and propaganda departments for its supply of necessary materials and paper. Anything above that would be taken care of by the Party leadership, that is, the Party organization.

The fact that “Nepokoren” (at that time nothing could be discussed about “Nova Makedonka” and “Bilten”) was published only five times all throughout 1947, undeniably and convincingly speaking about the anti-Macedonian character of that concern... The first time we printed only 100 copies in small format. The second time we printed 70 copies, of which 20 were sent to Voden where they were seized and destroyed by Gousiopoulos. The third time we printed 200 copies, the fourth time 300, and the fifth time 400 copies. That was it!

These are the facts... This is what Rakovski said about this:

The Macedonian national liberation movement in Greek occupied Macedonia was the subject of controversy, discussion and cooperation between the CPM/CPY and the CPG. Tempo was in Greece, Abas was in Solun and there were other similar contacts made over time. The various phases of the Macedonian liberation movement did not occur spontaneously or “independently”. It was a reflection of the engagement and activities in both the CPM/CPY and CPG. After NOF was formed, it operated for a year and a half

under the CPM/CPY's leadership. NOF was also under the CPM/CPY leadership when it was transferred and placed under the CPG leadership. In other words, the Macedonian communists who stood at the helm of the Macedonian liberation movement always worked under the leadership of the CPM/CPY or CPG. This is how it was... But, of course, some call it misinformation and plain demagogy. And then when NOF was put under the CPG they spoke of losing its autonomy because the NOF leadership was somehow "at fault". And that, I suppose, explains everything...

22.

After NOF was handed over to the CPG on November 21, 1946, it was completely cut off and isolated from the CPM/CPY. "Nepokoren" had no opportunity to receive or publish information about life and progress in the People's Republic of Macedonia and Yugoslavia. But there was more to it than that. Before "unity" was established, anti-Macedonian acts had dramatically escalated and, as I mentioned earlier, they had led to severe political crimes perpetrated against the Macedonian people. Then it became clear to us that "there was no return for us no matter what happened", which in fact meant "don't wait for support from the CPM/CPY, no matter what happens..." Obviously, by doing this the CPM/CPY, in fact, not only surrendered NOF to Zahariadis, but literally destroyed all bridges, preventing any and all CPM/CPY interventions in support of NOF.

Just because the CPM/CPY remained silent on the issue, did not mean that it approved of Zahariadis's anti-Macedonian-anti-Yugoslav policy. But, regardless of that, it was hard for the Macedonian communists and NOF leaders not to feel abandoned. It was hard for them to have sentimental views of things given the harsh reality they were under... (This is what Rakovski wrote in his critical review).

Following the same question, Kiriazovski wrote:

"With Mihailo Keramitchiev's departure for Skopje to be treated and to work, where he is now, and with the withdrawal of some NOF regional activists from the "hot terrain", including Aianovski,

it became clear”, Rakovski wrote, ” that support and help from the CPM/CPY cannot be expected no matter what happens...” Here, too, Pavle Rakovski has aggressively attacked and defamed the CPM/CPY under the invented pretext that the Yugoslav leadership allegedly forced the NOF leadership to be handed over to Zahariadis and allegedly demolished the bridge between the CPM/CPY and NOF. Rakovski wrote: “The Macedonian communists and NOF leaders found this hard. They felt abandoned...” However, the truth is completely different. The CPM/CPY, in the spirit of their principled policy, never left the Macedonians and were not indifferent to what was happening in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia. They repeatedly objected to the Greek leaders when their policy towards the Macedonian people was not correct and detrimental to the liberation movement itself. I will quote a small part of a letter from the CPY Central Committee sent to the CPG Central Committee from which it can be seen whether the CPY had abandoned the Macedonians or not:

“There were many reasons for dissatisfaction among the Macedonian people in Greek occupied Macedonia. They were not allowed to run their own affairs in the people’s government, they were not allowed to run their Macedonian units in DAG, they were not allowed to run their own Macedonian organizations and, their Macedonian national liberation movement was constantly compromised. The Macedonian cadres in Greek occupied Macedonia were discriminated against for having participated in the People’s Liberation Army in the FPRY. DAG refused to recognize the ranks they had achieved in the Yugoslav army, and the CPG refused to recognize their CPY Party memberships. All these negative acts, perpetrated by the Greeks, were certainly reasons for dissatisfaction among the Macedonians. But most of all, the Macedonian people were dissatisfied with the negative approach taken against the Macedonian National Question, especially during the CPG Central Committee’s V Plenum...” (History, No. 2/81, p. 295-296.)

Rakovski wrote: Did that mean that I did not have the right to complain...? Did it mean that the CPM/CPY really did not abandon us...? However, like this and other similar letters I wrote and interventions I made, my complaints were screams in the desert that

fell on deaf ears. They brought us no result and no one knew about them. The Greek side completely ignored them... just as they ignored many of the agreements and documents they had signed! We were practically left on our own and without a spine...

And let us not forget that some people prefer not to speak about the issues Rakovski speaks and remain silent about the crimes perpetrated against the Macedonian people... Let us instead speak about and emphasize trivial issues such as those who fled to Yugoslavia and remained there, including Aianovski. And let us be brave about it without even the slightest concern for the dignity of the historical profession... One more thing: Kiriazovski has taken it upon himself to publicly declare me an anti-party element who spread the “harshesht” and “most dangerous misinformation” against the CPM (CPY), only because I pointed out the fact that the agreement was not the work of the NOF leadership, of which I was a member, but the work of both the CPM (CPY) and CPG leaderships.

23.

Kiriazovski wrote: “Pavle Rakovski has admitted that the KOEM leaders passed a resolution against the CPY. But, in order to conceal the harmful consequences of that document, he invented some “arguments”. Namely, he claimed that the CPG never published a document that supported the Informburo condemnation of the CPY. This however is not true. In addition to the June 30, 1948 circular letter to the DAG political commissars, with which they were familiarized with the Informburo resolution which was then accepted by the CPG in 1949, along with some other documents with anti-Yugoslav content, there was the CPG Central Committee VI Plenum Resolution, during which the CPG spoke in favour of the Informburo resolution against Yugoslavia...” (p. 296.)

Rakovski wrote: Zahariadis founded KOEM on March 27, 1949, under which he collected all Macedonian military and political cadres. Less than three months later, on June 20, 1949, he called a KOEM meeting. He attended the meeting in person during which he outlined, in the form of a party document, his famous resolution against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and against Tito, that is, against the CPM and the political leadership of the People’s

Republic of Macedonia. He then demanded that it be adopted and individually signed by everyone.

The CPG itself, however, never did publish, under its own name, such a document supporting the Informburo and condemning the CPY. The small regional KOEM organization was in no position to act on behalf of the CPG in this matter.

Something that needs to be pointed out here is that these “arguments” are not fiction. The CPG at that time, through the KOEM active, did not publish such a document under its own name. It did this in October 1949, a few months later - with the publication of the anti-Yugoslav resolution adopted during the CPG Central Committee VI Plenum held on October 9, 1949, a month and a half after DAG was defeated, and after Rakovski and the other NOF leaders were sent to prison... Another thing to point out here is that the circular letter from a year ago (June 30, 1948) was not published at all. This was a confidential letter and, of course, not all DAG commissars received it.

24.

As I said earlier, the CPG never did publish, under its own name, such a document supporting the Informburo and condemning the CPY. The small regional KOEM organization, however, was in no position to act on behalf of the CPG in this matter so why ask it to do this? It is likely that there was another purpose for this. According to logic and the actual facts, it was a provocation, a trap set to trap:

a) The Macedonian military and political cadres.

If the KOEM leaders were to refuse to sign the document, because of sympathies for the CPM/CPY, then they would come into collision with the CPG. Of course they could not have taken into account, and perhaps did not even know about the Tito-Stalin collision. A collision between KOEM and the CPG would certainly cause cleavage and confrontation within the CPG and DAG leaderships. This would inevitably lead to the disintegration of DAG units which would be catastrophic for DAG. Then Zahariadis could

blame KOEM as being the main and public trigger for the defeat of the people's revolution and for the downfall of the Macedonian liberation movement. As an integral part, the KOEM leadership would then be labeled traitorous to both the Greek and the Macedonian people. And that, of course, would be enough to earn it its liquidation.

