

Traianos Pasis

**The Natural and the Artificial Nations
The Macedonians and the Greeks**



Voden 2015

Nations and Nations emergence

A nation, in its current form, is a group of people with common characteristics. The most important of these are common origin (race), common homeland, common historical course, language, religion, particular culture, customs and traditions, and not necessarily all of them. The most basic, however, is the development of its national consciousness. That is, the feeling that all these characteristics create in a group of people as information (inform, hence the term being conscious), along with the feeling that they have a common historical course, common interests and problems in the specific geographical area (homeland), common plans for the future make them consider that they constitute a nation.

This understanding of the concept of nation was established in our time mainly by the ideological and cultural movement of the 18th century, called Enlightenment. This movement liberated the human spirit from the obscurantist and dogmatic concepts that had been imposed by religious superstitions, the intolerance of the churches, and the arbitrary and uncontrolled power of absolute monarchies. Authoritarian feudal regimes were abolished, processes of democratic governance and the restoration of the equality of citizens and social justice were launched. The power of the monarchies that "*came from God*" began to be replaced by the power that comes from the people. The people now began to function as a conscious group of citizens, whereas until then it had functioned as a group of subjects. These groups of subjects are often referred to in history as nations or folks. The authoritarian rulers determined the identity of all their subjects, and to a greater or lesser extent the culture, language, religion, customs, traditions and the historical course. The boundaries of the homeland of this type of people were determined by the rulers' ability to expand their territory.

The struggle of the weak against the authoritarianism of the strong certainly appeared from the first steps of human collective behavior. Altruistic instincts appeared as solidarity towards the weak members of the group, such

as newborns, the sick, the weakest of the group. At the same time, predatory instincts also appeared, with the seizure of survival goods from the authoritarian strong and their imposition on the weak.

To get some idea of the first steps of human collective behavior, we only have to look at the behavior of some animal species that function as a group, something that is often presented to us in an admirable way in television documentaries. There we will see the emergence of the instincts of solidarity towards the weaker members of the group, but also the instincts of imposition and predation of the stronger ones. We will also see the fight, often to the death, for the imposition of the strongest, male as a rule, for the leadership of the group. The male leader is also the stallion of the group with whom the females mate. A typical example in modern times can be the **closest relatives** of humans, the chimpanzees. They live in large families, consisting of one male, several females and many children. When the dominant male disappears, his male descendants fight fiercely for leadership of the group, something that still happens among humans today.

It cannot be a coincidence that in the Macedonian dialects of Aegean Macedonia, the penis of a man is called "**kour**". "Kouroi" refers to statues of naked adolescents in ancient Greek history, that is, adolescents with their kouros uncovered. Its feminine equivalent is "**kora**", which in the Ionian dialect is pronounced "kore". "Kora" in Macedonian means thick skin or thick leather, which is a woman's pee. Kore in ancient Greek was the name given to a young girl, a virgin, while kore in its current meaning was called a thegater. The word "kora", like many other Macedonian words, has also passed into Modern Greek and means the thick crust, mainly of bread. The diminutive of the word "kora" is "**korka**" (little daughter), which reached today's Macedonian altered into "**kerka**". We must keep in mind that in antiquity there was no modesty imposed by Christianity regarding the human genitals and that they were considered of grave importance, which is why they were presented oversized in the statues (statuettes) created by primitive people.

The strongest, therefore, stallion was the primitive k(o)yrios, that is, the first form of the dominant, the lord, the ruler, the master of the group of people. He was also considered the "father" of the group, the tribe, the nation. In ancient times, they said that the man gives birth. We have the example of the Bible that mentions "*Abraham who gave birth to Isaac and he gave birth to Jacob*". This Abraham is considered the "ancestor" of the Jews, but also of the Arabs, who are considered descendants of the son he had from the Egyptian Hagar. The "ancestor" of the Greeks of antiquity was considered someone named "Hellen". We will talk about the "ancestors" of today's Greeks below. Gradually, the term "kyrios" (pronouncing the "y" as "ou", as pronounced by ancient peoples, but also by modern Europeans, including Macedonians) lost its original meaning and ended up meaning the master, the sovereign, the ruler. It was also attributed to the gods as "Fathers" and the progenitors of all things. Before the Enlightenment, it was attributed as a title to rulers, feudal lords and in general to the entire ruling class, the so-called "aristocracy". After the emancipation of the peoples brought by the Enlightenment and especially after the French Revolution (1789), the title of "kyrios" began to be attributed to every citizen, as an indication of at least formal equality.

The father, therefore, was also the leader of the group of his descendants, which for this reason was also called the patria, and the large patriarchal family in ethnology is considered the first form of elementary social organization that led to the creation of nations. The natural leader of the patria was called the patriarch, to distinguish him from the sons and grandsons, who had also already become fathers. A problem certainly arose when the patriarch died and one of his children had to take over the leadership of the patria. The successor was usually appointed by the old patriarch, but this did not mean that he was accepted by the other sons. It was natural, therefore, for there to be competition between them. Such competition is mentioned in some of the oldest written histories of ethnogenesis, that of the Jews. In Genesis, one of the books of the Bible, the case of Joseph is mentioned who, because he was the favorite son of the patriarch Jacob, his brothers envied him and sold him as a slave to Arab merchants, who in turn sold him to an Egyptian official. He

became regent and brought his brothers to Egypt because, as it is said, he correctly interpreted Pharaoh's dreams. This is another testimony to the fact that the Egyptian kingdom, that is, the ancient Egyptians, was not a mono-ethnic state. Joseph is considered the father of the Jews but his brothers, who certainly created families, are not mentioned as such. History, generally, mentions those who managed to become rulers.

There is a very serious reason to deal with the history and mythology of the Jews, because it has much in common with the history and mythology of the ethnogenesis and origin of the Greeks of antiquity and of the Modern Greeks.

The Jews, before they were organized into a political entity, were a multitude of nomadic tribes who roamed with their herds over a large area between Mesopotamia, Arabia and Egypt. A basic characteristic of their religion, as among other Semitic peoples, was the concept of monotheism in its most rigid, however, version. *"You shall have no gods before me"* was their basic principle. This brought them into rivalry with the religion of the Egyptians, who, in addition to the one and supreme god, had other gods, including the ruler of the country, the Pharaoh, whom the subjects were required to worship as their god. This seems to have been the reason why the fanatical Jews were persecuted by the Egyptians and were forced to take refuge in the barren, therefore indifferent for the Egyptians, Sinai Peninsula. From the Egyptians, however, they were taught the art of power. This was based mainly on military organization and persuasion. A key feature of persuasion in order for the subjects to accept the authority of the rulers was the projection of beliefs, according to which the rulers, that is the Pharaohs, were the earthly representatives of the gods and therefore had rights over the land and people. Thus, questioning their authority also meant violating divine laws. In this way, the mentally submissive subjects were also politically submissive to the arbitrary authority of the regime. The fear of weapons combined with the fear of God was the catalytic factor that allowed the centuries-long survival of extreme authoritarian regimes.

The religious beliefs of the Jews did not allow, of course, the worship of other gods, especially earthly ones. However, their hatred for the regimes that oppressed them and exploited the most fertile lands and people, made them seek similar ways of rallying the populations and using them for political purposes. Thus, they invented the creation of another form of representatives of their god on earth. It was that of the god's envoys. The people, that is, those to whom the god appeared and gave the order to impose his commands and will on earth. These were usually the patriarchs, the high priests, the prophets, and even their kings. They formed legends and traditions according to which they were the "*chosen people*" of the only true god, who freed them from slavery by causing great destruction to the Pharaoh's regime. He opened the Red Sea for them to cross and then drowned their pursuers in it, he sent them manna and quails when they had nothing to eat and much else. In order to politically unify all those nomadic tribes, they created genealogical views of descent from the most virtuous people of prehistory, Noah, the prophets and the patriarchs, who communicated directly with the god and were the exponents of his will on earth. The most important thing, of course, was that he declared them as his "chosen people", gave them laws by which they were to live (Ten Commandments) and promised them settlement in the "*Promised Land*".

Such religious propaganda boosted the morale of the faithful and turned them into fearless and risky warriors, as they believed that what they were doing "was the will of God" and that even if they lost their lives enforcing God's "commandments" they would inherit the "eternal kingdom". Something similar, in other words, to what the Muslims did a few centuries later, and even modern-day fanatical Islamists.

The "**Promised Land**" was **Canaan**, the area that is now Israel, Palestine, Lebanon, Eastern Syria, and Eastern Jordan. It was the "Promised Land" for three main reasons. First, it was fertile as it was irrigated by the waters of the Jordan, the Orontes and other smaller rivers, while to the east and south there were large deserts. The second and most important reason was the fact that

its geographical location made it a commercial hub of global importance. The great trade routes of the East and NE Africa ended there and the sea routes began, that connected it with all the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, especially at a time when ships were the main means of transporting products. The third reason was the fact that the region was at the center of the greatest civilizations of the time, the **Hittites** in the north, the **Assyrians** and **Babylonians** (Mesopotamia) in the east and the **Egyptians** in the south. Thus, the Canaanites were mainly engaged in trade, to such an extent that the concept of Canaanite was identical with the concept of merchant. The commercial ports of the region were the most important in the Mediterranean for many centuries. The peoples of the region never achieved political unity, as they were divided into many communities (tribes), the merchants who settled in the region also belonged to various ethnicities of the wider region and their commercial interests imposed on them the need to have good relations with the neighboring powerful and wealthy empires and consequently to accept their tutelage. Thus they created many autonomous city-states, the most important of which were **Tyre, Sidon, Beirut, Byblos, Tripoli, Arad, Gabala, Ashkelon**, etc. The merchants and shipowners and generally the inhabitants of the wider area of this global commercial center were known to the ancient Balkans and Latins by the name **Phoenicians**, probably because one of the goods they traded was the deep red, the purple color (phoenix) and the purple fabrics which were a luxury item at that time. Since the main means of transport of that time was the ship, it was natural for many of them to build large ships and create a large fleet that dominated the entire Mediterranean.

The need to move goods and supply ships forced them to create trading stations and supply ports, initially in the eastern Mediterranean and gradually in the central, western and Black Sea (*Euxine Sea*). Of course, Cyprus, Crete and the Aegean islands, as well as the coasts of the southernmost tip of the Balkan Peninsula, were the first places where they established such stations. They constituted the sea passage to Europe. Furthermore, it was easy for them to settle there, as there was no strong state in the region. The morphology of the soil and its low fertility had not allowed the creation of strong and wealthy

states, with the result that the local populations were divided into many weak kingdoms. Thus, it was easy to penetrate, to erode local powers, and even to push them away from strategic points, such as fertile plains and ports.

Moreover, the rulers and indigenous populations saw the Phoenicians and North African settlers as carriers of wealth and superior civilization, just as we in the Balkans see Western Europeans today and seek close relations with them, but we also ask them to make investments in our region, from which we expect to benefit as well. We also grant them land and ports and other facilities in return, of course, for a price, shares and bribes to the rulers. At that time, that is, Orientalism had exactly the same meaning as Europeanism has today, since civilization and wealth belonged to the East. Thus, it was not difficult to settle and be accepted by the natives. The initial settlement, of course, was friendly and gradual, so there was mutual cultural interaction. Gradually, however, these colonies grew in size, resulting in their political dominance in the region.

On the contrary, the eastern coast of the Aegean Sea, in generally of Asia Minor, were not suitable for the creation of such trading stations-colonies. There, in ancient times, the powerful Hittite empire dominated, and then powerful states, such as those of Phrygia, Troas, Lydia, etc., which also had developed shipping and trade. The Lydians had even been the first to mint and use metal coins as a means of commercial transactions. The Lydian king Croesus, whose name has become synonymous with wealth, has remained famous. The ports of the region were under their control, as well as the taxation of port operations and products.

Along with merchant shipping and the accumulation of wealth, it was natural for piracy to develop. This often took on large proportions and was a major threat to trade. History often mentions cases where emperors and kings launched campaigns to suppress piracy. Organized pirate groups attacked convoys and stole goods and ships. This forced the powerful states to create a navy, which, however, was small, as they were continental in nature and their main interest was their power on land (Assyria, Mesopotamia, Egypt and later Persia). Thus, large pirate fleets were created, which ravaged the

Mediterranean. Pirates, of course, avoided being based in ports controlled by powerful empires and preferred the ports of the Mediterranean that were remote from them. The islands of the Aegean and its western coasts offered themselves as a refuge and as headquarters for these pirate groups. Moreover, most of the islands of the Aegean were uninhabited or had few inhabitants, thus were were suitable as a refuge for pirate fleets. It was a natural consequence that merchants and shipowners paid "insurance premiums" to pirates for the safe movement of their goods and ships or they built their own warships. Thus, powerful colonial-pirate fleets were created which dominated the entire Mediterranean.

History mentions attacks by the "**Sea Peoples**" against continental cities and states. Even in modern Greek encyclopedias and history books, the Aegean is mentioned as the base of the "Sea Peoples." Many historians, in fact, argue that the dissolution of the Hittite empire is due to the raids of the "Sea Peoples". Raids are even mentioned against the powerful empire of Egypt. The fact that they are referred to as "Sea Peoples" and not by a national name, like all the other peoples, shows that they were a multinational pirate conglomeration. It cannot be a coincidence that the **Trojan War** (12th century BC) is also placed in the same era as the dissolution of the Hittite empire of Asia Minor (12th - 13th century BC).

