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The very act of the foundation of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), together with all its subsequent actions as a political entity from 1944 to the present day, show that 'Macedonianism' is the basic totalitarian ideological tenet of that state. With this tenet the state and the Slavic component in a population of several different ethnic groups have constructed their existence as a nation and their 'historical' mission. Right at the very start, 'Macedonianism' was proclaimed as a sacred dogma, allowing of no discussion, let alone questioning. It has been practised with all the means available to a State that, up to 1991, had been forced to operate under a totalitarian Communist regime where there 'was but one' Truth and where the question that bulked above all others was 'the security of the State'. Anyone dissenting did so with the foreknowledge that he or she would be 'eliminated'.

When this totalitarian regime collapsed, as it was bound to do, from external causes, nothing changed. There has been no relaxation in the human geography of power at FYROM, not even in the sacred dogma and the State's duty to safeguard it. The question is one about which a society trained for generations at the hard camp of Macedonianism remains tight-lipped, phobia-prone, and trigger-happy. An alternative view of the matter has yet to establish itself, any dialogue being considered out of the question. Instead, every pronouncement to the international community by every Skopje government since 1991 has insisted that even the slightest modification to State 'Macedonianism' would be fatal to the very existence of the State and the people. And the outward and visible sign of this insistence is the claim to have a monopoly on the name 'Macedonia'.

These final apocalyptic assertions from Skopje have effectively been espoused by scores of other states, the USA being one example, precisely because they are well aware how ramshackle is the whole artificial but temporarily expedient structure. They are certainly not ignorant of history. But for the time being they play down what is a self-evident fact. Following the adoption of 'Macedonianism' as an ideology, FYROM has been trapped in a dead-end of its own making. Sooner or later it is bound not only to destabilize at large a region which is still in a state of flux, but also to place its own Balkan interests in jeopardy. Those powerful foreign interests that protect Skopje and make use of her may be counting on exploiting for themselves when the time comes. But the sad conclusion from major events on the international
stage – in Iraq, say, in Palestine, in the Islamic world, or in the global context of terrorism – is that in some at least of the places where decisions are taken politics is no longer the art of foresight and anticipation. For the Great Powers of today, it is no longer five minutes to midnight, but five minutes past.

What are the main claims of ‘Macedonianism’, the official totalitarian State ideology cultivated in Skopje?

1) It claims that Macedonia has long been a distinct political entity; and that during the two Balkan Wars (1912-1913) against the Ottoman Empire, master of the region from the 14th century onwards, the latter partitioned a ‘united’ (when was she ever thus?) Macedonia among ‘its conquerors’, namely Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia, with a small part of it later coming into the possession of Albania.

2) It claims that Serb Macedonia – what was known until 1941 as Vardarska Banovina – was liberated in 1944, to become from thence onward the metropolitan centre of the ‘splintered and still subservient Macedonian nation’. It is the ‘inalienable national rights’ of this nation which the now independent State of FYROM has been seeing to, in line with an express provision of its present constitution (a clause necessarily revoked in 1995).

3) It claims that Greek Macedonia is still ‘under foreign occupation’, viz by Greece, which is said to have ‘inflicted genocide on the Macedonian People’. (This region is therefore always referred to as ‘Aegean’ - never as ‘Greek’ - Macedonia by Skopje, which officially recognizes the Greek Civil War of 1944-1949 as ‘the Macedonian’ national liberation struggle to free Aegean Macedonia’ and to incorporate the latter in ‘the free motherland’, meaning FYROM). It makes similar claims, though these often fluctuate, against Bulgaria, and less loudly against Albania.

4) It claims that the ancient Macedonians – notable examples being Alexander the Great and his father Philip – ‘were not Greeks’. As ‘conquerors of Aegean Macedonia’ and ‘oppressors of our brothers the Aegean Macedonians’, from 1913 onwards, the Greeks have been ‘usurping’ the history, the civilization, and the name of the ancient Macedonians, ‘the forefathers’ of FYROM’s (Slav) Macedonian nation.

These four central tenets of ‘Macedonianism’, given in chronological sequence with the necessary background, are already enough to show that while feigning ‘legitimate irredentism’, Skopje is openly and unambiguously declaring her expansionist designs towards Greek Macedonia. The arguments themselves are full of holes, yet they have been swallowed, wittingly, by dozens of civilized states, the United States included. Why? Because they want to advance their own interests and promote hidden geopolitical agendas in the region. But this is a serious blunder, and it goes against their interests. And in politics a blunder (said Talleyrand) is worse than a crime. Small the FYROM may be, but in the hands of powerful third parties it could be lead to catastrophe.

It should lastly be pointed out that for the State and the Slavs of Skopje ‘Macedonianism’ has become an article of faith, a question of existence. This question needs fodder to survive, which means constructing an equally fictitious ‘enemy’: Greece. But at the same time this State and its Slavic population are well
aware, since they see it in their daily lives, of what Greece – ‘the enemy’ – can do for them. Better than any of Skopje’s other neighbours, with more resolve, effectiveness and credibility, Greece is assisting them with their economic development, their orientation towards Europe, the cohesion of their ethnically disparate society, and the existence and the security of their State. This she does better and more credibly than all the other Balkan countries put together; and all that she is after is peace in the region, productive cooperation, and a common sense of dignity. The pity of it is that the two positions are so far apart.

It is in the hope of contributing to the peace and prosperity of all the neighbouring nations that the Society for Macedonian Studies and its partner the Karipis Foundation for Macedonian and Thracian Studies have published the present volume. It is intended for common use, to encourage open dialogue. The publishers are the leading firm of EPHESUS Editions. My hope is that as a result of the incontestable evidence here brought forward, the decision-making bodies concerned, and citizens of any true democracy, will have second and perhaps wiser thoughts.

Nikolaos I. Mertzos
President
Society for Macedonian Studies
Thessaloniki, July 2007
The Society for Macedonian Studies and its Work

Those were troubled times that saw the conception, the birth, and the coming of age of the Society for Macedonian Studies. Greece and its people were sorely tried, in a country that was under enemy occupation, and was then torn asunder and stained with blood. Yet the Society maintained a high scholarly level of research throughout, high as the flag that floated over the threatened country. Leading academics from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki served it in those dark days, and made sure that it was well supplied with research students of quality. A host of important books and periodicals, fruit of the Society’s long years of research activity, still graces the shelves of libraries in Greece and abroad.

It was Greece’s achievement that, despite the deep wounds of ten years of war and civil strife, she was able to get back on her feet, as was the Society itself. Faced with the threat of her scheming neighbours, she built herself a protective wall of essential alliances to safeguard her independence, thus avoiding imminent loss of territory to the forces of totalitarian Communism. Today, as a member state of a United Europe, she enjoys many advantages: a strong and democratic political system, a tightly-knit fabric of nation and society, enviable prosperity, and a strong defence shield that guarantees the safety of the Greek frontier.

Not that there has been any lack of plots of foreign origin, targeted on Greece’s independence and security, and in particular on Macedonia. These plots are by and large disguised, with the indirect but all too obvious aim of destabilizing the whole region. The issue is a political one, and as such, responsibility for it rests on the Greek state and government. The Society for Macedonian Studies does however have its own duty here, which is to undertake a scholarly analysis of this political issue as the country’s leading academic specialist on Macedonia.

My colleagues at the University of Thessaloniki and I have come forward solely with the aim of giving the Society for Macedonian Studies our academic support. I have chosen to offer my services without any other reward than the knowledge that my name stands side by side with those of the notable scholars who have been of service to the Society in the past, or are still so in the present.

Right from the start my goal has been to make a contribution to updating our Society’s scholarly discourse and output. I have therefore asked my distinguished colleagues on the Board for their permission to be responsible for running the section of the Foundation responsible for research work. I am honoured that the Board’s chair and other members have entrusted me with this responsibility. I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to them.

The first fruits of these efforts to produce research work geared to the needs of the time is a ‘Research Project on FYROM Irredentism’. Projects of related interest will follow at regular intervals. The Society’s research, and the organizing of a special Research Centre to go with it, are an integral part of modernizing its function as a respected and important Greek scientific institution.

John Koliopoulos

Professor of Modern History, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
On 2 August 1944, to mark the 41st anniversary of the Ilinden Uprising, the Anti-Fascist Council of Makedonija [AFCM] met at the Monastery of Prohor Pchinski, near Kumanovo. It was this Meeting that paved the way for the founding of the People's Republic of Makedonija and the Republic's inclusion in the Jugoslav Federation. The Meeting acknowledged the right of the 'Macedonian People' to self-determination, and declared the anniversary of the Ilinden Uprising a national festival. From that day to this, the PRM, or SRM [Socialist Republic of Makedonija], as it was renamed a few years later, or FYROM as it became at the start of the 1990s after the break-up of Jugoslavia as a unit, has faithfully stuck to certain ideological principles, most of which have had to do with Greece.

The present work proposes to highlight FYROM's irredentist policy towards Greece from 1944 to the present, a policy that is in flagrant breach of the Interim Agreement signed by the two parties in 1995 expressly calling on them to put an end to any mutual expressions of irredentism. There is one basic premise that has been consistently ignored both by the international community in general and by most of the interested parties. What FYROM mainly relies on, not just for its prolongation or its development, but for its very existence, is its irredentist ambitions at Greece's expense. Should these ambitions collapse, FYROM would be hard pressed to even survive. We shall examine the issues involved under three main headings, which put in a nutshell our neighbouring country's political and ideological principles over the years:

1) Renaming Greek Macedonia 'Aegean Macedonia', and representing it as an irredenta, as an integral part of FYROM.
2) Claiming the existence of an oppressed 'Macedonian minority' within Greece.
3) Appropriating emblems and symbols, and the Greek cultural legacy in general (with Ancient Macedonia as the focal point).

The Society of Macedonian Studies has set up a research project, under the supervision of Professor John Koliopoulos, who teaches history at the

1. Iakovos D. Michailidis is Assistant Professor of Modern and Contemporary History in the History & Archaeology Department of the Philosophy Faculty of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
2. AFCM was the political wing of the Communist armed resistance movement active in Jugoslav Makedonija during the German-Bulgarian Occupation.
3. [Irredentism (the correct form): a collective policy of seeking, by word or action, to achieve that one's country of origin shall have restored to it territory which it has meantime lost to a neighbouring country. An individual pursuing this policy is an irredentist. The lost territory itself is termed irredenta, 'unredeemed'. The origin of this series of terms was in Italy during the late 1870s, when it was hoped to annex to the new Italian state territories that had formerly been Italian. Translator's Note].
University of Thessaloniki, in order to document these three lines of argument. A group of scholars, as Research Fellows of the Society, have studied a whole series of official documents of state, including parliamentary minutes, official speeches by government officials, and party political charters and manifestoes, school textbooks, writings by historians, and Internet sites, spanning from 1944 to the present day. Auxiliary unofficial documents used are those of non-governmental bodies and organizations (particularly of an irredentist kind), but only insofar as they relate to official state policy discourse. We have not for the time being concerned ourselves with independent action by private organizations: the project has confined itself to investigating how FYROM’s apparatus of state jumped on the irredentist bandwagon.

With regard to things as they stand today, careful scrutiny of the sources mentioned above is enough to show that although aggressive phrasing has been ironed out of FYROM’s Constitution, although the Sun of Vergina has been dropped from the official national flag, in consequence of the Interim Agreement, and although the phrasing used in the international forum is now studiously diplomatic, irredentist language is still widespread throughout the political fabric of the country. A contributory factor is the way young people are taught, particularly at primary and secondary school. No historian can hope to offer a solution, a ‘magic bullet’, that will deal with both sides’ problems; and in any case, even were there such a solution, it is beyond the ambit of the academic community. Political problems – such as the Athens-Skopje dispute – call for purely political solutions. All that need be said is that when details, data, and arguments from history are employed and frequently appealed to by all the parties involved, we, as specialists in this field, have an obligation to supply Greeks and the international community at large with the essential information that will (we hope) enable them to understand the individual parameters of a complex situation and aid the dialogue by putting forward their own productive views.

Irredentist ‘Aegean Macedonia’

This claim is a common one found in many of the sources. Impressively resistant to time, it is the most serious proposition in FYROM’s irredentist propaganda. Note that it could not have been put forward before 1940, since this use of the term ‘Macedonia’ had not yet been invented: the term in use, Vardarska Banovina [Vardar Province], denoted the South Serbian districts.

The first occurrence of the term is in the founding manifesto of AFCM (already cited). Here the unification of ‘Macedonia’, based on the right of self-determination, was a primary goal: ‘It is essential that we unite the whole Macedonian people of the three parts of Macedonia into one Macedonian state... Macedonians from Greek and Bulgarian Macedonia must follow the example of Macedonians in Yugoslav Macedonia’.
This goal was not just praiseworthy ambition on the part of the local leadership of the SRM [the Socialist Republic of Makedonija] it reflected, every so often, the party line of the Federal Jugoslav Government. In the period from immediately after the Allies' liberation of the Balkans from the Axis Powers in the last months of 1944 to the end of the Greek Civil War in 1949, there was a spate of official Jugoslav irredentist pronunciamenti against Greece. Significantly, only a month or two after the AFCM Manifesto, during the first session of AVNOJ [the Anti-Fascist Council for the Liberation of Jugoslavia] in Belgrade [9-12 November 1944], General Vukmanović, known as Tempo, representing PRM [the People's Republic of Makedonija], claimed that ‘Macedonians’ living in Greek and Bulgarian Macedonia were eagerly awaiting union with the mother republic. Timed to coincide with the session, a letter of protest (published in the newspaper Politika for 13 November) from ANVOJ’s Vice-President Dimitar Vlahov to the Greek Prime Minister accused Greece of ‘imperialist’ policy against her northern neighbour, and of oppression of the ‘Macedonian Anti-Fascists of Aegean Macedonia’.

The oneness of the ‘Macedonians’ was clearly marked on wall maps in various buildings in PRM; Thessaloniki appeared as the Macedonian

---

Macdonianism

Interviewed for the New York Times early in April 1945, Josip Broz Tito, president of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, said that though his country had no territorial claims on Greece, there was nothing to prevent the possible wish of Macdonians to unite. On 22 July 1945, Belgrade also sent a protest note to Athens, accusing Greece of the ‘persecution’ of ‘our Macdonian compatriots’ in ‘Aegean Macedonia’ by parasitastic groups and by state authorities as well. Belgrade called for these people to be granted human rights and for unimpeded return of the refugees to their homes. On 11 October 1945, in a speech at Skopje during celebrations of the fourth anniversary of the Yugoslav resistance against the Fascist Occupation, and in front of thousands of people including refugees from Greece, Tito himself said that Yugoslavia would never renounce ‘the right of the Macdonian people to unite’. There were (he said) ‘our brethren in Aegean Macedonia, to whose fate we are not indifferent. Our thoughts are with them, and we care about them’. He ended: ‘I promise you that all Macdonians will one day be united in their own community, Macedonia.’

But this was not to be the end of the Yugoslavian crescendo of protest against Greece. In a speech to the Constituent Assembly of Yugoslavia, on 26 January 1946, Bane Andrejev spent a good deal of time talking about Greek ‘terrorizing’ of Slav speakers within Greece, emphasizing that the latter should ‘go on with their fight for freedom’. At the same time, Andrejev insisted that for Greek and Bulgarian Macedonia to unite with PRM was no act of hegemony but the consummation of the Macdonian legitimate demand for union. Similar was the tenor of a speech by the veteran Communist activist Dimitar Vlahov, leader between the two World Wars of the United VMRO. He referred at great length to areas not yet incorporated into the Yugoslav Federation. He also had something to say about the situation in Greek Macedonia, where (according to him) there were 129 ‘terrorist groups’ working to annihilate Slav speakers. Vlahov ended by advocating the formation of a united Macedonia within the Federation.

---

7. DS Greece 1945-1949, 868.00/7-2445, Reel No. 3, Telegram from Kirk to the State Department, Cazerta, 24 July 1945, Call No. Emp. 3046. The contents of this Note were published in the Greek newspapers at the beginning of September; see Μακεδονία, 2 September 1945.
9. Halkias Archive, ‘Parts of Tito’s speech at Skopje on 11 October 1945’. See also Μακεδονία, 14 October 1945. See also Ελληνικόν Θάρρος, 25 November 1945, Ελληνικός Βορράς, 25 November 1945, with photo of the final paragraph of Tito’s speech. See also Α. Κηγού, Η συνωμοσία εναντίον της Μακεδονίας [The conspiracy against Macedonia 1940-1949] (Athens, 1950, in Greek), p. 143.
At the beginning of April 1946, Dimitar Vlahov made a speech at Monastir, present day Bitola, about ‘Aegean Macedonia’, expressing the longings of the ‘Macedonian’ people. His local audience was swelled by a thousand or so refugee Slavophones [speakers of any Slavonic language] from Greek Macedonia. The Parliamentary Vice-President called on them to continue devoting their labour to the work of renewing and rebuilding Jugoslavia.

On 26 April 1946, Col. Pečo Trajkov, Skopje’s army commander, gave an interview to a Toronto newspaper in which he said that PRM had indeed been incorporated into the Jugoslav Federation, but that this was not the end of the matter. Goče Delčev’s slogans of ‘a complete and united republic’ still rang in their ears (he said); and this would be achieved by uniting ‘Pirin Macedonia’ and ‘Aegean Macedonia’ (regarded by Trajkov as ‘occupied territory’) with PRM itself.

On 2 July 1946 the Congress of the ‘Union of Macedonian Women’ was held in Skopje. Ourania Perovski, as representative of refugee women from Greece, made a reference to the peoples of ‘Aegean Macedonia’ who (she said) still languished under ‘monarchist-fascist terrorism’. The celebrations of Ilinden began on this very same day in Skopje, as did the 1st Congress of the Macedonian Popular Front. Among the VIPs taking part were Lazar Količevski, the President of the People’s Republic of Makedonija; M. Nesković, the President of the Republic of Serbia; and the Federal Minister of Justice, Frane Frol. There were also delegations from Pirin Macedonia, headed by the Bulgarian parliamentary deputy Hristo Stoichev; and delegates from Greek Macedonia and from Trieste. In the city’s Stadium, named for Tito, was a banner with the words ‘We have never denied the Macedonian People’s right to unite. We will not deny our principles because of personal sympathies’, then, quoting Tito’s speech of 11 October the previous year, ‘We have brethren in Aegean Macedonia, to whose fate we are not indifferent. Our thoughts are with them, and we care about them’. This was the cue for fiery oratory in favour of the union of the ‘Macedonian People’. The key speech was Frol’s. To the plaudits of the assembled crowd, he gave his pledge that Jugoslavia would strive to this end. PRM’s president, Količevski, invoked the example of the unification of Italy in the 19th century. He referred to the People’s Republic of Makedonija as ‘our own Piedmont, for the liberation and union of all Macedonia’. He expressed his belief that the struggle for ‘Aegean Macedonia’ would wipe out the ‘monarchist-fascist’ [Greek] regime and would give the people back their freedom. Similar in tone was

13. IAYE 1946, File 67/2, Dalietos’ telegram in code to Greek Foreign Ministry, Belgrade, 16 April 1946, Call No. 296.
15. Halkias Archive.
16. IAYE 1946, File 67/2, Dalietos’ report to Greek Foreign Ministry, Belgrade, 2 July 1946, Call No. 1206.
17. PRO/FO 371/58615, Clutton to Bevin, Belgrade, 22 August 1946, Call No. 310.
Vlahov’s speech. He underlined the need for unremitting struggle so that the other two parts of Macedonia, the Greek and the Bulgarian, be joined to PRM. As representative of the refugees from Greek Macedonia, Mihail Keramičiev spoke of his fellow-combatants’ distress. ‘We Macedonians of the Aegean’ (he said) ‘are more uncertain than ever today which road to go if we are to gain our freedom and enter the People’s Republic of Makedonija’. The Congress then resolved to send a memorandum to the Paris Peace Conference including the words: ‘...in another Part of the country, Aegean Macedonia, there is raging terrorism... Our people ask that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be applied in Aegean Macedonia’. Simultaneously the following declaration was published in the newspapers: ‘Women and men of Macedonia! Taking part in the 1st Congress of the Macedonian Popular Front were dear friends and delegates from Pirin [i.e. Bulgarian] and Aegean [i.e. Greek] Macedonia. This turned the Congress into a demonstration of the unshakeable determination of the Macedonian People, from all the Parts of Macedonia, to be completely free and at unity with our own PRM, within the Federal Jugoslav Republic. It has been a basic item on the agenda of the Popular Front, from the very first day of its existence, that the Macedonian People (in its entirety) must be united with its Republic’.20

A further step forward in Skopje’s irredentist actions was the publishing, in the 26 August 1946 issue of the official State news organ Borba [The Struggle], a map showing Jugoslavia’s borders, as in force and as determined by ‘ethnic group’. It is immediately obvious that the ‘ethnic’ boundaries take in very nearly the whole of Greek Macedonia, Thessaloniki included. Along with the map – which, it is important to note, was then published in many Jugoslav newspapers and journals – was an extensive article attacking ‘the terrorism practised in Greece against democratic citizens, especially Slavophones’. More than twenty thousand ‘fellow-nationals’ had, according to Borba, been obliged to leave Greece and flee to Jugoslavia and Bulgaria. The reader needs to be aware here that the original of this map is to be found among Bulgarian nationalists of the period between the two World Wars, when Sofia had a virtual monopoly on Slav irredentism in the Macedonian Question. In 1933, for instance, the Macedonian Institute in Sofia attempted to reinforce Bulgarian expansionist plans by circulating a ‘Geographical Map of Macedonia’ (see illustration below). This same map, showing the ‘Geographical and Ethnic Boundaries of Macedonia’, was subsequently reproduced at Skopje, as an illustration for a History of the Macedonian People published in 1969 and reissued by the State Publishing

20. IAYE 1946, File 67/2, Telegram from Dalietos to Greek Foreign Ministry, Belgrade, 7 August 1946, Call No. 1461. See also Halkias Archive. See also Mόσης, op.cit, pp. 40-41.
21. IAYE 1946, File 1/4, Letter from Dalietos to Greek Foreign Ministry, Belgrade, 10 August 1946, Call No. 1513 See also Halkias Archive, IAYE 1946, File 1/10, Letter from Lieut.Col. of Artillery K. Iatros to Greek Foreign Ministry, BIT 902, 23 September 1946, Call No. Classified FET/3392203/A2/II. See also FO 371/58615, Clutton to Bevin, Belgrade, 22 August 1946, Call No. 310.
22. [This carefully-chosen expression would also have been capable of the meanings ‘republican citizens’ and ‘citizens of the Republic’ (i.e. PRM). Translator’s Note].