The truth is Zahariadis tried to conceal his own betrayal of DAG and the revolution by accusing the CPY and Yugoslavia of "betrayal". It is an undeniable fact that after Zahariadis failed to show "Yugoslav betrayal" through the KOEM "trick", he was forced to invent a new "trick", the famous "attack from behind". He tried to convince everyone that Yugoslavia attacked DAG from behind. But, as it turned out, there was no such attack and Yugoslavia had nothing to do with DAG's defeat. I have no doubt that anyone researching this subject based on the events that took place and based on the documents left behind, will easily find the truth; convening the KOEM meeting "five minutes to twelve" on the eve of DAG's defeat was nothing more than a provocative act with an obvious goal to provoke a new split in the leadership in order to accelerate DAG's defeat...

If, on the other hand, the KOEM leaders decided to sign the document against the CPY/CPM and against the leadership of the People's Republic of Macedonia, they would discredit themselves in the eyes of the "Skopje leaders" and in the eyes of the CPY. And that, it seems, was most important and most acceptable to Zahariadis...

b) This was also a provocation and a trap against the "Skopje leaders" and against the CPY.

Namely, if the KOEM leaders signed the document (and that's what happened) against the CPM/CPY and against the People's Republic of Macedonia's leadership then, perhaps in response (this is what Zahariadis was certainly hoping for), the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY would declare the KOEM leaders traitors and would anathematize them. That, of course, would be a brilliant move on Zahariadis's part. By doing so the "Skopje leaders" and the CPY would not only remove themselves from the game but would

abandon the so-called “Slavophones” altogether for at least one generation. Then, led by enthusiastic anti-Macedonian leaders, these “Slavophones” would have nowhere to turn except to remain as an internal Greek phenomenon - as a “Slavophone” speaking part of the Greek people...

Not knowing where they were expected to go and when, the NOF leaders were taken individually, in two's or in three's so that they had no chance to talk to one another. They were sent to see Zahariadis at DAG Headquarters/ provisional democratic government of Greece. They had no idea that they would be signing the KOEM resolution. Maybe Rakovski was the only one who thought and said to himself “now was not a good time for open confrontations and for creating new cleavages”... This is how Rakovski evaluated the situation...

Responding to that Kiriazovski said: “The truth however was different. Zahariadis's purpose was not the one that Pavle Rakovski has served us wholesale...” (p. 296.)

“As for the second eventuality (under b), Pavle Rakovski ‘triumphantly’ bragged about the fact that the CPM/CPY allegedly did not condemn and did not anathematize the KOEM-NOF leadership.” (p. 296.)

It is common knowledge that Pavle Rakovski was among the members of the KOEM-NOF managing body that managed to flee and live in Yugoslavia. For their difficult activities in the field these people were awarded several decorations...

Kiriazovski wrote: “Zahariadis actually wanted to include the Macedonian national question, that is, the Macedonian factor, as an integral part of the informative campaign against Yugoslavia, as it is clearly specified in the CPG Central Committee's March 3, 1949 radio program!”

However KOEM and its resolution did not exist at that time and the above-mentioned radio program could not be applied to them. So the burning question here is: Why did Zahariadis create KOEM so late

in the game, that is, just before DAG's catastrophe? And then impose his resolution on it?

Kiriazovski wrote: "Rakovski is wrong in claiming that the CPY did not react to anti-Macedonian actions (alluding to the signing of the famous KOEM resolution and thus avoiding speaking about it). "For example, the CPY Central Committee repeatedly orally and in writing reacted against the idea of some allegedly independent Macedonian state within a Balkan federation proposed during NOF's Second Plenum, held in February 1949. The CPY Central Committee called this a hostile act directed against Federal Yugoslavia and against the People's Republic of Macedonia." (p. 296-297.)

"Regarding the Macedonian national question, and also with an attempt on your part to use this issue in the Informburo campaign against Yugoslavia, we have already given you an appropriate answer with the radio program of March 3, 1949. We also acknowledged that you with your denial from March 7, 1949, renounced the position taken during the NOF Second Plenum, and with that, once again you acknowledged that your mass organizations (NOF), under your leadership, are leading a wrong policy in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia."

The other part of the other radio program reads: "It is characteristic that for the purposes of this campaign against the CPY, separate manifestations of the mass organizations under the leadership of the CPG are also used. Thus, for example, the NOF Second Plenum Resolution for Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia claims that a new situation has been created in Yugoslavia, which should mean that the CPY position and attitude regarding the struggle in Greece has changed." (p. 297.)

According to Kiriazovski all these documents quite clearly deny Rakovski's claims!

However, it is interesting to note that these documents refer to the decisions made during the NOF Central Committee Second Plenum, held on February 3 and 4, 1949, that arose before KOEM was established and cannot "deny" Rakovski's opinions as to why

Zahariadis called the assets to form KOEM precisely “five minutes before twelve o’clock”.

This was Kiriazovski’s conclusion, given with these unnecessary words: “If Pavle Rakovski does not have enough of these facts we are ready to give him more... (his insistence that the meeting of the KOEM assets was held on June 20, 1949, on October 3, 1949, etc.)” (Page 297.)

Of course, when the KOEM meeting was held, as Rakovski claims, has nothing to do with the contentious issue: why were the KOEM assets called. After that, postures were only verbally expressed. Well, if you take into consideration that Rakovski, whenever he wants to freely rewrite well-known texts, God knows what he will invent and attribute to himself and what he said at the meeting. As for the October 3, 1949 text Rakovski wrote (during the first day of his prison sentence), the following can be said: Whatever he wrote to the CPG Central Committee then was almost the same of what he wrote to the CPM Central Committee when he returned from prison. This can be confirmed... The document is entitled: Protest letter to the CPM Central Committee.

(April 1983)

X. AS ALWAYS “THE EARTH WILL CONTINUE TO REVOLVE”

(Publicly condemned and convicted by the INI associates through the Voice of the Institute for National History (INI), I invoke Galileo Galilei’s comment as a title - a response, and in the text that follows one will see the historical reality that needs to be respected...)

“Recognizing or distorting the historical truth?” Using this title Risto Kiriazovski wrote a critical review for the Voice of the Institute of National History (INI) number XXVII 3/1983, 331-338. The review was accepted by the editorial staff on June 28, 1985, and published this year (1986).

The main characteristic of the review was:

- a) It is a carefully compiled review of what has been said, that is, what has been written by the CPG, EAM and ELAS leaders, which could have some connection to the issue of forming “separate Macedonian units” within ELAS, and
- b) the fact that his author, despite the negative experiences that existed with the CPG leadership’s attitude towards the Macedonian national liberation movement (as they very well know, the ordering of executions and the killing of Macedonian partisans), tries to convince us that historical truth is only what is spoken or written by the people from the CPG...

“Do you want to know the truth? Then allow freedom in the word!” Kiriazovski and I (Rakovski) were comrades (former in the battle field, and now here). The only difference between us now is that we hold opposite views. But that should not be scary. The truth is born from the clash of opposites. Only, now, here we have unequivocally the necessary freedom to express our views. However, five times so

far, the editors of our newspapers did not publish my articles because Kiriazovski (a representative of INI) did not give his consent. Here is a case characteristic of that relationship: Through a long article, published by one of our more reputable periodicals, Kiriazovsky painted a rather ugly picture using personal insults that were not nice, but in doing so he opened more questions about our ELAS and DAG recent history. (See “History” number XVII, 1 (Skopje 1981), 288-297). I offered my contribution to highlight some of those issues, especially about events in which I participated directly. Again, the editorial board refused to accept it... The fact is my articles were continuously rejected by the editorial board despite the fact that some of my articles were previously published including an article entitled “For the Roots of Evil.” (See “History” number XIII, 1 (Skopje 1977), 87-114. Also see, “History” number XIV, 1 (Skopje 1978), 235-258, article entitled “On the occasion of the publication “Aegean Storms” by Vangel Aianovski-Oche...”).

It is not at all disputable that the people from the CPG and ELAS leaderships discussed and finally decided to form “separate Macedonian units” within ELAS. What is incredible is that Kiriazovski did a review to prove the opposite by quoting “original documents of that time” of something indisputable and widely known! Theory and practice in the CPG’s politics were two quite separate constituent elements. My dispute with Kiriazovski is a matter related to the practice. As far as I know, Greek authors (mainly former CPG, EAM, ELAS and DAG officials), for understandable reasons, are not talking about the unpleasant events that occurred in Voden when the CPG attempted to implement this decision (to form separate Macedonian units). It is also unpleasant and surprising to see Kiriazovski doing the same thing. Namely, not finding it necessary to expose what happened, that is, why the CPG, in March 1944, failed to create “separate Macedonian units” from the Macedonian people in Voden, as planned. As is well-known, the CPG (via Barba Nikos a CPG official and CPG regional secretary better known as Takis Papadopoulos) asked Voden fighters to act as “a separate Macedonian unit” for only one month, and then be deployed in the ELAS Greek units. Consequently, the Macedonian people were publicly denied the right to have their own struggle and to fight for their own freedom as an equal ally to the Greek people.