Troy, capital of the **Troad**, was a rich and fortified city in NW Asia Minor. Its wealth was due to its strategic location. It was located on the continental passage between Europe and Asia, but also at the entrance to the Dardanelles Straits, which formed the sea route between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (*Euxine Sea*). This gave it the opportunity to control these trade routes and develop trade and shipping. It was a strong competitor to the colonial cities of the Aegean and its western coasts and a serious obstacle to their expansion towards the Black Sea. The campaign was carried out by an alliance of colonial city-states under the leadership of the king of **Mycenae**. It was crowned with success and led to the destruction of Troy.

The Trojan War is described in the epic poems **Iliad** and **Odyssey**. The victors wrote them as their epic exploits. Furthermore, they wrote them in the 8th century BC, that is, after about four centuries, which means that they relied on legends and oral traditions of the victors. It is a mixture of historical events with legends and myths. No significant written testimony was preserved from the side of the defeated. This means that anyone who wants to approach the truth must seek the deeper causes of the events and question the objectivity of the victorious authors. The victors always present themselves as just, heroic, moral, etc.

In the case of the Trojan War, they have as an excuse the return of the Beautiful Helen, the wife of the king of Sparta, who was kidnapped by the dishonest Trojans. This was gladly accepted by the ancient Greeks and to some extent by the modern Greeks. However, from a careful study of the Iliad, other conclusions are drawn.

The alliance of Troy

The Asia Minor peoples mentioned as members of the Trojan alliance are: **Trojans, Paphlagonians, Alizones, Mysoi, Phrygians, Maeones, Carians, Lycians and Leleges** and the Balkan Peoples: **Thracians, Paeonians, Cikonians, Dardanians and Pelasgians of Larissa**. During historical times, the inhabitants of present-day Northern Macedonia (the region of Skopje, which in antiquity was called **Skopoi**) are also referred to as Dardanians, while they also appear as inhabitants of the European side of the Hellespont, which for this reason was called Dardanelles. The **Paeonians** at that time appear to occupy the entire region, which was later called Macedonia. Often, the ancients called all these Balkan peoples by the general name Thracians. The Pelasgians during the pre-Hellenic period are referred to as the inhabitants of the southernmost tip of the Balkans and the Aegean islands. During the Trojan War, they participated in the Trojan alliance and are referred to as inhabitants of Thessaly (Larissa), except for its southeastern tip, where the "Danaoi" who were later called Greeks were settled. The **Carians** and **Leleges**, who appear

as inhabitants of Asia Minor, are referred to by historical sources as inhabitants of the Aegean islands and its western coasts, during the pre-Hellenic period. Ancient traditions mention the **Phrygian** origin of **Pelops** as the ruler of the Peloponnese, from whom the region took its name. Certainly Pelops was not an isolated individual whom the natives made their ruler, but he was the ruler of a people of Phrygian origin. The presence of Phrygians is also mentioned in Macedonia. The name of Edessa is considered Phrygian. It is considered likely that the Phrygians, displaced from the Peloponnese, settled in Macedonia. They are also mentioned as Thracians who moved to Asia Minor. The same happens with the Mysians who are also mentioned as a people of Asia Minor. The peoples, therefore, who inhabited the area that was later called Greece, according to ancient sources and especially Greek ones, during the Trojan War they participated in the alliance of the Trojans. No native people is mentioned as an ally of the attacking Danaans. In the Iliad, the son of the ruler of Troy, **Paris**, is also mentioned as **Alexander**. This very important event is not mentioned anywhere in the official modern Greek histories, for the simple reason that it shows that the name Alexander is not Greek.

The victors themselves called themselves Danaans, Achaeans or Argives. "**Achaeans**" is of unknown oriental origin, while "**Argeians**" comes from Argos, which was then the leading city and seat of the leader of the alliance, Agamemnon. It was the equivalent of Troy, as Troy was the leading city of the respective alliance. The ancient Greek traditions themselves say that the **Danaans** took their name from their ancestor and first ruler, **Danaus**, who came from **Egypt**. This is also confirmed by the fact that their culture, which was later called **Mycenaean**, had a direct relationship with the Egyptian (sculpture, painting, hieroglyphic writing, etc.). But all historians agree that the Phoenicians in the 12th century BC had already dominated the Mediterranean, mainly the eastern part which was closer to them. Cyprus, Crete and the Aegean islands were ideal places to establish trading posts, port facilities and pirate shelters, as most of them were uninhabited or had few inhabitants, because they were barren due to lack of water (Syra, hence the

name of Syros, in Phoenician means dry, rocky). Even the great Greek historians, **Thucydides** and **Herodotus**, mention the colonization of the Aegean islands and its coasts by the Phoenicians. For Boeotia, in fact, whose colonization is later, they also write about **Cadmus**, leader of the **Phoenicians** who founded **Thebes** and prevailed throughout the region. Besides, **Thebes** was called one of the largest cities in **Egypt**.

Thucydides writes that *"the islanders were robbers, Carians and Phoenicians"* (A 8). **Herodotus** even mentions that the Phoenicians colonized even the northernmost island of the Aegean, **Thasos**, which he himself visited: "I also went to Thasos, where **I** found a sanctuary of Hercules founded by the Phoenicians, who sailed out with their ships to find Europe and built the city of Thasos". The settlement of the Phoenicians is not disputed by modern Greek historians, but they mention it in the sense that among the peoples who settled in the region were the Phoenicians.

Modern Greek-speakers, in order to support the locality of their ancient "ancestors", put forward various hypotheses, the main one being that the Greeks probably took their name from the **Sellians**, who were the inhabitants of a region of Epirus. Sellians - Hellenes - Greeks. However, the information that exists presents the Sellians as **Thesprotians** or **Molossians**, nations that ancient sources, including the famous geographer **Strabo**, present as barbarian nations (**Epirotic nations** or **Pelasgians**). But all Greek sources also say that in the area where the oracle of Dodona was located, the cult of the "**Pelasgian Zeus**" had been established. This means that the inhabitants were part of the wider family of Pelasgians, the indigenous people, that is, who pre-existed the Greeks.

The Thracians, the Slavs and the Vlachs

"**Sela**" in Macedonian is what the villages are called. There was also a Pelasgian city of Thesprotia named Sella. And because this can be characterized as an archaeomania analogous to the archaeomania of the

Modern Greeks, an explanation is useful. Herodotus states that in his time the **Thracians** were *"the greatest nation after the Indians"*. To understand what size we are talking about, we must take into account that, except to modern India, modern Pakistanis were also Indians, and where the Indus River is, the inhabitants of Indochina and Indonesia. That is, areas and inhabitants far more than all of Europe. When, therefore, Herodotus mentions the Thracians as the most numerous people after the Indians, it is obvious that he is not talking about a people of the size that we today consider to have covered only present-day Thrace and Bulgaria, which is not even 1% of the Indians. The Thracians, together with the Celts, are mentioned as peoples who covered most of Europe. The Celts are placed in central-western Europe, while the Thracians in central-eastern Europe. They did not create any political unity and are referred to as various Celtic or Thracian peoples or nations. In our region they are known by the general name Thracians but also by individual names: **Cikkones, Odrysians, Moesians, Trivallians, Getae, Paeonians, Siropaeonians, Pelagonians, Odomantes, Venoi, Mentaroi, Pieri, Bottiaei, Almopi, Serboi, Sellites, Tralleians, Dioi** etc. Dozens of Thracian peoples have been recorded, with the northernmost one of the Getae in the area of present-day Romania. Linguistic studies have shown that the Dacians, who are referred to as inhabitants of present-day Romania, were closely related to the other Thracian peoples and especially to the Getae, with whom, in fact, they are identified.

The **Illyrians** are shown to occupy the coastal strip from Epirus to Dalmatia (present-day Croatia). However, they are also mentioned as ancient inhabitants of western Macedonia, western Serbia, and even Pannonia (present-day Hungary). During the campaign of Alexander the Great, they participated as part of the Macedonian army with a separate leader. Herodotus, who traveled as far as **Scythia**, north of the Black Sea and has personal knowledge, characterizes the Thracians as the *"most populous people after the Indians"*, meaning that the Thracians were not only a part of the Balkan peoples, but were also spread further north.

Beyond the written references and the nomenclature, we must also look at the geographical area in which these Thracian peoples moved. It is the area that in our time, incorrectly, is called **the Balkan** Peninsula. Wrongly, because the Ottomans called it by this name. It would be more correct to call it **the Thracian Peninsula**, as its indigenous inhabitants, if not all of them, certainly the majority were Thracians. To the west, south and east it is isolated from other countries as it is surrounded by seas. To the north there is the **Carpathian mountain** range, which is a continuation of the Alpine mountain range and approaches the Black Sea at the height of present-day northern **Romania**. This also constitutes a natural wall which makes it difficult to move people and goods. For this reason, when the Romans occupied the region, at the end of the 1st – beginning of the 2nd century AD, they did not establish a strong army and did not build fortifications and fortresses along the entire length of the mountain range, but only in the narrow plain between the western edge of the mountain range and the Black Sea. Thus, the region became a political and military center of the Romans and for this reason it was Latinized to a much greater extent than other regions, resulting in the name Romania. In the next two centuries, the Romans are dominant and there are no invasions of aggressive peoples from the north and east. However, two new names appear in the region that characterize peoples. They are those of the "Vlachs" and the "Slavs".

For the **Vlachs** and **Slavs**, there is absolutely no source that says that they were peoples who broke through the defensive lines of the Romans to invade the Roman-Thracian territory of the empire as happened, for example, with the Goths, the Huns, the Avars, the Pechenegs, the Turks, etc. Thus, various hypotheses were expressed about how some indigenous peoples were renamed Vlachs and Slavs.

A common version of the Vlachs is that they "took their name from the *walha* with which the ancient Germans characterized the Romans and foreigners in general, or from the Old Slavic word *vlah* which means foreigner". The first version cannot be true, because the ancient Germans (Goths) did not settle

permanently in the region, so that their naming would prevail, or if it had been so, they would have been called Vlachs also other foreign peoples. The second view seems more likely, because it was natural for the locals to call the Romans foreigners. It is also possible, however, for the reason that the root *vla-* is the root of words related to power. "**Vlanta**" in Macedonian is the government, "**vlantika**" is the despot and ruler, "**vlast**" is the power, the authorities. In Macedonian, the Vlachs are called "**Vlasoi**" which is an alteration of "vlastoi". It is most likely, therefore, that the locals called the Romans "Vlachs", who were indeed foreigners and rulers of the region. The Vlachs with the Vlasoi in Macedonian are either an alteration of the same word, or it is the root with the same meaning but in a different Thracian dialect. Subsequently, the concept of Vlachs was extended to those indigenous Thracians who adopted the Latin language with Thracian elements. After the 7th century, the Eastern Roman Empire adopted Common Greek as its official language and Latin fell into disfavor. The ruling class adopted Greek, while Latin-Thracian remained the language of the unprivileged (farmers-breeders, etc.), who did not have power (*vlast*), but the name remained with them. The same happened earlier with the other Thracian dialects, which were kept by the unprivileged and consequently uneducated, the "Slavs".

The "**Slavs**" are first mentioned by Roman officials and clergy in Byzantine sources from the 6th century onwards as **Sclavoi**, **Sklavinoi**, **Sthlavoi**, **Sthlaveni**, while in Western sources from the 7th century as **sclaveni** or **sklavi**. They themselves never used these names. This shows that the name was a characterization. In Latin, which was the official language until the 7th century, *sclavos* is the equivalent of the Greek *dūlos*. Indeed, the Thracian peoples of the region had become slaves of the Romans. After the 9th century, some of the northernmost Thracian peoples adopted the term "**Slovenes**" (Slovenes and Slovaks). The Latin language had now been replaced by Greek and Slovene did not refer to a slave, but also to "**slava**" that means glory, honor, while the similar "**slovo**" means word. In Macedonian, "with the word" or "through the word" is called "So laf", that is, with one word Slaf.

Byzantine sources mention a "*descent*" of "*Slavs*" in the 6th century, reaching as far as the **Peloponnese**. The main cause of this mass migration is the **Huns**. A people of Mongol origin who in the second half of the 4th century AD invades from central Asia, defeats the Romans many times and plunders the wider region. The Danube valley became the epicenter of their settlement. They expanded westward and, led by Attila, occupied most of central-western Europe. In 451 AD, the Roman army, reinforced by many Germans, defeated the Huns in the Catalaunian Plains (France) and forced them to capitulate. They, of course, do not return to Central Asia from where they came, but remain in the Danube valley centered on Pannonia (present-day Hungary, western Romania, northern Yugoslavia). Thus, hard-nosed and predatory as they are, they become tyrants of the local Thracian peoples of the region. The latter, as was to be expected, unable to withstand the oppression of the barbarian Huns, initially take refuge in the surrounding mountain ranges and gradually move towards the southernmost regions, where the other Thracian peoples were already slaves of the Romans. In the bridgehead that the Huns created in the 5th century, other groups of their fellow Asians continued to arrive, with the most important being the **Hungarians** in the 8th century, who, as they imposed themselves on their predecessors, gave them their current name. These Asian settlers were also the most reluctant to accept refugees from Syria and other Asian countries.