From the beginning of September 1946, the war of words between diplomats in Athens and Belgrade heats up. The opening shot was fired in Skopje on 12 September 1946, at the ceremony for the transfer of Goče Delčev’s remains. Vlahov delivered an inflammatory oration in which he denounced the policy of the ‘Greek fascists’. It was aimed (he said) at annihilating the ‘Macedonian People’ and at driving them out. Greece had ‘no ethnic, political, or economic rights’ over ‘Aegean Macedonia’.  

23. Halkias Archive.
▲ Covers (in photocopy) of the book Macedonia as a natural and economic unit (Sofia 1945, in Bulgarian, republished Skopje 1978, in Slavmacedonian).
He virtually repeated these assertions a few days later at Monastir, when addressing a large gathering of some ten thousand people. ‘Greece has no right to Aegean Macedonia’ he said ‘which has always been made up of Slavs’. He went on: ‘The Macedonian People has, according to the Atlantic Charter, every right to unite. A United Macedonia exhibits [sic] full and perfect ethnic, racial and economic unity. Each part of it seeks nothing other than union within the context and borders of Jugoslavia’.

At the end of September, Andrejev returned to the theme of acts of terrorism against the Slavophone population. He declared his firm intention of fighting to save them from imminent extinction.

At the Paris Peace Conference, the Jugoslav delegate to the Political & Territorial Committee on Bulgaria, Moša Pijade, declared in committee session that ‘Aegean Macedonia’ was going through ‘the most tragic era of its history due to brutal violence’, and asked the Great Powers to intervene immediately ‘to put a stop to this regime’ so that the ‘oppressed Macedonian people could be freed from the Greek yoke and form a state within the Jugoslav Federation’.

Throughout the 1940s, the verbal pronunciamenti about the oneness of the Macedonian area and about irredenta ‘Aegean Macedonia’ were translated into action. It is now accepted that Jugoslavia was actively involved in the Greek Civil War, and that it openly incited, not so much the resistance fighters of Markos’ Democratic Army, as those Slavophone organizations vowed to the secession of Greek Macedonia. One such was the secessionist movement led by Ilias Dimakis known as ‘Goče’. In November 1944 he made Monastir his headquarters and worked hard at reorganizing his band, recruiting widely from refugees in Greece. Before very long he had a body of about a thousand men, which he named the ‘First Aegean Strike Brigade’. Dimakis himself became the Brigade’s

25. Halkias Archive.
26. IAYE 1946, File 43/4, Session Minutes of the Political & Territorial Committee on Bulgaria, 6 September 1946, IAYE 1946, File 1/4, Telegram from Dragoumis to Greek Foreign Ministry, Paris, 6 September 1946, Call No. 1426. See also Καθημερινή, 7 September 1946, το Βήμα, 7 September 1946, το Φως, 7 September 1946.
commander. As his second-in-command he chose Naum Pejov, a veteran of the SNOF [Slavomacedonian People’s Liberation Front] and a native of the village of Gavros, near Kastoria: Pejov had fled to the PRM in June 1944. Dimakis’ Political Commissar was Mihail Keramičiev, from the same village as Pejov, with Vangel Ajanovski-Oche from the Edessa region as Keramičiev’s deputy.27

There is also today evidence for the view that NOF [People’s Liberation Front] was organized at the instance of PRM, the Communist Party of Makedonija, and its overt aim was the union of Greek Macedonia with the Jugoslav Federation. Very revealing indeed is the content of a conversation between Količevski and NOF leaders in Skopje, at the very end of the year 1946. Količevski gives them orders to go down into Greece and fight alongside the Greek Communists. ‘You will now go down there… The KKE [Communist Party of Greece] will direct your struggle… The [party] line of the KKE has

![Image: The ‘First Aegean Strike Brigade’ marching through Monastir.](image)

27. A few days later, the Aridaia & Edessa Battalion went the same road, under the leadership of another SNOF veteran, the schoolmaster Pavle Rakovski. See the article by Sfetas, «Αυτονομιστικές κινήσεις των Σλαβοφώνων κατά το 1944, η στάση του ΚΚΕ και η διαφύλαξη των ελληνογιουγκοσλαβικών συνόρων» [Slavophones’ separatist moves in 1944, the Greek Communist Party’s position, and the maintenance of the Greek and Yugoslav borders], pp. 105-124 [in Greek] in: Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Μακεδονία και Θράκη, 1941-1944. Κατοχή – Αντίσταση – Απελευθέρωση [Proceedings of the International Conference ‘Macedonia & Thrace’: Occupation, Resistance, Liberation]. Thessaloniki, 1998.

28. NOF [Popular (or ‘People’s’) Liberation Front] = НОФ [Народно Осбодителнот Фронт]. Activist organization of Slavophones in Greece. Founded at the instance of the Jugoslav Communists. Active throughout the Greek Civil War, its aim being the secession of Greek Macedonia.
been put right... you can trust them... any problems you have, you can sort them out with the KKE leadership... fight whole-heartedly along with the Greek People... against chauvinism, separatism, and local trends'.

It is clear that these pro-Jugoslav elements in NOF had a single professed aim: the secession of Greek Macedonia and its union with the Yugoslav Federation. Supporting evidence of this is an article published by the organization in its periodical Bilten [The Bulletin] on 15 March 1946, in which NOF denies accusations of collaboration with the Bulgarians. ‘We are not Ohranites[‘Guards’] it reads, ‘still less are we separatists. This is proved by the line we take. Our struggle is against separatism, for two reasons: it leads the Macedonian People to the precipice, to new slavery, and separatism is the line taken by the forces of international reaction, which want to break up the unity of the Yugoslav peoples’. This disclaimer was however accompanied by an affirmation of the policy of secession for Greek Macedonia and enosis with PRM: ‘The Macedonian People have the right to unite and this right they have won with the gun. The Macedonian People of Aegean Macedonia have, by joining the ranks of ELAS[the National Popular Liberation Army] and by fighting Fascism, at the same time been fighting for national freedom... The Macedonian People of Aegean Macedonia has every right to ask to be united with its pillar and prop, progressive Vardar Macedonia... We wish to live with our free brethren of Vardar Macedonia, to be able to enjoy the fruits that the greater part of our people has won’.30

The PRM’s and Jugoslavia’s irredentist claims continued unabated for the duration of the Greek Civil War. Elections for the Popular Front of Macedonia were held in Skopje, on 7 March 1948. As president of, respectively, the Presidium of the People’s Parliament of Jugoslavia, and the Council of the Popular Front of Macedonia, Dimitar Vlahov condemned ‘monarchist-fascist’ Greece and referred to ‘our Macedonian brethren in Aegean Macedonia, alongside the Democratic Army, fighting for its overthrow’.31 In a speech to the 2nd Congress of the Macedonian Popular Front, Količevski criticized Bulgaria’s ‘Patriotic Front’ for ideas of aggrandisement, and in the same breath proclaimed the right of the ‘Macedonian’ people to unite within the Yugoslav Federation.32 Commenting on his statements, and on the dissonance between Belgrade and Sofia, the Greek daily newspaper Kathimerini observed that Serbia and Bulgaria were bickering not just amongst themselves, but like the proverbial ‘two cocks fighting over someone else’s barn’ – the ‘barn’ being, Greek Macedonia.33 Vlahov then went on to make new speeches in which he insisted that Greece had no

---
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sovereign rights over 'Aegean Macedonia', which, he said belonged from the ethnological point of view to the Slavomacedonians.34

The year 1949 came in, and the drama of events in Greece reached its high point. Since the autumn of 1948 it had gradually emerged that relations between the KKE, the Greek Communist Party, and its Jugoslav counterpart were becoming increasingly strained. This very soon became clear for all to see; and it was the direct consequence of the rupture between Stalin and Tito, and Tito's expulsion from the Cominform in the summer of '48. At the very beginning of 1949, a close associate (Petros Roussos) of the senior Greek communist Nikos Zahariadis was summing up the work done outside Greece by the Party in 1948. He referred to 'Tito's treachery', and called it 'a stab in the back' for Greeks.35 There was a double sequel: firstly, a split within the ranks of the NOF, with a cleavage between pro-Jugoslavs and others who remained loyal to the Greek Communist Party, and secondly, a resolution by the Party at its 5th Plenary Session (30-31 January 1949), adding fuel to the flames. The Party’s Secretary-General, Zahariadis, gave his audience a taste

34. Αλήθεια, 15 June 1948.
36. On the founding and activities of NOF the classic work on the Slavomacedonian side is still the study by Ристо Киризовски [Risto Kirizovski], Народно Ослободителниот Фронт и Другите Организации на Македонциите од Егејска Македонија (1945-1949) [The People’s Liberation Front and other organizations of Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia (1945-1949)], Skopje, 1985, in Slavomacedonian.
of what was to come in his opening remarks. ‘In our People’s new rising’, he said, ‘the Macedonian people have given their all. With their blood they have won the right to free and independent life and development. There can be no doubt that as a result of the victory of the popular revolution in Greece the Macedonian people will win the right to free and independent life and development’. This was a frank confession of a change of direction on the minorities’ issue, and it was certainly due to the tight corner in which the KKE found itself at the start of 1949. Therefore, despite the objections of many leading Party members, the 5th Plenary resolved to finally recognize the right of the ‘Macedonian People’ to national reconstruction and self-determination:

‘...In northern Greece the Macedonian People have given their all for the struggle and are fighting on with admirable and total heroism and self-sacrifice. It cannot be doubted that as a result of victory by the DSE [Democratic Army of Greece] and the People’s Revolution, the Macedonian People will have full national restitution, as they themselves want it, winning it tomorrow by giving their life-blood today. Macedonian Communists will always be at the head of their people’s struggle. At the same time Macedonian Communists must beware of the divisive and disruptive activities fostered by alien elements in order to disrupt the unity between the Macedonian and the Greek People, a disruption that can only assist their common enemy, monarchy and fascism, and American and English imperialism. At the same time, the KKE must root out all obstacles and must strike at all chauvinist demonstrations of Greek expansionism, that are causing resentment and discomfort among the Macedonian People, thus helping the disrupters with their treacherous activity and stiffening the forces of resistance. The Slavomacedonian and the Greek People can only win if united. If divided, all they can do is lose. So the two peoples’ unity in the struggle must be jealously guarded, as the apple of their eye, and strengthened little by little, day by day’.

The resolutions of the 5th Plenary Session were followed by a whole series of Party initiatives in pursuit of the new policy. The 2nd Plenary Session of the Central Committee of NOF was held on 3 February 1949. In his speech, Zahariadis set out what the Slavophones were being offered in exchange: essentially a reshuffle of the Republic’s Provisional Government to promote a Slavophone to a ministerial post; NOF representation on the DSE’s General Staff; the renaming of the DSE’s 11th Division as the ‘Macedonian Division’; and the founding of a ‘Macedonian’ Communist organization. In the hope particularly of pushing the group round the pro-Tito Keramičiev further to the sidelines, Zahariadis promoted to the NOF Secretariat two of his old buddies among the Slavomacedonian activists, Paskal Mitrevski and Pavel Rakovski. The KKE leadership was indisputably breaking new ground with these decisions, as was noted by the bourgeois Press, which spoke of the Party’s ‘irrevocable split...from the body of the Nation’.37

37. Ελευθερία, 4 March 1949.
It was not many weeks later, on 25-26 March 1949, that the 2nd Congress of the NOF was held, at Psarades on the Prespa Lakes district of Florina. To an audience of seven hundred delegates, Zahariadis acknowledged the part played by the ‘Macedonian’ people, and then harped on the need for unity with the Greek People if victory was to be achieved. At the end of its deliberations, the Congress condemned Keramičiev’s pro-Yugoslav group, and declared the ‘Macedonian’ people’s right to self-determination. ‘In the present critical moments of the 2nd NOF Congress’ an the Declaration, ‘the enemies of our people are trying on all sides to disrupt the unity between the Macedonian People and the militant unity between the Macedonian People and the Greek People, a unity essential for the victory of both Peoples. Enemies of our People, of every sort, are exploiting military difficulties and the other difficulties stemming from them, and are exploiting the situation in Jugoslavia, uttering various different slogans that make headway with certain craven and drooping elements, inciting them to break ranks. We, the seven hundred delegates to the 2nd Congress of the People’s Liberation Front, do brand these conspirators who are sowing disruption and desertion in our lines, treading on the blood of our thousands of heroes, as common traitors and miserable deserters from our People’s struggle. All who have been led astray by the preaching of the enemy and the disrupters’ subversive manoeuvres, and who have taken the easy road of flight and desertion, have done a hellish deed of counter-popular treachery that will help none but the enemy, the monarchist-fascists, and the imperialist camp’.38

On the very next day, 27 March, Zahariadis’ pledge to the 2nd NOF Congress was put into effect, with the founding of KOEM [the Communist Organization of Aegean Macedonia]. A week later, on 3 April, Mitrevski became Minister of Supplies in the Provisional Government, Vangel Kojchev became a member of the DSE’s Supreme War Council and Kokochev became president of Directorate of National Minorities.

Throughout the spring of 1949 there were various different contacts, of a desperate kind, between the KKE and NOF, and Slavomacedonians who had taken refuge in Skopje. The purpose was to persuade these latter to change their minds and join the DSE, even were it only at the eleventh hour.39
1949 the Keramičiev-Dimakis group sent the KKE a letter that put an end to all attempts to play the go-between. It made a blanket criticism of KKE policy on the Macedonian Question as ‘in error’ and ‘biassed’ against the ‘Macedonian’ People. Per contra, the letter lauded the Communist Parties of Jugoslavia and Makedonija, and Tito himself, to the skies for their policy. The Slavomacedonian ‘guerrillas’ naturally included among the conditions of their assistance to the KKE that they should receive ‘an apology in writing’ for the ‘injustices’ done to NOF; that independent ‘Macedonian’ units should be created, with a ‘Macedonian’ cadre at the head of each; that anti-Tito propaganda should be discontinued; and that free communication between Greek and Jugoslav Macedonia should be restored. These were demands to which the KKE obviously had no choice but to assent.

On 28 July 1949, a month or so before the end of the Greek Civil War, an end which was already in sight, Tito addressed a convention of pro-Jugoslav NOF cadres in Skopje. The majority of them were refugees from Greece. Tito launched a fierce attack on the KKE. He accused it of never having been remotely interested in the rights of Slavomacedonians in Greece. He
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The newspaper Μακεδονικός Φρουρός [Makedonikos Frouros], 15 May 1949 and 5 June 1949.

'The NOF and the Cominform greatly wanted to detach Greek Macedonia. 'Over my dead body!', says the Evzone. Nobody knew this better than Tito'.

From the newspaper Μακεδονία [Makedonia], 24 April 1949.
called on refugees from Greece to work for their peaceful integration into Jugoslavia – which was interpreted in Greek circles as meaning that he had given up his territorial claim on Greek Macedonia. Tito also met deputations of refugees from Greece and wounded guerrillas, a meeting which was given an official atmosphere by the presence of numerous high-ranking members of the Federal and local Party officials. The refugees apparently thanked Tito for his help, while condemning the revanchist language of KKE broadcasts against Jugoslavia. Tito allowed a day or two to pass, then on 2 August 1949, on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the proclamation of the PRM, and in front of a very large audience – of perhaps as many as 35,000 people, according to foreign diplomats – he delivered his bombshell.

He accused the KKE of not behaving properly towards the ‘Macedonians of the Aegean’. It had not placed them in senior Party positions; and it had not permitted ‘Macedonian schools’ to function in free Greece. Immediately afterwards, Makedonija’s president, Količevski, described his Republic as ‘the Piedmont of a future United Macedonia’. The above phraseology was a mirror of the revaluation of Jugoslav policy towards Greece. While the goal remained the same, to wit the secession of Greek Macedonia and the shielding of the ‘Macedonian minority’ in Greece, the means were now different, since virtually all the Slavomacedonian activists had by now fled to the PRM.

Once the Greek Civil War came to its close, PRM propaganda on behalf of ‘Macedonia irredenta’ increased. Now it was spearheaded by Slavophone ex-guerrillas who had taken refuge en masse in Jugoslavia after the War ended. Their efforts were aided and abetted by various different academic bodies in the PRM, giving them the necessary touch of authority and impetus to keep going. At the start of 1950, for instance, with the encouragement and economic assistance of the local Party leadership, the ‘Union of Refugees from Aegean Macedonia’ [UR] was set up in Skopje. Its aim was to pull into its ranks all the refugees from Greece who had made their way to the PRM. Membership of UR was open to any refugee living in Jugoslavia. Run by a General Council, it had branches, each with its own local council, in various parts of the country. The Union’s interest was by no means confined exclusively to refugees in PRM, however; it extended to the Slavophone residue in Greece. In his summary to the general assembly one year after the inception, the Union’s Secretary General stated that UR had a duty to keep a close eye on developments in Greek Macedonia, and to denounce the ‘monarchist-fascist’ Greek government’s policy of discrimination against Slav-speakers.

45. ΙΑΥΕ 1949, File 34, Sub-File 2, Report from Baizos to Greek Foreign Ministry, Skopje, 7 August 1949, Call No. 602/Δ/1.
46. ΙΑΥΕ 1949, File 34, Sub-File 2, Report from Baizos to Greek Foreign Ministry, Skopje, 7 August 1949, Call No. 589/Δ/1.
In June 1951, it was put on record in a resolution of UR's Assembly that it was the Union's duty not to be indifferent to the terrible sufferings of their People in Greece.49 A codicil to the same resolution read: 'We must regularly keep the [Jugoslav] Government informed of the Athens Government's policy of genocide, and encourage it to take initiatives in international forums'.

These observations placed the irredentist issue on the agenda of the SRM’s – and hence Jugoslavia’s - relations with neighbouring countries from the very first. The same purpose was also served by the use of the term ‘Aegeans’ [Егејциите] to describe refugees from Greece, in place of the non-specific ‘Macedonians’. It was clear, in other words, that the use of the term in question promoted the concept of the unity of the Macedonian People, while also pointing to the existence of ‘enslaved, unredeemed brethren’ and keeping alive the prospect of their future union under the leadership of the Jugoslav Communists. The same September, UR issued its own monthly newspaper, Voice of the Aegeans [Глас на Егејците].

This newspaper was one of several activities by which the UR hatched, and then gradually systematized and codified an irredentist campaign to the detriment of Greece. Dozens of articles were published by Voice of the Aegeans before its demise in 1954, a sacrifice on the altar of the triple rapprochement between Greece, Jugoslavia, and Turkey. All attempted to construct and bring to the fore a history of ‘Aegean Macedonia’, linking it with the broader historical superstructure of the SRM. The story of the closure of this activist organ is some indication of how organically it was connected with the official local political establishment. The stake of PRM’s government in UR is also attested by the fact that in the summer of 1951 Dimči Mire, president of the local parliament, was a member not only of UR’s Council General but also of the committee responsible for the newspaper. The reason why UR’s activities were being encouraged by the Federal Government was, according to an evaluation by the British Embassy at Athens, that Belgrade wanted ‘to keep Macedonian consciousness alive, since it might prove useful in the future’. This might, the evaluation added,

49. Глас на Егејците, No. 11, 17 June 1951.
be a way of discouraging refugees who were not eager to stay in Jugoslavia and wanted to return to Greece.\footnote{50. FO 371/95163: Confidential Report from the British Embassy at Athens to the British Embassy at Belgrade, Athens, 7 August 1951, Call No. Emb.1041/43/51.}

From the very first moment, the UR’s Slavomacedonian activists regarded it as of the greatest urgency to write their own history, which (they insisted) had been deliberately passed over in silence by Balkan historians; and they also laid great weight on the political education of the young. Construction of a Slavomacedonian myth: this was their ultimate goal. The Slav Macedonian way of thinking had by now cottoned on to the unique advantage, for this purpose, of actually living in PRM, friendly mother and homeland. What was needed for success was to mobilize all the available forces of the political nomenklatura among the Slavomacedonian political refugees. Their writing of a ‘constructed’ history proceeded along three main lines. First they recorded the military events of the past ten years, the German Occupation, and the Greek Civil War, and set them in a connected chain of Slavomacedonian history. Second, they linked this whole period with the remoter past, and above all with the Ilinden Uprising of 1903. Third, they singled out Slavomacedonian heroes from the more recent historical past and set them among the pantheon of other Slavomacedonian heroes of the Federal Republic.

The method of achieving the first of these aims preoccupied the editorial staff of Voice of the Aegeans throughout the paper’s existence. At the UR’s annual General Assembly in June 1951, there was lengthy discussion among the organization’s leading cadres about what goals were advisable. Naum Pejov made a keynote speech in which he said:

‘Out of our young people must be created a vigorous national intelligentsia that will defend the interests of our People. We have never yet had the chance to develop an intelligentsia, because it has been doing its studies in neighbouring countries and has been shaped in a mould hostile to our national liberation struggle... We do not have any official confirmation for the lives laid down and the material destruction suffered by our People, and this is one part of our national history that our young ones must be indoctrinated with. It is one way of showing our friends and our enemies that we mean to live free. So memoirs must be compiled, the lives laid down must be recorded, and brochures and books must be written with professional skill.’\footnote{Глас на Егејсите, No. 11, 17 June 1951.}

Another delegate, Basil (not to be confused with Naum) Pejov, observed that the Union of Macedonian Writers ought to take steps to publish material about the life and struggles of the ‘Macedonian People’ of ‘Aegean Macedonia’. The need to raise the refugees’ cultural and academic level...
was pointed out by Risto Andonovski and the UMW’s secretary Micho Terpovski singled out children’s education as the central focus of this need.