The people of Voden however refused to become bearers - implementers of such a nationalistic anti-Macedonian practice.

In general, it is impossible to believe that Kiriazovski knows nothing about this. In practice however, he acts like the politicized Greek authors: He remains silent on the practices and emphasizes the theories...

There is also something else that cannot be accepted. It is natural, even today, for the people of Voden who then were CPG activists, to recount why the CPG attempted to form a “special Macedonian unit” in the city Voden and failed.

In an article entitled “Voden Macedonian Battalion” (thirty-eight years after its formation), published in INI Journal No. 2-3 / 1981, author Tashko Mamurovski, in a brief explanation based exclusively on information obtained from the Voden activists, noted that:

“Before the ELAS Macedonian Voden Battalion was formed, during the months of April and May 1944, long discussions were held at the CPG Voden Region district, during which the Macedonian CPG activists demanded that they be allowed to form their own partisan units. At that time, the CPG Voden Region district, in accordance with the CPG Central Committee for Macedonia... allowed the formation of Macedonian units, provided that they act only one month, that is, until ‘Ohrana’ is disarmed and then the units can join ELAS. The Macedonian communists did not agree with this opportunistic attitude of the CPG leadership and rejected it. And that is why the separate Macedonian units were not formed!” (p. 187.)

Vangel Aianovski in his book “Aegean Storms”, whose reviewer was Risto Kiriazovski, provided us with some information on the Voden “special Macedonian unit”. In pages 128 to 133 he gave a detailed description of the event (the same one which Kiriazovski is silent about) on how and why the CPG attempted to carry out this decision in Voden and failed. Briefly and specifically he said that: In May 1944, at an expanded meeting of the Macedonian communists and anti-fascists from the city Voden, Barba Nikos, secretary of the regional committee, announced that the CPG Central Committee had accepted the request from the Voden Macedonian Communists and

approved the establishment of the Macedonian partisan unit which was to have its own Macedonian leadership. “Barba Nikos’s comments caused joy and enthusiasm among the audience...” wrote Aianovski. The next day Barba Nikos called on Aianovski, a candidate for commanding the planned unit, and told him: “Yesterday we did not tell you all the details contained in the letter from the CPG Central Committee... The unit that will be formed will act independently for only one month, and then it will be dissolved... The fighters will be deployed in other ELAS units... Our goal is to attract as much of the Macedonian population as possible in the ELAS partisan units, because there is a danger that they will be armed by Kalchev... (Anton Kalchev was a Bulgarian officer who was organizing an autonomist counter-band movement in Western Aegean Macedonia...) This is a ‘good plan’ and spectacular strike against Kalchev’s plans and his masters in Sofia!”

But the unit was not created. The Macedonian communists disagreed with this “good plan” hatched out by our Greek “patriots” in the CPG, EAM and ELAS leadership...

I (Rakovski) gave a description of the Voden events in question in my book “In the deep night, the dawn is born”, published by INI, and in the INI messenger number 2-3/1982 in an article entitled “CPG, EAM, ELAS and the Macedonian national liberation movement”. I described the circumstances under which, in June 1944, one month after the CPG’s failure in Voden, about which we did not know in Meglen Region, the party leadership in Tresen Region, on my introduction, decided to immediately carry out an urgent counter-measure against the dangerous influence of the autonomist movement in that region: On June 16, 1944, it formed the Voden Macedonian Battalion. With the battalion’s formation the CPG leadership showed signs that it was pursuing equality for the Macedonian people... This deed was seen as a practical application of the CPG line to mobilize the people in the armed struggle against the fascist occupiers. However, Secretary Kole Pop-Sermidzhiev immediately left to inform the CPG Voden District Committee of this decision to make sure the CPG line of both “equality for the Macedonian people” and of “raising the people in armed struggle” was consistently applied...

Mamurovski, based on information he obtained from direct participants and witnesses, in the above-mentioned article (Glasnik 2-3 / 1981), has also given an interesting account on the circumstances under which the Voden Macedonian Battalion was formed in Meglen Region. (p. 188-189.)

In his book “Pozharsko in ELAS, NOF and DAG”, author Gorgi Iskov, who lost his brother, his sister, her husband, and his own arm up to his shoulder, proudly wrote how the mobilization started from his village Pozharsko with Zertzev and his daughter Risa Zertseva and teacher Katina Iskova - Pashku being mobilized. (p. 15) Meaning, one could say that the Voden Macedonian Battalion was born in the village Pozharsko, Meglen Region...

In his article entitled “Formation of the ELAS Voden battalion”, published in the magazine “Voice of the Aegeans”, number 15, on October 6, 1951, author Hristo Andonovski, then CPG activist in Meglen Region and the city Voden, wrote: “The Tresen Region CPG regional committee, at its meeting held on June 15, 1944 in the village Tresino, after a strong request from the Macedonian activists, members of the CPG, decided to form a separate Macedonian military unit in the composition of the ELAS units. At the meeting it was decided that the composition of the newly formed Macedonian battalion should be exclusively of Macedonian volunteers and, as a mark, the fighters would have to wear a red band around their neck...”

In his book “Macedonians under Greece in the struggle against fascism”, published by INI in 1968, Hristo Andonovski, among other things, wrote:

“On June 16, 1944, the Voden Macedonian Battalion was formed. Its appointed leaders were Pavle Rakovski-Gotse and Giorgi Atanasov-Blaze, and later, Gorgo Urdov-Dzhodzho, organizing secretary of the Voden Region committee, was appointed to serve as commissar of the battalion. A Greek named Lefteris Fundulakis, a lieutenant of the Greek Army, was appointed battalion commander!” (P. 177-178.)

All the survivors from the command structure, all ordinary Voden Macedonian Battalion fighters, as well as the entire Voden Region population, will say the same thing: The ELAS Voden Macedonian Battalion was born in Meglen Region because its first volunteer fighters were from Pozharsko, Baovo and other Macedonian villages in Meglen Region.

But Kiriazovski has decided to ignore all of this... calling it misinformation! In fact Kiriazovski has gone as far as accusing the Macedonian CPG activists, the direct participants and witnesses, the commanders and fighters of the battalion, and even the people, of “distorting the historical truth” and spreading misinformation.

This must not be allowed...

The District Committee in Voden, for some reason, thought that these formations were the work of the Macedonian Partisans from the Yugoslav part of Macedonia. Regarding this, Aianovski wrote that Dzhodzho Urdov, then organizational secretary of the District Committee, was given the task to go to Kaimakchalan and lead a raid against them and disband this “newly created Yugoslav Army”. And if it encountered resistance, to use all necessary force... (Aegean Storms, pp. 135-136.)

None of this, of course, happened by accident... As is well-known, a document was adopted and signed on June 20, 1943 by representatives of the National Liberation War and the Communist Parties of Yugoslavia, Greece and Albania. This document called for forming military and political alliances between the various people’s revolutions of the three above-mentioned countries. (This document was written in French and can be found in the Archives of Macedonia.) There was also the “Agreement” reached in September 1943 between representatives of the CPG and CPM/CPY for “cooperation” between the two parties and movements... (See details: Sources for the Liberation War and the Revolution in Macedonia, 1941-1945, volume I, book 2, Skopje 1968, p. 320.) At the request of the Yugoslavs, the CPG was also asked to form separate Macedonian units and arrange for the issuance of “Macedonian lists” for all of Aegean Macedonia. The Yugoslavs also insisted that constant contact be maintained, in general, at all

times between representatives of both parties and movements. This explains why, in this particular case, the District Committee concluded that this was a Yugoslav move.