The migration of the indigenous peoples is gradual and in small groups and therefore they do not prevail or impose themselves on any region or people. They are scattered throughout the southern Thracian peninsula and create small communities, which the Byzantines call **Sclavinias**. The collapse of Roman (Byzantine) power in the Peloponnese and the displacement of the last Greeks must be due to other reasons, if we take into account that nowhere else were peoples displaced by these immigrants. The reason seems to be the descent and settlement in the Peloponnese of a group of **Avars**, who are clearly a more warlike tribe. It is worthy of attention and reflection that only the Greeks were displaced and not other populations. In Macedonia, for example, nowhere is there any record or indication of the displacement of the

ancient Macedonians from Macedonia and nowhere is there any evidence that says that some populations are Macedonians displaced from Macedonia "by the Slavs". But the same is also testified by Byzantine sources, which present these immigrants as peaceful villagers engaged in agriculture, animal husbandry and technical work. Nowhere are conflicts with the local populations mentioned. They do, of course, often rebel against Byzantine authoritarianism and feudal exploitation.

The same is evidenced by the case of the **Bulgarians**, about whom all Byzantines agree that *they were "Slavicized by the Slavs of the region"*. However, in that region (between the Danube and the Aemos mountain range) it is known that **Thracians** inhabited it. The new settlers who settled there in the 6th century were former slaves of the Romans and then of the Huns. Therefore, they were poorly educated, did not have any kind of political power and it does not seem anywhere that they had developed a superior culture which was adopted by the local Thracians. The political power of the region promoted the Latin and then the Greek language. It is therefore not possible that the local Thracians there abandoned their native language within about a century and adopted the language of the more "uncivilized" and politically powerless (slaves) new settlers, so that the Bulgarians who settled there were "Slavized", especially at a time when there was no educational system and mass media. Common sense says that the Bulgarians adopted the language of the more numerous indigenous Thracians there, who were indeed slaves (Slavs) of the Romans. Common sense also says that it is impossible that the *"most populous people after the Indians, the Thracians"*, disappeared, as did their languages, and that their place was taken by a language and a people that until the 6th century AD were non-existent. Common sense says that the Thracians of the Balkans were turned into slaves by the Roman conquerors and this designation replaced their national names. The same happened with the Thracian dialects which were called "slave languages", i.e. Slavic.

Those Thracian populations that came into closer contact with the Romans were initially Latinized, and then Hellenized. It was natural for those

who were far from the administrative, military, and urban centers, and especially the agricultural and pastoral populations, to keep their native dialects. When the Latin language was replaced, as the official language of the Eastern Roman Empire by the Greek one, it followed the same fate as the Thracian dialects. Only the agricultural and pastoral populations kept it. The Roman ruling class gradually switched from Latin to Greek. The Latin-speaking people of the Balkans, the so-called Vlachs, are Thracians who were Latinized. Many mistakenly present them and associate them with Wallachia or Romania, since the Latinization of the Thracians did not take place only there, but throughout the Balkans. Some of them certainly come from there and followed the other Thracian populations, for the same reasons we mentioned above.

The same is evidenced by the presence of some groups of "*Slavic-speaking*" dark-skinned and swarthy natives of Macedonia and the wider region. It is obvious that they are not of European origin, but they speak the Macedonian language. If they were slaves or populations transported here by the Romans or the Ottomans, they would either speak their native language or the language of the rulers, that is, Latin, Greek or Turkish. So they have settled here before Roman times.

Pre-Roman written historical sources mention the settlement of slaves during the time of **Philip** and **Alexander**. It was a result of the destruction of the 32 colonies that the Greeks had created on the Macedonian and Thracian coasts and the conversion of their inhabitants into slaves. The same happened with the destruction of Thebes and the other Greek cities in the region and the conversion of their inhabitants into slaves. Those slaves, therefore, were a natural consequence of learning the language of their masters, Macedonian. After the enslavement of Macedonia and the wider region by the Romans, the Macedonians were transformed from masters into slaves (Slavs). That is, they were transferred to the same category of slaves of Greek origin and all of them took together the Latin designation of slaves, which later was paraphrased to Slavs. The Macedonians usually called them **Gypsies**, which is a paraphrase of **Egyptian**. Egyptians (Danaeans called themselves) were also called all the

settlers from Phoenicia as they were vassals of the Egyptians. It is possible, however, that some of these dark-skinned Macedonians are descendants of those Macedonians whom Alexander the Great united in marriage with Persian women. Some of them, after their demobilization, probably returned to Macedonia with their wives and children and are Macedonian-Persian mixed-race. However, they keep their language and Macedonian customs.

The language, therefore, of these S(k)lavs is the language of the ancient Thracian tribes, among which is **Macedonian**. Of course, it did not remain the same but changed as all ancient languages changed. The ancient Thracians, who according to Herodotus, "*the greatest nation after the Indians*", did not disappear but were renamed "S(k)lavs by the Roman conquerors.

In Homer's time, **Macedonia** was referred to as **Paeonia** and its inhabitants as Paeonians. Later, the Macedonians dominated the region and the region took their name. It was common in antiquity for a people or region to change its name, depending on which ethnic group dominated it. During the campaign of Alexander the Great, the Paeonians and the Agrians are referred to as part of the Macedonian army. On the contrary, the Greeks are usually referred to separately as "**hostages**" or "**Greek mercenaries**". Arrian, who described the campaign of Alexander the Great, often speaks of "*two tribes*": those of the Macedonians and the Greeks, nowhere does he speak of a third tribe, that of the Thracians. This means that he considered them to be fellow tribesmen.

Changing names and fake stories

The known descriptions that exist about the dominance of the Macedonians in the former Paeonia are very incomplete and unclear. Sometimes they speak of displacement, such as that of the Pierians from Pieria to eastern Macedonia, and sometimes of the integration of their region and their transformation into vassals. In the time of Alexander, the Thracian ethnicities of Macedonia were already integrated into his kingdom and there is no mention of Thracians displaced from Macedonia. The Pierians who had been

displaced from Pieria and had settled in Pangaion (between Serres and Kavala) were already integrated into the Macedonian kingdom and there is no mention of their further displacement or autonomous presence. This, of course, is what common sense says. The regimes of that time that sought to expand their territory did not do so because their own lands were not sufficient for agricultural cultivation or livestock farming, especially at a time when the population of Europe was approximately 5% of the current population. In addition to expanding their territory, they also wanted subjects for conscription, work or taxation. When annexation was not done through diplomatic means, it was done by destroying or displacing the political-military ruling class. The common people simply changed the ruling class. Something similar to what happened with modern Macedonia. In order to impose itself on Macedonia, Greek chauvinism attacked the political-military infrastructure that sought its liberation and autonomy, exterminated or displaced the most resistant sections of the Macedonian people and turned the rest into vassals.

Even some inhabitants of Attica are referred to as Thracians, even before the Greeks appeared. **Strabo**, in the seventh book of the Geographical Works, mentions the occupation of Attica by the Thracians. "*... for Attica was occupied by the Thracians after Eumolpus,...*" This Thracian Eumolpus is also mentioned as the reformer of the Eleusinian mysteries. This shows that the Pelasgians were one of the Thracian ethnic groups. For his time (1st century BC), Strabo writes: "*The Thracians, Illyrians and Epirotes are still in some areas today. But even in the past, more than now without a doubt the barbarians occupied most of Greece*).

As for Macedonia, Strabo explicitly says that it is occupied by Thracians. "*Macedonia is occupied by Thracians and some parts of Thettalia, and Acarnania and Aetolia, upper Thesprotians and Cassopians and Amphilochians and Molots and Athamanes, Epirotic nations*". That is, for Macedonia he states that it is occupied by Thracians and does not mention individual ethnicities, such as Macedonians, Paeonians, Pelagonians, Bottians, etc. Below he also explains what the descent of these "barbarian" Epirotic nations was due to: "*...but the Romans encamped in their houses, established themselves over*

them as rulers. Polybius says that after the destruction of the Macedonians and Perseus, seventy cities of Epirus were destroyed (most of them were Molossians), five and ten thousand people were enslaved". (So Polybius says that [Aemilius] Paulus destroyed seventy cities of Epirus after the destruction of the Macedonian state and the defeat of Perseus (most of them were Molossians) and enslaved one hundred and fifty thousand people.)

The displacement of populations in conquered areas was a common practice of the Romans. Just as some of the Epirotes, who were allies of the Macedonians, were displaced towards western Central Greece, thus some Macedonian populations were displaced and other Thracian populations took their place. The Romans divided Macedonia into four regions, even prohibiting relations between them, precisely in order to break their initial cohesion.

The relationship between Macedonian and the Greek language

According to written sources and the findings of archaeological research, the first Phoenician colonies were established on some of the Aegean islands, mainly the Cyclades. Their culture (Cycladic) was called "pre-Hellenic" by the Greeks and the naming of its real origin is avoided. The seats of the goddess Astarte of the Canaanites are presented as seats of Artemis. The spread of the colonies is gradual. Thus, the few first settlers who come into contact with the indigenous people of the islands and the neighboring Peloponnese and Attica adopt the toponyms of the indigenous people: The names **Peloponnese, Argos, Sparta, Athens, Attica**, etc. are pre-Hellenic. The population of the settlers gradually increases and they coexist with the indigenous people, with whom they mutually influence each other culturally. The settlers have no problem adopting the local gods. Moreover, most religions of the eastern Mediterranean have a related structure. They are the individual gods of fertility, wisdom, the sea, war, etc. and there is a higher god or father of the gods. They simply change the names: **Dias or Zeus, Ammon Ra, Osiris, Yahweh, Allah, Mithra** , etc. For example, the Latins called Zeus Jupiter and for the twelve gods of the Greeks they had the corresponding gods but with

Latin names. The Greek-speaking people who will settle in England will call the god **god** or in France **dieu** , etc. The settlers, in fact, who are merchants, shipowners, pirates and all kinds of adventurers, are the least fanatical in religious and national matters. The saying "the customer is always right" is not new at all. And the "customers" in our case were the indigenous people. But also those tyrants who wanted to impose themselves on certain peoples, appear as the chosen ones of the gods in whom the locals believe. We have the example of Alexander the Great, who spread the word that he was the son of Ammon Ra, the supreme god of the Egyptians. He did this precisely because he wanted to impose himself on peoples where belief in Ammon was widespread. That is why he identified **Ammon** with **Zeus** and is often referred to as "**Ammon Zeus**". We have the example of **Xerxes**, who, according to Herodotus, during his campaign towards Greece, when he arrived in Troy he made sacrifices to the goddess **Athena**, while in his army there was a gold-decorated chariot of **Zeus**, which was even pulled by eight horses.

The cunning merchants and adventurers of all kinds, therefore, had no problem changing the names of the gods and calling them by the names that the natives called them, over whom they wanted to impose themselves like Alexander and Xerxes and exploit them more easily.

Trade and piracy yielded great profits to these first colonies. When they destroyed the alliance of the natives in the 12th century BC (Trojan War), they became absolute masters of the commercial centers and maritime transport of the **Mediterranean** and the **Black Sea**. The wealth that accumulated allowed them to create fortified cities, imposing temples, palaces, baths, markets, theaters, etc. Their language was enriched with words that they took from the native peoples and from all the peoples with whom they traded. Thus, their language was completed and acquired words for every concept or object, with many synonyms. The invention of the new alphabet allowed for a better recording of the spoken language compared to the writings that had been used up to that time. By recording the sounds, it is possible to write all words and especially concepts, to record tenses, conjugations, derivatives, compounds,

etc. It becomes the most complete and richest language of the era. Gradually, in addition to being **a language of international trade and international transport** it also becomes a language of **international relations**. Of course, wealth gives them the opportunity to be educated, to travel, to know other cultures and to enrich their own culture. Those who have solved the problem of their survival and have the financial means can engage in literature, the arts, the sciences, research, philosophy, etc. Wealth provides them with this opportunity. The Macedonian language, therefore, like the other local languages, took part in and contributed to the creation of international Greek. However, it is different from Greek. Macedonian is based on the local Thracian dialects, while Greek is based on Phoenician and other dialects of the Middle East. It is a product of the contact of Middle Easterners with Europeans and especially the southern Balkan people.

The "local origin" of the Greeks

The rallying of all the indigenous peoples of the region against them, during the so-called **Trojan War**, shows a serious political problem for the Phoenician-Egyptian Danaans. As wicked and demonic as they are, they do not neglect the issue of political propaganda, which will make them more acceptable to the indigenous people. In addition to adapting their religious traditions to those of the locals, they develop ideologies, mainly mythological, that present them as indigenous.