At the start of 1952, *Voice of the Aegeans* acted on Naum Pejov’s prompt, putting out a request to any ‘Aegeans’ with photographs of different parts of Makedonija, and in particular with photographs of dead bodies, to send them to the editorial team for publication in a planned album. 52 The Union’s Council General was simultaneously collecting details about lives lost. The intention was to put out a kind of White Book about Aegean Macedonia. A collateral manoeuvre was a move to erect a War Memorial to Slavomacedonian ‘Aegean’ heroes killed in the 1940s. 53 In July 1953 the editorial board was compelled to admit, to its evident discomfiture, that the results had not come up to its expectations, and that the only publication so far had been a brochure on Greek Macedonia. 54

It was also at this time that leading Slavomacedonian cadres shouldered the task of recording the bloody details of recent history, to be made public in the columns of the refugee newspaper. There were a great many contributors, but the main names were those of (Naum) Pejov, Andonovski, Andreas Tsipas, and Keramičiev. As can be seen from the articles, Pejov, the ex-separatist, had not only contrived to heal the scars of the wound to his authority in 1944, but had outgunned, in the ideological sense, all others who thought like him. His various speeches at different refugee assemblies, his stream of articles on events during the Occupation and the Civil War: these were patiently hosted in *Voices of the Aegean*, even when, as often happened, they made up one half of its reading matter. It was on the Occupation and the Civil War that Pejov concentrated, for the most part or on what the SNOF 55 and the NOF were up to, their relations with the Greek Communist Party, and the doldrums of the ‘Slavomacedonian’ minority that obstinately stayed in Greece. 56 Tsipas 57 and Keramičiev 58 covered much the same ground as Pejov. Andonovski 59

---
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and Šimovski were chiefly interested in folklore and are valuable in that they preserve much information about life in Greek Macedonia in the years between the two World Wars.

Articles from the newspaper were cannibalized for a book entitled Егејска Македонија [Aegean Macedonia], published by the Union of Refugees Press in 1951, under Andonovski’s name. Also in 1951, Keramičiev contributed an article to the collective work Егејска Македонија во нашата национална история [Aegean Macedonia in our national history]. The newspaper’s directorate undertook the placing of his book and its distribution to refugee organizations. In August 1952, the UR’s Secretariat decided to set up an ad hoc committee to opine on whether or not it was worth publishing two new books about the Occupation and the Greek Civil War, one by Andonovski and one by Pejov.

It was as the ‘Aegeans’ were compiling their own history that the first young students entered the University of Skopje, newly founded in 1949. In January 1952, the newspaper was able to report, with evident satisfaction,

---

that there were now a total of five students in the University’s Faculty of Philosophy. These were Gjorgji Sevriev, Dimitar Velikov, Krste Bitovski, Spiro Stojanski, and Kuzma Gjorgjevski. In 1952, Todor Šimovski became the first ‘Aegean’ from the Faculty to take his degree, and at the start of the year the student roll included 47 ‘Aegeans’, with scholarships from PRM each worth 4200 dinars a month.

The basic thing to note is that production of an ideological armoury of texts about the Greek Civil War and the Ilinden Uprising lasted until 1954. These texts were mainly for internal consumption by ‘Aegean’ refugees. After 1954 there followed a period in which the older stock of historical commentaries was being legitimated and incorporated into PRM’s collective national ideology. It was also the year 1954 which saw the definitive settlement, even if not quite the actual finish, of the issue about whether refugees should remain in the country. Not that the production of history books specially for ‘Aegeans’ came to a halt. Матица на Иселениците од Македонија, the ‘Centre for Macedonians in Exile’, founded in 1951, continued the work of the UR, particularly in the political domain. And if Voice of the Aegeans fell silent in 1954, it was at once replaced by a monthly called Makedonija [Македонија], whose first editor was none other than Andonovski, and an annual called The Exile’s Calendar [Иселеницки Календар].

It was not only ex-guerrillas from Greece who were looking into the history of ‘Aegean Macedonia’ with interest. Before very long this subject was introduced as a separate category of reference and research, into the repertoire of the SRM’s official organ for such studies, IEE, the Institute of National History. The IEE had been founded by SRM’s government in 1948, with one clear aim – ‘to write and publicize the official history of the Macedonian People’, and to incorporate it into Yugoslav history as a whole.61 On 1 July 1956, delivering a speech for the IEE’s first anniversary, in front of Party officials and academic VIPs, Šimovski –

refugee from the Kilkis district who had been the first ‘Aegean’ to join the Institute, in 1952 – said that one of the IEE’s basic obligations ought to be to collect historical material, not just about the distant past, but about the recent struggle of the ‘Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia’. Here (he said) events of great importance had taken place – struggles worthy of inclusion in the official history, lest they be forgotten. Šimovski’s prompting seems to have had its effect, for over the coming years a series of ‘Aegean’ historians were to join the Institute, their one and only task being to compile a history of ‘Aegean Macedonia’. In 1964, a post was found for Risto Poplazarov, from Kalohori near Kastoria, who four years earlier had graduated from the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Prague in Czechoslovakia. In 1967, it was the turn of Krste Bitoshki, from the village of Gavros, also near Kastoria, who had completed his studies in the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Skopje in 1956. They were joined in 1970 by Risto Iliovski, a child of the Paidomazoma, who had studied in Budapest; in 1972 by Stojan Kiselinovski, another child of the Paidomazoma, who had studied in Romania; in 1974 by a Democratic Army veteran, Risto Kirjazovski; in 1976 by Vasil Gotevski from Idroussa, a history graduate of the University of Warsaw; and in 1977 by Eleftheria Bambakovska, from Kardia near Kozani, a history graduate of the University of Skopje. Significantly, by the end of the 1980s a quarter of all the Institute’s research fellows were of Greek extraction; and it was they who monopolized the discussion of research on subjects of Greek interest. The Balkanology Section was well known to be packed with ‘Aegean’ staff. It was headed by Rastislav Terzjovski from Perlepe [Prilep], and all its researchers without exception were of ‘Aegean Macedonian’ origin: Šimovski, Kirjazovski, Kiselinovski, and Theodoros Papanagiotou. In 1976 Šimovski was drafted to the editorial team of the Institute’s review Гласник [The Messenger], to be followed in 1979 by Iliovski and in 1983 by Bitoshki. (It is a striking fact that even in today’s FYROM, no historian hailing from any other region has written about historical developments in Greek Macedonia). Thus their texts are fatally loaded with sentimental effusion, hyperbole, and hostile innuendo towards Greece. It is further interesting to note how the ‘Aegean lobby’, as they call themselves, has imposed itself, with regard to Party legitimacy and political approach, even on history as written in the Jugoslav Federation.

The rise of the ‘Aegeans’ as academics in the 1960s and 70s went hand in glove with the war of words between the diplomats of Athens and Belgrade during these two decades. The battle over the Macedonian Question, a
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battle as often as not fomented by the Jugoslavs, could now be based on a rich fund of reserves supplied by the 'Aegeans' – persevering though in the wrong, and now with the legal blessing of the State. A three-volume work, [*Историја на македонскиот народ* (*The History of the Macedonian People*)], was published to great applause by the Institute of National History in 1969. It included extensive references to 'Aegean' Macedonia, the texts having been written by the troika Andonovski, Šimovski, and Bitoshki.

The same period saw the publication by the Institute of a whole series of books by other 'Aegeans'. The great majority of them were by veteran guerrillas who had, rather late in the day, discovered that writing history could be a road to rehabilitation. ‘Aegean’ historians were also now coming into closer touch with the public in the rest of the Jugoslav Republics, as a result of the printing of their own works in Belgrade, their appearances in Jugoslav books of multiple authorship, and publication of their articles in Jugoslav journals. ‘Aegean’ Slavomacedonian guerrillas could well afford
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68. Krste Vitoshki [Крсте Битоски], ‘Отпорот на Македонците против асимилаторските стремежи на грчката вооружена пропаганда (1878-1908)’ [The Resistance of the Macedonians to attempts by the armed Greek propaganda to assimilate them], Југословенски историски часопис, 4 (Belgrade, 1969, in Slavmacedonian), 125-128; Risto Poplazarov [Ристо Полпазаров], ‘Некои моменти од борбата на Македонците против грчката и бугарската црковно-просветна доминации во втората половина на XIX век (до 1888)’ [Some key moments in the Macedonians’ struggle against Greek and Bulgarian religious and educational domination in the later 19th century, up to
to speak with pride of their part in the Resistance, their work alongside Tito’s Partizani, and the rectitude with which they toed the Yugoslav Party line. These were very considerable virtues when taken in relation to the building of the Yugoslav Federal State.

In the decades to come, the slogan of an irredentist ‘Aegean Macedonia’ would be PRM’s flagship, used whenever the international situation warranted it, a serviceable bludgeon at official discussions between Greece and Yugoslavia. This was the era of ‘the non-existent Macedonian Question’, the long haul of the Cold War. The allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization found it expedient to give preferential treatment to a Yugoslavia that did not ‘toe the Soviet line’. At the same time they put pressure on the powers that be in Greece not to rock the boat but to keep their mouths shut, since that was what the interests of the Western world dictated. The then Prime Minister of Greece, Constantine Karamanlis, and his Foreign Minister, Averof, tasted the fruits of this Realpolitik early in the 1960s, when their Yugoslav counterparts precipitously withdrew the issue of ‘unredeemed Macedonian regions’ from the conference agenda.

In the summer of 1960 one Slavomacedonian newspaper after another published articles attacking an alleged Greek policy against Slavophones in Greek Macedonia. The lead was taken by the official Government press organ, Нова Македонија [New Makedonija]. The campaign was reinforced by speeches from Tito’s Foreign Minister, Drago Kunč. Diplomatic reflexes were immediately triggered by these developments. On 2 June 1960,
The newspaper Μακεδονία [Makedonia], Thessaloniki, 20 June 1950.

The newspaper Μακεδονία [Makedonia], Thessaloniki, 9 September 1950.
Dimitrios Nikolareizis, the Greek Ambassador to Belgrade, had a meeting with the then Yugoslav Foreign Minister, Kosta Popović, their agenda being the recent speeches by Kunč, and the resuscitation of the Macedonian Question by Yugoslav circles more generally. The meeting was revealing as to the Jugoslavs’ approach to the question and the arguments advanced by them. Popović told his Greek guest quite frankly that in Jugoslavia’s view there did exist a ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece. Taken aback, the Greek Ambassador replied that this was ‘a serious thing to say’. He went on: ‘We have always been under the impression that it was only circles in Skopje that brought up any question of a Macedonian minority; and that the Government in Belgrade never encouraged them to bring such a question up’. He assured Popović that his Government would react ‘violently’ when it heard this piece of news; and that Premier Karamanlis would be enraged, especially since he was just about to pay an official visit to Belgrade.69 Popović rejoined drily, no doubt hoping to play down the unfortunate impression he had made, that his government could hardly overlook the existence of a ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece, since this would be a departure from their principles. At the same time, (he said), he quite understood the Greek position.

One month later, in July, the Foreign Ministers of the two countries, Averof and Popović, met at Tito’s bower, the Brijuni Islands. At the top of their agenda was the Macedonian Question. Popović repeated the familiar position of Jugoslavia: it was impossible for Belgrade to ignore the existence of a ‘kindred’, ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece, without saying a word, when Greece was involved in acts of provokatsia to this minority’s detriment. This was a position rooted (he said) in firm Jugoslav convictions. The Federal Government could not exercise control of statements by local governments, or of ‘what the papers said’. He did however accept that this would not have occurred to the same degree by comparison with Greece. Averof, visibly annoyed by what his counterpart had just said, replied with emphasis that the minority question ‘might well blow Greek-Jugoslav relations sky-high’. He advised Popović to be more prudent. There were, after all, SRM documents which referred to Greek Macedonia as ‘Aegean Macedonia’. ‘What is Skopje implying here?’ (he enquired). ‘That Greek Macedonia does not exist? Or that it ought not to exist? This would mean war’. But despite this verbal sparring, the two Ministers’ meeting appears to have ended in a gentleman’s agreement to avoid any action that might poison bilateral relations.

At the beginning of October 1960, in a speech to the People’s Parliament of Makedonija, with the Yugoslav Federal Vice-President Kardelj in attendance, Prime Minister Količevski insisted that the presence of a ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece was an incontrovertible historical fact.

No one (he said) could prevent his People taking an interest in their fate.\textsuperscript{70} These irredentist speeches in SRM were not without their consequences. This time the fuse was an answer that the new Prime Minister, Aleksandar Grilčo, gave an American journalist at a reception for members of the Press, on 14 November 1961. Greece was (he said) taking ‘\textit{certain disquieting measures}’ to the detriment of the ‘Macedonian’ minority. Grilčo also told the journalist that Athens’ ultimate policy aim was to efface the minority’s \textit{ethnic consciousness.}\textsuperscript{71} Finally, he repeated his country’s fixed position that the only way bilateral relations between Makedonija and Greece could be improved was by Greece’s recognizing minority rights. Two days later, the Jugoslav Ambassador at Athens was summoned by Averof for a friendly rap over the knuckles for Grilčo’s indiscreet remarks. The ambassador made light of them, and, in the hope of showing that they were not espoused by Belgrade, he assured the Greek Foreign Minister that they had not been published in \textit{Borba} [the official Party paper] or transmitted by Tanjug [the State News Agency].\textsuperscript{72}

Now that there was a bush war of speeches, Averof himself entered the fray, on 7 December 1961. In an address to the Greek Parliament, the Foreign Minister described the Grilčo speech as ‘\textit{unacceptable},’ and repeated the fixed Greek position, that no ‘Macedonian’ minority existed in the country. A week later, on 15 December, a spokesman for the Jugoslav Foreign Minister, Kunč, made use of Averof’s address for a whitewash of Makedonija’s Prime Minister, repeating his country’s firm position that there was indeed a ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece and adding that nothing but giving this minority their ‘rights’ would normalize bilateral relations.

\textit{Generous measures were taken by the local SRM government at this time for the benefit of their refugees from Greece. A law was passed in 1961 recognizing service in the ranks of NOF or SNOF as a ‘period of employment’. (This measure had been in force earlier, but only for service in the DSE: it had been discontinued in 1956 in deference to ‘Greek-Jugoslav friendship’). Many refugees had also been given awards for services rendered to their country; and a fair number of others had got a pension. Three leading ‘Aegean’ cadres had been elected People’s Deputies. Two of them went on to hold a ministerial post: Pejov, as Minister of Farming and Forests, and Mitrevski, as Deputy Minister of People’s Legislation. Keramičiev became a Deputy and, like Ajanovski-Oche, a senior official in the Ministry of the Interior. Taško Hadjijanev became a senior official in the Ministry of Farming and Forests. Minas Fotev became a senior official in the local SRM Government Office.}

And so things stood until the end of the 1980s and the start of the ‘90s, when

\begin{itemize}
\item[70.] Nova Makedonija, 6 October 1960.
\item[71.] \textit{Καθημερινή}, 15 November 1961.
\item[72.] PRO/FO 371/160434, Letter from the British Embassy in Athens to the Foreign Office, Athens, 17 November 1961, Call No. 1033/25/61.
\end{itemize}
the break-up of Yugoslavia resulted in the independence of its component Republics, including Makedonija.

The establishment of FYROM in September 1991, this did not put an end to claims about ‘unredeemed’, ‘Aegean’ Macedonia. Quite the contrary. It is now generally accepted that forces were unleashed, rather than held in check, by the new données. Gone were those formal inhibitions that Belgrade entertained from time to time. The fledgling country was flooded with maps showing a Greater Macedonia, unified as far as the foothills of mount Olympus. These maps were reprinted in school textbooks, sent as postcards, and were even used on stamps. Only then did the powers that be in Greece look the problem squarely in the face. Initially they had been stunned; then they were angry.

Today, twelve years after the signing of the Interim Accord, an agreement more honoured in the breach than in the observance, the irredentist output from FYROM, so far from withering away, is wider, and more intensive. As was said earlier, the relevant references may have been deleted from the Constitution, and the need for diplomatic equilibrium may have succeeding in papering over the cracks so far as the international arena goes. But these days FYROM’s irredentist propaganda lurks in official government discourse and in a whole host of government decisions and acts, party political manifestoes, and pronouncements by State foundations. To take but one example, insistence on the use of the term ‘Aegean Macedonia’ is universal and permanent. That piece of irredentism occurs even on the official website of FYROM’s Foreign Ministry, where the Minister is said, at the end of December 2006, to have had a meeting with a delegation from ‘the Union of Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia’.

This particular organization, and others like it of refugees from Greece, receives annual funding from FYROM’s treasury (as can easily be seen by reference to the official government bulletin). One effect of funding has been, almost inevitably, the return from the dead of the newspaper Voices of the Aegean, complete with a bevy of verbal aggression against Greece. Another generous beneficiary of the state coffers is a newspaper called Ne Zaborav [‘I do not forget!’].

FYROM also funded the 3rd Rally of ‘Child-Refugees from Aegean Macedonia’ in Skopje in summer 2003. FYROM’s Parliament is not far behind in irredentist measures: the parliamentary calendar of official holidays now includes an ‘Aegean Brigade Day’. (This brigade was originally recruited from Slavophone activists hard at work, as we have seen, to achieve the secession of Greek Macedonia and its union with what was then the Yugoslav Federation). A ‘unified unredeemed Macedonia’ also receives much exposure on the official website of the Church in Skopje, Orthodox, but schismatic. Of the same tenor are long print run publications by official state bodies such as FYROM’s Institute of National History or her Academy of Sciences, all intended to set in solid type the indissoluble links joining Macedonian lands together.
It is also interesting to see how, from 1998 onwards, the durable concept of a Greater Macedonia, as a separate geographical entity, has reappeared on the scene. Until 1998 its historicity went back only as far as the nineteenth century, as is evident from one reprint after another of the official *Historical Map of Macedonia*. On this map, issued at Skopje in 1992, the only territory marked as ‘Macedonia in Prehistoric Times’ is that occupied today by FYROM. But in the ‘revised editions’ of the atlas, in 1998 and 2006, all of geographical Macedonia is now included. So too for the classical period. In the 1992 edition there is no clear boundary between classical Greece and Macedonia in classical times. But in
the 1997 editions Greece and Macedonia are shown as two different regions.

The same goes for the way Macedonia is represented in the remaining historical periods. Whereas in the 1992 edition no ‘ethnic and geographical boundaries of Macedonia’ are shown for the Medieval period, in the 1997 edition Medieval Macedonia is a visible entity with geographical as well as ethnic borders.

Thus FYROM’s irredentist ideology underwent a certain radicalization from 1998 onwards, in defiance of the provisions of the recently signed Interim Agreement. There is an ongoing attempt to construct a national myth and the means used is the aggressive appropriation of the region’s history – up to and including designs on the ancient Macedonian Greek heritage and its legators in prehistory. The phrase that best describes this desperate

attempt to construct a 'Macedonian' identity different from the Greek identity is one from Roman law: prior tempore, fortior iure ['earlier in time, therefore stronger in law']. But it is the Greek identity that is of uninterrupted continuation since prehistoric times, and that has come down to its modern legatees, the dwellers in FYROM.

The shift in ideology has also made its way into FYROM’s educational system. The more recent school textbooks, in primary and secondary schools, refer constantly to ‘Aegean Macedonia’ and to the unity of the Macedonian area. In essence, the narration of the country’s historical past is entirely based on a linear continuity the axis of which is the geographical area of Macedonia. Everything – from the ancient Macedonians, the Roman and Byzantine past, the Ottoman period, modern times, to the present – centres on Macedonia and its inhabitants. Macedonia is described as a country that has been enslaved and liberated, and today continues its glorious history with FYROM as its vehicle.

Very revealing are the instructions to candidates for university places

▲ Blaže Ristovski & team, *Историја за VIII одделение* [History Textbook, Grade VIII] (Skopje 2005), p.120.
in, a directive from the country’s Ministry of Education. These instructions require young students to answer questions about the enslavement of ‘Macedonians’ in neighbouring states, and about their struggle for freedom and union with the mother-homeland. This indoctrination of today’s students in FYROM with irredentist dreams lost in the mists of history and antiquity is perhaps the gloomiest aspect of the present situation, for it offers no hope for the future. The ideology of ‘Macedonian national identity’ is Slav to its very foundations and for six decades the inhabitants of FYROM have been saturated with it. Given that this ideology has caused so many tremors and cracks in the Balkan superstructure, the present weaning of young people in FYROM on a diet of descent from Alexander the Great is not merely quaint: it is positively dangerous.

**The ‘oppressed Macedonian minority’**

The unity of the ‘unredeemed but integral Macedonian area’ is intimately bound up with the existence of a ‘Macedonian minority’ - ‘oppressed’, of course – in adjacent countries. This credo was included, as we have seen, in AFCM’s founding meeting; and it has continued unchanged as a feature of political discourse and state policy to saturation point ever since. On 21 December 2006 the President of FYROM was still telling Parliament about his interest in the fate of the ‘Macedonian minority’ in neighbouring countries. References to ‘Macedonian minorities’ and FYROM’s interest in them recur in the Ministry of Culture’s plans for 2004-2008, reinforced by publications on this subject, which is also a publicly stated platform of the ruling party, IMRO [Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization]. It should be noted that the political leaders of the country attend any refugee organization’s anniversary celebration without fail, and often deliver inflammatory speeches. President Kiro Gligorov was to be seen at the 2nd Rally of ‘Child Refugees from Aegean Macedonia’, in Skopje in 1998. Prime Minister Gruevski took part in the 26th Rally of ‘Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia’, in Tnovo in 1995. The then Foreign Minister, Kazule, was at the 22nd Rally of ‘Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia’, in Tnovo in 2002.
The emblems and the appropriation of the historical past

When the name of the city of Skopje’s airport was changed to ‘Alexander the Great’, it was just one more straw in the wind. The country continues to print stamps depicting Philip II and Alexander. And on the official Church website emblems are appropriated openly. All this betrays FYROM’s need to reposition itself historically and geographically.