The information provided by Aianovski challenges Kiriazovski's dispute as to when, where and under what circumstances the Voden Macedonian Battalion was created. According to Aianovski: Around July 20, 1944, news reached the District Committee that many Macedonian anti-fascists from Meglen Region had massively moved to Kaimakchalan with a desire to join the partisan units. This move, of Macedonians going to the mountains, the District Committee estimated was due to Yugoslav partisan influence. There were Yugoslav partisans at the time stationed on Kozhuv Mountain. The District Committee ordered them to stop their activities. Dzhodzho Urdov, then CPG organizing secretary for Voden, together with Risto Kordalov, Tushi Keramitchiev and several members of the diversionary group was ordered to go to Kaimakchalan and disband the newly formed partisan units. They were ordered to use force if they encountered resistance. (p. 136.) According to Aianovski:

“The District Committee used the situation to implement a decision to establish a separate Macedonian battalion in the composition of the ELAS 30th regiment. With the formation of the Macedonian battalion, the CPG Central Committee aimed to attract as many Macedonian anti-fascists in the ELAS ranks as possible, and later deliberately transferred them to other ELAS units. In fact, the Macedonian battalion served only as a pretense to attract the Macedonian people, and in no way to satisfy their intrinsic national aspirations. In order to carry out this action smoothly the District Committee appointed Lefteris Fundulakis, a Greek, as battalion commander, and Dzhodzho Urdov as battalion commissar. The CPG had full confidence in Dzhodzho Urdov, then CPG Central Committee organizational secretary, because by nature he was submissive and never opposed CPG decisions. Giorgi Atanosovski ... and Pavle Rakovski were appointed assistants in the leadership...” (p. 136-137.)

On the basis of all these Macedonian source materials and testimonies from direct participants and witnesses, we should be able to objectively conclude that:

- The CPG, EAM and ELAS leaderships had long discussions before they finally decided to form separate Macedonian units within ELAS...

- This “Twist” in their attitude towards the Macedonian people was happening in parallel with SNOF’s dissolution and the tension that had arisen in the Macedonian national liberation movement. The Greeks were worried that with SNOF’s loss the Macedonian people may be attracted to the controversial autonomist movement...

- In principle, by its decision to establish separate Macedonian units, the CPG recognized the right of the Macedonian people to have their own struggle, to fight under their own name as an equal ally of the Greek people. However, the Macedonian units were needed for “only one month”, that is, until the autonomist movement was broken up...

- In practical terms the decision was not accepted only because the Macedonian CPG activists did not agree that the Macedonian units should exist for “only one month” and then be disbanded. They saw that this was a cruel anti-Macedonian nationalist policy that denied the Macedonian people their right to organize and fight on their own behalf...

- Faced with dangerous influence from the rebel autonomist movement (primarily because of the CPG, EAM and ELAS anti-Macedonian policies), the Tresen Region party leadership was forced (as the only countermeasure) to transit from “equality in principle” to “equality in practice” for the Macedonian people; from a verbal declaration to action... This time the party “applied” the party line in order to raise the people in the armed struggle against the fascist occupiers. Namely, on June 16, 1944, it created a special Macedonian military formation...

The special Macedonian military formation, according to the proclamation, existed and acted as a “Macedonian people’s army”, as “the power of the Macedonian people”... a guarantee that the Macedonian people will freely speak their Macedonian mother tongue at all times...

The above was expressed in a leaflet dated September 5, 1944. The leaflet also outlined the special Macedonian alphabet I created for the needs of our ideological and political work at “Macedonian National Army” Headquarters. (See: Communist, Skopje May 7, 1971, p. 19.) We abandoned the Greek and Bulgarian alphabets because they could not serve the Macedonian people’s unity, the battalion and our people in general.

According to the Proclamation issued by headquarters, my role, as a third member of the battalion command, was to prepare for the ideological and political education of the fighters and put together an agitation and propaganda department to serve the needs of the Macedonian people... The proclamation was published by INI under the title “Macedonians under Greece in the struggle against fascism”, p.179, by Hristo Andonovski, and by INI “Glasnik” number XXV, 2-3, Skopje, 1981, p. 191-192, in an article written by Tashko Mamurovski.

This was how the Macedonian military formation in Meglen Region was created following the decision made during a meeting held on July 5, 1944, at the camp where the unit was stationed. Included among those who participated in the meeting were:

- 1) Barba Nikos, CPG district secretary for Voden Region,
- 2) Giorgi Urdov–Dzhodzho, CPG district organizational secretary,
- 3) Petros (Hristos Moshos), ELAS 10th Division representative,
- 4) Barba Traiko (Kole Pop-Sermidzhiev), Macedonian regional committee secretary for Tresen Region,
- 5) Giorgi Atanasov-Blaze, and
- 6) Pavle Rakovski-Gotse.

Dr. Risto Kiriazovski has been a historian for about three decades studying the history of the Macedonian national liberation movement in that part of (Greek occupied) Macedonia, and there should be no doubt that, based on the many original Macedonian source documents he has studied, he knows everything there is to know about the aforementioned historical realities. But why has he not paid attention to them and, instead, chose to say that:

“According to the original documents preserved from that time, the task of forming the battalion was entrusted to the CPG District Committee for Voden Region, and its realization was entrusted to Giorgi Urdov–Dzhodzho, District Committee organizing secretary, and activist Kole Pop-Sermidzhiev. Pavle Rakovski... was involved in the action as an ELAS reserve regional activist, and not as a member of the CPG’s regional committee, as he claims...” (History, XVII 2, 1981, p. 289.)

Kiriazovski continued: “Rakovski is persistently insisting that he was the founder of the aforementioned battalion, he and nobody else! (Clearly this is a low blow against Rakovski.) Even if there was no original documentation that clearly speaks about the reasons, the founders and the course of the battalion’s establishment (the circumstances under which the battalion originated excluded the existence of such documentation, and the fact Kiriazovski only speaks about it, but does not quote from it, confirms it)... was a large and complicated issue...” No it was not! It was consistent with the implementation of the party line. Taking into account the politics, tactics and the mentality of the CPG leadership this was not the work of the Regional Committee... or the work of a small body... The decision to create the Voden battalion as well as the Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion... was made by the CPG Central Committee Politburo, and its practical implementation was entrusted to the CPG District Committee for Voden Region. Like other Macedonian activists in this district, Rakovski too was involved in the process. (p. 332.)

As we can see, Kiriazovski never did ask the question why did the CPG people want to create “separate Macedonian units” so late in the game, and why did they want to “disband them only a month later”? He must have had more in his mind... By proposing the idea that Dzhodzho and activist Kole Pop-Sermidzhiev created the Voden Macedonian Battalion Kiriazovski was trying to conceal:

a) The CPG’s unsuccessful attempt to form a “special Macedonian unit” in Voden that was to be led by Vangel Aianovski-Oche, and above all

b) The reason for its failure; which was an anti-Macedonian nationalist demand to have it created and then disbanded a month later.

The CPG leadership's decision to dissolve SNOF in May 1944 was a heavy blow to the Macedonian national liberation movement which, in a way, gave rise to the spread of the counter-band autonomist movement. The CPG's attempt to create a Macedonian unit for only a month could not and should not be regarded as a cancellation of the CPG's previous policy - suppression of the Macedonian national liberation movement. The CPG wanted to attract Macedonian fighters into its Greek lead struggle and into the ranks of the Greek units for a couple of reasons. Creating a short term Macedonian unit was going to achieve two objectives: one, swell the Greek ranks with Macedonian fighters after the unit was dissolved, and two, stifle the creation of a Macedonian organized military force by robbing it of its fighters...

Knowing all this then why does Kiriazovski, in his reviews, in this case, act like the Greek authors – being silent about Greek nationalism and trying to conceal anti-Macedonian acts committed by the CPG leadership against its own membership and against the wider public. We need to speak up and point this out:

“In support of this assertion”, Kiriazovski wrote, “we are changing parts of several original documents of that time!” (p. 332.)

And, have a look at what he has changed:

He has made changes from line 40 on page 332 to line 14 on page 333:

He adjusted part of the report written by CPG official Panos (Evripidis Kapetanios), dated May 27, 1944, to refer to the enthusiasm expressed by the 45 activists in Voden when Barba Nikos announced the CPG Central Committee decision to allow the formation of a “special Macedonian unit”. That was it. He said nothing about the planned “separate Macedonian unit” that was never formed or that it was going to be led by Aianovski. He was silent on this matter leading the uninformed reader into believing

that the Voden Macedonian Battalion was formed by the District Committee!

He has made changes from line 15 to line 21 on page 333:

He adjusted part of the CPG Bureau for Macedonia report to the CPG Central Committee, posted on August 15, 1944, to read: 41 days after the acceptance of the Macedonian military formation as the Third Battalion of the ELAS 30th Regiment... In this report, in fact, the bureau for Macedonia justifies why it accepted an entire battalion.