They modified the myth of **Noah's** flood to local conditions. The myth of Noah appears in the Old Testament as a genealogical history of the Jews. In addition to being more widespread in the Middle East, we must take into account that by the 11th century BC the Jews had already dominated a large part of Canaan and, as is well known, the religious beliefs of the rulers were adopted by a large part of the new subjects. Moreover, the Jews themselves mixed with the surrounding peoples. We have the written examples, where Abraham took the Egyptian Hagar as his wife and later Joseph took as his wife the woman who had married a Hittite officer of his army. Subsequently, those

who embraced the Jewish religion joined the Jewish nation. We have the example of the Khazars in the Caucasus region who were Judaized or the Sudanese of Africa, who after the establishment of the modern state of Israel settled in it and constitute a distinct minority of approximately 130,000 black Jews. This shows that the Hebrew does not mean descent from the Hebrews of the Bible. That portion of the Jews who later became Christianized merged with the other European peoples and ceased to be part of the Jewish people. After their dominance in Canaan many Jews became merchants, but also several foreign merchants embraced Judaism. Thus, what happened to the Canaanites who were identified with the concept of merchant, also happened to the Jews, some of whom also participated in the colonial expansion in the Mediterranean forming part of the multinational people of the Phoenicians.

The myth of Noah, which was part of the ethnogenesis of the Jews, is modified for the needs of presenting the Middle Eastern and North African settlers as indigenous. Noah was saved by God because he was the only virtuous, while by the flood he caused he drowned all the corrupt. The place of the god of the Bible is taken by the god of the natives of the wider region, Zeus. In order to punish people, he causes a flood and drowns everyone except the virtuous king of Phthia **Deucalion** and his wife Pyrrha. **Deucalion's ark** ran aground on the neighboring mountain Orthry or on Parnassus, just as Noah's ark ran aground on Mount Ararat. Deucalion's son was **Hellas**, who is considered the mythical ancestor of the Greeks, while his sons Doros and Aeolus and his grandsons Achaeus and Ion were considered the ancestors of the four tribes - Dorians, Aeolians, Achaeans and Ionians. The myth, therefore, of the ethnogenesis of the Greeks has its roots in the Middle East.

It is argued that the **Dorians** probably got their name because they were good spearmen, the **Aeolians** because, as good sailors, they were good at manipulating the winds as the driving force of ships, the **Achaeans** are related to the Hittites, while they say nothing about the **Ionians** who were the most important tribe. Perhaps because the name **Ion - Ionas** refers to the Middle East, as it is found as a common compound in many names. In the Bible there is the well-known prophet **Jonah**, princes, rulers with the name

Jonathan or Jonadab, Joash, Yosaf, Job etc. Even the name **Homer** refers there, as it has a common root with the oriental names **Omer, Omar**. What is done by the Modern Greeks with the presentation of Ludwig as Loudovikos, Kopernik as Kopernikos, etc. or London as Lontino, Berlin as Verolino, Beograd as Veligradi, Barcelona as Varkeloni was certainly also done by the ancient Greeks.

Other ancient traditions say that Deucalion's ark ran aground on Mount **Athos**, today's Holy Mountain (Agios Oros). **Tatos** in today's Macedonian is father and tatko is the diminutive, meaning little father. Tatos in older dialects (called Old Slavonic) is referred to as **atos**. At the top of the mountain, according to Greek sources, there was a statue and a sanctuary dedicated to "**Atos Zeus**", that is, Father Zeus. And this happens because the ancient Greeks used to pronounce the "t" of the Macedonians as θ, as well as the χ as κ, the π as φ, the γκ as γ, the μπ as β, the ντ as δ. Even today this is seen in the Middle Eastern languages, and mainly in Arabic where χ, θ, φ, γ, β, δ predominate, while in the corresponding Balkan and Italian languages k, t, p, g, d predominate. Macedonia, for example, is pronounced by everyone except Greeks with d (ντ), Graikos with g (γκ), Thessaly as Τεσάλια, Athina as Ατίνα or Athens. The Macedonians, during their violent Hellenization, called the Θάλασσα (sea) ταλάσσα.

Athens has this name because according to tradition the goddess Athena, after whom it was named, was not born from a mother but directly from the head of Atos (father) Zeus of the natives. Thus, the goddess born from **Atos** (father) was called **Atina** by the natives and Athena by the oriental settlers. The name of Mount Atho is the Greek pronunciation of Ato in the dative case, which is why it is written with -ω. The phrase "to the Ato" the ancient Greeks would have written in one word "τῷ Ατῷ". The ancient Macedonians, like the modern ones but also the neighboring peoples, did not use the letter θ-ητα, while the Latin-speaking peoples use the soft τ, something between τ and θ, the th. Also today, the Macedonians and most Europeans call Athens Atina or Athens. It is another serious essential difference that shows the linguistic

diversity of the ancient Greeks from the Europeans.

Hercules, **whom** the Greek-speaking people present to us as a mythical hero of the Greeks, was a mythical hero and was worshipped by the **Phoenicians**, as well as other peoples of the Middle East, as a God. The historian Arrian, who described the campaign of Alexander the Great, informs us that during the conquest of Tyre in Phoenicia there was the most ancient temple in honor of Hercules and that another Hercules was worshipped as a god by the Egyptians. He even characterizes the **Hercules of Tyre** as being many generations older. It is therefore obvious that the myth of Hercules has its roots in **Egypt** and the **Middle East**. It is also no coincidence that the birthplace of Hercules of Greek mythology is considered to be Argos in the Peloponnese, where it was the center of power of the **Egyptian Danaans**.

The reason for the modification of the myth and the presentation of Argos as the birthplace of Hercules is photographed in the Trojan War. All the indigenous peoples around the Aegean had rallied against the Danaan settlers and treated them as foreign invaders. Thus, they began to create ideologies that presented them as indigenous. Just as they modified the myth of Noah, so they modified their myth about Hercules and presented **Argos** in the Peloponnese as his birthplace. They presented their kings as descendants of this Hercules (**Heracleides**) .

According to Dorian tradition, which also conceals some truth and is not disputed by Greeks, the **Heracleidae conquered** and colonized the Peloponnese, but after the death of Heracles they were expelled by the natives of **Eurystheus** and moved to various areas of Central Greece (Athens, Marathon, Nafpaktos, etc.). After successive attacks they managed to return and definitively impose themselves on the Peloponnese. Heracles, therefore, was a mythical hero of the Greeks because they were settlers from Phoenicia and Egypt, and according to tradition thanks to him they settled in the Peloponnese.

The name of the Greeks

The adoption of the name **Hellenes** in place of the Egyptian **Danai** is photographed in the Iliad. The main protagonist is **Achilles**. He is the personification of the invincible, the fearless, the invulnerable, the hero. His soldiers are the legendary Myrmidons, also called Hellenes. **Hellas** in the time of Homer (8th century BC) was the name of a small city or region of Phthiotis, northeast of present-day Lamia. The Iliad was at that time a particularly popular epic poem recited by artists as a means of entertainment. But it was also an educational tool, as were the books of the Old and New Testaments for Christians for many centuries. It was natural, therefore, that everyone considered it honorable to be descended from those fearless Greeks of Achilles. The events described in the Iliad were considered their true history and that is why scenes from it were depicted on the facades of temples.

The reason why they did not choose the name "Myrmidons" must be sought in the origin of the name "Greeks". The Greek counterfeiters try to attribute it to the Epirote peasants "**Selloi**" in order to give some locality to their "ancient ancestors". It is completely absurd, however, that the megalomaniac and civilized plutocrats adopted the name of some uncivilized and ignoble peasants (Selloi), whom they even called **barbarians**. In other words, they are looking for the roots of the name in completely unlikely versions, except for a very likely one. The possibility that they took their name from the god **El**. El was the supreme deity of the ancient Canaanites and the peoples of the wider region. **El** literally in Phoenician meant **god**. The Greeks, therefore, were the ones with divine origin or divine blessing. Besides, Achilles was invulnerable for this reason. This version is also supported by the story of **Europa** who was a princess of Phoenicia (Tyre) and who, according to Greek traditions, gave her name to the European continent. The name "Europe", therefore, is Phoenician. It is also Greek because the Greeks were settlers from Phoenicia and the wider Middle East. This Europa is also referred to as **Ellotis**, a name apparently synonymous with **Ellinis**. As the daughter of the king of Phoenicia (Tyre), she had divine origin and, in this case, from the supreme god

of the Canaanites, El. According to Greek traditions, Europa was abducted by Zeus and transported to Crete. He had two sons with her, one of whom was the later king **Minos**, from whom the Cretan civilization was named Minoan. We have, in other words, another case where the king is the son of a god, just as Alexander spread that he was the son of Ammon. The case, that is, of Jesus who is claimed to have been the son not of Joseph but of a god, is not at all new. This tradition is another testimony to the origin of the **Minoans** from the **Middle East**.

To understand what was happening in the region around the Aegean, it is necessary to see what was happening in the Middle East. Until the 12th century BC the region was dominated by the powerful Egyptian state. It controlled the entire region from Libya to Mesopotamia. It ensured political stability for many centuries, but it also imposed taxes. The islands of the Aegean became the headquarters of commercial and shipping companies (branches or subsidiaries), but also a refuge for pirate groups. They were, in other words, a kind of tax haven. Something similar to the off shore companies that rich modern Greeks set up to avoid controls and taxation. These colonies, with the great wealth they accumulated, strengthened and created a powerful federation of city-states following the model of the Phoenician city-states. During the 12th century they defeated the alliance of indigenous peoples around the Aegean (Trojan City) and began to settle on the eastern and northern coasts of the Aegean.

Egyptian sources report major attacks by the "Sea Peoples" during the 11th century BC. Of course, these "sea peoples" did not live in boats but on some islands and coastal areas of the eastern Mediterranean and it is obvious who they are. They were repelled, of course, by Egyptian forces but the continuous attacks weakened the state, which entered a prolonged decline and never recovered. It definitively lost control of Phoenicia and the wider region. It was precisely then (end of the 11th century) that the state of Israel was created and the Phoenician city-states gained full autonomy. This new situation led to the repatriation of many Phoenician settlers from the Aegean region, as

their ancient homeland was more suitable as a base for commercial enterprises, for the reasons mentioned above. This is also the logical cause of the stagnation observed in the colonies around the Aegean after the end of the Trojan War, even though it ended with a victory for the colonial powers. The Greek counterfeiter tries to attribute that stagnation to the "*descent of the Dorians*", which coincides in time with the decline of Egypt. And this, because the real cause refers to the origin of the Greek settlers from the Middle East. However, this does not hold true as a cause. The Dorians prevailed in only one part (Peloponnese) and the decline of the Ionian, Achaean and Aeolian cities is not justified.

The reason for the great prosperity of the Phoenician colonies around the Aegean, which appears after the end of the 8th century BC, is easily visible if we look at the political developments in the Middle East. The **Assyrian** empire gradually strengthens and expands from the 9th century. During the 8th century it occupies the entire region of Phoenicia, definitively dissolves the state of **Israel** and the autonomous city-states of Phoenicia in 722 BC. The gradual expansion of the Assyrians also caused the gradual migration of large populations and merchant shipping companies of the region to their colonies in Cyprus, Crete and the Aegean region. Something similar, in other words, to what happened in our time with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the civil war in Syria. The Greek counterfeiter does not want to say the real reason for the increase in the population of the colonial cities of the Aegean and is content to mention the cause for the Second Greek colonization of the 8th century BC and later, as "*the great increase in the population of the Greek cities*". The simple increase in population does not justify the great prosperity of the Greek cities. It is justified only by the settlement in them of rich Middle Easterners, merchants, shipowners, bankers, scientists, intellectuals and artists from their troubled and enslaved homeland. The Assyrians are succeeded by the Babylonians and then the Persians. Thus, the Phoenicians, that is, the Middle Eastern merchants and shipowners (shipowners) settled permanently in their

colonies in the Aegean and were cut off from their ancient homelands in the Middle East.

The colonies become metropolises and continuers of the impressive civilization, which was later called Greek. It was called Greek precisely because it was multinational and therefore did not previously have a national name. Thus, the name Greeks was chosen and promoted by them themselves and that is why no European people called them by that name. They called them Graikos, a name that obviously did not mean any national origin, because nowhere was any people or country mentioned with that name before. Apparently it was some characterization analogous to Slav or Vlach, which ended up becoming a proper noun. One possibility is that it is a synonym for gray or has a root from the Macedonian verb **gree**. Gree means illuminates and burns and is usually attributed to the sun that illuminates and burns. Consequently, **Greek** probably meant the **sunburnt**, which in the plural was **Greek(k)tsi**. This can be considered the strongest possibility, if we see how the natives of America called each other during their encounter with the white settlers. The whites called the natives "**Redskins**", a synonym for **sunburn**, while the whites were called by the natives the "Palefaces". This is also the reason why even today all European peoples call **Greeks** those who call themselves Hellenes and the place they inhabited as **Graecia**, in various variations.