This is especially so in school textbooks, where the proposition that the ancient Macedonians were somehow ‘different’ from the rest of the Greeks is a rigid dogma.
Afterword

All that has been said here bears undeniable witness to an irredentist attitude towards Greece among FYROM’s organs of state and official foundations. Article 4 of the Interim Accord provided that neither of the two signatories should ‘promote or support claims on any part whatever of the dominion of the other, or claims to change the existing boundary’. The interpretation of this clause is, I think, obvious; as obvious as is its violation.

It can be taken as proved, then, that only in the international forum, these last few years, has FYROM troubled to tone down the impression that it is casting envious eyes on Greek territory. But it is also true that, the international shop-window apart, nothing has really changed – either in official political discourse or among the bodies that shape state policy. The objectives on the agenda of AFCM have been religiously observed for sixty years and more, as if time had stood still. And to boot, the new developments in FYROM - the radicalization of irredentist ideology through now wholesale appropriation of the historical past, linking it to the educational process - leave little room for optimism. At the same time, the possibility that FYROM may come up with a wiser and more moderate policy has taken a severe dent from developments over the past ten years, with more and more countries recognizing it as the Republic of Macedonia in a knock-on effect. These developments do not breed much hope or optimism for the future. The only thing that needs be said in conclusion, is that irredentist attitudes and practices of this sort have not even the makings of good-neighbourliness; nor are they founded on international treaties; nor (and that is for certain) do they help find lasting and constructive solutions to the problems endemic in the bilateral relations of FYROM and Greece.
In August 2005, FYROM’s Ministry of Education and Sport approved for circulation and use in primary schools a series of new history textbooks. The provision of the law in force is that for each class, there are more than two textbooks in circulation and the teacher has the option of selecting the textbook which she or he will use in class.

The books added to the previous textbooks (the 2003 and 2004 editions) were as follows:

a) (For Grade 5) Коста Ачиевски, Даринка Петреска, Виолета Ачковска, Ванчо Горгиев [Kosta Atsievski, Darinka Petreska, Violetta Ačkovska, Vančo Gjorgjev], Историја за V одделение [History Textbook, Grade 5], Skopje 2005.

b) (For Grade 6 I) Milan Бошковски, Јордан Илиовски, Небо Дервиши [Milan Boškovski, Jordan Iliovski, Nevo Derviši], Историја за VI одделение [History Textbook, Grade 6], Skopje 2005.

c) (For Grade 7) Виолета Ачковска, Ванчо Горгиев, Фејзула Шабани, Далибор Јовановски [Violetta Ačkovska, Vančo Gjorgjev, Fejzula Sabani, Dalibor Jovanovski], Историја за VII одделение [History Textbook, Grade 7], Skopje 2005. Also: Блаже Ристовски, Шукри Рахими, Симо Младеновски, Стојан Киселиновски, Тодор Чепреганов [Blaže Ristovski, Šukri Rahimi, Simo Mladenovski, Stojan Kiselinovski, Todor Čepreganov], Историја за VII одделение [History Textbook, Grade 7], Skopje 2005.

d) (For Grade 8) Владо Велковски, Халид Сејди, Аријан Алјадеми, Димка Ристеска, Горги Павловски [Vlado Velkovski, Halid Sejdi, Anjan Aljademi, Dimka Risteska, Gjorgji Pavlovski], Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade 8], Skopje 2005. Also: Блаже Ристовски, Шукри Рахими, Симо Младеновски, Стојан Киселиновски, Тодор Чепреганов [Blaže Ristovski, Šukri Rahimi, Simo Mladenovski, Stojan Kiselinovski, Todor Čepreganov], Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade 8], Skopje 2005.

The same approval was given for the use of Primary School Grade 5 and Grade 6 textbooks issued by the publishing house of Македонска нскра [Makedonska Iskra], which the present author did not have at her disposal at the time of writing. Since, however, all of these textbooks were compiled on the basis of a Detailed Programme worked out by the Pedagogical Institute, it can be said with certainty that the Македонска нскра books do not deviate from the image presented by the textbooks being examined here.

The material in the latter books is limited in comparison to earlier editions.

1. Stavroula Mavrogeni has a Ph.D. in Balkan Studies. She is a specialist member of teaching staff in the Department of Balkan Studies in the University of Western Macedonia.
Nearly every page is adorned with photographs or maps, thus leaving still less space for the text. On the other hand, the material about national history is markedly reduced in favour of world and Balkan history. Thus for example of the 120 plus 130 pages of the two Grade 7 books, two thirds comprise chapters about world history, European history, and Balkan history. The remaining third is about national (‘Macedonian’) history. It is noteworthy that half of the section on Balkan history deals with the history of the Albanian state and nation.

Obvious quantitative changes apart, the new FYROM school textbooks do try to limit the verbal excesses that proliferated earlier editions and which were intended to influence the pupil’s minds. Their removal is, in principle, a step forward. However the new books continue to cultivate in the pupil the vision of a Greater Macedonia. In the 2005 edition, indeed, the Albanian version of irredentism crops up along with the Slavomacedonian.

This can be seen from six elements, which are as follows:

a) Geographical definition of the ‘fatherland’.
b) Historical continuity of the ‘fatherland’.
c) Ethnic identity of the population of the ‘fatherland’.
d) ‘Partitioning’ of the ‘fatherland’.
e) Oppression of the ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece.
f) Cultivation of Albanian irredentism.

A. The geographical definition of the ‘fatherland’

The visual image of the ‘fatherland’ is effected by the use of the map Geographical and Ethnic Boundaries of Macedonia. This is the notorious map produced by Bulgarian circles in the late 19th century, and which has been reprinted by Slavo-Macedonian historians from 1945 onwards.

In the Grade 5 history textbook, by Atsievski and his team, the map in
question can be found on p.20, in the chapter on Macedonia in the Balkans in prehistoric times. The pupil thus gets the impression that Macedonia was a separate entity even as early as in the prehistoric era. Curiously enough, the boundaries of this entity coincide with those of the map Geographical and Ethnic Boundaries of Macedonia.

This visual image of a geographic unit recurs in various different periods of history. The caption on p.95 of Ristovski and team’s Grade 6 textbook, for instance, states that there is a Map of South-West Macedonia, with the Provinces which revolted in the Neguš [i.e. Naoussa] Uprising. A clarifying note says that the continuous line shows ‘the geographical and ethnic boundaries of South-West Macedonia’, while the ‘area in revolt’ is rendered in colour. Again, on p.120 the
Map is entitled *Macedonia at the time of the Ilinden Uprising*, with a note to explain that the continuous line shows ‘the geographical and ethnic boundaries of South-West Macedonia’.

On p.16 of Velkovski and team’s Grade 8 history textbook, the authors have produced their own misleading version of a map of the kings and kingdoms of the Balkans, printed before the Balkan Wars. Macedonia has subsequently been coloured in so as to give the pupil the impression that by 1912 it was a recognizable region in itself.

Images of a Greater Macedonia apart, there is an obvious attempt to make a distinction between Macedonia and Greece. In the map *The Colonies of the Greeks*, on p.37 of Atsievski and team’s Grade 5 textbook, one finds the labels МАКЕДОНИЈА [Makedonija/Macedonia] and ХЕЛАДА [Hellada/Greece]. In a map of Athens and Sparta on p.39, Macedonia is correspondingly given...
separate colouring, to distinguish it clearly from the Greek city-states.

Similarly on the map of *Rome at her Zenith*, where an attempt is again made to distinguish between МАКЕДОНИЈА [Makedonija/Macedonia] and ХЕЛАДА [Hellada/Greece]. The distinction is fixed firmly in the pupil’s mind by being repeated in the texts of the books. On p.56 of the Class V book, for example, it is stated that at the time of Philip II, ‘Macedonia was in the central part of the Balkan peninsula, north of Greece’.

In essence, the new FYROM school history books present ‘Macedonia’ as originally a geographical entity, and only afterwards a geographical and ethnic entity. The boundaries are alleged to have been carved out in prehistoric times, to be preserved throughout the historical period. Pupils are left with the impression that, despite developments down the years, ‘Macedonia’ was always a recognizable unity, one that the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest ‘partitioned’.

B. The historical continuity of the ‘fatherland’

The aim of the authors of these school textbooks is to persuade their readers – which effectively mean primary school pupils – that today’s Slavomacedonians are descendants of the ancient Macedonians, by linking past to present. One finds elements of this scattered throughout the books: the synoptic statement, for example, on pp. 4-5 of Atsievski and team’s Grade 5 textbook, intended as an introduction to History:

‘Our fatherland has a long and rich history. In ancient times it was a powerful state. In the reign of Philip II, Macedonia was the most powerful state in the Balkan Peninsula. In the reign of his son, Alexander of Macedon, it spread out over three continents, and was a world power.

Later, in the Middle Ages, thanks to the work of the Thessaloniki
brothers Cyril and Methodius and the first beginnings of Slav writing and literature, Macedonia made an important contribution to world civilization.

During the empire of Samouil (in the 10th and 11th centuries), Macedonia was a powerful state in the Balkans. Later, it often came under foreign rule (Byzantine, Bulgarian, Serbian). In the late 14th century, Macedonia was conquered by the Osmanli and was incorporated into the Ottoman Empire.

Our forefathers loved their fatherland and fought for it. They rebelled in order to be freed from foreign rule. One of the greatest and best known revolts was the Ilinden Uprising (1903), when the Kruševo Republic was founded.

After the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), Macedonia was partitioned among its neighbours – Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia – and its population was subjected to denationalization’.

In the form followed by all these textbooks, the unbroken linear continuity of ‘Macedonian’ history is presented as self-evident. The concept of continuity is built round the term ‘Macedonia’. Emphasis is placed on the superiority of the ‘fatherland’, both politically - (it extends ‘to three continents’) and culturally (its ‘important contribution to world civilization’).

C. The ethnic identity of the population of the ‘fatherland’

‘Macedonia’ having been defined as the age-old ‘fatherland’, the attempt is then made to prove that the ‘Macedonian’ nation is a homogeneous entity that has survived from ancient times to the present day. The schoolbook authors’ goal is to present the history of the Slavomacedonian nation as a continuum.
in time and place; to leave their pupils feeling that they are carrying on the civilization of ancient Macedonia as its rightful heirs. It is an attempt to link today's Slav Macedonians with the Macedonians of antiquity. So far as the ancient world is concerned, the authors try and make a distinction between Ancient Macedonians and Southern Greeks. The learner is asked to 'point out some differences between the organization of the Macedonian state and that of the Greek cities'; and also to 'consider why the Macedonians held their own Olympic Games independently of the Olympic Games in Greece' [Atsievski, pp.56 and 58]. Their aim becomes still more obvious when they are talking about Macedonian civilization. The Macedonians' pantheon comprises only Zeus, 'Zeïrena' (Aphrodite), Dionysus, and Heracles: the other Olympian gods are missing. The Macedonians are presented as speakers of 'a specific language related to those of neighbouring peoples [Greeks, Illyrians, Thracians]'. It is stated that in any case 'they differed from other peoples in their dress' [Atsievski, p.67]. The effort to draw dividing lines is sometimes not far short of comical:

The Macedonians ate sitting down, in contrast to the Greeks and Romans, who ate lying down. At banquets they did however sometimes copy the Greeks and eat lying down [Atsievski, p.67].

In the new history textbooks for primary schools in FYROM one will find no mention of the 'Hellenization' of the upper layers of Macedonian society, used in older textbooks in order to explain away the existence of inscriptions in Greek, the performance of plays in Greek, and so on. The same differentiation between Greek and Macedonian is made for the period of Alexander's successors. Hellenistic civilization is treated as the outcome of a union 'of the civilization of Macedonia and Greece with that of Oriental peoples' [Atsievski, p.71].

As is well known, the Slav tribes established themselves in the Balkans many centuries later. Here is how the authors attempt to insert the ancient Macedonians into the ethnogenetic progress of the 'Macedonian people':

When Slavs were establishing themselves in Macedonia they came across the ancient Macedonians. Relations were poor to start with, but improved later. The Macedonians were Christians, with a superior civilization. Gradually they began to work together. For their new fatherland the Slavs accepted the name 'Macedonia' and started to call themselves Macedonians. The aboriginal [starosedelci] Macedonians accepted the Slav language, and later on the Slavonic script. The Vlachs are remnants of the old Macedonians [Boškovski, p.32].

Thus one can see that FYROM's new school textbooks have dropped the term 'Macedonian Slavs – Македонски Словени', which appeared ad nauseam in previous textbooks about the early medieval period as the characteristic term for the Slavs of Macedonia. The indigenous population is
now claimed to have been Slavized in its entirety and to have been identified with the ‘Macedonians’, now of Slav origin. And in any case, the use of the term ‘Macedonians’ – in the sense that Slav Macedonian historians give it – is placed earlier than the Christianizing of the Slavs in this region, in the very same period that ‘Macedonia’ proves to be the fatherland of the ‘Macedonians’. It is from this moment in time that Macedonia is regarded as being inhabited by ‘Macedonians’. In the reign of Samuel, for instance, there is mention that the ‘Macedonian empire’ was inhabited ‘in its greater part by Macedonians, besides whom there were also Greeks, Armenians, Vlachs, Albanians, Serbs, and others living there’ (Boškovski, p.32). Furthermore, Boškovski tells us [p.35] that ‘St Cyril and St Methodius were by origin Slavs from Thessalonica’ (or Солун, as the city is called in his text).

We should lastly observe how an attempt is made to incorporate the Vlachs into the ethnogenesis of the Slav Macedonians. The Vlachs now appear as descendants of the Ancient Macedonians who have successfully preserved the characteristics of their nationhood and have survived into modern times.

D. The ‘partitioning’ of the ‘fatherland’

In the way the ‘partitioning’ of ‘Macedonia’ is presented, the Balkan Wars – described as ‘wars of conquest’ – hold centre stage. Beginning on p.114 of Ačkovska and team’s history textbook for Grade 7 is a chapter entitled ‘The Balkan countries’ policy of conquest at the expense of Macedonia’, with the following account of the period:

During the First Balkan War (1912), it was in the Macedonian region that the armies of Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria fought the Ottoman powers. The Ottoman forces were defeated and forced to retreat. Macedonia was conquered and partitioned among Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria.

The authors then instruct the pupil to analyse the map of Macedonia after the First Balkan War in relation to the conquered regions from the point of view of the neighbouring states.

They continue:

Not one of the Balkan countries was satisfied by the partition. This is why the war known as the Second Balkan War (1913) broke out between them. The greater part of Macedonia was now taken by Greece. The region which went to Serbia was that of the present Republic of Makedonija, less Stromnitsa and environs. The last and smallest part went to Bulgaria. This partition was ratified by the Peace Treaty of Bucharest (August 1913).

On p.116, Ačkovska sums up the outcome of the Balkan Wars as: …catastrophic for Macedonia. She was partitioned among
Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria, with a small part also annexed to the fledgling Albanian state.

In the second Grade 7 history textbook, by Ristovski and team, p.97, the aim of the Balkan Wars was ‘to expel the Osmanlis from the Balkans and to partition the regions that had been under their sway’. In a view expressed on p.130, ‘the Second Balkan War took on an overt, conquering, and anti-Macedonian aspect, as Greek soldiers distinguished themselves by the crimes they committed against the unarmed Macedonian population’. At p.131 the authors comment:

The Bucharest Peace Treaty had grave political, ethnic, and economic consequences for the Macedonian people. The treaty meant that the territorial and ethnic unity of Macedonia was disrupted; that a process began of ethnic expulsion of the Macedonian people and colonization by a non-Macedonian population, the aim being to alter the traditional historical ethnic character of Macedonia. The name Macedonia and the language Macedonian were banned; and the Balkan states carried out a policy of assimilation and denationalization. The Macedonian economy was in ruins, and the population was forced to emigrate from its native land.

On p.135 we read:

By the Treaty of Bucharest on 30th July/10th August 1913, Macedonia was partitioned four ways between the combatant powers: Serbia (Vardar Macedonia), Greece (Aegean Macedonia), Bulgaria (Pirin Macedonia), with a smaller piece thrown to the newly founded state of Albania. This act disrupted the totality of Macedonia, and it was upheld by the Versailles Peace Treaty (1919) and the Paris Peace Treaty (1946).

The ‘partition of the fatherland’ is given visual form by maps of various kinds. On p.114 of Ačkovska and team’s Grade 7 textbook there is a map with the title Macedonia after the First Balkan War. The ‘Greek occupation zone'
is shown in yellow, the ‘Serbian occupation zone’ in red, and the ‘Bulgarian occupation zone’ in green.

In Ristovski and team’s Grade 8 history textbook (p.14), the title of the map is Macedonia, as partitioned after the First World War. A footnote tells the reader that the broken line represents ‘state borders’, the continuous line ‘the boundaries of Macedonia’, the colour yellow ‘Greek occupation’, the colour blue ‘Serb occupation’, the colour mauve ‘Bulgarian occupation’, and the colour yellow ‘Albanian occupation’.

On p.131 of Ristovski and team’s Grade 7 history textbook, the map entitled Macedonia and her geographical and ethnic borders after Partition (1913). Here the footnote tells the reader that the broken line represents ‘state borders’. It should be pointed out here that the Ristovski who is the author of these handbooks is none other than Blaže Ristovski, a notable Academician and a former Vice-President of FYROM, in the years 1991-1992.

The same map reappears on p.54 of Velkovski’s textbook for primary school
Grade 8, where it is called simply *Partition of Macedonia*. The caption tells the reader that the yellow line marks ‘ethnic borders’ and the colour green indicates ‘the part of the region under Greek rule’.

On p.115 of the same textbook, the map’s title is *Macedonia after the Second Balkan War*. The colouring immediately suggests a unitary area partitioned between neighbour states. At the same time, pupils are urged in another of the handbooks [Velkovski, p.55], to remember the ‘historical ethnic borders of Macedonia’.
E. Oppression of the ‘Macedonian’ minority in Greece

The principal element in this approach is to have the pupils convinced that after ‘partition’ of the ‘fatherland’, there remained compact ‘Macedonian’ populations within the national borders of the ‘partitioning’ states. Greek Macedonia, after the Treaty of Bucharest, is characterized as ‘the Aegean part of Macedonia’ (Ristovski, Grade 8 history textbook, pp. 13, 31, 46, 86, 101, 103, 151-154 passim; Velkovski, Grade 8 history textbook, pp. 39, 53-54, 87, 110-114, 127, 150-151), leaving no doubt in the pupil’s mind that here is an irredenta portion of the ‘fatherland’.

The situation is described in the blackest hues. Ristovski (Grade 7 history textbook, p. 132) writes:

As a result of the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), Macedonia was partitioned between the Balkan States (Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Albania, which had only just been recognized). The partitioning of Macedonia had grave political, ethnic, and economic consequences. The Balkan states started to carry out a policy of expulsion of the Macedonian people and colonization by a non-Macedonian population. The name Macedonia and the Macedonian language were banned; and the Balkan states carried out a policy of assimilation and denationalization of the Macedonian population.

And in a separate chapter of the same book, ‘The Position of Macedonians in Greece’ is described thus (pp. 46 sq):

As a result of the Balkan Wars and the First World War, Greece had territorial expansion northwards (the Aegean part of Macedonia and Western Thrace). Most of the population [of the new territory] was of non-Greek, and mainly Macedonian, origin. After the First World War, Greece started to carry out a policy of expulsion of the Macedonian people and installation of a non-Macedonian population.

The Neuilly Peace Treaty envisaged ‘voluntary emigration’ of other-national population between Greece and Bulgaria. On the basis of this Treaty, 80,000 or more Macedonians were forced to emigrate to Bulgaria.

The Lausanne Peace Treaty (1923) envisaged a compulsory exchange of Muslims in Greece and Christians in Turkey. On the basis of this Treaty, almost 350,000 Muslims (Turks and Islamized Macedonians) were forced to emigrate to Turkey. Greece replaced them with a Greek and non-Greek Christian population of about 618,000. This altered the ethnic (Macedonian) character of the Aegean part of Macedonia. After the great colonization, all villages, towns, rivers, and mountains were christened with Greek names.

And on p.47: No sooner had the Peace Treaty of Bucharest
been signed, than Greece began to carry out a policy of assimilation and denationalization of the Macedonian people. The name Macedonia and the Macedonian language were banned. Macedonians were called Bulgarians, Slav-speaking Greeks, or ‘locals’ (aboriginals). The use of Macedonian in everyday life, at festivals, and at funerals was strictly forbidden. The Cyrillic script was removed from churches, monuments, and gravestones. Books in Slavonic were burned and destroyed. Only in 1925, and because of pressure from the League of Nations, did the Greek state print, at Athens, an Alphabet Book (Abecedar) in Macedonian, and in Roman letters; but because of reaction from Belgrade and Sofia this Alphabet Book was never used for the education of the Macedonian minority.

Pupils are given a similar picture in Velkovski’s handbook. In a chapter entitled ‘Macedonia’s Position after the Treaty of Bucharest’, they are required on page 51 to answer the question ‘Should we approve of the partition of regions, peoples, and states?’ They are then taught that:

In its desire to create a single-language state, the Greek state hastened to alter the ethnic character of [this] part of Macedonia by expulsion of the Macedonian population and colonization with a non-Macedonian population in these parts.

… This voluntary population exchange rested on the Neuilly Peace Treaty. What had been a treaty for the voluntary emigration of Macedonians in fact turned into a treaty for forcible emigration. To replace the emigrant Macedonian population, a Greek population was installed in [colonized] these parts.