In this quote, as he did in the previous one, there is no information that the bureau and the District Committee formed the Voden Macedonian Battalion. Kiriazovski produced no such document. Therefore, with these carefully selected citations, he tried to lead the reader to the conclusion that the Voden Macedonian Battalion was created in Voden by the District Committee...

And that was all. This completes the changes made to that “original document of that time”...

From line 22 to line 33 on page 333:

By name and surname, Kiriazovski publicly accuses the author of these lines of altering the facts. For saying that the Voden Macedonian Battalion was formed not in Voden Region but in Meglen Region!

It is not by ignorance, nor can it be considered as a possible typographical error. But here Kiriazovski made a mistake, perhaps, because he did not know that Meglen Region is part of Voden Region... Or perhaps he was trying to mislead the readers who are not familiar with the political map of Greek occupied Macedonia...

Further down Kiriazovski categorically stated that: “It’s not true!” In other words, he refused to accept my explanation that the Voden Macedonian Battalion was created without the knowledge or participation of the District Committee and that the District Committee found out afterwards and its consent and approval was

granted after the fact. He refused my explanation even though I was a direct participant in this event... I cannot accept that Kiriazovski is not aware of this fact even though he was informed about this by other field activists including Aianovski. Kiriazovski should have also known that the District Committee attributed the formation of the battalion in Kaimakchalan to the Yugoslavs. The District Committee proclaimed it a deed of the Yugoslavs and ordered it to be disbanded, even by force if necessary. But Kiriazovski has ignored all this... he is silent on it. He persistently emphasized that: "The Voden Macedonian Battalion was formed in Voden Region", clearly for the readers' benefit, even though he knows that no one is thinking or claiming otherwise. He insisted that: "The decision to form the battalion was announced by the CPG District Committee secretary for Voden Region, which took place at a meeting of a larger group of Macedonian activists from Voden Region, held in the city gardens in Voden..." Yes, but this does not mean that this is proof that the battalion was formed here... If that was so, then:

"How was it possible to form an entire battalion without the CPG regional leadership's knowledge in whose area it was formed?"

Kiriazovski insists on all this because he knows that this is how things appear on the surface for those who look from afar...

Further down, until the end of the review, only because of lack of "original documentation that very clearly speaks about the reasons, the founders and the course of the establishment of the battalion", extensive materials are placed that exclusively speak to the category: "what it would have been if..."

Kiriazovski wrote: "Cancellation of the Lebanon Agreement meant collaborating with the internal and external enemy. At the same time, this determination required the activation of all the revolutionary forces and close cooperation with the liberation movements in the Balkans and, above all, with the Yugoslav national liberation movement. Given that the Macedonians were the most significant and most reliable force in that calculation, the Greek party leadership, this time, turned their attention to them. This was due to the "moves" made by this leadership, which kept in

touch with and which had an immediate connection to the formation of the Voden Macedonian Battalion...” (p. 334.)

As we can see Kiriazovski here is silent about what actually happened... He is silent regarding the historical fact that the Lebanon Agreement was accepted and implemented by the CPG, EAM and ELAS. He based his assumption on that which was not the case - the cancellation of the Lebanon Agreement. However, as an example, we will look at several of the mentioned “moves” that, according to Kiriazovski, had an immediate connection with the formation of the Voden Macedonian Battalion...

From line 31 to line 39 on page 334:

Part of Partsalidis’s performance in the Greek parliament was presented to the PEEA National Committee (the Greek AVNOJ) on May 25, 1944, in which, among other things, he calls for following the path of the Yugoslav peoples in overcoming the reactionaries...

From line 40 to line 43 on page 334:

There was information that in April 1944, PEEA appointed Andreas Dzhimes as his representative to the NCOJ and General Headquarters of NOV and POJ.

From line 1 to line 11 on page 335:

Part of Georgios Siantos’s radio broadcast from June 24, 1944, was sent to Andreas Dzimas, instructing him to inform Marshal Tito about the situation in Greece and seek help from Yugoslavia, not only political help, but also military action against a common enemy. Siantos announced: “We are recruiting and creating separate Macedonian partisan units!” In this regard, in footnote number 15, Kiriazovski emphasized, without any need: “And from this document you can see who made a decision to form Macedonian units!” And, again, he is silent about the fact that they were forced to do it. We will say more about that a little later...

From line 12 to line 23 on page 335:

A part of the resolution from the CPG Conference on the Aegean (Greek occupied) part of Macedonia, held on June 25, 1944, condemned the Lebanon Agreement saying that “the Greek people... depended on their own might and in close cooperation with their Yugoslav Allies, have the strength to exact destructive blows, speed up the dissolution of fascism and liberate their fatherland!” And so on...

Having in mind that:

The CPG, with a special declaration made during the CPG Central Committee Tenth Plenum, held in January 1944, emphasized to its allies and to the world its famous request for expansion beyond its northern borders... (Up to Veles for “strategic security” purposes...) (See: January 1944 CPG Central Committee Tenth Plenum Declaration in: Saranta Hronia TU KKE, CPG Central Committee edition, p. 504.) (See also: Hristo Andonovski, “Macedonians under Greece in the struggle against fascism”, INI 1968, p. 154-155.)

With the signing of the Lebanon Agreement in May of 1944, and in the spirit of the said declaration, the CPG solidified its commitment to the domestic imperialist bourgeoisie to fight together “for Greece’s interests” and due to the “great sacrifices” made during the national liberation war, it earned them the right to expand Greece’s borders northward and for Greece to become “a new free greater Greece”! (Ibid., p. 152.) When these historical events are taken into consideration it becomes clear that Kiriazovski used empty words when he talked about the so-called alliances and cooperation between the CPG and the CPY and the Yugoslav people...

It is surprising and truly unpleasant to see Kiriazovski remains silent on the Greek manifestation of Greek nationalism, anti-Macedonian sentiments, and anti-Yugoslav expansionism, while trying to guide the reader in a roundabout way that our historiography is somehow on the wrong track...

As for the contentious issue, he has said nothing about when, where and under what circumstances was the Voden Macedonian Battalion created, in the so-called “moves” of the Greek party leadership, mentioned earlier. It is unclear where Kiriazovski’s assertion that

“there was a ‘connection’ in the formation of the Voden Macedonian Battalion” comes from... It appears this too is as an attempt to again “fool” the uninformed reader...

Further on, just before the end of his review, Kiriazovski wrote (without insulting me):

(a) “Regarding the ELAS Voden Macedonian Battalion’s separation and departure to Vardar Macedonia, Rakovski wrote: ‘...before being attacked and disarmed (Markos at that time was commissar of the ELAS division in Macedonia, and that was well-known) the battalion fled over Kozhuv Mountain and landed in Kavadartsi. This took place during the night of October 12/13, 1944’. Led by Rakovski the battalion maneuvered to avoid being attacked...” (By ELAS.)

And further on he wrote:

(b) “In one of his statements made on October 3, 1949, regarding the same case, Rakovski gave the exact opposite information. In particular, he wrote: “I was deceived by my own conviction and by that of the late Dzhodzho, to transfer the Macedonian battalion to Kaimakchalan across the border. They told us that they would not arm us heavily, give us very heavy weapons, and we will immediately be returned to raise the people to a war against the Greek reactionaries and England...” (p. 337-338.)

Clearly, all this has nothing to do with the issue... What has Kiriazovski accomplished by comparing an event from October 1944 to an event that took place five years later, in October 1949...?

In (a) Rakovski spoke about Markos, then ELAS commissar in Macedonia, who ordered the attack on the battalion with aims at disbanding it. And, as Kiriazovski himself said, while facing danger, the battalion retreated to the Yugoslav part of Macedonia. The same thing happened with the Lerin-Kostur Macedonian battalion. The battalions retreated to avoid a possible armed conflict. The Greek ELAS units opened fire on the Macedonian partisans. Here is what Markos said: “While the Macedonian (Lerin-Kostur) battalion fought on Bigla Mountain against the Germans, it was attacked by

ELAS units from the 28th regiment...” (“Markos’s Biography” by Dragan Kliakich, 1979, p. 75.)