These settlers gradually developed the ideology of locality, precisely because they realized that the powerful empires that were imposed on their homelands no longer gave them hope of returning and self-determination of their homeland. They themselves cultivated the ideology of common national origin (*omaimon and homodoxos-of the same blood and the same faith*), so that over time the fact that they constituted a multinational cultural and political federation of merchant-pirate colonies would be forgotten. In other words, they did something similar to what our current rulers do, who baptize the multinational conglomerate on which they imposed themselves with one name, "Greeks", and try to erase the traces of the real origin of the individual ethnicities that they dominate. Just as the **Romans** (Romans) were renamed

Greeks for political reasons, so too were the ancient **Danaans** (Phoenician-Egyptians) renamed **Greeks** for political reasons. This is the most basic common characteristic of today's "Greeks" with the "Greeks" of antiquity. They are both artificial creations of the political expediencies of evil rulers.

At exactly the same time and for the same reasons, a portion of those Middle Eastern Phoenician immigrants also created colonies in the western Mediterranean. The leading city of those colonies became **Carthage**, on the African coast just opposite Sicily. The overpopulation caused by the massive influx of new settlers from the 8th century BC onwards is the cause of the so-called Second Hellenic Colonization. At that time, the coasts of Macedonia, Epirus, Thrace, the Black Sea and southern Italy were also filled with **colonies**. Now, in addition to merchant shipping colonies, they also occupy the best coastal agricultural lands, in which they settle "**beneficiaries**" who exploit them. All these colonies and fiefdoms were obliged to pay an annual tax to the metropolis and to maintain warships at readiness. Thus the metropolises became all-powerful and imposed themselves on the entire wider region.

The greed of these colonialists was natural to "awaken" the sleeping and highly divided Balkan and Italian peoples. In the southern Balkans, the **Macedonians** rallied the indigenous peoples by force or diplomacy, while the **Romans** did the same in the Italian peninsula. The Macedonian alliance initially destroyed or annexed the Greek colonies on the coasts of Macedonia and Thrace and then expelled them from Thessaly. It defeated the Greek alliance at **Chaeronea** in 338 BC - strangely enough on August 2 - while it completely destroyed Thebes, which dared to react. This forced the Greek cities to capitulate. The privilege they had to control trade and trade routes and collect taxes from the colonies is abolished. They are even obliged to give up their warships for the needs of the Macedonian army. Thus, the reasons that made the Greek cities very rich and powerful disappeared. They enter a course of endless decline, which forces many Greeks to return to their ancient homelands in the Middle East. Thus, the Greek people, as they were politically (artificially) constituted, dissolves into the parts from which they were

composed and ceases to exist as a separate people. The language, however, that was formed by them continues to be the language of international trade and diplomacy. The ruling classes of the peoples of the wider region learn it as an international language, just as they learn **English** today. A Greek is now called a Greek speaker. Thus, the Macedonians became "bilingual". The ruling class, in addition to Macedonian, also spoke Greek. The use of Macedonian by the Macedonians is also mentioned in written sources. Plutarch mentions the use of Macedonian by Alexander, when he addressed Macedonians. Describing his quarrel with his friend Cleitus, he writes: *"Alexander, unable to suppress his anger, hit him by throwing some apples that were next to him and searched for his sword. And when one Aristophanes of the bodyguards disarmed him and the others surrounded him and begged him, he jumped up shouting in **Macedonian** for his aides"*. The Greek counterfeiterers, unable to ignore the written testimony, are quick to say that Macedonian existed but it was a dialect of Greek. However, if it were so, they would not call the Macedonians "barbarians", that is, non-Greeks.

The timeless conflict between indigenous people and foreigners

The Macedonians caught the germ of slavery and imposition on other peoples from these Greeks. So, when they decided to pay back the Greek colonialists and the Persian conquerors with their own coin, they used the international language or, as it became known, Common Greek as their language. They could not communicate with the Macedonian beyond the Balkans. They did not completely destroy the Greeks as the Romans did to the Greeks' cousins, the Carthaginians, because they needed their experience and their language to govern the empire they founded, imitating their oriental neighbors. The Eastern Romans (Byzantines) and even the Ottomans did something similar later, that kept Greek as the second language of their empire.

How much the Greeks felt akin to the Macedonians was shown a little later. The Greeks invited the Romans to intervene in Greek affairs and became

their allies when they invaded to conquer Macedonia, Epirus and Thrace. As a reward for that alliance, the Romans granted the Greek cities their "freedom", but without the right to garrison and taxation. When the Greeks violated that agreement, the Romans revoked the freedom they had temporarily granted them and completely destroyed Corinth, which was the leading power of the Achaean alliance.

Control of trade and shipping passed into the hands of the Macedonians and then the Romans. The center of Mediterranean trade shifted from Athens and was replaced, in the West, by Rome and the other Italian cities, and especially Venice and Genoa, in the Aegean and the Black Sea by Constantinople, and in the East by Alexandria in Egypt and the ports of Phoenicia. The ancient Greek cities became commercial substations for other powers and declined. The Greeks were replaced by Balkan people, Romans, Franks, Catalans, Venetians, Genoese, etc. The modern Greeks are descendants of these peoples much more than they are of the ancient Greeks. Venice and Genoa were merchant states, that is, of the same character as the Greeks, and therefore they occupied the same places that their Phoenician-Egyptian colleagues had previously occupied. Gradually, the ancient center of the Greeks, Athens, ended up being an insignificant town of 8-9 thousand inhabitants. At the time of the founding of the modern Greek state, the ancient Greek centers of Thebes, Athens, Corinth, Sparta were centers mainly of Albanians (Arvanites), remnants of all the previous colonialists and Hellenized Balkan immigrants due to Byzantium. The area where the Greeks flourished fell into such decline that the diminutive of Graikos, Graekylos, came to mean the uneducated, the uncivilized. These Graekylos they dressed them in ancient Greek costume and mask and the current narcissistic nation of Modern Greeks emerged, which considers as their own everything that shines from the past and anywhere the Greeks passed.

The ancient Greek writers are clear about the origin of these Albanians, who were renamed Greeks. The most famous geographer, Strabo, places them in the northern Caucasus. The historians who described the campaign of

Alexander the Great, and especially Arrian, explicitly mention the Albanians as allies and part of the Persian army. They appear in the Balkans for the first time in the 11th century AD, while their presence in the Caucasus ceases. There are no written reports about this movement, or if there were they have disappeared or been buried. The reason for this movement, however, is obvious. Since the end of the 10th century AD, intense revolutionary activity has been developing in the Balkans by the indigenous peoples. It is the Bogomil movement that challenges the authority of the Byzantine feudal lords and despots. The result of that indigenous movement was the creation of the state of Samuel (976-1018 AD), based initially in Prespa and then in Ohrid, Macedonia.

The Byzantine rulers used to transfer foreign populations to rebellious areas in order to break the unity of the natives and use them as vassals. Thus, they placed the Albanians west of Ohrid, that is, at the other end of the Balkans from what was their capital, Constantinople. For the same reasons, they also transferred a part of them to Greece. It is no coincidence that the Albanians have as their national symbol the double-headed eagle of Byzantium. They were vassals of these rulers, who had as their state symbol (flag) the double-headed eagle. For the same reason, the Orthodox clergy also uses the flag with the double-headed eagle. It was the ideological and political support of the Byzantine oligarchy, in return for the privileges that it granted them. They are both remnants of Byzantine rule. That mentality of the vassal of the dynasties subsequently caused the Albanians to become vassals (pashas) of the Ottomans and most of them to convert. This is also the reason why their language is not related to the languages of the indigenous Slavs of the Balkans.

The Modern Greeks and Macedonia

For over two millennia there was no people or any populations that could be called Greeks by origin. From the 7th century AD the international Greek language became the official language of the Eastern Roman Empire

(Byzantium). The reason is exactly the same as the one that made the Macedonians adopt Common Greek as the language of administration of their empire. Constantinople had now lost control of the Italian peninsula and its territory extends from the Balkans to Egypt, where the Greek language clearly prevails over Latin. Moreover, all the emperors of Byzantium from the 6th century onwards are of Asian origin (Armenians, Lydians, Phrygians, Paphlagonians, Isaurians) and their army consists mainly of Asian mercenaries.

From the end of the 14th century AD, some Byzantine subjects, seeing the decline and the upcoming dissolution of Byzantium, began to promote the idea of the origin of the Greek-speaking Romans from the ancient Greeks. The reason is the re-publication of ancient Greek writings in Europe as part of the Renaissance. After so many centuries, only the brilliant civilization and mainly philosophy survive from the history of the ancient Greeks. The origin, the colonialist behavior towards the natives, the adventurism, piracy, slavery and other negative aspects of the Greeks have been forgotten and are not promoted. Nevertheless, the obsession with the origin of the Modern Greeks from the ancient Greeks will find resonance only after the 18th century with the Enlightenment movement that appears in Europe. The worship of Hellenism will take on great dimensions and will be transmitted to the enslaved Romans through the Enlighteners Rigas Feraios, Adamantios Korais, the Philiki Eteria, etc. The enslaved Romans themselves had no idea about ancient Greek civilization, as the Byzantine priesthood prevented the publication of ancient Greek writings and persecuted ancient Greek philosophy. These were saved and resurfaced thanks to the Arabs and Western Europeans. This is also the reason for the disrespect of the enslaved Greeks towards the remains of ancient Greek treasures. Not only did they not protect them from the European antiquities thieves, but they also helped them in their looting for a small fee.

The European philhellene movement was exploited by the enslaved Greeks to secure the support of Europeans in their liberation struggle. However, as always happens, the oligarchic and chauvinist forces exploited that movement to achieve their colonialist aims. Thus, that fraudulent support also had its

negative consequences. When it became clear that the revolutionaries of Greece could not succeed on their own and their revolution had been suppressed by the Ottomans, the European allies intervened dynamically. They destroyed the Ottoman fleet during the naval battle of **Navarino** (October 1827) and intervened with a French expeditionary force (14,000) in the Peloponnese. Thus, they forced the Ottomans to recognize the creation of a free Greek state within the borders of ancient Ellada, which the Europeans called **Grekia** (Greece – Грција= Grecia). Precisely because it was a creation of the Europeans, the international name of the state was established by the one by which foreigners called it. After the independence of Greece, the multinational mixture **of Byzantines, Arvanites, Vlachs** and Hellenized **Avars** and **Thracians (Slavs)** now receives systematic propaganda about their descent from the glorious Greeks of antiquity. The first king of Greece, **Otto**, follows the policy of his father, the king of Bavaria, who was a fanatical lover of ancient Greece. The Anglo-French also promote that ideology, as they want to reduce the great influence of **Russia** on the peoples of the region. They promote the change of the national name Romios (Rum millet) to Ellinas and replace the concept of **Romiosyni** with the concept of **Hellenism** because the former refers to Rome (Italy) and makes the populations vulnerable to **Roman** (Italian) propaganda.

"Homogeneous" (*of the same descent*) Roman merchants from all over the Ottoman territory arrive in the new state, as they have fallen into disfavor there after the revolutions of the Greeks and other Balkan peoples. Many Phanariotes also arrive, who until then were the closest collaborators of the Ottomans and held positions of rulers, ministers, diplomats, admirals, etc. In other words, all those who during Roman and Turkish rule were the privileged Christian class that exploited the subordinate Christian peoples, arrive. They crowd out the real revolutionaries, persecuting some, such as Kolokotronis and the Macedonian Karatasos, murdering others, such as Odysseas Androutsos, etc. and become the rulers of the new state.

The geographical area occupied by this, however, is one of the most barren areas of the Balkans and the population is too small to sustain these wealth-addicted new tyrants. Thus they form a chauvinistic ideology that allows them to incorporate other countries into their country and other populations into their subjects. Thus they call Greeks all populations that speak the international Greek language and Greek countries all those that have Greek-speaking populations or in antiquity belonged to the sphere of influence of the Greek language. Furthermore, they baptize Greeks also all peoples that belonged to the Roman nation, the Rum millet of the Ottomans, that is, the subjects of the Roman Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople, regardless of their mother tongue.

To understand the extent of the arbitrariness and fraud, we must think about what would happen if today's Latins, that is, the inhabitants of the Rome region, argued that all Catholics and all Latin-speaking peoples of the world are their fellow nationalities and should be united in one state under their leadership. The Vlachs, that is, of the Balkans, should belong to the Latin nation along with the Spaniards, Portuguese and all Latin-speaking peoples of Central and South America.

The **Anglo-French** protectors of Greece support this chauvinistic ideology because it serves their plans in the Balkans, as the other newly created states **Serbia** and **Bulgaria** are pro-Russian. They fear that an autonomous Macedonia, due to its religious and linguistic affinity with **Russia**, will also be included in its sphere of influence. This is why all Western European historical institutions support the outrageous historical distortions of the modern Greek ideology. Thus we arrived at the ridiculous ideology of “**Slavic-speaking**, but with a Greek conscience, **Vlach-speaking**, but Greek, Turkish-speaking, **Albanian-speaking**, **Armenian-speaking**, **Chechen-speaking**, etc.... but **Greek**”. – Smart idiot.