After the great Greek colonization, the Greek state voted a law, in 1926, whereby the place names in the part of Macedonia lying in Greece changed. All villages, towns, rivers, and mountains were rechristened with Greek names.

After the political partition of Macedonia in 1913, the Greek state began to carry out an energetic policy of denationalization and assimilation of Macedonians. The name Macedonia and the Macedonian language were banned. Macedonians were called ‘Slav-speaking Greeks’. All Macedonians were obliged – and were forcibly constrained – to change their first name and surname. Macedonian was banned, and at the same time it was strictly forbidden to converse in Macedonian, even in the home.

In parallel, pupils are asked, in a homework exercise on p. 54, to answer questions the like of these: ‘What did the denationalization and assimilation of the Macedonian population in the Aegean part of Macedonia consist of?’ and ‘What was the policy carried out by the Greek state against the Macedonians
in the Aegean part of Macedonia?" The handbook also encourages pupils to study and learn more about ‘the process of disnationalization and assimilation by neighbouring peoples against the Macedonians.’

Pupils are taught that, despite the hostile situation that allegedly prevailed in Greek Macedonia, ‘Macedonians’ did not cease to fight for their national rights. Ristovski writes (p.47):

The Macedonians put up stiff resistance to the Greek policy of disnationalization and assimilation. In 1934, IMRO (United) was quite active, here as well, in promoting the Macedonian nation and the Macedonian language.

And on p.49: Under difficult conditions, under foreign rule, the partitioned Macedonians in various different states developed their activities to a significant degree, both in nationhood and politics, and in culture and education. They were actively involved in the ranks of the Communist Parties of Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Albania, and in other organizations.

In the case of Velkovski’s handbook, the writers have realized that a picture is more immediate than a text, and they embellish the chapter in question with a painting by a Greek artist, on page 39. The picture is titled in Greek, with the words Αη Λαός [‘the sainted People’]. It has typical Greeks (a soldier, an Evzone, and so on), the Greek flag, a quatrain from Ritsos (‘A little people, and it fights/though it has no swords and bullets…’), and is liberally sprinkled with Greek symbols. The caption for pupils reads: ‘Macedonians fighting for their national rights! As far as the aims of the ‘progressive Macedonian movement’ between the two World Wars are concerned, what Ristovski’s Grade 8 book has to say is:

All the Macedonian fighters ranged themselves on the side of national self-determination and the union of the Macedonian people into one separate state.

The Second World War is considered by the authors to have brought new troubles on the ‘Macedonians’, with their ‘fatherland’ having been ‘partitioned’ yet again by other dynasts. Velkovski’s chapter on this is adorned (p.100) with a map entitled Map of conquered Macedonia, after the handing over of the administration to Bulgaria by Germany. The caption to the map
marks ‘state borders’ with a broken line and ‘geographical and ethnic borders’ with a continuous line.

Ristovski’s other handbook, for Grade 8, gives much the same picture, with the map on page 87, entitled Partitioned Macedonia, after the 1941 Conquest. Here a broken line denotes ‘geographical and ethnic borders, deep blue the ‘German Occupation’, light blue the ‘Bulgarian Occupation’, yellow the ‘Italian Occupation’, and shocking pink the ‘Albanian Occupation’.

The assessment is, nevertheless, that the ‘Macedonian’ people did not accept the situation as a fait accompli, but began to organize their own struggle for freedom. This struggle is portrayed visually in maps of ‘free regions’. In Velkovski’s Grade 8 textbook (p.105), there is a map labelled The successes of Macedonian units helped to increase the free regions. The map
shows several regions of Greek Macedonia as ‘free’, leaving the pupil with the impression that they were liberated by Tito’s Partisans. This is a recycling of the familiar tale that ELAS permitted Partisan units to enter and to remain in Greek territory. It is true that ELAS – a Greek organization – did control a broad range of regions in Greek Macedonia, but these regions cannot be regarded as ‘liberated’.

An identical viewpoint is encouraged by two maps in Ristovski’s Grade 7 textbook. On the map (p.92) entitled Free regions of Macedonia in 1942 [see
previous page), several regions of Greek Macedonia have been coloured blue, as ‘free’, while another map (p.94) shows in colour the ‘free’ regions in the year 1943.

Ristovski’s Grade 8 history textbook describes the struggle of the ‘Macedonian’ movement under the Occupation as follows (p.103):

The Macedonians in the Aegean part of Macedonia took part in the Anti-Fascist Struggle. Throughout this struggle they promoted their cultural and national values. Throughout the Second World War, the Macedonians managed to promote Macedonian cultural and national values. In the People’s Liberation Struggle, various Macedonian newspapers were printed in Aegean Macedonia; for instance, ‘Slavjanomakedonski glas’ [Voice of the Slavomacedonians], ‘Iskra’ [The Spark], ‘Pobeda’ [Victory], and ‘Sloboda’ [Freedom]. The first Macedonian schools were opened. Textbooks and literature were printed. The Macedonian language was introduced into the liturgy.

Pupils get much the same picture from Velkovski (p.112). As regards the narrative of events in the Second World War, one observes an important different in Velkovski’s treatment of the Drama Revolt of 1941, seen by Slavomacedonian historians as an uprising of the ‘Macedonian’ people. In Velkovski’s textbook, on page 87, this revolt is treated as due to ‘pressure from the Bulgarian government at the expense of the Greek refugee population’. This policy (says Velkovski) caused ‘great dissatisfaction among the Greek and Macedonian population’, the result being the outbreak of the Drama Revolt, in which ‘among those taking part were Macedonians under the influence of the Greek Communist Party’.
At all events, both textbooks are in agreement that ‘after 1945, all the gains of the Macedonian people were wiped out once more by the Greek state, and Greece went on with her traditional policy of disnationalization and assimilation of the Macedonian people in this part of Macedonia’ (Velkovski, p.112; Ristovski, p.103).

The two textbooks also converge in their view of the Greek Civil War, opining that it was the Slavomacedonians who were ‘the basic player in the war’ (Ristovski, p.152; Velkovski, p.151). In Ristovski’s words (p.154):

After the defeat of the Greek Democratic Army, the Aegean part of Macedonia suffered great hardship. There was great material damage, with natural wealth and foodstuffs being destroyed. Above and beyond this, there were some 21,000 Macedonian dead there: in the 1951 Census there was no mention of 46 Macedonian villages that had had a total population of 20,913 in the year 1940. A large number of villagers were forcibly evicted from their homes. Some 20,000 Macedonians were compelled to flee across the border, taking refuge in Vardar Macedonia, various districts of Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, and the USSR. It was yet one more exodus in the history of the Macedonian people.

On the same page Ristovski speaks of ‘the founding of the free Macedonian state – that is, the People’s Republic of Makedonija – characterized moreover as ‘free Macedonia’. These references effortlessly lead the pupil to the conclusion that the remaining parts of Macedonia were ‘enslaved’.

Greece’s postwar policy is then described as ‘a policy of disnationalization and assimilation, while we read that ‘Macedonians taking refuge in East European countries were stripped of their citizenship, and banned from returning to the country, their property rights not being acknowledged’ (Velkovski, p.151). Greece’s policy is compared to Turkey’s: the two countries ‘do not respect the national rights of their minorities (Macedonians, and Kurds’)’. It is however conceded that:

Within the last few years, as a result of pressure from the international community, we can observe both in Greece and in Turkey a more tolerant attitude to demonstrations by Macedonians and Kurds (Ristovski, p.116).

From 1990 onwards, there have been significant changes in Greece as regards Macedonians. In the Aegean part of Macedonia, despite all the difficulties, Macedonian organizations, such as The Rainbow, have been founded, and Macedonian newsheets, such as Zora and Nea Zora [The Dawn, The New Dawn] have been printed. In Moglena, in 2001, the first Macedonian church (Aghia Chrysi Moglenon) was consecrated. But all of this has been done without the use of the nation’s name, and without official recognition. (Ristovski, p.152).
F. Cultivation of Albanian irredentism

There is some limited cultivation of Albanian irredentism in FYROM school history textbooks, limited mainly because the material on the history of the Albanian nation occupies relatively less space. Be this as it may, the pattern of developing the theme is not dissimilar to the corresponding pattern for the Slavomacedonians. We will confine ourselves to elements whose aim is to mark out ‘Albanian’ territory and its ‘partitioning’, and to ‘prove’ that the Greek state has a ‘repressive’ policy.

On page 50 of the Ačkovska and team textbook, it is asserted that ‘the Albanians did not agree with the reforms, and they decided to put up resistance as these reforms were being put into practice. In 1833 revolts broke out from the Çamëri to Shkodër, and from the Korçë area to Vlorë’. A little later, on page 52, there is a reference to alleged plans for the partition of Albania, with the assertion that ‘even before the outbreak of the Eastern Crisis in the 1870s, the neighbouring Balkan states – Greece, Serbia, and Montenegro – had plans to extend their borders in regions with an Albanian population’. An Act of Partition was, say the authors, signed at Budapest. It is also opined, on page 53, that:

With this agreement we have the partition of regions where Albanians had long been living. Specific regions of the Ottoman state would pass into the hands of Greece, while Serbia would be given Kosovo and Montenegro would be given parts of northern Albania.

Following the incorporation of ‘Albanian’ regions into Greek territory, the Greek state began (it is claimed) to oppress the Albanian population. Page 73 of Ačkovska ’s textbook says:

The condition of Albanians in the Çamëri, which remained within the frame of the Greek state, continued to deteriorate, the Greek government refusing the Albanians all cultural and educational rights, and indeed preventing them from expressing themselves as Albanians. The Albanians doggedly sought the help of the Great Powers, but all their efforts were without result.

A similar picture of ‘oppression’ is painted for the period between the two World Wars, by Ristovski and team (p. 120):

But Albanians in Greece were in a completely different situation. The Metaxas government exercised great pressure on Albanians in the Çamëri. A large number of males aged from 16 to 70 were thrown into jail and shipped to the Greek islands.

Of the period of the Greek-Albanian War, Velkovski and team write (p.92):

With the help of Albanian warriors, the Greek army soon recaptured the Çamëri. The Albanian people in the Çamëri played their part in the struggle against the Fascists. In the
summer of 1943, the Albanian warriors of the Çamëri joined forces with units of the Greek army as a common army in the struggle against the conqueror, while in the Spring of 1944 the Ali Demi brigade was formed and incorporated in ELAS.

Of the puppet state set up by the Italians Velkovski and team write (p.91):

This was not a national Albania, for it did not include all regions inhabited by Albanians. The Çamëri, a region in Greece where there were a large number of Albanians, lay outside its borders.

In parallel, the events of 1944 in Epirus are thus described by Ristovski and team (p.120):

In June 1944, when the Germans had withdrawn, a general assault began on the Albanian population of the Çamëri. More than a thousand men, women and children were killed. Many were subsequently forced to escape to Albania.

The passages quoted make it clear that despite some improvements and some toning down of excesses of language intended to fire up the pupils, FYROM’s primary school history textbooks, taken as a whole, continue to recycle the stereotypes of Slavomacedonian history-writing from 1945 onwards. ‘Greater Macedonia’ is presented as an unbreakable unity in time and place. Furthermore, today’s Slavomacedonians appear as the heirs to the history and civilization of the ancient Macedonians. Another sacred cow is the ‘partition’ of ‘ethnic and geographical Macedonia’ by the Treaty of Bucharest. This treaty is seen as the origin of the ‘oppression’ of the ‘Macedonians’ who stayed behind in ‘Aegean Macedonia’. Lastly, and not without its interest, there is the surfacing, in FYROM school textbooks, of Albanian nationalism: this, even if limited in extent, makes for similar stereotypes for ‘Tsamouria’ (Çamëri).
Vlasis Vlasidis

Irredentism on the Internet

The rekindling of the Macedonian Question at the start of the 1990s, as Jugoslavia disintegrated and FYROM came into existence, put what was already a complex issue on quite new foundations. This time, communications were the ‘other means’ by which war was continued, the aim being to impress. Traditional media apart, conflict spread to new fields unknown to earlier generations. Under these conditions, the Internet was flooded with the views of those who were caught up in the Macedonian Question. Hardly were the 1990s upon us than the Slavomacedonian diaspora – individuals and organizations belonging to the fledgling state that would later be known as FYROM – began to make use of the Internet as a way of putting forward their views, as an information board, and as a medium for communicating with the rest of the world. They proved to be quite successful, for reasons which will be explained below.

About the theory

The Internet is one of the most significant advances in human communication. It has reset the way people communicate with one another and it has redefined people’s relations with information media and organized bodies. When it first arrived it was regarded as an exotic. This meant that it caught the attention not only of the general public but of researchers in the social sciences. The result was a plethora of articles about this wonderful new medium, never mind that it was extremely difficult to foresee what effect it would have in the long run.¹

One immediate problem for theoreticians was this particular medium’s character and potential. Another was its importance and the changes it would bring about in communications. Literally hundreds, if not thousands of articles were written on this, and further hundreds of co-authored volumes appeared, mostly in England and America. This was only natural. Even political communication did not have a long history before the Internet came on the scene. Meanwhile there were numerous, and conflicting, opinions about how to approach information media, how to evaluate them, and what message they would convey.

In particular, until the end of the Second World War, the importance of communication in the development of societies had been insufficiently appreciated. It was Harold Innis² who first formulated the idea that communication plays a very significant part in the development of societies, and that the development of technology influences the character of communication and the openings for it, hence bringing about dramatic changes, or even structural alterations, in societies.

Innis’ pupil Marshall McLuhan³ studied relations between the individual and technology in communication. Taking as his basis the attraction and the impact of television, he formulated the view that what matters is not so much the message per se, but the medium used to transmit the message. The average citizen reckons that something is important simply because she or he saw it on the telly, and not because of its intrinsic value.

The same line – the need to make clear the importance of the medium – was also taken by Dallas Smythe.⁴ What Smythe concentrated on was the relationship linking technology with institutions, organizations, and large companies. One of his main theses was that those in power want people to fully accept new technologies as such, instead of wanting to create the services people actually need. He dedicated himself actually to persuading institutes,
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organizations and companies to understand people’s needs before going on to develop the tools to satisfy those needs.\textsuperscript{7} Another school of thought is associated with the name of Jürgen Habermas. Revising the negative attitude to the media of such leading members of the Frankfurt School as Adorno, Horkheimer, or Marcuse, he concerned himself with the importance of the media in creating and developing contemporary democratic political systems and the civil society.\textsuperscript{8}

To a third school of thought, the Hermeneutics, belong those who have laid special emphasis on the way individuals interpret the messages broadcast by the media, and the way these individuals use these messages in their everyday lives and their relationships with other individuals\textsuperscript{9}. Lastly there is the political thinking of Joshua Meyrowitz, which has been, and still remains, popular. Combining elements of all three schools of thought mentioned above, Meyrowitz focuses on the role of the electronic media.\textsuperscript{10} It can thus be seen that even before the Internet began to become popular, there was ferment, controversy even, in theories about the part played by the media in contemporary society.

So it was logical that the appearance of the Internet should result in a whole series of analyses of its possible effects on personal, and in particular social, relationships. The issue of greatest interest was whether it would change the way people talked politics, or perhaps even replace the way politicians talked politics in a democracy. Thus some saw the Internet as the new public platform,\textsuperscript{11} the medium whereby one could become a more active citizen,\textsuperscript{12} while others explored the ability it gave a small party to reach a wide public.\textsuperscript{13}

In liberal theory, the Internet is (or ought to be) a public domain in which individuals of differing social backgrounds, cultures and origins are able to freely discuss whatever is interesting. Waldstein saw this view as reflecting the ideas of Habermas about communication without obstacles, noting however that the Internet does not cease to be a domain defined by power relationships.\textsuperscript{14} A number of researchers have viewed the Internet as in contradistinction to TV – the medium that provides everybody with the same access and the same rights, so much so that it could become the model for some other, truly liberal society.\textsuperscript{15}

As regards the organization of state and society, many have asserted that the Internet was in line to alter the way we perceive society or at least the way we perceive the relations between the citizen and the state. As early as 1997, Dertouzos was estimating that the concept of the ‘nation’ (ethnos) would in future not be identifiable with a physical area, but would have the meaning of ‘belonging’: that is, it would be closer to what the ancient Greeks meant by ethos. Just as the ‘nation’ will not be effaced by these new technologies, so the national culture of peoples and their cultural heritage will not be effaced by a process of creating a global culture. What may happen is rather the opposite: we may all of us enhance our contact with other cultures, or even enhance communication between peoples as entire wholes.\textsuperscript{16} Negroponte went still further: the Internet can (he says) bring about radical changes in international relations. ‘It is thanks to the Internet’ (he wrote in 1997) ‘that the children of the future will not even know what nationalism means’.\textsuperscript{17} But whereas Dertouzos may to a large

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7} On Smythe and his work, see V. Mosco, M. Pendakur, J. Wesci (eds.), Illuminating the Blindspots: Essays in Honor of Dallas Smythe, Norwood New Jersey, Ablex, 1993.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1989.
\item \textsuperscript{11} Joshua Meyrowitz, No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior, New York, Oxford University Press, 1985.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Zizi Papacharissi, ‘The Virtual sphere: The Internet as a public sphere’, New Media and Society, 4 (1) 2002, 9-27.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Damian Tambini, ‘New Media and Democracy. The civic networking movement’, New Media and Society, 1 (3), 1999, 305-329.
\item \textsuperscript{14} L. Clare Baten ‘On line 2a6oty: La Francedu people virtuel’, New Media and Society, 7(4) 2005, 517-532.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Maxim Waldstein, ‘The politics on the web: the case of one newsgroup’, Media, Culture and Society, 27 (2005), 740, 759.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Michael Dertouzos, What Will Be. How the New World of Information Will Change our Lives, New York, 1997, p. 282.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p.283.
\end{itemize}
The beginnings of Internet controversy about the Macedonian Question

What we need to take into account is the background of the Internet confrontation between Slavomacedonians and Greeks in the early 1990s: the general conflagration in the Balkans; the attempt by America to create, for its own benefit, a new status quo in the former Eastern Bloc; the ideological positions taken up by various European states as to how to deal with these transitional and disintegrating societies; and the prestige enjoyed, after the successful conclusion of the Israeli-Palestinian Oslo Agreement, by NGOs, resulting in generous funding.

Regionally, there was the tension, at all levels, between FYROM and Greece, a tension full of confrontations. This involved the use of any and every means to undercut the bargaining power of the other side during negotiations about FYROM’s eventual name and about not only bilateral relations, but external relations with the USA and the EU. There was also the fact that in each of these two countries, up until 1998, the media offered a more or less negative picture of the other, so perpetuating confrontation and hindering the political leaders on both sides from getting any closer to one another.

Both in Greece and in FYROM, those who rushed to the defence of the national battlements on the Internet were the young, students at universities abroad, research workers, university and school teachers, and young second generation emigrants with a good education, involved only to a slight or minimal degree with émigré organizations in the host country. Since the activities and the style of diaspora organizations leave them cold, these young people will normally refrain from them. FYROM’s independence and the consequent reignition of the Macedonian Question was a very different matter. It went straight to their hearts; to a great extent they identified the defence of the national position on the Internet with their own knowledge and with their own chosen means of communication. Furthermore, they could now close ranks around a collective Internet identity, and the occasional use of this identity would be more significant to them than their identity in the natural world.

The first appearance of controversy was on Usenet, at the virtual cafes which were the haunt of Internet users logged on to a particular subject, topic, or personal interest. These
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forums started to be popular with users with a declared interest in the Macedonian Question. Sometimes they sent emails using their real names, sometimes they had a pseudonym giving a clue to what they wanted to identify with or hype up. This produced groups such as a social culture, macedonia and newsgroup.alt.news.macedonia. The primary basis for the kind of information they used to hype their views was their personal experiences, hearsay, news items and academic texts, and NGO reports.

Because it was not feasible for people of Greek and Slavomacedonian origin to work together, what eventually happened was that there were two newsgroups: Greek Macedonia (Macedonia@husc.harvard.edu) and Slavomacedonian Macedon (Makedon@ubvm.cc.buffalo.edu), each mainly engaged with the controversy surrounding the Macedonian Question. The aim of this separation was to define the two sides and to make their positions quite clear. There were, it is true, faint signs of people from the opposite camp, the ‘rival’ national community, asking to be admitted to a newsgroup. Sometimes the motive was a genuine desire to keep up with the newsgroups, for personal or professional or academic reasons. Or the intention was to ‘troll’, that is, to take part in the discussions in such a way as to reduce the effectiveness of the newsgroup.

Thus both Greeks and Slavomacedonians have tended to entrench themselves in various different newsgroups, and various different third parties on each newsgroup have tended to play a complementary role. This is due to the general habit among Internet users of trying to find a niche somewhere or other – most commonly in areas where there are other users who share the same ideas, views and convictions. In essence, they tend to create lookalike Internet communities similar to those that have been ‘really’ created in the various stages of social organization.

There was Internet war between Greeks and Slavomacedonians over the ownership and use of the two terms ‘Macedonia’ and ‘Macedonian’, and also about naming of websites, since what everybody was after was to get the best possible registration with search engines such as Yahoo or Lycos. This was an important element, whether in relation to matters of identity, or to accessibility to visitors. Research has shown that most Internet users do not search beyond three pages of search engine results.

People quickly began to create their own webpages so as to get better exposure for their views on the Macedonian Question. The most active in coordinating this movement were Steve Saragi, a second-generation émigré from Agios Germanos, at the time a student at Toronto University; Kiril Vidimčê, at the University of Minnesota; Igor Trojovski, at the University of Arizona; Boris Šoposki, from Tetovo, at the Rochester Institute of Technology; Alexander Shopov, in Sydney; and Aleksandar Konenči, editor for the Historical Dictionary of the Republic of Macedonia [sic] and for the TV channel Canadian Macedonian News BBS. These same people also created an e-catering service called MAK-NEWS, hosted by some computer or other at the University of Buffalo in the United States.