In (b) Rakovski spoke about a written statement that was requested from him by the CPG Politburo. CPG Politburo member Dimitrios Vlantas put a pad of paper and three pencils on the table in front of him and said: “Describe your ‘betrayal’ in detail with particular reference to how and why you took the battalion to ‘Serbia’...” The statements Rakovski made about the promises the Yugoslavs made... were false. The purpose of the battalion’s withdrawal, the formation of the “First Aegean Shock Brigade”, the constitution of a Political Commission for Aegean Macedonia with further mobilization of fighters... was a misleading tactical maneuver against the great Greek appetites - aspirations expressed by the CPG Central Committee during the Tenth Plenum Declaration, the Lebanon Agreement and the EAM program for a “Greater New Greece” and so on...! But, after all that was said and done, history will have the final say on all this...

Because of what Rakovski wrote under duress (a and b above), to basically save his skin, Kiriazovski used the opportunity to attack him and accused him of being a man without real dignity, an adventurer, a man without principles, who allegedly claimed that: it was not Greek political and armed anti-Macedonian sentiments that forced the Macedonian units to leave... but this was done by the Yugoslavs who accepted those units...!

There was a time when Kiriazovski (sitting on the opposite side of the barricade) condemned NOF and referred to the people like myself (along with the people from the CPG) as “leaders of a division”, “leaders of a rebellion”, “adventurers”, “crypto-Fascists”... And judging by his silence and concealment of some matters, in this and other of his texts, he is still on the opposite side of the barricade! He is not alone, of course. Sometimes I was like him. History is at fault, a stepmother until yesterday. Grkomani, Bugaromani, Serbomani... They are all the work of history...

But that’s the past! Today the Macedonian ideal is blooming and strong everywhere in the world where Macedonians live. The name

“Macedonia” will not perish! It is also possible that Kiriazovski too will find his way home...

* * *

General Markos said that “they were forced” to form separate Macedonian units within ELAS “in Voden, Lerin and Kostur” to “get the Macedonian people in the ranks of ELAS”, to “organize them” in order to remove them from the counter-band propaganda! General Markos was the second person in the CPG leadership, member of the Politburo... and later DAG Supreme Commander... He said this on page 74 of his biography, written by Kliakich.

This may seem believable and quite normal for the Yugoslav public but things were different than they seemed. Namely, the National Council (“Ethnikon Simvulion”) of Democratic Greece, convened a meeting in May 1944 in a place called Korishades and completely ignored the Macedonian people. During the introductions and greetings the Council treated the Macedonian people like they were Greek people. The Council did this officially in front of the Greek and foreign guests and made sure the “Greek character” of Macedonia was publicly emphasized. (“Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War, V. I, Doc. No 104, p. 407.) Because of this SNOF, the Macedonian political organization with its clear Macedonian national, ideological and political agenda, as well as with its organizational activities, found itself in direct and irreconcilable opposition to the CPG and the National Council’s policies regarding the Macedonian question. And as is well-known, SNOF was dissolved in May 1944 which the Macedonian population found very painful. This created a tense situation. In protest an important group of Macedonian fighters and political activists left the struggle at home and joined the Macedonian units in the Yugoslav part of Macedonia so that they could fight against the occupier as Macedonians. The Macedonian dissatisfaction at home was quickly exploited by the controversial autonomist movement with the slogan “fight for a free autonomous Macedonia”, which was spreading dangerously. Counter-bands turned up where they never existed before. Outside of the “Ohrana”, in Voden Region for example, the people in the city Voden were armed by the Germans. Some of the surrounding villages around the Voden-Ostrovo

Passage were also armed. “Ohrana” was led by Giorgi Dimchev, a Macedonian native of Bozets, Enidzhevardar Region. He left Macedonia and went to Bulgaria when he was a child. He achieved the rank of air force officer in the Bulgarian army and was assigned the role of commander of a counter-autonomist military formation in Voden, known as “Ohrana”. Dimchev was working in the service of the occupiers...

The anti-fascist struggle, of course, suffered as a result of the official and public declaration of the “Greek character” of Macedonia. ELAS tried to break the counter-bands in villages without Macedonian help but failed. This is what Thanasis Midzhopoulos-Stavros, ELAS 13th Regiment party secretary, wrote in his book “Το 30-ον συνταγμα του ΕΛΑΣ” (Geneva, 1977, p. 261):

“...We had serious losses (ELAS was attacking with three battalions). One hundred and fifteen were dead and one hundred and fifty wounded. Our ammunition was exhausted. All of this was difficult to come by. The drama with the wounded was especially shocking. They were transferred to the slopes of Karakamen Mountain where they lay for days in a very dense, humid and dark forest...”

A year ago, during the summer of 1943, ELAS fiercely fought many battles against the autonomists in Lerin and Kostur Regions which ended without results... small military victories with great losses. But, politically, ELAS was losing hopelessly. The autonomist movement was still burning. It became very clear to the Greeks that they needed the Macedonians, especially Macedonian revolutionary troops, in order to liquidate the success of the counter-bands. ELAS did not have such a thing at that time. Therefore, as we all well know, the Greeks asked for Macedonian troops from the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia to do this.

Here is what Svetozar Vukmanovich-Tempo wrote in his report to the CPY Central Committee, dated August 8, 1943:

“Our troops from Bitola Region went to Greece to Lerin and Kostur Regions at the request of Greek headquarters. There they achieved a major political breakthrough among the Macedonian masses. The

Macedonian people welcomed them as their liberators and all the counter-band fighters voluntarily surrendered their weapons. The Macedonians wanted to be placed under the command of the Macedonian Main Headquarters. We rejected this because of the Greek party's (CPG's) position on the Macedonian question!" (See: Liberation War and the Revolution in Macedonia 1941-1945, Volume I, Second Edition, p. 183.)

That was a year ago in the summer of 1943. Now, however, after liquidating SNOF, the CPG could no longer seek help from the CPY. The CPG itself disabled the organized Macedonians and enabled the spread of the autonomist movement. Now the CPG had to manage its own affairs. Its strain with the Macedonian national liberation movement and the danger from the spread of the autonomist movement, or, more precisely, the Macedonian reality that was shaped as a consequence of the CPG, EAM, ELAS and the National Council leadership's nationalist anti-Macedonian policy, forced the CPG to re-think its strategy and again create new Macedonian units. The CPG was expecting that if its tension with the Macedonian national liberation movement could be mitigated the Macedonians would come on its side and with the Macedonian units on its side the Greek units would succeed in suppressing the autonomist movement, breaking its organized military force - the count-bands...

These were the reasons and the historical reality as to why the CPG decided to establish Macedonian units within ELAS...

* * *

Instead of forming a military unit in August 2, 1944 (Ilinden), as expected, Renos Mihaleas, ELAS IX Division representative, formed the Kostur-Lerin ELAS Macedonian battalion. This was done about a month and a half after the Voden Macedonian battalion was formed. Because of this Mihaleas ran into trouble with Leonidas Stringos, CPG Bureau secretary for Macedonia and Thrace. This is what Renos Mihaleas wrote about that moment: "The Secretary: 'Why did you establish an entire battalion when the order was to form only one unit in Lerin and Voden Regions...?' Renos: 'And what would have been the damage if divisions were formed...?' The

Secretary: ‘You are naïve. If the Macedonians had divisions, we Greeks would not be in Macedonia...!’ ...” (See: CPG and Macedonian National Question, p. 593.)

This is the historical truth about how the “special Macedonian units” were created. Obviously, the two battalions were created contrary to CPG, EAM and ELAS plans and wishes but they “accepted” the battalions because they needed them to do their dirty work. The Greeks, unfortunately, could not help but show their real attitude towards the Macedonians...

- First they sent their famous “medical committee” which scandalously began to declare the new Macedonian volunteer fighters incompetent. After a brief conversation with each fighter, during their medical examination, especially those who spoke Greek poorly, the medical committee, more often than not, declared them incapable of fighting and denied them access to the battalion.

- In July and August 1944 the English sent weapons and other military material to the Thirteenth Regiment. Part of it was supposed to go to the Third (our) battalion. But we got nothing...

- After intensive military exercises, the first Macedonian unit began to act. But soon an order arrived ordering the unit to go to Paiak Mountain where it would remain at the disposal of the Thirteenth Regiment command... As a result, it ceased to exist as a Macedonian unit.

- It was difficult to get arms. However, we quickly managed to train the second unit to fight. Its success was talked about and celebrated far and wide. But then another order arrived and the second unit was ordered to leave for Karakamen Mountain where it was going to be placed under the disposal of the Sixteenth Regiment!