The Ottomans ceded Thessaly and Epirus to Greece without wars or revolutions, because they were pressured by the Anglo-French. The latter, fearing that with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, the Russians would

descend into the Mediterranean, now actively supported the Ottomans. During the Crimean War (1854), they even participated with an expeditionary force on the side of the Ottomans. In Thessaly and Epirus there was a certain majority of Greek speakers and there was no significant separatist movement. Thus, their annexation was easy. In Macedonia, however, Greek speakers constituted a minority of around 10-12% of the population, but they too showed no inclination to unite with Greece. The main reason was the situation in which their Thessalian neighbors found themselves after their integration into Greece. Their situation, not only did not improve, but also worsened. The Greek landowners who had replaced the Turkish landowners were even worse. This is also the reason why the most important uprising of the Thessalians was against these Greeks (Kileler 1910) and not against the Ottomans.

Lies about Macedonia

To justify the occupation of half of Macedonia, they also resort to a series of distortions of history. They try to present the ancient Macedonians as a Dorian race and base this view on a passage in Herodotus that speaks of the participation of the Dorians in the Greek fleet:

"... these, besides the Hermioneans, were of Dorian and Macedonian nationality, having finally rushed from Erinyes and Pindus and Dryopis..." (8' 43) and another that is even more illuminating:

"During the reign of Deucalion he lived in Phthiotis, and during the reign of his son Dorus the Greek in the country between Ossa and Olympus, called Histiaeotis, and from Histiaeotis, because he was expelled by the Cadmeans, he lived in Pindus, called Macedon, and from there he immediately moved to Dryopida, and from Dryopida itself, after coming to the Peloponnese, he was called Doric."(A ' 56)

It is clear that the Dorians who settled in Phthiotis migrated to eastern Thessaly and then to Pindus (southwestern Macedonia) from where they quickly left for the Peloponnese. From that short stay in southwestern Macedonia, some attributed to them the designation "Macedonian", just as the

Pontians who temporarily migrated to Russia were given the designation "**Russians**" or "**Russopontians**", without this meaning that the Pontians are Russians or the Russians are Pontians. Absolutely nowhere is there information that any Dorians stayed in Macedonia or that they had any kinship with the Macedonians. If they had any kinship, they would have known it and behaved as relatives. And a simple reading, however, of the ancient historical texts shows exactly the opposite. The attitude of the Greeks during the Macedonian-Persian conflict is characteristic. The mainly Greeks, the Athenians, were forced to send hostages and an expeditionary force with Alexander, as they were subordinate to him after their defeat at Chaeronea in 338 BC, but on the other hand they had secret contacts with the Persians, which were revealed with the capture of the Greek delegation by the Macedonians. The leader of the **Persian fleet** and the **Persian** land army in Asia Minor was **Memnon the Rhodian**, who was also a **Dorian**. The greatest resistance against the Macedonians was offered by the Greek colonies of Asia Minor, especially **Miletus** and **Halicarnassus**, which was also a **Dorian** colony, which after a long siege were completely destroyed by the Macedonians and restored to power the indigenous **Carians** and **Lydians**. The most elite body of the Persians and the personal guard of Darius were composed of Greeks.

Arrian, **who** described the campaign, often speaks of the hatred that existed between the **two tribes**, the **Macedonian** and the **Greek**. He writes about the battle at Gaugamela: "The Greeks insulted the Macedonians, as they saw their phalanx divided... and something between the Greek and Macedonian tribes fell into hostility towards each other".

In the military council held to decide whether or not to besiege Tyre, Alexander says something very important: *"That is, if we advance against Babylon and Darius, the Persians will prevail again on the coasts and with a larger fleet they will carry the war to Greece, where the Lacedaemonians are fighting us openly, while the city of Athens continues to be on our side for the time being rather out of fear than out of friendship"*. Such doubts are not

expressed anywhere about the Thracians, Illyrians and Thessalians who follow Alexander and form part of the Macedonian army.

To support the "Greekness" of Macedonia, they often use the phrase: **"There are indeed Greece and Macedonia"**, which they attribute to the famous geographer of antiquity Strabo (Book VII of the Geography). However, this phrase is absolutely nowhere to be found in the book. It is found in the Epitome of the edition of Strabo's Geography, which was published in the 14th century AD in the Vatican. It is one of the many editions that were published during the Renaissance in Italy. Epitome are the introductory notes of the editors. So, one of the editors, presenting the contents of the work, wrote that Macedonia should be examined together with Greece. Fifteen centuries, that is, after Strabo, one Latin considered that Greece and Macedonia should be examined together. Anyone who reads Strabo's book itself will see that he considers present-day **Central Greece** and the **Peloponnese** to be Greece. He does not even consider Epirus and Thessaly to be Greece, let alone Macedonia, which is located further north of them. He even characterizes the neighboring peoples of Greece, **the Epirotes** and **Thessalians, as barbarians** (Pelasgians), let alone the Macedonians who live even further north.

Herodotus, who describes the Persian invasion of Greece (480 BC), explicitly says that the Greeks themselves did not call the Thessalians Greeks, nor Thessaly as Greece. Thus, he writes that the Greeks decided to line up in the straits of Thermopylae because: "They decided, therefore, to guard this passage to prevent the invasion of Greece by the barbarians, and to prevent the naval army from sailing to Artemisium of Histiaea... and the entrance to Greece through Trachinus [a village next to Thermopylae] is as narrow as half a river." Of course, the first battle took place there. Therefore, those **Graecomanians** of all kinds who proclaim here in Macedonia that **they "guard Thermopylae"** should find out where Thermopylae is and go and guard it.

In that conflict with the Persians, the Greeks were completely alone. The still weak Macedonians and Thracians were already vassals of the Persians. According to Herodotus (Book V of *Terpsichore*, 23) during Darius' campaign to conquer Macedonia and Thrace, the Greeks of Ionia, with Miletus as their leading city, collaborated with the Persians and participated with a military force, in exchange for Darius' promise to allow them to establish a colony, Myrcynus, at the mouth of the Strymon in order to exploit the region's wealth in shipbuilding timber and silver mines. The Thessalians, according to Herodotus, had invited the Persians even before the campaign began for the simple reason that the Greeks were cruel colonialists of the region. Even the Greek colonies of Sicily refused to send help because, as they claimed, when they needed it, during their conflict with the Carthaginians, the Athenians and Spartans did not help them.

The writer and traveler **Pausanias** (2nd century AD) in his work accurately describes ancient Greece. The 10 books that make up his work "**Tour of Greece**" are: Attica, Corinth, Laconia, Messenia, Ilia (2), Achaea, Arcadia, Boeotia and Phocaea. That is where all ancient writers considered Greece. That is where the founders of modern Greece also considered it, which is why they did not call the state "**Kingdom of Southern Greece**" but simply "**Kingdom of Greece**". At that time, absolutely nowhere did they mention Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace as Northern Greece. Moreover, the countries they conquered during the Balkan Wars were characterized as "**conquered countries**" or "**New Countries**". They explicitly say that "**Greece doubled its territories**" as if those "territories" did not have peoples with personality and the right to self-determination. They shaped the chauvinistic ideology of "**Greater Greece**" in the following decades.

The ideology of Greater Greece was constructed by the regime that was imposed on the newly created state. Even before it was officially recognized, a merciless struggle for dominance of the ruling groups began. It is known as the civil war of 1824 - 1826. The local **Kotzabasis** (tax collectors of the Turks),

the newly arrived "homogeneous" big merchants and the **Phanariot officials** fought for their dominance in the new state. They completely pushed aside the ideological fighters and with the military and financial assistance of the **Anglo-French** they prevailed completely. They became the new regime, just as authoritarian and unjust as the Ottoman one.

The problem, however, was the fact that the territory of the state was very small, the wealth-producing sources were minimal and the subjects were not enough to satisfy the greed of the ruling class, which was accustomed to the privileges it had within the Ottoman and Byzantine empires. They had to expand their territory. The admiration and the cult of antiquity that had developed in Europe for the ancient Greeks was a very good prerequisite for the creation of the chauvinistic ideology of Greater Greece. Thus, the renaming of the Romans to Greeks was not only favorably accepted by European public opinion, but also had its encouragement and fervent support.

All the Byzantine Greek-speaking populations were easily renamed Greeks. The fact that the Byzantine Greek language was the official language of the multinational ruling class of the Eastern Roman Empire and of the also multinational official Byzantine Orthodox Christian church was overlooked. The international Greek language was completely arbitrarily renamed into a national language and its various ethnic speakers into a Greek Nation. It is like saying that all Latin speakers (Vlachs, Italians, Mexicans, Cubans, Brazilians, Spaniards, etc.) belong to the Latin nation and therefore should be united with Latium of Italy.

For the non-Greek-speaking followers of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the consciousness that had been cultivated was used, that they belonged to the Roman nation (Rum Millet), which was completely arbitrarily renamed Greek. They were the flock of the church, that is, the sheep who were convinced that they were sheep of the same breed (faith) as their own, and thus had to be included in their flock. This multinational flock was recognized as a religious nation by the Ottoman Empire (Rum Millet). The wicked rulers of the newly created Greek state renamed it the Greek nation. Greece, therefore, is a multinational state, more multinational than any other

state in the wider region. The Macedonians are one of the ethnic groups that was forcibly incorporated into this state. These shepherds (the despots etc.) do exactly the same as what natural shepherds do to their sheep. They herd them to protect them from wolves, with the aim of exploiting them themselves. For animals that offer them nothing, they feel no love and do not protect or care for them. With the clergy there is an essential difference. They exploit their flock, to live as parasites on it, without offering it anything. They offer it only hope for the other life, as the real, natural god relentlessly shows us that he does not take their supplications, prayers and rituals of all kinds into account in the slightest.

Clergy and oligarchy support each other because they are the same parasitic union that exploits people. Spiritual guardianship assists politics. They have shown how Christian and patriotic they are in the current great crisis that the Greek state is going through. They refused to accept cuts in their salaries and privileges, like all other citizens. Otherwise, they urge their followers, *"if they have two tunics, to give one to their fellow men."*

The Byzantine priesthood represents the absolute degeneration of Christianity. It exploits religion for purely economic and political reasons. So that it can seize and economically exploit its ignorant and God-fearing flock. That is why it collaborated closely with all the conquerors and supported them. It even supported the non-Christian Ottomans, because they maintained and increased its privileges. They kept a part of the tax paid by the slaves, while the monasteries and the metropolises had large areas of land (**endowments**), which were cultivated by the enslaved peasants for a fee that simply allowed them to survive. Thus, the priesthood and its entourage could live as privileged parasitic drones from the labor of others. This was also the reason why they condemned the Balkan enlighteners and the revolutionaries. This was the reason why they shamelessly undermined, by collaborating with the Turkish occupiers, the liberation struggle of the Macedonians. This is the reason why they supported and continue to support the racist policy of the Greek regime. This is the reason why they undermine the struggle of modern Macedonians for

redress of the injustices against them and respect for their fundamental human rights. They are the most shameless and insidious racists. Having professionally practiced the art of hypocrisy and having developed rhetorical skills, they unleash mud, lies, filth and slander from the cesspool of their filthy souls against the Macedonian fighters. The arch-slanderer racist **Anthimos** has gone so far as to threaten us with a raid by thugs if we dare to set up a radio station broadcasting in Macedonian. This wretched Peloponnesian is fighting the local Macedonian language and the script of the Thessalonians Cyril and Methodius. He even appears modest. He proclaims that "*We do not claim anything else... let the others not claim it either!!!*". It's good that they have enough, of what they've grabbed.

It is the inalienable right of everyone to have whatever religious beliefs they want. However, no one has the right to impose them on others and, above all, has absolutely no right to use them for livelihood or political purposes.

The need to support the artificial ideology of Hellenism led to the creation of all kinds of propaganda mechanisms. Education, administration, church, mass media, publishing houses, etc. rallied around the construction of the history of the newly created nation. Its territory was transformed into a brainwashing ghetto. From the **Ottomans** they learned the technique of creating **Janissaries**. The Ottomans only put a small number of Christian children in special schools where they turned them into Janissaries. The Greek regime made the entire educational and religious system an immense **school for creating Janissaries**. Thus we see populations denying their real origin and adopting a fabricated origin. Thus we have reached the ridiculous phenomenon of Hellenized Albanians (Arvanites), Macedonians, Vlachs, Thracians, etc. turning against their fellow citizens who did not join this vast janissary factory and madhouse, and against their native languages.

From the historical sources used, mythology and selected parts of ancient historical writings were mainly used. Those parts that do not speak about the real origin of the ancient peoples, especially the Greeks, nor about

the real causes of the concentration of wealth that created powerful and impressive civilizations were selectively compiled.

Popular wisdom says that, "half the truth is equal to a lie". A very typical example is the use of the information that says *"the Macedonian kings participated in the Olympic games and it is known that only Greeks participated in them"*. This is a truth, but it is half. The other half, which is not presented, says something else. **Herodotus** (E' 22) states in this regard, *"Those who are descended from Perdiccas are not Greeks, as they say and as I happen to know and with the following reasons I will prove that they are Greeks, and moreover the directors of the Greek games at Olympia also decided that they are. Because Alexander wanted to compete and came down for this reason, those of the Greeks that opposed him by making an objection, claimed that barbarians are not allowed to participate in the race, but only Greeks. Alexander, however, because he proved that he was an Argive, was judged to be a Greek and competing in the stadium he finished together with the first"*.