Most of the foregoing opted, consciously or unconsciously, to use these stereotypes. This arose from the need to validate Macedonian Identity perse, and to promote it in accordace with their convictions. Thus the Macedonian symbols were widely employed by both sides. Significantly, it was the same symbols that both sides borrowed from the past in order to prove their identity. Whether Slavomacedonian or Greek, in the present, these two identities, different form one another, are legitimated by the relationship with one and the same Macedonian past.

27. On ‘trolls’ and ‘trolling’ see Donath, op.cit., pp.45-49.
29. For example, www.macedonia.com was secured by the Greeks, and www.macedonia.net and www.macedonia.org were secured by the Slavomacedonians.
32. Both Donath J. S. Donath, ‘Identity and Deception in the Virtual Community’, in M.A. Smith, P.Kollock (eds.), Communities in Cyberspace, New York, Routledge, 1999, p.30 and Walther (J. B. Walther, “Group and Interpersonal Effects in International Computer Mediated Collaboration”, Human Communication Research, 23 (3) 1997, 346) think that taking part in the Internet makes most people want to burst out their anonymity with a declaration of identity. Walther emphasizes the need to use stereotype images in order to make it easier to identify with a group, a country, a place, or a culture.
It was in this context of individual initiative and personal drive that HR-NET and MAKEDON were born and functioned. Here were people who were essentially volunteers, joining forces with the common aim of doing something to bring to public notice the position of their own side in the controversy over the Macedonian Question. This kind of citizen movement was one which has developed only in the last twenty or thirty years. Until 1998 if not later, a site’s influence was out of all proportion to the type and size of its proprietor. Quite often a team of two or three people who knew a bit of English, who could write Internet texts, who had some personal contact or acquaintance with foreign journalists or members of international NGOs, would have many times greater effect that a news agency of the traditional type with dozens or hundreds of employees, and rigid horizontal and vertical structuring, but only plugging traditional national rights in an outmoded and stilted language of denunciation.

The Former Jugoslav Republic of Makedonia (FYROM) was later than other Balkan countries to have its own (official) presence on the Net. In 1994-1995, with academic bodies and university institutes from other countries already ‘on’, FYROM was conspicuous by its absence. This lag was due to various factors: the new infrastructures that FYROM had to create after independence, the Greek embargo, constant protest by Greek Internet users about the use of the name ‘Macedonia’, the two-letter ISO code, and so on and so forth, including, strange as it may seem, the UN embargo on Jugoslavia.

It was partly thanks to FYROM’s voice on the Internet that George Soros’ ‘Open Foundation’ made itself heard, and loudly too. As part of its goal to enhance private information media, it activated a server enabling non-state media or other news sources to appear on the Net. Immensely important was a grant of 25.000.000 USD from the Foundation for developing private information media in FYROM, setting up NGOs, and promoting the concept of the civil society. It was indeed the first player to make this grant, with the IMF giving the first loan early in 99. The result was that the media market oriented to American rather than European models. To get the whole operation off the ground, the Open Foundation encouraged cooperation between the grant-receiving bodies and Press organizations in other countries. At the same time it promoted material produced by media in Open Foundation collaterals.

---

For more about this phenomenon, see Damian Tambini, ‘New Media and Democracy. The civic networking movement’, New Media and Society, 1 (3) 1999, 305-329.

Not that this practice was confined only to the Greece-FYROM dispute. An even more typical case was the great impact of the www.alb-net.com website managed by Albanian Kosovar volunteers. This was ahead of all the media in posting photographs of the slaughter in the village of Račak. Contrast the very slight impact of the once mighty and independent Jugoslav State News Agency Tanjug, which had been utterly discredited during the autocratic rule of Milošević.

and in international NGOs in Europe, the United States, and Australia. The Macedonian Information Center and the Macedonian Information and Liaison Service were not slow to make use of the opportunities provided. They put out a daily news bulletin (in English), with brief coverage of the political scene and more extensive coverage of FYROM’s foreign policy, economy, cultural life, and historical past. The bulletin was posted on the Internet for Slavomacedonians abroad and for the media in Canada and Australia.

The lull in the Macedonian Question after the signing of the Interim Agreement in 1995 was matched by a slump in the number of visits to related websites. Numerous sites became ‘inactive’, and others changed their subject matter. But some were still up and running, and others would appear in the course of time, relying no longer on the enthusiasm of volunteers, but on communications theory. Moreover, as time went by and use of the internet increased, it became clear that an Internet source was losing its strangeness for the general public. It was the professional communications scientists in hermeneutics who seem to have found the solution: they placed more importance on the message, and less on the medium. The need was now to write texts that were accompanied by other audiovisual material, such as photos, video, and graphics, the aim being to grab the user’s attention right away and persuade her or him that the source message was important enough to be worth getting, by them and by others.

The Slavomacedonian Internet in the 21st century

From the middle of the first decade on the 21st century onwards, there is little in the Slavomacedonian Internet to remind us of those first heroic two years from 1992 through 1994.

37. The Macedonian Information Center (MIC) was an organ of the World Macedonian Congress, under the direction of Andoni Mitrev and Vladimir Petreski. The Macedonian Information Liaison Service (MILS) was set up by the Ilinden Foundation and the Support Committee for European Integration, under the direction of Ljupčo Naumovski.
Content

A. The texts

Practically all the sites have texts about the historical past, and focus on specific historical periods. Numerous texts have a narrative basis. Less often a text will deal with archaeology, or the cultural heritage. Texts about social anthropology are very rare indeed. These texts are normally excerpts from other texts already published in books, magazines, or newspapers. Texts written specifically for the Internet are rare. Earlier, in the 1990s, a large number of the texts for Slavomacedonian Net users drew on the work of foreign writers – mainly social anthropologists, historians, or journalists. In the last few years things have changed. The majority of the texts are written in a simplified language, by the woman or man in the street – whether from FYROM itself, or, and more and more, by Slavomacedonian expatriates of Greek Macedonian origin living in Australia. Two very typical examples, both written by Christ Stefanou [Risto Stefanou], from Trigono near Florina, are History of the Macedonian People from the [sic] Ancient Times to the Present and Macedonia. What went Wrong in the last 200 Years? The second of these was first published on the website of the author’s brother (www.oschima.com), along with other personal histories by people from Trigono.

Stefanou’s texts are reproduced on www.unitedmacedonians.org (the site of Boris Mangov in Toronto), on www.maknews.com, on www.mymacedonia.net, and in the FYROM wikibooks. It is undoubtedly these wikibooks that are visited most frequently, in fact more than any other website originating from FYROM. A similarly much-visited item is the Google link for the history of Macedonia. Also popular with Net users is Aleksandar Dončki’s book The Descendants of Alexander the Great of Macedon.

Most of the earlier texts were about the ethnogenesis of the Slavomacedonians in the 19th century, and about the Ilinden Uprising was a crucial point for the appearance of the Slavomacedonians on the stage of modern history. Omnipresent were the two figures of Goče Delčev and Krste Misirkov. Today that particular period of history receives very little attention. Though there is still a website dedicated to Misirkov (www.misirkov.org), with a whole battery of texts about the difference between the Slavomacedonians and other Slavic nations, there is no information link to it from any other site. Probably Slavomacedonians are no longer worried about getting the international community to understand just how they are different from the Bulgarians, or it may be that this aim has already been achieved.

Slavomacedonian attention has now been transferred to the distant past, to Ancient Times. Over the past three years there has been a substantial increase in the number of texts about ancient Macedonia, from the Neolithic Age to the time descendants of Alexander the Great. The aim is to demonstrate that the Macedonian past was not firmly anchored to the Greek past. Instead, what they try to prove is that the ancient Macedonians were a completely different people, of different origin, with a different path through history, a different way of conducting politics, a different civilization, and a different language, from the Greeks. The purpose of this fixation with ancient Macedonia is to establish a separate Macedonian identity, as different from the Greek as chalk from cheese. This identity is to have Antiquity as its starting point. Historically, it is to move parallel with, but always apart from and different from, the Greeks. It would seem that neither of the two previous accounts will do any longer: the ‘19th-century ethnogenesis’ theory, or the once popular ‘inflationary’ theory of an ethnogenesis at the time when the Slavs were settling the Balkan. Instead, the forming of a separate ‘Macedonian identity’, way back in ancient times, makes it easier for Slavomacedonians to do two things: to be accepted as direct heirs of the ancient Macedonians, in historical continuity with them, and to deny the right of any other people to lay lawful claim to the Macedonian heritage.

This is essentially an attempt at the invention of a past based on full estrangement of Macedonians from Greeks. To bolster their position, these authors will even quote studies on genetics ‘proving’ that the Greeks were a people from the Sub-Sahara, and therefore with no underlying kinship with the ancient Macedonians. The texts are often in the form of a ‘proof’ or a ‘revelation’ or a reply to some rhetorical question: the proof of the difference between Greeks and Macedonians, the revelation of lying Greek words and the manifestation of historical truth.

Naturally enough, evidence from historical sources to support these views is either not there at all or is so fragmentary that only a very naïve reader would accept the ‘proof’. But most of those who visit these sites are not usually well acquainted with the Macedonian Question, or (what is still worse) are out of touch with the science of history. This means that they can all too easily swallow the fragments laid out for them on the Macedonian websites. Conversely, if you make the effort to investigate the sources, you will soon find either that the English translation of the ancient Greek is inaccurate or that in another part of the same text the writer expresses a different view.

The texts discussing the identity of the ancient Macedonians’ language are in much the same vein. Scratch marks on rocks and bits of inscriptions are quoted in support of the view that the ancient Macedonians spoke a language different from Greek, and that the symbols of their script were not the same as the letters of the Greek alphabet. The evidence is thin, to say the least, and the authors make no mention of the incomparably larger number of inscriptions discovered in the country, written in the Greek language and the Greek script. The painful lack of testimony is again obvious from the fact that, on these very same webpages, an independent effort is made with reference to the historical past to prove the non-Greekness of Macedonia, the above evidence is not used at all and passages from Greek and Roman writers are quoted instead.

Very few articles bother with Roman or Byzantine Macedonia. Those that do, mainly concentrate on Tsar Samouil and ignore the achievements of the Macedonian Dynasty. There is not much greater enthusiasm for Macedonia in the early years of Ottoman rule, whereas the opposite is true when the texts are examining the 19th century and the ‘Macedonian nation’ has an easier job of it to make its debut.

It is a striking fact that there is no place in this historical myth for references to the Slav past and Slav identity. Until recently there were a lot of Internet texts about the way Slav populations settled the Balkan and about their (hypothetically!) obvious Macedonian identity. These texts have now disappeared. The change of position is accounted for by what is a new and quite remarkable thesis that the Slav origin of the Slavomacedonians was due to pressure from the Soviet Union and Jugoslavia, hence from ‘evil’ Communist propaganda. Even to the recent Slav past, references are not many. Thus while the Slavomacedonians lay claim to the Bulgarian National Awakening almost in its entirety, there is nothing about relations with Russia in the 19th century, let alone Panslavism. The silence is deafening. It is only too easy to suppose that the appearance of texts about Russian and Panslavism would have been read as covert goodwill, or indeed preference, for the Russia of today – far from desirable, seeing that FYROM’s government and opposition parties, to say nothing of the

---

8. The most important text is Vasil Ilyov’s, on Slavomacedonian websites, on http://www.unet.com.mk/ancient-macedonians/.
44. It is reproduced from ‘Ancient Quotes on the Macedonians as a Distinct Nation’, on http://www.historyofmacedonia.org/Ancient-Macedonia/AncientEvidence.html.
42. See 'Ancient Quotes on the Macedonians as a Distinct Nation', on http://www.historyofmacedonia.org/Ancient-Macedonia/AncientEvidence.html.
40. Translator’s note [i.e. the Byzantine imperial Macedonian Dynasty, beginning with Basil I, Translator’s note].
38. The most important text is Vasil Ilyov’s, on Slavomacedonian websites, on http://www.unet.com.mk/ancient-macedonians/.
34. 'Ancient Quotes on the Macedonians as a Distinct Nation', on http://www.historyofmacedonia.org/Ancient-Macedonia/AncientEvidence.html.
28. The most important text is Vasil Ilyov’s, on Slavomacedonian websites, on http://www.unet.com.mk/ancient-macedonians/.
18. The most important text is Vasil Ilyov’s, on Slavomacedonian websites, on http://www.unet.com.mk/ancient-macedonians/.
8. The most important text is Vasil Ilyov’s, on Slavomacedonian websites, on http://www.unet.com.mk/ancient-macedonians/.
Slavomacedonians abroad, are investing politically in ace relations with the United States.

This context, the deslavization of 'Macedonian' identity, explains a recent change of preferences with regard to the issue of the Christian religion. It is no accident that St Cyril and St Methodius, the 'Apostles to the Slavs', have steadily been marginalized in academic books and journals, in popular literature of all kinds, and on the Internet. This indicates that the Slavomacedonians want to build a historical identity far distant from any Slavic origin.

The place of Cyril and Methodius is now occupied by another apostle, St Paul. In the course of his journeys, Paul reached Macedonia and taught the Christian beliefs there. It follows that the conversion of the Macedonians (not of course Slav) took place centuries earlier. The inference is that St Cyril, St Methodius, and St Clement of Ohrid were responsible for that small part of the Slavs which settled in the Balkan in the eighth century, and which was then incorporated into the Macedonian mainstream.22

A hallmark of the published texts is their downplaying or their complete omission of the other ethnic groups in Macedonia. It is as if Ottomans, Greeks, Jews, Albanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Vlachs had never been. Even revolts by other ethnic groups are brazenly Macedonized. The role of the Albanians shifts, depending on where the website comes from, FYROM, Australia, or Canada. If from FYROM, Albanians are incorrigible baddies. If from Australia, there are no Albanians. The Exchange of Populations – Christians from Asia Minor for Muslims from Macedonia – that too is condemned, for two reasons: first, because Macedonia was settled with refugees, and second, because the half million Muslims exchanged in 1922 were not Turkish but Macedonian Muslims.23

A further accusation made in the texts consists of the personal testimonies of 'child refugees. The last twenty years or so have seen a steady stream of books of two types: 'I was there' accounts by child refugees from Western Macedonia recounting their experiences during the last two years of the Greek Civil War, or commemorative albums about Slavophone villages in the neighbourhood of Kastoria and Florina.24 Most are by émigrés now living in Canada or Australia, or by descendants of 'child refugees' who have emigrated to the New World. The various Slavomacedonian sites give these books (and their launches) exposure to the general public, taking advantage of the opportunity to enhance their webpages with quotes and photos.

All the narrative texts without exception hype the view that the Slavomacedonians were persecuted by the Greek authorities according to a prearranged plan, the goal being to cleanse Western Macedonia of non-Greek populations. For all these writers, the Greek Civil War and the great battles between the Greek Democratic Army and the Greek National Army were meaningless. No mention is made anywhere of the prearranged plan to remove children beyond the Greek borders, the Greek state's recourse to the United Nations for the return of the children to Greece, or the concentration of these children in 'child towns'; as if none of this had ever happened. Here the historical past does not exist; and the truth is a product only of their own recollections and the tales they heard when young, a substitute for historical reality.

The picture given of Greece is the blackest possible. FYROM's southern neighbour is the incarnation of absolute evil. It suffered no damage during the Civil War, and its only aim was to prevent the Slavomacedonians from unifying into a state as first created by Tito, if not actually to inflict ethnic cleansing on them. The texts are illustrated by photos of the idyllic life in the Slavophone villages around Kastoria and Florina before the Second World War, and of the same villages in ruins in the years that followed. The inference is that all of these villages were destroyed during raids by the Greek army, no matter if some of them were deserted simply because of mass emigration after the Civil War.25

6 The symbols and the maps
The texts apart, we should now look at the symbols and the maps that are used. The Slavomacedonian webpages display the symbols of the Macedonian Dynasty (King Philip

---

52. ‘History of the Macedonian Orthodox Church’, on http://www.mpc.org.mk/English/MPC/history-mpc.asp. Also ‘Immigration of the Macedonian Orthodox Church’, on http://www.m-p-c.org/history/history.htm.
53. ‘Similarly nearly half a million Muslim Macedonians, in spite of their cries that they were not Turks, were uprooted from Macedonia and forcibly evicted to Turkey’. Quoted from http://www.maknews.com/html/articles/stefov/stefov51.html.
55. There is a publishing house in Australia for Slavomacedonians' memoirs and recollections. It is called Pollitecon Publications, and its website is www.pollitecon.com.
Il II and King Alexander III), more or less constantly. They are doing this with pictorial materials that have been used for many decades not only by Greek scholars and official bodies, but by scholars the world over, as tokens and emblems of the Greek identity of ancient Macedonia. The materials in question are the head of Philip II from a gold amulet of Roman date (now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris); the Alara herm with the figure of Alexander the Great (now in the Louvre); and the Macedonian star of sixteen rays, as stamped on the chests in the Royal Tombs at Vergina.

Another symbol used on the webpages is the lion. This is not the same lion as the one used by Bulgarians and Slavomacedonians and is seen on the heraldic devices of state organizations and the political parties IMRO (Bulgaria) and IMRO-DPMNE (FYROM); it is the figure of the lion as depicted in works of art from ancient Macedonia. The most favoured type is the one from the hunting-scene, with two men and a lion, on the mosaic pavement from Pella. 56

The choice of these particular symbols is not surprising. Since the Slavomacedonians lay claim to the entire history and civilization of ancient Macedonia, it is logical that they should use the same symbols. What is surprising is that they adopt those very depictions of the symbols that demonstrate the Greek identity of Macedonia. Other versions of the symbols there are none - even though they might have been expected to use finds from excavations in Macedonian towns and tombs now inside FYROM territory. This attitude shows that the Slavomacedonians are after the entire ancient Macedonian legacy as it stands at present and not some different version or variation of it.

Maps are just as significant as the symbols. Essentially, there is not a Slavomacedonian webpage without its map. Every author dealing with the 'Macedonian national question', whether as an individual or as a representative of an organization, feels the need to display at least one map of Macedonia. This trend is only natural: Macedonia is not the best-known place in the world, and it needs to be put on the map.

The most popular of the published maps is that of Macedonia and its geographical boundaries as defined in the 19th century, a Macedonia marked off by the borders of FYROM.

Albania, Bulgaria, and Greece. The Internet public is deliberately led to believe that there are irredenta territorial regions and populations under foreign occupation, by the way in which Macedonia is pictured, with one part shown as the Republic of Macedonia (Republika Makedonija) and the other two parts as Pirinska Makedonija and Egejčka Makedonija. This map appears in several versions, but always in the same form, with Macedonia divided into three parts even when it supposedly presents today’s FYROM and her neighbours.8

Maps of ancient Macedonia and of the campaigns of Alexander the Great also make their appearance. In all the above maps Macedonia and Greece are shown as entirely discrete entities – as different states.8

Minorities

FYROM may well be a case of a state with limited national homogeneity. Its Slavomacedonians are 64.2% of the population. The rest is made up of minorities: Albanians (25.2%), Turks (3.9%), Roma (2.7%), Serbs (1.8%), and other peoples, mainly Vlachs and Bosnians (2.2%).9 The country is subject to frequent racial tension, the most acute being between Slavomacedonians and Albanians, which took the form of armed conflict in 2001. Strangely enough, however, national homogeneity and race relations are not particularly prominent on Slavomacedonian websites; and when they do appear, they are invariably about the Albanian minority, which is painted in the blackest of colours and is held responsible for all the miseries of Greece’s neighbour.0

What Slavomacedonian webpages do harp on is the ‘Macedonian minorities’ (real or supposed) living within the territory of neighbour states, and the official ‘oppression’ and ‘persecution’ which they suffer. Protest to international organizations and NGO reports appear alongside articles by journalists and doleful screeds about the fate of the ‘minorities.’ Many of the accusations made have been answered ad hoc, or have collapsed spontaneously. This makes no difference to our neighbours’ Internet. ‘Action stations’ is the word.61

Organizations

The Slavomacedonian presence on the Internet today consists of different webpages, chat rooms, and blogs. The webpages originate from the state, other organizations, public bodies and private individuals.

The webpages of state organizations are not self-evidently concerned with irredentism. What they have to say they say in the proper way, and that is what they are mainly interested in. There are no multiple references to the country’s ‘glorious past’. It is true that when it comes to display than one might have feared. Conversely, they make an attempt to be modern in conception and function and to resemble the webpages of better-developed states. Even the pages of local government organizations do not look permeated with hyped-up irredentist sentiments, or even with plugging a more progressive policy than the one adopted by the official state. The same goes for the parties – even for IMRO-DPMNE, which is trying to prove that today’s party is the direct descendant of IMRO of the early twentieth century.62 Public sector bodies by and large do not often make irredentist references on their pages: one thinks of the Macedonian Information Agency (www.mia.com.mk), the Emigration Office (www.emigration.com.mk), or the State Archives (www.archiv.gov.mk).

Only when we get away from the webpages of FYROM’s state organizations does the picture begin to change. Two categories are worth mentioning in this connection: NGOs, and Slavomacedonian expatriates.

The most important NGO is the Macedonian Human Rights Movement International (www.mhrmi.org). Its headquarters are in Toronto, Canada and it is mainly concerned with formulating accusations against (primarily) Greece and (secondarily) Bulgaria and Albania. The accusations are of violation of the human rights of the minorities in those countries. The reports contained on the MHRMI site are reproduced by all the webpages promoting FYROM’s irredentist propaganda, including the websites of many NGOs, voluntary organizations, and private individuals. Most of the articles are taken from the Helsinki Watch on Greece page (cm.greekhelsinki.gr/index.php), which is continuously brought up to date from European and Greek databases. The most important pages with texts of this sort are those of the Macedonian Human Rights Committee of Melbourne and Victoria,63 of the United Macedonian Diaspora,64 and of CMHRC, the Canadian Macedonian Human Rights Committee.