There were no armaments for the four remaining units. Only those fighters who brought their own weapons were armed. Altogether, about two hundred fighters were without weapons. I told Dzhodzho: “I believe they were lying to you when they told you that you would be at the helm of a Macedonian battalion. We are only here to attract Macedonian fighters for someone else to command. You, as a

member of the CPG Bureau for Macedonia and Thrace, deserve better. It looks like they are punishing you. But the most unacceptable thing about all this is that we Macedonians are given the role of idiots: We are luring Macedonian fighters into the ranks of the Macedonian army and sending them to fight as a Greek army. In fact, the right of our people to fight for themselves, for their own sake, for their freedom, has been taken away. The Macedonians fighters who have taken on the lion's share of this fight, and have suffered immensely as a result, are being represented as Greeks!"

Dzhodzhov did not answer me. A bit later he said: "For what they failed to do in Voden about two months ago, last May, they are doing now through us in Karadzova, Meglen Region!" He then explained to me in detail how and why the formation of the "special unit" in Voden did not work out.

We decided to act openly and resolutely as Macedonians in Voden. We also informed Foundoulakis about this and he agreed. The result is well-known: The second unit never left for Karakamen. But:

- It received a new order: Do not accept new volunteers... The new volunteers were to be sent to the ELAS Greek units and, if they refuse... send them back to their villages... This was an unequivocally anti-Macedonian act, undertaken with an obvious goal - to prevent the further growth of the Macedonian military force. And as is well-known, the Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion received the same order. And the worst of it is:

After the Macedonian battalions quickly and efficiently broke up the autonomist movement and its organized military force - the counter-bands, they themselves were dissolved. According to Markos:

"The CPG Central Committee Politburo, with a confidential letter to the commissar of ELAS 28th regiment, ordered the Macedonian battalion to be moved to the south, and to ultimately be disarmed because it posed a danger to Greece!" (From Markos's biography, p. 75.)

This, of course, is not true. The two Macedonian battalions posed no military danger to ELAS or endangered Greece in any way. What

worried the Greeks was that the Macedonian battalions going through the Macedonian villages and interacting with the Macedonian people brought such joy and boldness into the hearts of the oppressed Macedonians and ignited their revolutionary spirits. This, the Greek leaders interpreted as “leading nationalist propaganda” and “awakening nationalism among the Macedonian people”, which was severely interfering with the image of the “Greek character” of Macedonia. This was a strong development of the Macedonian liberation movement, as the Greeks later openly admitted during the CPG Central Committee Twelfth Plenum, held in June 1945, when they declared that the territorial integrity of the Greek state was threatened (TO KKE AII TO 1931-1952, p. 110). Later, the CPG Central Committee, at its September 12, 1951 meeting, confirmed that the CPG leadership was afraid that “Tito wanted to join Aegean Macedonia to Yugoslavia” through NOF (p. 271). The CPG also spoke about this publicly during its 6th Plenum held in October 1949 when it said that it had discovered that “Tito was making war plans against Greek Macedonia...” This, according to the same Greeks, would have jeopardized the Greek positions and Greek “national” interests in Macedonia. The battalions had to be disbanded as soon as possible and this mass Macedonian revolutionary movement had to be extinguished... This, however, was in direct contradiction to the EAM and ELAS official program, which now ignored the existence of the Macedonian people and did not foresee any democratic rights for them...

This was also in direct contradiction to CPG Central Committee’s statements made through its central organs, the magazine KOMEP and the newspaper Rizospastis in which, a while ago the CPG declared to the world through its Tenth Plenum and through the Lebanon Agreement, that today Macedonia is as Greek as the district of Attica... (See COMEP, No. 16, August 1943, p. 331-332.) Let us also not forget the famous thesis that appeared in the summer of 1943 in “Rizospastis” which proclaimed that: “After the exchange of populations, Macedonia is as Greek as Attica...!” And in Attica, of course, one cannot even imagine finding a single Macedonian or non-Greek person. So, according to the CPG, there were no Macedonians in Macedonia...!

The Lerin-Kostur Macedonian Battalion managed to survive in the field barely two months, from August 2, 1944 (when Renos created it) until the beginning of October 1944. The Voden Macedonian Battalion lasted from June 16, 1944 to October 12, 1944. To avoid colliding with Greek forces, which had aims to dissolve them, the Macedonian battalions were forced to retreat to the other (Yugoslav) part of Macedonia...

These are the facts...

LITERATURE

1. Το ΚΚΕ, επισημα κειμενα εκδοση ΠΛΕ, Τομος 1, 1964, Τομος 2, 1965, Τομος 3, 1966. vol. 1, 1964, vol. 2, 1965, Vol. 3, 1966.
2. Σαραντα χρονια του ΚΚΕ, 1918-1958, επιλογος και ντοκουμεντα, ΠΛΕ, 1958.
3. ΚΟΜΕΠ, οργανο της ΚΕ του ΚΚΕ αρ. 5/1944, 12/1945, no. 5/1943, 12/1945.
4. Στα αρματα, στα αρματα, Χρονικον της Εθνικης Αντιστασης 1940-45. 2-η εκδοση ΠΛΕ, 1967.
5. Μαρξιστικη βιβλιοθηκη, τεωρητικο οργανο της ΚΕ του ΚΚΕ, αρ 4/1934.
6. Χρονικον του αγωνα, 1878-1951, εκδοση της ΚΕ του ΚΚΕ, 1952.
7. Αποφαση της 12-ης ολομελειας τη κε ΤΟΥ ΚΚΕ, εισηγηση και τελικως λογος του Ν. Ζαχαριαδη, εκδοση Ρηγα, 1945.
8. Ριζοσπαστης, κεντρικη εφημεριδα του ΚΚΕ, απο 26.1.1927, 1-3.1931, 20.7.1943, 3.12.1974.
9. Προς τη νικη, εφημεριδα οργανο του ΔΣΕ, απο 27.2.1949. - Prosecutors, a newspaper organ of DAG, from: 27/2/1949.
10. Το ΚΚΕ απο το 1931-1952, βασικα ντοκουμεντα, εκδοση της ΚΕ ΚΚΕ 1952.
11. Λαϊκη φωνη, εφημεριδα, οργανο του Μακεδονικου Γραφειου του ΚΚΕ, απο 28 δεκεμβριου 1945.
12. Νεος κοσμος, περιοδικο, οργανο της ΚΕ του ΚΚΕ, αρ. 9/1950, 10/1950, 10/1951 and 4-5 / 1957.
13. Παυλου Νεφελουδη: Για της πηγες της κακοδαιμονιας - για της βαθυτερες αιτιες της διασπασης στο ΚΚΕ 1918-1968, 4-η εκδοση, Αθηνα, 1974.

14. Στρατηγου Στ. Σαραφη: Ο ΕΛΑΣ, Αθηνά, 1946.
15. Ρενου Μιχαλας: Γραμα προς τον Ντ. Ραδοσαβλεβικ, φωτοτυπο του πρωτοτυπου, INI Skorje.
16. Ξενοκρατια, αποκαλυπτικο χρονικο τον ξενων επεμβασεον στην Ελλάδα 1944-1974. Ερευνα επιτελειου συντακτον του περιοδικου “Επικαιρα” υπο την διευθηνση του Τζον Φρημαν. Εκδοσης Παπυρος-Γραφικαι τεχναι ΑΕ, Αθηνά, 1975.
17. Κυριακος Διακογιανης: Στην κολαση της Κ.Υ.Π., 2-η εκδοση Αθηνά, 1974.
18. Ευαγγελου Αβερωφ - Τοσιτσα: Φοτια και τσεκουρη. Ελλάς στα 1946-1949 και θα προηγητεντα, σμνοπτικη ιστορικη μελετη, 2-η εκδοση ελληνικη, Αθηνά, 1975. (The book has two editions published in Paris one after the other in French).
19. Γιαννη Κορδατου: Ιστορια της νεοτερας Ελλάδος, Τομος πεμπτος.
20. Επικαιρα, ευδομαδιαιο περιοδικο, Αθηνά, αρ. 436, 437 απο της 9 and 16 δεκεμβριου 1976.
21. Ελευθεριος Σταυριδης: Στα παρασκηνια του ΚΚΕ, Αθηνά, 1953.
22. Γιαννης Ανδρικοπουλος: 1944 - Κρησιμη χρονια. A critical year, 300 unpublished documents from Winston Churchill’s personal archives referring to Greece from March 8 to December 5, 1944. Historical sources, edition “Diogenesis”, Athens 1974.
23. Ανδρε Μαλρω, Αντιαπομνημονευματα, a Greek edition.
24. Εντυ Μαϊερς, Ελληνικη περιπλοκη, Αθηνά, 1945.
25. Στραταρχης Βιλσον, Οκτω ετι περα των θαλασσων, a Greek edition.