This is another of the ancient sources that testifies that the Greeks called the Macedonians barbarians, that is, foreign-speaking and foreign-national.

In this passage, Herodotus presents, on the one hand, historical events that took place a few decades earlier, and on the other hand some views that he bases on mythological traditions. He cites the fact that **Alexander I** wanted to take part in the Olympic games, but an objection was made against him, because the Greeks considered him a barbarian, that is, a foreigner. The committee of the games accepted his arguments because they were convinced that his origin was from Argos. Herodotus himself also presents the myth of the origin of the royal family of the Temenids from Argos: *"The seventh ancestor of this Alexander was Perdiccas, who founded the Macedonian dynasty in this way. From Argos three young men fled, from the descendants of Temenus, Gavanos, Aeropos and Perdiccas. From the Illyrians they passed through the mountains to Macedonia. There they entered the king's service with a salary, one shepherd with horses, the other with oxen and the*

youngest, Perdiccas with small sheep...". That is, he states that the founders of the Macedonian power were political refugees or economic immigrants from Argos and absolutely nowhere is the origin or any connection of the Macedonians with Argos mentioned. This probably also indicates some historical reality. The arrival of the three brothers (Temenids) in Macedonia coincides in time with the great invasion of new settlers from the Middle East, which also caused the Second Greek Colonization of the 8th and 7th BC centuries. It was a natural consequence that other autochthonous people from the Peloponnese were displaced and migrated to Macedonia and elsewhere. It is very likely that these immigrants used the widely spread myth of Hercules, originating from Argos, to show that they have royal descent, in order to be able to impose themselves more easily on the indigenous people of Macedonia, with whom they also had a racial relationship. It is also very likely that they had no connection with Argos, but created the myth of descent from Hercules, who originated from Argos, in order to show that they have divine origin so that others would accept them as kings.

As Herodotus informs us, similar arguments were used by the **Persians** to secure the alliance of the **Argives** during their campaign in Greece. The Persian delegation said to the Argives: *"Men of Argos, King Xerxes sends you a message: We Persians believe that we are descended from Persis, whose father was the son of Danae [and Zeus], Perseus, and his mother was Andromeda, daughter of Cepheus. Therefore, we have the same blood as you and it would not be right to fight against the people from whom we are descended, just as it would be wrong for you to help others to resist us. It would be better for you to remain uninvolved in the coming conflict..."* And indeed the Argives remained uninvolved. This mythological argument, however, cannot be used as proof of descent. This mythology, in fact, says that the Persians had the same origin as the Argives, while for the royal family of Macedonia it simply says that it comes from Argos and not from the Macedonians. According to this logic, the Persians were more closely related to the Argives than the Macedonians.

Why the Olympic Games committee accepted Alexander's mythological arguments is easy to see from the analysis of the political situation of that period. Alexander (498-454 BC) during the Persian invasion (480 BC) showed a philhellene stance, informing the Greeks about the movements and intentions of the Persians. Moreover, for this reason he received the nickname "**Alexander the Philhellene**", which also shows that he was not Greek. After the Persian invasion, the Greeks realized that they needed the alliance of the Macedonians and changed their geostrategic doctrine. They opened up to the indigenous peoples and especially to the Macedonians. They adopted the view that "*Greeks are the participants in Greek education*" and it is not a matter of origin. Thus, since the ruling class of Macedonia indeed "*participated in Greek education*", as in addition to Macedonian they also knew the international Greek language, they could be characterized as Greek. It is obvious, therefore, that the acceptance of the request for Alexander I's participation in the Olympic Games was a purely political expediency. From that time on, those who spoke or wrote in the Greek language were characterized as Greek. We have the example of the historian **Thucydides** who was a descendant of the king of **Thrace**, Olorus, who, although of Thracian origin, is characterized as Greek. **Herodotus'** father was **of Carian** origin, but he wrote in Greek and is characterized as Greek. The **Jewish** historian **Josephus** wrote in Greek, as did the **Syrian Lucian**. The Jewish Evangelists and Apostles wrote the Christian books in Greek without being Greek. With such practices of "half-truths that are equivalent to lies", Greek counterfeiters systematically deceive their ignorant citizens.

Another testimony that the Greeks called the Macedonians barbarians, that is, foreign-speaking and foreign-nationals, are the writings of the great Athenian orator **Demosthenes**, who explicitly characterizes the king of Macedonia Philip as a barbarian. In his Third Oration Against Philip (parg. 30-31) he explicitly says that he is not a Greek. In order to question Philip's right to interfere in the internal affairs of Greek cities, while the Athenians and Lacedaemonians as Greeks had this right, he says:

*"You also know well that whatever the Greeks suffered from the Lacedaemonians or from us [the Athenians], they at least suffered from genuine children of Greece. ... But for **Philip** and for what he is doing now they do not react in the same way, although not only **is he not a Greek**, not only does he have **no connection with the Greeks**, but he is not even a **barbarian** from a place from which it is honorable to say that he comes, but a wretch from **Macedonia**, from where not even a slave of excellence could have been bought before".*



The thief and liar shouts, to frighten the householder

The subjects of the Greek regime, either out of necessity to be on good terms with the authorities or out of ignorance, accepted those pleasant lies and gradually adopted the view of descent from the ancient Greeks. They learned that, wherever the ancient Greeks had settled or the Greek language had prevailed, they were rightfully theirs and had to be integrated into the "national core". The other peoples appeared as foreigners who had settled in Greek lands and consequently had to be expelled or subjugated. Thus were created populations fanatical and doped with the aggressive nationalism that

we see before us today. In the eyes of these deceived and doped subjects, all the indigenous Balkan peoples disappeared. The Thracian peoples, who according to Herodotus were the most populous nation after the Indians, theoretically disappeared and were renamed S(c)lavs, Vlachs or Bulgarians, while those who were linguistically Hellenized were renamed Romans, initially, and then Greeks.

The indigenous peoples who fought to regain their freedom and free themselves from the slavery of the Roman conquerors are presented as foreigners. All the **Thracian-speaking** peoples who rebelled are also characterized as **Bulgarians**, as this is helped by the fact that the Bulgarians were indeed foreigners in the region, as were the Romans (Romii), and that the Bulgarians adopted the language of the Thracian slaves of the region. The kingdom of **Samuel** (976 – 1018), which was created in the territories of the ancient Macedonian alliance (**Macedonia, Thessaly, Epirus, Illyria, Thrace, Serbia**) and was the result of the revolutionary activity of the indigenous peoples against the Roman occupation, is characterized as Bulgarian. It is known, of course, that Samuel's deputy leader was the **Vlach Nikulitza**, who, in fact, after Samuel's death (1014) took over the leadership of the rebels and continued the struggle until 1018, when he was defeated by the Armenian-born Emperor Basil II in the Skopje region. The kingdom founded by the same populations under the leadership of the **Vlach** dynasty of **Asan** in 1185 is also presented as Bulgarian.

The reason they easily attached the designation "Bulgar" to all these peoples, although it is known that the Bulgarians were a minority even in present-day northern Bulgaria, is because it is customary for all subjects of a state to be called by the name of the rulers. For example, all the allies of **Alexander the Great** during his campaign in Asia are referred to as Macedonians (**Thracians, Illyrians, Thessalians** , etc.). In addition, the language they adopted after their assimilation by the indigenous Thracians was deliberately called "Bulgarian" by the Byzantines, to make it appear foreign. As part of the same misleading policy, they called the Macedonians "Bulgarians"- including

the Vlachs- of the **Ilinden** era who were fighting for a free Macedonia that would belong to the Macedonians. The composition of the rebels was the same as that of the kingdom of **Samuel** (976-1018), the same as that of the kingdom of the Vlachs **of Asan** (1186-1398), the same as that of the kingdom of the Serbs of **Stefan Dusan**. **The Thessalians, Macedonians, Epirotes and Thracians** were subjects of that Kingdom. Moreover, these peoples under the leadership of Serbian rulers resisted the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans and were defeated in the battle of **Maritsa** (1371), today's **Evros**, which also constitutes the demarcation line of the modern Greek state with Turkey. During that conflict, the **Byzantine** emperors, that is, **Hellenism**, had concluded a hundred-year peace treaty with the **Ottomans**. The Ottomans were brought to the Balkans by Emperor **John VI Kantakouzenos** to use them as allies against the usurper of the Byzantine throne, John V Palaiologos. These scoundrels who cared only about power were modeled after the Romans, and especially the Despotates, because they granted them privileges and shared power with them.

The same was the composition of the population that made the 1822 revolution in Macedonia, which ended in the destruction of **Naoussa** and dozens of Macedonian villages. Moreover, the leaders of that revolution were Macedonians, "*bilingual – Slavic-speaking*", Tasso **Karatasso** from **Dobra Bogroditsa** (Kali Panagia) in Imathia and **Angelis Gatsos** (Gele Gatsov) from **Sarakinovo** in Pella. These were also the leaders of the Macedonians who, after the suppression of their revolution, went to Greece and helped in its liberation. The Greeks, instead of returning that help to the descendants of those Macedonians, sent to the rebellious Macedonia the fascist beasts who murdered, raped, burned, blackmailed, and terrorized the non-Greek-speaking indigenous Macedonians (Macedonian-Vlach-speaking), who now call them Bulgarians. Today, many Macedonians, whether deceived or forced, honor those criminals as liberators. And they are obliged to call this extreme humiliation freedom. Those, therefore, who belong to the Greek nation, belong to this dishonorable nation which repaid the help of the Macedonians for its liberation by undermining their own liberation struggle, with crimes.

The real history of the Macedonians and the ancient Greeks is well known only by those who have read all the ancient historical writings. The truth is well known to all state-run historians, but they do not tell it. They tell the history for which they are paid to tell. Unfortunately, any citizen of this state who wants to know the truth must not only read, but also study the ancient historians. Of course, few do this. However, everyone often hears that since the time of Philip and Alexander "**Greeks are the participants in Greek education**" and it is not a matter of origin. They also know that since the advent of Christianity, Greeks were called those who spoke international, **Common Greek** or those who were followers of the ancient religions. Nevertheless, they accept the pleasant and convenient lie of the origin of modern Greek-speakers and followers of the Roman Orthodox Patriarchates from the ancient Greeks.

The truth is that the modern Greek nation is purely an **artificial construct** of the dregs of the **Byzantine ruling class**, which became the ruling class in the kingdom of Greece, but also of its Western colonial protectors. Its creation was based on lies, fraud, violence, the falsification of history, hypocrisy, Byzantine obscurantism, the abuse of religion and history as a political tool. It is an artificial creation of a syndicate of cunning exploiters. Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, parts of which were conquered by the kingdom of Greece, are ancient countries and their names existed even before the ancient Phoenician-Egyptians settled in the region, who after the 7th century BC were renamed Greeks. Those, therefore, who say they are Greeks, are the Romans, that is, the descendants or followers of the Roman conquerors. Many of them were brought to the region by the Romans or the Greek conquerors to alter the composition of the population to the detriment of the locals. Many of them constitute the modern phenomenon of **Janissaryism**. This syndicate of systematic fraudsters has included them since they were babies and, with the brainwashing to which it has subjected them, has made them its instruments and systematically turns them against their compatriots and against their ancient mother tongues.

The indigenous **Thracian-Illyrian** peoples of antiquity, including the Macedonians, did not disappear. They were erased from the minds of their subjects by the Roman conquerors and mainly by their Byzantine Orientalist successors, whose ideological and political remnants govern us and afflict us today. The same applies to their languages. Of course, they are not the same as the ancient ones, but an evolution of them. Just as Modern Greek is an evolution of Ancient Greek. Today's Greek speakers understand Ancient Greek texts only through translation. The ancient Thracian peoples, including the Macedonians, exist and are distinguishable for those who want to see them. They are the indigenous peoples of Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, Serbia for the southern Balkans. And they do not need to be studied by anthropologists and all kinds of scientists to establish the kinship that exists between them in profile, psychosynthesis, mild character, customs. It is obvious that the Macedonian-speaking and the Greek-speaking or Thracian-Latin-speaking indigenous peoples belong to the same group of peoples. The latter simply adopted the international Greek or Thracian-Latin (Vlach) language for some reasons.