It might be claimed that these are routine pages of NGOs fighting to turn Balkan society into civil societies. But this seems not to be the case. Reading more closely between the lines, the only reports that the pages in question host are those of international and other bodies and organizations which relate to Slavophones in Greece, the Rainbow Party and related topics; they do not include any information about minorities or about human rights within FYROM.65 And their policy is in every case one of maintaining and archiving reports to the detriment of Greece – no matter if some of the charges have been shown in the course of time not to be well founded, or have been altered.

The United Macedonian Diaspora (http://www.umdiaspora.com) deserves special mention. Founded in Washington D.C. in 2004, its aim is to operate as a decision-influencing centre. Its basic goals are the unity of Slavomacedonian expatriates; recognition of the constitutional name of FYROM; human rights of minorities consisting of Macedonians; investment in FYROM; FYROM’s entry into the European Union and into NATO; and improvement of bilateral relations between FYROM and the USA.

The World Macedonian Congress and the United Macedonians are the major spokespersons

for Slavomacedonians abroad. They maintain a strong presence on the Internet. The WMC writes its texts mainly in Slavomacedonian, whereas the UM mainly uses English. Their pages are a long way from the moderation of FYROM’s state organizations. They engage in an overtly aggressive policy against Greece and Bulgaria, and cherish the idea of a Greater Macedonia. The UM, in particular, is a favourite arena for Risto Stefov, the man who feeds most of the irredentist Slavomacedonian propaganda webpages with his own writing.

Besides the above, there is a large number of Slavomacedonian expatriate organizations in Canada, Australia, and certain European countries, all maintaining Internet websites. Their pages are sometimes signed with the organization’s name, and at other times signed with emotive names from the historical past, such as ‘Goche Delchev’ or ‘Ilinden’. The material they host comes first and foremost from their own events and protests; secondarily it is made up of selected details about the identity of their country of origin and its history. This material is normally scrappy and artless, and the impression it makes on the visitor to the site is limited. If the Macedonian Question is what you are interested in, you would do better to go elsewhere.

The Canadian Macedonian Historical Society deserves special mention as well. This body mainly works offline, but it has a competent presence on the Net. Its webpage promotes the Society’s own events, but also hosts in their entirety all events taking place in Canada that have to do with the Slavomacedonian issue. It also holds lectures, and it maintains a library and a bookshop selling books on history and social anthropology. These reflect the opinions of the Slavomacedonian diaspora and have invariably been published outside FYROM.

The most effective propaganda pages, however, are those kept up by private individuals. Several of these are so full and well-designed that they must surely be maintained with substantial donations from various state organizations in FYROM, if not from diaspora communities. Or they may simply be due to the abilities of highly competent and highly active individuals dedicated to promoting the Slavomacedonian cause. Thus there is www.makedonija.info which belongs to Bill Nikolov, president of the Macedonian Human Rights Movement International, and www.oscchima.com which belongs to Risto Stefov, a familiar name since his texts are recycled on numerous Slavomacedonian websites. Five sites – mymacedonia.net, historyofmacedonia.org, maknews.com, www.macedon.org, and www.macedonia.org – contain no information giving a clue to the identity of their owner, leaving the field wide open for speculation.


How do all these sites communicate with each other, though? Do they have some specific intercommunication schedule? The answer is probably no. However most Slavomacedonians active on the Net do take part in a variety of Slavomacedonian forums that exist, mainly for expatriates. The most important of these is http://groups.yahoo.com/group/RMDigest/, which has a direct link to the Reality Macedonia site. Only a small number of members may be taking part in these forums, but most of them have sites of their own, so that every scrap of news or information will be passed on, to find its place – not automatically, but almost always – on many of the Slavomacedonian webpages, thus increasing its effect.

**Blogs**

Blogs are the latest trend on the Internet. If you have time to write, you keep an open diary at regular or irregular intervals. Your subjects may be public or private, topical or not. In many countries blogs are competing in influence with the more traditional information media. Even in FYROM, this kind of e-diary has just recently started to appear, covering numerous themes including politics.

Over the last two years Slavomacedonian blogs dealing with Macedonian issues have also made their debut. The best known is Macedonian Tendency (http://david-edenden.blogspot.com), belonging to David Edenden nickname of the writer from Greek Macedonia.

---

He puts forward his personal views, which are sometimes illiterate, on all the familiar subjects. Examples are: 'Hellenism is Nazism' [sic], 8 'Hitlerite Propaganda and “The Name Issue”'. 9 He is quite a popular blogger, so much so that he can give advice to politicians like Vasil Tupurkovski via established journalist sites. 0 Also highly active is http://makedonskistorija. blog.com.mk, belonging to an anonymous blogger, which is preoccupied with the identity and origins, primarily of the Bulgarians, and secondarily of the Greeks, in Macedonia.

There are of course other blogs, posted by Slavomacedonians in FYROM or in other countries, which deal with Macedonian issues and Greece, but they do not do so exclusively or on a daily basis. Examples are http://ilinden2000.makedonsko.drustvo.blog.com.mk, belonging to Aleks of Italy; http://blog.com.mk/node/76678, with information about Macedonia's civilization and its wines; and http://blog.com.mk/node/74417, belonging to Volan, dedicated to his ancestor Alexander the Great and to Slavomacedonian national identity.

Chat fora

What the Internet has certainly achieved is to put people from different national communities in touch with one another so they can chat or argue about subjects, which may be neutral or may be bristling with danger (e.g. national differences). Contact can be established in one of two ways. It may be indirect, as is the case with different webpages containing different opinions about a single issue, and addressed to the generality of Internet users, who are normally uninterested in this kind of subject. Or it may be direct, as with the chat forum. In the latter case, what is transferred to the Net is virtually all the social contracts of ‘real life’. Topics of political communication and political alliances are set down; power relationships are created. 10 The people taking part in the conflict are either advertising themselves under their true identity (if that is what they want) or creating a murky or entirely false identity. This makes them feel safe, and so they can express themselves more freely than in the real world. Moreover, not being able to resort to physical violence, they are not going to suffer violence themselves, which means that their words can be more scathing. They will probably also take up, and be seen to take up, a more extreme political position.

Taking part in an international forum may be regarded by most of us as an act of no importance, yet there are tens of thousands of people doing it. Most of those engaged in this way are from one of the professions or similar: academics, researchers, political scientists, or journalists, the world over. These fora reach a wider public when an issue shows signs of overheating, conflict, or crisis. Chat forum participants can address themselves to more individuals than just readers of scientific books and journals, or readers of newspapers with a small or middling circulation.

The most familiar Slavomacedonian forums are http://forums.vmacedonia.com/login.asp?target=default.asp; http://www.macedonians.proboards62.com; and http://forum.makedonija.name/. But there are many others, either based in FYROM or abroad. There are also, of course, analogous Greek forums dealing with Macedonia, the most important of these being (http://www.macedoniaontheweb.com/forum/). Since the Macedonian Question is a subject much discussed in many forums, it pops up elsewhere, sometimes in the expected place, for example the expatriate forum (http://www.omogena.com/forums/ubbthreads.php?Cat=0), and sometimes in the unexpected, for example the Greek football forum (http://www.greeksoccer.com/forums/index.php?s=d8340e07350c3b365d0d54c81625a&showforum=141). The balloon goes up whenever Greeks and Slavomacedonians meet on neutral ground to talk about the Macedonian Question and the identity of Macedonia, as on http://www.topix.net/forum/world/macedonia.

In any particular forum there may not be sufficient hard knowledge, but there is always pride, a romance, spite, and intransigence in overplus. Essentially it is the Slavomacedonians who are unwilling to enter into dialogue, since what they are trying to do is impose their view of the matter on everyone else. For them there is but one Macedonia, and it is theirs, a Macedonia belonging rightfully to them and to nobody else, Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian, Turk, or Jew.

Some write under their own name, others under an alias; but nearly all of them reveal a

strong ego and a strong superego identifiable with Macedonia itself. The longer the present state of the country remains lamentable, and the worse it becomes, the more often we shall hear a harking-back to the glorious Macedonian past. For that is how they try and dredge pride from the past to cope with the present and the future, and with the other Balkan peoples who are getting ahead faster than they are.

This discontent is particularly strong in the direction of all other neighbouring countries and other national groups within FYROM itself. Things may look all well and good on the surface, but the calm is completely deceptive. This is obvious from the Internet. There it is ‘other nations’ who always take the rap; while the Slavomacedonians, the chosen people, are always the victims. FYROM is never going to be a Balkan Switzerland.

Varying positions and plurality of viewpoints

If you are looking for variant theories about the ethnogenesis of the Slavomacedonians, or variant ideological approaches, you have only to surf the Slavomacedonian pages to be bitterly disappointed. There could be no sharper contrast with the Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian, or Albanian sites on ethnogenesis and the historical progress of the nation. Here a plurality of viewpoints and approaches coexist or even conflict. But such is not the Slavomacedonian Internet. All sites plug the same view of the ethnogenesis of the ancient Macedonians, their essential difference from the ancient Greeks, the non-Slav identity of the nation, oppression by neighbouring peoples, and deliberate expulsion of Slavomacedonians from Greek Macedonia after the Second World War.

There are no maverick views. The only difference between one site and the next is in the quantity of text, its quality, and the relative priority it gives to a particular period in history. This sameness of views and beliefs is also found in the chat fora, whether these are for the eyes of Slavomacedonian sympathisers only, or are meeting-places with Greeks and those who accept the Greek position. The monotonous uniformity of the views is such as to recall the conditions for expressing one’s views in the days of Communism, when every course and every priority, every person and the entire ideological framework, was centrally directed.

Concluding remarks

The Slavomacedonian Internet space devoted to national history and national culture is one where a bizarre new view is solidly hyped up. It is that today’s Slavomacedonians are not of Slav descent, but are direct descendants of the ancient Macedonians, who were of course nothing to do with the ancient Greeks, quite the contrary. The entire way the course of history is handled rests on this schema: contrast with the Greeks, and ‘proof’ of difference, and of Greek plotting against Macedonian ‘victims’. To bolster up these claims, use is made of the symbols that to this very day have symbolized that Macedonia has a Greek past; this is backed up by photographic material.

Greece is identified as the double-dyed villain of the piece. Down the centuries she has been in opposition to anything Macedonian; she has manifestly subverted it and attempted to Hellenize it. She has also been manifestly responsible for many of the miseries of her neighbour, and has even acted against the latter to a preconcerted plan.

It is no easy task to find a convincing explanation for this state of affairs. It would be unwise to treat all websites as centrally funded and controlled, by FYROM itself or by some body working hand in hand with it with the aim of telling the whole world about this bizarre new interpretation of the Macedonian past, and getting them to believe it as well. In the sophisticated age of globalization and free personal expression over the Internet, such an explanation is too simple. A more systematic approach will show that what is behind it is a combination of factors.

First and foremost, we ought to take account of education and the history of FYROM. On education and school textbooks in FYROM, see Stavroula Mavrogeni in the present volume, and her article ‘Μακεδονική σάρισσα και δικέφαλος αετός: Τα νέα σχολικά εγχειρίδια της ΠΓΔΜ’ [Macedonian lance and double-headed eagle: the new FYROM schoolbooks] (in Greek), in Evangelos Kofos, Vlasis Vlasidis & Yannis Stefanidis (eds.), Μακεδονικές ταυτότητες: Η διαχρονική τους πορεία [Macedonian identities: their course through the ages] Athens, Patakis, 008; and Vlasis Vlasidis, ‘We and the Others: Greece’s image in FYROM’s Press and...
with its new textbooks, is the one that young people in this country and the schools of the Macedonian diaspora grow up with.

The second factor is the choice of confrontation with the Greeks, since this is the easiest field in which to make a show of Slavomacedonian nationalism. Attempted confrontation with the Albanians was a traumatic experience for the Slavomacedonians. They were unable to attack by force of arms, since the international community and the Great Powers, led by the USA, overtly sided with the Albanians. The Ohrid Agreement, which established the Albanians as a regime to be reckoned with, also essentially turned FYROM into an internationalist state. Any attempt to overthrow the status quo might well have worsened FYROM’s relations with the USA, which is not at all desirable. Thus national pride is now seeking to heal its wounds by sparring with the Greeks, a strong but not in the least aggressive neighbour.

The third factor is the diaspora Slavomacedonians’ long-running confrontation with Greek emigrants, and above all Greek emigrants from Macedonia. The fact that the Greeks are more numerous, wealthier, better connected to power centres, and children of a country with a glorious past and present, causes Slavomacedonians a feeling of inferiority. It is only reasonable that they should be seeking to improve their self-confidence by laying claim to the glorious past of ancient Macedonia, so that they can continue the confrontation from a coign of better vantage.73

---

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS
‘Irredenta Aegean Macedonia’
2 August 1944: Charter manifesto of ASNOM, the Anti-Fascist People’s Liberation Council of Makedonija. The primary aim reveals itself as the unifying of Macedonia, based on the right to self-determination. ‘It is essential that we unite all the Macedonian people, from all three parts of Macedonia, into a single Macedonian national state…Macedonians from Greek and Bulgarian Macedonia must follow the example set by the Macedonians in Jugoslav Macedonia’. 
Dimitar Vlahov’s article in Nova Makedonija, 22 September 1946: the headline reads, “Greece has no right of any kind to Aegean Macedonia.”
Map published in Borba, the Jugoslav Communist Party’s official newspaper, on 26 August 1946. The map shows the ‘Geographical and Ethnic Boundaries of Macedonia’.

The last paragraph of an article about Pitu Guli. ‘After four years of bloody combat in the common struggle beside our brethren the Jugoslav peoples, the Macedonian people is now on equal terms with the other peoples of Jugoslavia. Today’s Socialist Republic of Makedonija has been born. It is looked to with pride, affection, and hope by Macedonians in Greece and in the Socialist Republic of Bulgaria, as by Macedonians scattered the world over’. The magazine Македонија, August 1973.
If cultural and artistic bodies today – in Sydney, Adelaide, Toronto, Melbourne, and elsewhere – display our rich Macedonian national culture, if we can speak today with satisfaction of our successes in the regions where we live, then we shall certainly conclude that this is the result [of the actions] of the Republic in this free segment of our homeland, and of all proud and honore[d] Macedonians the world over. The magazine Македонија, January 1977.
There is magic power in the free Part of our homeland.

The magazine Македониа, April 1977
Announcement in the magazine Македонија, April 1977:

‘Since a large number of our compatriots abroad have asked for recognition of their participation in NOV [the National War of Liberation], ELAS, or the DSE, we are publishing here, for their clearer information, the circular from the Pensions and War Victims Insurance Service of Makedonija, as it is of interest to our compatriots abroad.

As per legal requirements, NOV [the National War of Liberation], ELAS, or the DSE will, subject to the insured person’s making an application, supported by genuine evidence or by attested statements by witnesses, as an item of proof during proceedings, be confirmed by a ruling in writing.

Since the persons in question are living abroad, as regards their application for the determination of the specific length of time they spent in NOV [the National War of Liberation], ELAS, or the DSE, the ruling will be made by the Scientific Committee of the Pensions and War Victims Insurance Service of Makedonija with the prior subjoined opinion of the Skopje Committee of the Union of Societies of SDM Combatants.

In order to determine participation in NOV [the National War of Liberation], ELAS, or the DSE, in respect of citizen persons of the SFR of Yugoslavia now living abroad, the following documents are required compulsorily, in addition to the application to the Pensions and War Victims Insurance Service of Makedonija:

- Certificate of citizenship
- Birth certificate
- Genuine written proof of participation in NOV [the National War of Liberation], ELAS, or the DSE
- Applicant’s CV.
25 March 1905 was the day on which genocide in the Aegean Part of Macedonia began. The Greek nationalist regime continued with genocide in the following decades of the twentieth century, having seized Aegean Macedonia after the Balkan Wars by a quirk of history. Europe’s reaction to the genocidal slaughter at Zagoritsani resembled its reaction to further slaughter in Aegean Macedonia: it existed to some extent, but never strongly enough, never sufficiently resonantly, never sufficiently humanely to halt genocide in Aegean Macedonia, for Europe to wash away its guilt. The magazine Македонија, April 1982 issue.
Cover picture of waterfalls at Edessa. The magazine Македонија, June 1982.

Cover picture of the city of Kastoria. The magazine Македонија, October 1982.
▲ Special Number, ‘1st Meeting of Macedonians from Florina’. Printed beside an Open Letter by Done Pavlovski is a poem entitles ‘Makedonija’, by Georgi Bolčevski from the village of Buf [i.e. Akritas]. It reads:

From the Vardar [r. Axios] to Solun [Thessaloniki], / from Ohrid to Pirin:/ swift rivers, limpid lakes/broad meads, and hills/Such is my sweet/Makedonija!/
Divided in three/her soul is yet one,/For us she is undivided!/Goče [Delčev]’s heiress:/ Such is my sweet/Makedonija!/
VLINDEN’s our sun/OCTOBER’s our creed/the Republic of Kruševo/Tito’s handiwork:/ Such is my sweet/Makedonija!/
The magazine Македонija, November 1982.
Macedonia and its Relations with Greece, published by the FYROM Academy of Sciences.

Cover of Risto Andonovski’s The Truth about Aegean Macedonia.
Map of Macedonia Partitioned, with ‘Solun’ [i.e. Thessaloniki] at its centre.

'Greater Macedonia' poster of the early 1990s.

A 'Macedonia Partitioned' poster of 1983.
The ‘partition’ of ‘Greater Macedonia’ is the subject of a book published with a grant from the FYROM Ministry of Culture. The cover has a schematic map of ‘partitioned Macedonia’: Violetta Ačkovska & Nikola Žežov, Betrayal and Murder in Macedonian History, Skopje 2004 (in Slavmacedonian). The first few pages of the text (pp.11-17) describe the assassination of Philip II.

Great Britain & Macedonia, 1944-1945 [documents]. A sourcebook published by the FYROM Institute of National History. The map of ‘Greater Macedonia’ can clearly be made out on the cover.
Great Britain & Macedonia, 1941-1945 (documents). A sourcebook published by the FYROM Institute of National History. Again, the cover has a map of ‘partitioned Macedonia’.

Great Britain & Macedonia, 1945-1948 (documents). A sourcebook published by the FYROM Institute of National History. This time the map of ‘Greater Macedonia’ is a shadow behind the British flag.
The map illustrates ‘The Settling of the Slav Tribes in Macedonia’. Macedonia is contrasted visually with Greece. The ‘national and geographical borders of Macedonia’ are shown.

Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1997, p.33

Map of The Balkans in Antiquity, with the additional words on which [i.e. the map] there is the name Macedonia, but not Greece. Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1997.

Map title: The Entry of the Normans and the Crusaders into the Balkans and Macedonia. All place names are given in their Slavonic form.

Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1998, p.63

Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 2006, p.74
Map title: The Entry of the Austrian Army into Macedonia, and the Karpoş Rising of 1689.
Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1992, p.49
Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1997, p.50
Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1998, p.84
Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 2006, p.92

Map, Independent Feudal Principalities in Macedonia in the 12th and 13th century. ‘Greater Macedonia’ is shown as a separate unit. All place names are given their Slavonic form.
▲ Map title: National Liberation Uprising in Macedonia in the 19th and 20th century. All place names are given in their Slavonic form. The Neguš [i.e. Naoussa] Rising is shown in mauve. 
*Istoriski Atlas* [Historical Atlas], Skopje 1998, p.105
*Istoriski Atlas* [Historical Atlas], Skopje 2006, p.114

► Map title: The Vilayet of Solun [i.e. Thessaloniki] in the late 19th century. The boundaries of ‘Greater Macedonia’ are shown. From: Bančo Gior-giev, *Sloboda ili Smrt* [Freedom or Death, Skopje 2003 (in Slavmacedonian)], p.55. The book was published with a grant from the FYROM Ministry of Culture.
Map title: **Macedonia Undivided**. From the Established Church’s official magazine *Premin*, Nos.17/18 (Sept.2005), p.21. The magazine is published with a grant from the FYROM Ministry of Culture.
Map title: The Partition of Macedonia after the Balkan Wars and the First World War. All place names are given in their Slavonic form. According to the key ‘the boundaries of the partition of Macedonia’ are shown by a red line.

Istoriski Atlas [Historical Atlas], Skopje 2006, p.127

Decision to open a FYROM Consulate at Thessaloniki. [The only thing is that the capital city of Greek Macedonia is referred to as ‘Solun’]. Source: Government Newspaper Služben Vesnik, No.30, 11 May 2004, p.5.

Decision by the Government of FYROM to fund the ‘Union of Societies of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia’. The Union’s headquarters are in Bitolj [Monastir]. Source: Government Newspaper Služben Vesnik, No.41, 24 June 2004, p.12.

Voted by the Parliament of FYROM in plenary session, that ‘during the year 2004 the following anniversaries of major events and important persons will be celebrated: […]

- 60th Anniversary of the founding of the ‘Political Committee of Macedonians in Greece’
- 60th Anniversary of the founding of the 1ST National Liberation Strike Brigade from Aegean Macedonia
- 60th Anniversary of the founding of the ‘Goče’ Macedonian Battalion from Florina and Kastoria. (Florina and Kastoria become in Slavonic Lerinski-Kosturiskiot).

Decreed by the Parliament of FYROM in plenary session, that ‘during the year 2004 the following anniversaries of major events and important persons will be celebrated: […]

- 40th Anniversary of the death of Milton Manaki, and 100th Anniversary of the arrival of the Manaki brothers in Bitolj [Monastir]
- 150th Anniversary of the Karatašo [i.e. Djamis Karatasos] Rising


Of the many different radio and television programmes to which grants were given, a radio programme entitled ‘Ethnic Changes in Aegean Macedonia’ received a grant of 85,050 dinars. It was broadcast by a station called ČE-DE DOOEL at Veles.