26. Δομνικ Εντ, Οι Καπεταναιοι, 4-τη ελληνικη εκδοση 1974, fourth edition.
27. Δημοκρατικός στρατος, περιοδικο, οργανο του ΔΣΕ, απ. 6/1948.
28. G. D. Kiriakidis: Civil War in Greece, 1946-1949, publishing house “Moscow”, 1972.
29. Proceedings of Aegean Macedonia in the National Liberation War, 1944-1945, Volume 1.
30. Sources of the Liberation War and Revolution in Macedonia, vol. 2, second book, Skopje 1968.
31. Hristo Andonovski: The Truth About Aegean Macedonia, “Misla”, Skopje, 1971.
32. Todor Simovski: Tashko Karadzha, article in INN “Glasnik”, number 1/1975.
33. Naum Peiov: Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece, INI 1968.
34. Vangel Aianovski-Oche: Aegean Storms, INI, 1976, Skopje.
35. Hristo Andonovski: Macedonians under Greece in the fight against fascism, INI, Skopje, 1968.
36. Vus, Zagreb weekly, numbers: January 29, 1977 to February 19, 1977.
37. Paskal Mitrevski: The first organs of the people’s government and the formation of the interim democratic government of Greece during the Civil War 1945-1949, a handout distributed to the symposium participants organized by MANU on the occasion of ASNOM’s 30th anniversary...
38. L. Moisov: Around the question of the Macedonian national minority in Greece...

ACRONYMS

AVNOJ – National Anti-Fascist Liberation Council of Yugoslavia
AFZH - Women’s Anti-Fascist Front
ASNOM – Anti-Fascist Assembly of National Liberation of Macedonia
BKF - Balkan Communist Federation
BRP(k) – Communist Party of Bulgaria
CPG - Communist Party of Greece
CPM - Communist Party of Macedonia
CPY - Communist Party of Yugoslavia
CVG - Greek Civil War
DAG – Democratic Army of Greece
EA - National Solidarity (Ethnic Allegiances)
EAM – National Liberation Front
ELAS – National Liberation Army of Greece
EON – National Youth Organization
EPON – All Greek National Youth Organization
KOEM – Communist Organization of Aegean Macedonia
KOMEF - Communist Review (Communist epithets)
KOS - Counter-intelligence Sector of JAN
MAO - Macedonian Anataphasic Organization.
NKVD – People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs
NOB - National Liberation Struggle.
NOD - National Liberation Movement.
NOBG - Peoples Liberation Struggle in Greece
NOBM - Peoples Liberation Struggle in Macedonia
NOF - Peoples’ Liberation Front
NOMS - Peoples’ Liberation Youth Organization
OKNE - Communist Youth Organization of Greece
ONOO – Local People’s Liberation Council
OZNA – People’s Defense Division
PAO - Pan-Hellenic Liberation Organization
PDEG – Pan-Greek Democratic Union of Women
PDOG – International Federation of Democratic Women
PEEA - Political Committee on National Liberation (Politics Epitropi ethnicis Apelevterosis).
PLM – People’s Liberation Movement
POJ - Partisan Units of Yugoslavia
PRM – People’s Republic of Macedonia

SID - Information Services of the Yugoslav Ministry of Foreign Affairs
SNOF - Slavo-Macedonian National Liberation Front
SKP(b) – Communist Party of the Soviet Union
SOF - Slavo-Macedonian Liberation Front
UDBA - Directorate of State Security
USSR – United Soviet Socialist Republics

About the author

Pavle Rakovski was born on May 23, 1913 in the village Dolna Kleshtina, Lerin Region. He graduated from the Pedagogical High School in Solun and worked as an educated worker, but was mostly known as one of the most prominent Macedonian champions and NOF leaders in Aegean Macedonia. After Greece's occupation in April 1941, he joined the anti-fascist struggle. He soon became regional head of the ELAS reserve force in Ostrovo Region. In the summer of 1944, on his own initiative, and in accordance with the Voden CPG District Committee, he helped create the ELAS Voden Macedonian Battalion, composed exclusively of Macedonian fighters. Rakovski (together with his companions Petre Sarakinov and Dinko Delev) created a 24 letter Macedonian alphabet and presented it to the Macedonian people in Voden Region along with songs and marches for the Voden battalion. The alphabet was used to teach subjects in the Macedonian language during the national liberation war.

After the Voden battalion was pursued by the CPG and ELAS, due to the fact that it was a "Macedonian battalion" and after it crossed over into Vardar Macedonia, led by Pavle Rakovski, the First Aegean Shock Brigade was formed on November 18, 1944.

Under orders from the Political Commission of Macedonia under Greece, in early 1945, Rakovski was sent to Meglen Region to do field work among the Macedonian population. He was one of the founders of TOMO, a Macedonian organization. NOF, for the Macedonians in Greece, was constituted on May 21, 1945 by the CPM leadership due to the new situation in Greece that included English intervention. As a member of NOF's Main Board, Rakovski, together with Dzhodzho Urdov, was sent to Voden Region to, among other things, carry out propaganda and publishing activities. In that sense, Rakovski was responsible for looking after NOF's publishing needs until the end of the Greek Civil War.

In November 1946, after NOF and the CPG made their unification agreement to join the Macedonian and Greek partisan groups, Rakovski took charge of the agitation and propaganda department and its activities. He organized the publishing of the NOF

newspaper “Nepokoren”. Rakovski took part in the Second International Peace Conference in Prague, held in April 1949, where he, as a delegate of the Conference and a NOF representative, greeted Conference delegates in the Macedonian language.

During the CPG arrests in 1949, following DAG’s defeat and the Informburo Resolution, Rakovski was charged with being one of the main culprits for DAG’s defeat. He was accused of being a “Tito Agent” and was arrested on October 7, 1949 by DAG’s security organs and interned at the central prison in Tirana. After a lengthy investigation, conducted in Moscow, and after the USSR Ministry of State Defense reached a verdict in 1952, he was sentenced to 10 years in prison and sent to a concentration camp in Siberia.

After relations between Yugoslavia and the USSR normalized in 1960, Pavle Rakovski and his family moved to the Socialist Republic of Macedonia and settled in Skopje. He was awarded several times by the Yugoslav government for his revolutionary work.

During the period when Macedonian war refugees were leaving the Eastern European countries and moving to the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, UDBA opened files on them and many were sent to the Idrizovo Prison to be interrogated, especially by their former comrades and leaders in the National Liberation Movement in Aegean Macedonia. Their loyalties to the Yugoslav regime were questioned and their political differences went as far as affecting historiography. History itself was abused – biased, non-objective, tendentious and disqualifying articles and books were written on the one hand, and quiet censorship on the “other side of the story” (on the truth) was imposed on the other.

Due to the division and disagreement between the people in the Macedonian National Liberation Movement in Aegean (Greek occupied) Macedonia, shortly after Rakovski arrived in Skopje from the USSR, he was ignored and politically and professionally marginalized. But, to the end of his life, he made it his mission to study and analyze Macedonian history, especially during the periods around the national liberation war and the Greek Civil war. He left behind thousands of documents, reports, analyses and reviews, of

which only a small fraction were published during his lifetime. In addition to the fact that his works were not published by the historical institutions, the press also refused to publish them. Of the many articles offered only one was published by “History” in 1977. Later, the Institute of National History purchased one of his manuscripts as study material. Thus, his revolutionary biography and records were kept at home “in a drawer”, for decades, even after his death.

Among the works Rakovski published included are: “The CPG and the Macedonians - Views, Reflections and Findings” (Makedonska kniga, Skopje, 1990), “Autobiography, or: my sufferings” (AEA, Mislal, Skopje, 2000); “Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece - Volume 1: ‘In the deep night the dawn is born’ (Makedonika, Skopje, 2011), Volume 2: ‘Truths and untruths’ and volume 3: ‘I protest and blame’ (Makedonika, Skopje, 2013)”.

Pavle Rakovski died in Skopje on February 10, 1990.