The difference with the more aggressive, demanding and authoritarian populations that we brought from the Caucasus and other regions of the East is clear. It is no coincidence that the Greek regime has settled the new settlers, the Russopontians, as well as the old ones in Macedonia and Thrace in recent decades and granted them privileges to remain here permanently. It has once again implemented the tactic of the Roman and Ottoman conquerors to settle foreign populations in areas where there were solid indigenous populations. It is also no coincidence that from these aggressive and authoritarian Orientals (Pontians, Lazians, Turkish speakers) the well-known groups of the **Tagmatasfalites**, the **PAOtzides**, etc. were created during the German occupation, who terrorized and murdered Macedonians. These populations also make up the core of modern neo-Nazis in Macedonia. With the authoritarianism, demandingness and mutual support that characterizes them, they have managed to become a state within a state. They forced the state to recognize the *“genocide or ethnic cleansing of the Pontians or Asia Minor*

Hellenism” and they shout en masse against anyone who questions it. At the same time, these same people keep silent or support the **ethnic cleansing and genocide against the Macedonians**. The Macedonians and the other Balkan people suffered no less than the Pontians and the rest of “Asia Minor Hellenism” suffered from the Ottomans and then from the Greeks. The cities and villages that were bombed and destroyed by the Greek army and abandoned by those Macedonians who managed to save themselves during the Balkan Wars, were occupied by them and do not allow the repatriation of the real owners to their homes. **Kukous** (Kilkis) is a monument to the genocide and ethnic cleansing against the Macedonians by the Greek regime. It was the first city and region where the barbarian Greeks implemented genocide and ethnic cleansing against the natives. Pontians, Lazians and Turkish speakers, etc. settled on the properties of those Macedonians and thus became instruments of the Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing of the Macedonians. At the same time, they audaciously demand that we recognize their genocide by the Ottomans. They attack en masse any Macedonian who dares to denounce the criminal policy of the Greek state against the Macedonians. They even go so far as to outrageously demand that we discuss with them our right to be called **Macedonians** and to call our language **Macedonian**. None of the conquerors who passed through Macedonia dared to ask for this. The Ottomans clearly respected the national identity of their subjects more.

Now that Greece has become bound by international human rights conventions that guarantee the individual and collective freedoms of the indigenous people, these same populations have created parastatal groups that have authoritarily declared themselves guardians of the local Macedonian culture. They have become carriers of black propaganda against it. As soon as some Macedonian cultural associations decided to organize themselves into a federation, these **cultural cadres and PAOtzides** have created a parastatal federation and are seeking to become guardians of Macedonian culture. It is their right to create **Pan-Pontian** and **Pan-Asian federations** and whatever else they want, but they have absolutely no right to interfere in the issues of

local Macedonian culture, whose only authentic exponents are the Macedonian clubs and all Macedonians.

Only Macedonians, including Greek-speaking and Vlach-speaking peoples of Macedonia, have the right to participate in the **Pan-Macedonian Unions**. Greek-speaking Thracians could also participate, as they have common roots, a common homeland and a common historical course with the Macedonians and since the time of Philip and Alexander they were citizens of the same state and mixed with the Macedonians.

This authoritarianism and disrespect for the locals constitute a very poor condition for harmonious coexistence. Disrespect for the place and the people who host them does not honor them at all and shows barbarity and ingratitude. Macedonians are not obliged to tolerate this disrespect, ingratitude and authoritarianism indefinitely, nor are they obliged to accept and tolerate their tutelage. Of course, it is anything but honorable for a portion of Macedonians to recognize in these brazen Orientals the role of the gendarme of the locals and to make declarations of servitude to them. Besides, it is known that most of them are hypocrites.

These settlers must not forget that the administration, the estates, the sources of wealth, the public positions, etc. in a **truly free Macedonia**, would rightfully belong to the natives of Macedonia, including those who were forcibly uprooted from their homes by the racist regime of Athens. The settlers are entitled to these estates, the public positions, etc., as much as thieves and receivers of stolen goods are entitled to stolen goods. Greece appropriated them in the same way and with the same law with which the Roman and Ottoman conquerors had appropriated them. If they were even elementary democrats or Christians, they should have respected the rights of the natives and supported their struggle for the redress of great injustices and the respect for their rights. Our constant appeals for support in our just struggle have met with absolutely no response. They were cold spectators of the barbarity and racist and predatory behavior of the state of Athens, while many of them were

and continue to be accomplices. It is obvious that any other similar appeal is in vain.

Kindness and tolerance towards barbarians proved to be naivety and self-deception. Macedonian self-respect proved to be weakness. We warned them repeatedly that it was a cruel insult to us to call our ancestors who made the **Ilinden** revolution "Bulgarians" and our language Bulgarian. We informed them that the Bulgarians were still a minority in today's northern Bulgaria and that their language was lost, as they adopted the language of the locals. We informed them that at the time of Ilinden, the followers of the Patriarchate were called Greeks and the followers of the Exarchate were called Bulgarians and that it was not a matter of origin. Nevertheless, they continued to use documents from that time to present us as Bulgarians by origin and our language as Bulgarian. They also know very well that Macedonians do not use and do not accept the term "**Slavs**". Nevertheless, they continued to use it with the obvious intention of belittling us.

Those who continue this tactic now give the Macedonians the right to call them "Turkish-seed" or "Grekylous". It is known that even their "brothers" the Grekoi called them "Turkish-seed", "Aoutides", etc., when they settled in Greece and they were told to leave. Many of them were expelled to settle in Macedonia and play an inhumane anti-Macedonian role. Moreover, most of the Oriental settlers who settled in Macedonia spoke **Turkish**, while the rest spoke international Greek. But their music, dances and songs are also Turkic in name and essence (**Amanedika, Tsiftetelia, Rebetika** , etc.). Let them ask themselves why the Macedonians and the other indigenous peoples, during the five centuries of Turkish occupation, did not adopt elements of this culture and those who adopted them are coming now to impose these on them. Quite simply, many of them are also Turkic populations who were Christianized. If they are descendants of the ancient Greeks, there is irrefutable evidence that Greek colonies in the Black Sea were founded only by the **Athenians, the Spartans, the Corinthians, the Thebans, the Chalcidians**. Let them claim, therefore, their right to return to their ancient homelands and in this just

request of theirs, they will have the undivided support of the Macedonians. Those who consider as **their benefactor El. Venizelos**, let them go to his homeland **Crete** and do to the Cretans what they do to Macedonia. If they feel like genuine descendants of the ancient Greeks, let them seek their roots in the Middle East and northeastern Africa.

Unfortunately, civilized ways are for civilized people and in this particular case they did not yield anything. Unfortunately, their attitude so far creates a very bad precedent, which does not help peaceful coexistence. This is also bad for the settlers themselves, because history teaches that **"time has its turns"**, and it is not at all certain that they will always be in a position of power against the locals, as they are today. Let the Greek state stop reinforcing the audacity and disrespect of these racists and let them gather together, because sooner or later, the accumulated anger of the Macedonians will be expressed in acts of taking the law into one's hand.

Macedonians, a natural nation of the Enlightenment

The Macedonians had no objection to organizing all the Balkan peoples politically in one state, as imagined and planned by the Enlightenment thinkers of the 18th century. As planned by the most important of them, the Vlach-speaking Thessalian, **Rigas Velestinlis**. The creation of a multinational state that would include all the peoples, from present-day Romania to Crete, with the name Greece or Thrace and the official language **Common Greek**, but also the free cultivation of all other languages. In the constitution he prepared he said: *"The Greek democracy is one, with all that includes in its bosom various tribes and religions.... The Greek people, that is, the inhabitants of the kingdom, without exception of religion and language,..."*. The constitution, like all its proclamations, spoke of equality and solidarity of all peoples regardless of gender, language and religion. Rigas also published **a map of ancient Greece**. It included the Peloponnese, Central Greece (Roumel), the islands of the southern Aegean and the coast of Asia Minor. None of the Enlightenment

and revolutionaries recognized the right of that Greece to become the ruler of other peoples and countries.

Rigas' teacher is considered to be the scholar and Enlightener **Josephus Moisiodacus**. His homeland is mentioned as **Cernavoda** in southeastern Romania (Cernavoda is mentioned by Rigas) and means black water (Mavroneri). Josephus' place of origin and the fact that he signs as **Moisiodacus**, which is a composite of two ancient Thracian peoples (**Moises-Dacians**) and not with the foreign names **Bulgaro-Romanian or Romios**, shows that he was aware of his ancient Thracian origin. Both, however, wrote and taught in international Greek, as did all the educated persons of all the Balkan people. This is exploited by professional swindlers to present them as of Greek origin, so that their subjects do not understand the true nature of their struggle and their origin. Moreover, Rigas' origin is from a non-Greek village, the "**Slavic**" **Velestino**. For many decades, swindlers called him "**Feraios**", because near his birthplace there was an ancient Greek colony named Ferai. It is also no coincidence that Rigas had **Alexander the Great** as his model, whose image he printed and distributed, and not some Byzantine Emperor. He was the symbol of the resistance of the indigenous people of the Balkans against the colonialists and conquerors. Today, in the context of counterfeiting, Greek swindlers use it. Alexander the Great was the most hated figure for the Greeks, because he was the one who put an end to their colonialism in the region. He can be considered the gravedigger of the Greeks. The Greek-captives know this well and that is why they did not have a single statue of him in modern Greece. As for the Pontians, let them not be ashamed of their real history and honor the glorious kings of Pontus, the **Mithridates**, who were rivals of the Macedonians and the last of them, the sixth, Eupator, had come to Macedonia as a conqueror in 88 BC. Because the Mithridates were Hellenists and adopted the Greek language, Pontic has many Greek elements.

In reality, the privileged class of enslaved Greeks persecuted all the ideologists of the Enlightenment who were struggling to rouse the Balkan peoples. The Roman Orthodox clergy excommunicated them and condemned

their teachings. It is no coincidence, too, that Rigas was betrayed by the great merchant "Greek" from Kozan, Demetrios Economou, and was killed by the Ottoman conquerors. The great merchants were the privileged class during the Turkish rule and did not want its dissolution, because this was how their commercial interests were best served. In other words, they did, once again, what their ancient Greek colleagues did, who collaborated with the Persians and the Roman conquerors, because at that time this was how their interests were served.

It is no coincidence that Moisiidakas and Rigas engaged in and wrote works on Physics. They did so to explain natural phenomena in a scientific way, with the aim of freeing people from the prejudices and superstitions that made them vulnerable to the views of the obscurantist priesthood. The priesthood, by attributing natural phenomena to metaphysical forces, such as evil spirits, demons, vampires, the wrath of God, sins, etc., created a dependence on the ignorant people from the church that exploited to manipulate and exploit the masses economically and politically.

For a similar reason, the Christian priesthood persecuted **Greek philosophy**. Ionian philosophy, which was generalized into Greek as early as the 6th century BC, shared the belief in the unity and self-reliance of nature, as a living organism, without intervention by extra-physical forces. For this reason, they were also called "**physicians**". The Byzantine priesthood persecuted Greek philosophy and ancient Greek culture in general, and exploited its prestige and especially its language as a cultural fold to increase or retain its followers. Thus, today's "Hellenism" ended up being Byzantine obscurantism, the so-called "Romanism", with an ancient Greek guise. Moisiidakas aptly characterizes the Romans as a "**private people**". It is the people who created the parasitic and obscurantist syndicate, which for centuries oppressed the peoples who were enslaved by the Romans and the Ottomans (**Rum Milliyet**). By transforming education, administration, church and army into brainwashing mechanisms, it created a circle of blind followers whom it uses as a mob, as blind mouthpieces, as settlers, as instruments of

policing the local peoples, as informers, as swindlers, as thugs, as slanderers, as paid assassins.

It is no coincidence that the core of the modern neo-Nazi movement in Greece is made up of retired military personnel. They are the products of the chauvinistic education of military schools and church indoctrination. In the behavior of today's neo-Nazis, one can see the type of Greek officers and non-commissioned officers who murdered, burned, destroyed, raped, and terrorized Macedonians in the period 1904-1908. They undermined the Macedonian struggle for a truly free Macedonia that would belong to the Macedonians with fascist methods. They played the game of their creators, so that they could take the place of the Ottoman conquerors in a role worse than theirs. In one century, they committed more crimes than the Ottomans did in five centuries of occupation. The Macedonians who were exterminated or expelled from their ancient homeland, the injustices, persecutions and oppression suffered by those who remained, are by far greater and worse than those suffered by the Ottoman conquerors. The local Macedonian culture and especially the language withstood twenty centuries of Roman and Ottoman occupation and within a century of Greek occupation they are in danger of extinction. And these Vandals, who surpassed any previous tyrant in barbarity, speak of freedom, democracy and social justice. Graecylism, with the ancient Greek name for Hellenism, passed through Macedonia as obscurantism and fascism.

The **Macedonians** are the **indigenous people** of this place called Macedonia and they owe this to absolutely no one. When the Balkan peoples threw off the Ottoman yoke, the Macedonians sought the same, relying on the principles of the Enlightenment. They fought for a free and democratic Macedonia, with social justice, with freedom and equality for all ethnicities, languages and religions that existed in it. It is the natural nation according to the principles and values of the Enlightenment. On the contrary, the "Greek" nation is an artificial creation of Byzantine obscurantism, feudalism and authoritarianism with the assistance of its Western colonial patrons. It is a product of

teratogenesis. All neighboring peoples are hostile towards it because it has committed great crimes against them. If peaceful ways are not found to transform it into a democratic multinational federation, according to the principles of the **Balkan Enlighteners**, the leader of whom was **Rigas Velestinlis**, it will sooner or later collapse, as the conditions that made it great gradually disappear, with painful consequences for the peoples who are its organs or its vassals. The Macedonians were and will continue to be pioneers in this struggle.

August 2015
Trajanos Pasois

REPUBLISHPMENT IS PERMITTED

ISBN 978-960-93-7678-5

Traianos Pasois is a native Macedonian of Pella. He has a 6th grade high school education. He became an amateur historical researcher for the needs of the struggle for the rights and dignity of the Macedonians of Greek territory and the restoration of the truth about the Macedonian Question.