Source: Government Newspaper Služben Vesnik, Government Decision No. 23-2306/1/21 July 2003

[119]
Pages from Aleksandar Trajanovski’s History of Macedonia.
Decree by the Parliament of FYROM to give a grant to the state radio station for broadcasts ‘in Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Serbian, 2½ hours daily (except Sundays). The programmes will be broadcast in the languages of our Republic’s neighbour countries. They will be of the nature of news broadcasts about events in the Republic, bearing on economic and political life and other major activities, and first and foremost, in the field of culture and similar manifestations, with pieces of music’. Source: Government Newspaper Služben Vesnik, No.98, 27 December 2002, p.33.
МАКЕДОНСКО РАДИО
БИЛТЕН ВЕСТИ НА РАДИО МАКЕДОНИЈА
- програми во странство -

Во Домот на армијата денеска ќе биде одржана свечена академија по повод 55-годишнината од егзодусот на Македонците од Егејскиот дел на Македонија. По завршувањето на Граѓанската војна во Грција над 120 илјади Македонци беа протерани од Егејскиот дел, иако во војната се бореа на страната на демократската армија на Грција. Организатор на свечената академија е Сојузот на здруженијата на Македонците од Егејскиот дел на Македонија.


▲ ‘There will be an official celebration at the Army Cultural Centre today, on the occasion of the 55th Anniversary of the exodus of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia. At the end of the Civil War in Greece, over 120,000 Macedonians were expelled from the Aegean Part, even though they had fought alongside the DSE in the War. This official event is being organized by the ‘Union of Societies of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia’. A sample of the state radio station’s ‘news’ broadcasting.

▲ Part of a Decree by the Parliament of FYROM in plenary session to give a grant for broadcasts by the General Secretariat for Those Abroad. ‘The General Secretariat for Those Abroad is making a contribution to the cost of printing programmes for the Meeting of Child-Refugees from the Aegean Part of Macedonia. 10,000 copies of the programme will be printed.
Cost of printing: (10,000 x 5.00): 50,000 dinars.
The total cost of these programmes of the General Secretariat for Those Abroad, which comes to 3.5m dinars, is included in the Approved Budget for 2003, under Code 443611 – Publications’.
Armed with a mandate from the new government of FYROM, Nikola Gruevski has arrived unexpectedly in Trnovo, where he gave his pledge to the Aegeans that after sixteen years of silence from the Macedonian state, he would try to broach this issue with Greece and the international community. “It is no shame for a state to start talks with another state on this issue”, said Gruevski. “It is quite another matter whether we shall get anywhere, or if it is not too late, but at least we will have tried. Nobody is going to point the finger at us: not Greece, not the European Union. For our part, in the succeeding period of time we shall open this question”.

Speech by P.M. Gruevski (31.7.2006) to 26th ‘Pan-Macedonian Meeting’ at Trnovo.
Decision by the government of FYROM to give grants to daily newspapers and periodicals. Among the newspapers receiving a grant was Македонско Сонце [Macedonian Sun]. This paper makes use of the Sun of Vergina and other symbols of ancient Macedonia.

Source: Government Newspaper Služben Vesnik, No.4, 3 July 2003, front page.
The Question of Macedonian Union during the Second World War, published by the FYROM Institute of National History. The cover has the map of 'partitioned Macedonia'.

[125]
Map: The successes of Macedonian units helped to increase the free regions. The ‘free regions’ include territory in Greek Macedonia. Blaže Ristovski & team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII], Skopje 2005, p.105.

Map: Free regions of Macedonia in the year 1943. The impression given is that these were liberated by Tito’s Partisans. The ‘free regions’ include territory in Greek Macedonia. Vlado Velkovski & team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII], Skopje 2005, p.94.
The baseline for the history of the Second World War is ‘Macedonia’s geographical and ethnic borders’. A Grade VIII history textbook map show ‘Partitioned Macedonia, after the 1941 Conquest’. At the bottom of the map is the legend ‘Greece’, which has apparently not been conquered by the Germans! Blaže Ristovski & team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII] (Skopje 2005), p.87.

Map: Conquered Macedonia, after the handing over of the administration to Bulgaria by Germany. According to the key, ‘state borders’ are shown with a broken line, and ‘geographical and ethnic borders’ with a continuous line. Vlado Velkovski & team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII], Skopje 2005, p.100.
Map: ‘The partition of Macedonia’. ‘Ethnic borders’ are shown with a yellow line, and ‘the segment of the region under Greek rule’ is shown in green. Vlado Velkovski & team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII], Skopje 2005, p.54.

Map: ‘Partitioned Macedonia after the First World War’. According to the key, ‘state borders’ are shown with a broken line, ‘the boundaries of Macedonia’ with a continuous line, and ‘Greek occupation’ with the colour red. Blaže Ristovski and team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII] (Skopje 2005), p.14.
Map: ‘Macedonia and her geographical and ethnic borders after partition (1913)’. According to the key, ‘state borders’ are shown with a broken line, and ‘geographical and ethnic boundaries’ with a continuous line. Blaže Ristovski & team, Историја за VII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VII], Skopje 2005, p.131.

Map: ‘Macedonia after the Second Balkan War’. The colouring immediately suggests a unified area partitioned by the neighbour states. Violetta Ačkovska & team, Историја за VII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VII], Skopje 2005, p.115.

Map: ‘Macedonia after the First Balkan War’. The ‘Greek occupation zone’ is shown in yellow, the ‘Serbian occupation zone’ in red, and the ‘Bulgarian occupation zone’ in green. Violetta Ačkovska & team, Историја за VII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VII], Skopje 2005, p.114.
Grade VIII map: ‘The Balkans, with their Kings’. The underlying original has been tampered with in order to show the ‘ethnic and geographical borders of Macedonia’. Vlado Velkovski & team, Историја за VIII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VIII], Skopje 2005, p.16.
It is made clear in the title that this is a ‘map of South West Macedonia, with the areas which revolted during the Neguš [i.e. Naoussa] Uprising’. According to the key the continuous line shows ‘Southwest Macedonia’s ethnic and geographical borders’, and the ‘region in revolt’ is coloured red. Blaže Ristovski & team, Историја за VII одделение [History Textbook, Grade VII], Skopje 2005, p.95.
Map: ‘Rome at her zenith’. An obvious attempt is made to distinguish between Македонија [Makedonija/Macedonia] and Хелада [Hellada/Greece]. Kosta Atsievski & team, Историја за V одделение [History Textbook, Grade V], Skopje 2005, p.79.

Map: ‘Colonies of the Greeks’. There is a clear attempt to separate Македонија [Makedonija/Macedonia] and Хелада [Hellada/Greece]. Kosta Atsievski & team, Историја за V одделение [History Textbook, Grade V], Skopje 2005, p.37.

The map ‘Мacedonia in the Balkans’ appears in the chapter on prehistoric times. The student thus gets the impression that Macedonia was a separate entity even as early as in the prehistoric era. Curiously enough, the boundaries of this entity coincide with those of the map Географски и етнички граници на Македонија. Kosta Atsievski & team, Историја за V одделение [History Textbook, Grade V], Skopje 2005, p.20.
The ‘Oppressed Macedonian Minority’
Para. 2, col.2: ‘In our country’, said Jakovlievski, ‘we start from the position that all national minorities, and by extension nationalities, must be constitutionally assured of equal rights and obligations, for the full affirmation of their national identity. On this basis, Jugoslavia is building up its relations with peoples of neighbouring countries who have populations living within Jugoslavia, and at the same time have within their own regions parts of Jugoslav people. Unhappily, there are still instances, so far as our own minorities in neighbouring countries are concerned, where these minorities are denied fundamental civic rights and freedoms, or even where their very existence is denied. This is against the provisions of the World Declaration of the Rights of Man, and of the Agreements and the many other international documents to which these countries, like others, are signatories’.

The magazine Македонја, December 1976, front page.
Article about the 8th Session of the ‘Union of Communists of Makedonija’, held in Skopje.

The whole of the article is given over to the longstanding demand for minority rights to be accorded to ‘Macedonians’ in Greece and Bulgaria. Some passages are quoted as examples:

Speech by Angel Čemerski, President of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Makedonija: ‘The decisive blow to nationalism will be dealt when the international rules of mutual conduct are explicitly honoured by the recognition of historical and contemporary reality,... when the rights of the Macedonian national minority in Greece are recognized and assured. ...it is alleged that Macedonia is only ‘a geographical expression’, having some foreign content and not a Macedonian national content’.

Tomislav Šimovski: ‘Despite our attempts over many years to establish good neighbourly relations, not one of the neighbouring countries – Greece, Bulgaria, and Albania – today recognized the Macedonian minority. This is true even of Albania, even if she recognizes the existence of a Macedonian minority on paper. It is my view that we have not made the minority problem plain enough, we have not made it familiar to the broad public in Jugoslavia. There must be additional efforts to inform people about it. People there [in Jugoslavia] deserve this. And I will add that it is not a question of minorities, it is a question of a whole people divided into three parts, a partitioned people. Only one part of it has its freedom and its rights, its state and an existence of its own’.

Naum Pejov (Para. 4 of his speech): ‘There have been changes in Greece over the period under review. PASOK has come to power, under the principal slogan of ‘Change’. We have in fact already seen changes in that country’s social and political life. But what changes have there been for the Macedonians [in Greece]? Even after a change of government, the very existence of Macedonians is still being denied. All the institutions making for the assimilation of the younger generation of Macedonians are still in place. There are still kindergarten schools where little Macedonian children are accepted – in their nappies, so to speak – so as not to learn their mother tongue, only to learn Greek. The functioning of assimilation institutions of this kind, and the attempt to turn Macedonians into janissaries, are violations of a fundamental human right and of human decency, going contrary to contemporary civilization’.

The magazine Македонија, June 1982, pp.3-4.
FYROM Law on Culture (Article 8, Clause 2)

‘National interest as regards Culture comprises: […] 6. Caring for the cultural development and asserting the cultural rights of the Macedonian minority beyond the borders of the Republic of Makedonija’.

A Ministry of Culture Programme for 2004-2008:

‘A special priority will be caring for the cultural development of the Macedonian minority in neighbouring countries, and for our people of the diaspora abroad’.

Interview given by FYROM Foreign Minister Antonio Milošoski to Radio ‘Free Europe’.

‘Makedonija has ways of reacting and a strategy in its disagreement with Greece about The Name, and I think they will get results’. This statement was made by FYROM Foreign Minister Antonio Milošoski in an interview on Radio Free Europe. ‘Our strongest argument is our truth’, said Milošoski. ‘We’ve never taken anything away from anyone, we’re just fighting for our constitutional name. It’s very easy to persuade somebody you’re right, as what it’s about is a name that the people chose, that we’ve had for generations, and that’s a foundation of our national identity. There’s no room for backing down. The backdowns over constitutional reforms and the flag show that Makedonija has made concessions. Now it’s high time we found a logical and realistic solution’.

Replying the question of how far the state should assist Macedonians in neighbouring countries, Milošoski replied that they had gone for a long-term strategy aimed at funding scholarships for people wanting to come and study in Makedonija.

‘This is how we are indirectly, and in the long term, bolstering our human resources’, said Milošoski. ‘The aim is for the scholarship holders to go back to their countries and stick out for their rights’. In his opinion, it was not to be anticipated that the government [of Makedonija] would come into conflict with neighbouring countries just because their governments failed to understand one another about what government controls there should be with minority organizations.
One month ago, the latest was that the European Court of Human Rights had issued a ruling against the Greek state and in favour of Rainbow, the Macedonian minority party in Greece. This was not only proof of but a great encouragement for the struggle of Macedonians in Greece for the state to democratize itself fully as regards its minorities....

During the Cold War, Greece was the Balkan darling of the West.... Greece became a member of the Club of the Powerful, and never missed a meeting. Taboo words were corruption, squabbles with her neighbours, and of course repression [репресија] of her minorities. Anyone who raised their voice about this was flung into jail or exile. In the summer of 1959 whole villages in the Kostur [i.e. Kastoria] and Voden [i.e. Edessa] area were forced to take an oath en masse that they would forswear their native (non-Greek) language and would always and only speak the sublime language of Greek. They were not able to sing at weddings, nor to mourn at funerals, in Macedonian; to say nothing of the fact that it was out of the question for a parent baptizing a child to choose a non-Greek given name. Some of the more obstinate of them found their estates confiscated and in other hands. But nobody in Greece, or in the international community, said a word. Forty years went by, from the end of the Civil War in Greece in 1949, to the burial of the Cold War with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. In Greece, however, not many heard the Wall fall, so far as minority rights were concerned. This is an issue where the Cold War is still in progress in Greece. Also alive and well is a nineteenth-century mindset about individual ethnic and national self-determination. Those walls will be thrown down only with great difficulty.... With the whole of the international community on the side of minority rights, Greece alone strangled otherness of language and nation.... Greece has a certain precedence [compared with her neighbours] because she is a NATO member and an EU member-state. But this special status is neither brand-new, nor an alibi for a democratic deficit [фалична демократија]. This is why they are asking Greece (as they will continue to ask) for the same as they would ask any democratic state: that she correct all her defects with regard to the rights of the individual or the social group. Sooner or later Greece will have to realize that the dynamics of the promotion of human rights before and after the Cold War are too different for her to cling to an antiquated model of discrimination.... It is high time to achieve full democratization. This is a message which, for the last ten years, Greece has been hearing not only from international organizations but, ever more clearly, from her own citizens, no matter whether they are Greeks, Turks, Macedonians, Albanians, Vlachs, or Roma by nationality'.

Attending the celebrations were Vlado Butskovski and Ljubčo Giordanovski. ‘Yesterday, in the church of St Saviour’s in Skopje, the jubilee of the 103th Anniversary of the Macedonian revolutionary’s death was celebrated with a memorial liturgy and the laying of wreaths at his grave. Wreaths were laid by senior officials of state, among them the Prime Minister, Vlado Butskovski, and the president of the Parliament of the Republic of Makedonija, Ljubčo Gjordanovski. The celebrations were also attended by Goče Delčev’s granddaughter, Katerina Dučjeva-Trajkova…. Honour was paid at the graveside by: representatives of seven political parties (SDSM, IMRO-DPMNE, NSDP, IMRO-NP, LDP, DOM, DPM-Tetovo); the Centre for Those Abroad; the Society of Citizen Admirers of the Person and Work of Josip Broz Tito; the Society of Child-Refugees from the Aegean Part of Macedonia; the World Macedonian Congress and political parties from Aegean and Pirin Macedonia, Little Prespa, and Golo Brdo [Albania]; schools, bodies, and societies named for Goče Delčev; and a large number of citizens from our country and from abroad. Delčev, one of the great ideologues in the Macedonian people’s liberation movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, was killed on 4 May 1903, in the village of Banitsa near Serres in Aegean Macedonia, fighting against an Ottoman army. He was born at Kukuš in Aegean Macedonia on 4 February 1872’.
From the Manifesto of IMRO-DPMNE, the party in power, pp. 1 and 66.

‘We shall align ourselves particularly with respect for the minority and national rights of Macedonians living within the territory of neighbouring countries’.
From the Statutes of IMRO-DPMNE, the party in power, Article 2 (taken from the party’s official website, http://www.vmro-dpmne.org.mk/statut.htm)

'The first element of the Party’s name is IMRO, the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization. It stands for the traditions of the Macedonian People. Ideological and political struggle was in consequence placed on the Party manifesto aims and goals. The second element of the Party’s name is DPMNE, the Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity. It signals the Party’s mode of action and political agenda.'
ИЗВЕДЕНА ПРОГРАМА

ИСТОРИЈА

Министерството за образование и наука
Биро за развој на образованието
Сектор за испити

ИСТИРИЈА

ДРЖАВНА МАТУРА
ВО ГИМНАЗИСКО
И ВО СРЕДНО СТРУЧНО ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

Испитната програма по историја за државна матура во гимназискиот и во средното стручно образование е донесена со решение на министерот за образование и наука бр. 11-6815/2 од 10.11.2005 година.
1. ВВЕД
Согласно концепциите и содржинските промени во гимназиското и четирегодишното стручно образование направени се промени и во испитите на крајот на средното образование.

Воодушевенето на централизирани испити на крајот на средното образование е во функција на контрола на квалитетот, а со тоа и на поддржување на наставата на средното образование. Имплементирањето на новите модели на испити во средното образование ја наметна потребата од изготвување испитни програми.

Испитната програма за државната мatura по историја за средното образование (гимназиско, четирегодишно стручно) е освоен документ на кој се томели матурски испит по овој наставен предмет. Во овој документ јасно е дефинирано кои знаења, умевна и способности ке се проверуваат на испитот.

Испитната програма пренесено е намерата за учењаците и наставниците, изготвување на испитните материјали, организаторите на испитите, како и за други потенцијални корисници. Како официјален документ испитната програма претставува најважен елемент во обезбедувањето транспарентност на образовното систем.

Испитната програма е изготвена според наставните програми по историја за гимназиското образование-општествоен-културни истоцавања (каде историјата е застапена како задолжителен предмет во І, ІІ и ІІІ година со 2 часа неделено понеде и е во ІV година како избран предмет, со уште 2 часа неделно). Затоа учените од средното стручно образование (каде што историјата се изучува како задолжителен предмет во І и ІІ година со 2 часа неделно) и учените од гимназиското образование во останатите две подречја: природно-математичкото и јазично-уметничкото (куде што историјата се изучува како задолжителен предмет во І, ІІ и ІІІ година со 2 часа неделно) коме изберат историја за матурски испит ке треба да вложат дополнителни напори за усвојување на наставните содржини кои не ги учел во текот на наставата.

Испитната програма ги содржи следните компоненти:
- Општа цел на испитот
- Содржина на испитот
- Спецификација на подречјата и способностите
- Конкретизација на целите
- Спецификациска врежа на испитот
- Опис на испитот
- Начин на оценување

2. ОПШТА ЦЕЛ НА ИСПИТОТ
Успешното полагање на државната мatura, која го вклучува и предметот историја, според Концепцијата за мatura и завршен испит во јакото средно образование ке значи и директен влаз во факултетите.

Со матурскиот испит по предметот историја се крии заокружување, односно се дава завршна оценка на знаената и способностите што учените треба да ги имаат на крајот на четирегодишното образовен процес.

Општа цел на матурскиот испит по историја е да провери дали ученот:
- знае и разбира определен број историски факти, поими, настани, појави, процеси и личности од стар век, среден век, нов век и најнов век;
- е способен да анализира, открива, и објаснува приично-последнички односи на историските појави и процеси;
- умее да споредува у одредени појави, процеси, личности, епоки и историски локалитети;
- е способен да толкува, аргументира и носи заклучоци за различни појави и процеси;
- умее да го разликува нормативиот од реалниот и декларативниот од обективниот во историските појави и процеси;
- е способен да проценува (преведува) одредени историски толкувања, настани и процеси;
3. СОДРЖИНА НА ИСПИТОТ

3.1. Спецификација на подрачјата (содржините) и способностите

Програмски подрачја:
- Стар век
- Среден век
- Нов век
- Најнов век

Ова се глобално дефинирани знаењата и способностите што треба да ги поседува ученикот.

За да го положи испитот ученикот треба да покаже дека:
- (C1) ЗНАЕ И РАЗБИРА определен прој историски факти, поими, настани, појави, процеси и личности;
- (C2) способен е да АНАЛИЗИРА И ОТКРива, објаснува причинско-последничките односи на историските појави и процеси, да ги спореди помеѓу одредени појави, процеси, личности, епохи и историски локалитети, да ги толкува, аргументира и носи заклучки за различни појави и процеси;
- (C3) способен е да ВРШИ ПРОЦЕНКИ (ВРЕДУВАЊЕ) на одредени историски толкувања, настани и процеси, да го различува нормативното од реалното и декларативното од объективното.

3.2. Конкретизација на целите (знаењата и способностите) по подрачја

ПОДРАЧЈЕ 1: СТАР ВЕК

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Знаења и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Стар Исток: Праи цивилизации – Египетска држава; Феникија и Палестина; Културните достигања на народите на старото Исток</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ученикот треба: перку различни техники на работа со историски текстови и илустративен материјал од периодот на старото век да превземе самоотоактивна активност на историски текстови и историски илустрации; да толкува историски документи и да ги вреднува различните интерпретации; да знае за почетоците на раните цивилизации, природите услови и да ги споредува основните карактеристики на општеството и државата уредувано во првите држави; да го разбира значењето на историското време и историскиот простор како главни одредници на историските настани, појави и процеси и причинско-последничките врски во појавите, развојот и пропаѓањето на државите (цивилизациите) на старото Исток; да ги вреднува културните и цивилизациона придобивки за човештвото од народите и државите на старото Исток.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Балканот во старот век: Стара Хелада – Спартата; Куприта на Хелада; Илири и Тракија</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Дава ги описание на природните услови и текот на создавањето на државите на Балканскиот Полуостров; да знае за критско-македонската култура и за Хомеровото време; да ги објаснува и да ги споредува карактеристиките на уредуваното од грчките посени Спартата и Атина; да ги сфаќа суштината на атинската демократија и реформите на нејзините најважни предшественици; да ги процессува значењето и вредностите на културните дострени на Хелада; да ги објаснува територијата на илриците и македонците, новиот специфичен начин на живот и обичаи; да ги објаснува процесот на создавање на Илиришкото царство и да знае за културата на Илири; да ги описува процесот на создавање на Тракиското кралицтво; да знае за потпапањето на Илирите и Тракиците под римската власт.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Македонија во старот век: Старата Македонска држава до Филип II; Македонската држава во времето на Филип II; Македонската држава во времето на Александар III Македонски; Религијата и културата на античките Македонци; Хелекнестики период</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Да ги објаснува специфичностите и карактеристиките во од傧авањето на старата Македонска држава; да ги објаснува подемот на Македонската држава во времето на Филип II и неговото завладување со хемеровското свет; да го објаснува прераснувањето на Македонија во светска сила; да ги вреднува значењето на Александар III Македонски и неговото место во светската история; да ги објаснува културниот период во историјата на старото век; да знае за религијата и културата на античките Македонци.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Подрачје 2: Среден век

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значај и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Светот и Европа во рано време | Мога на проучување на основите на еволуцијата на културата на позната академска литература; ги проучување на свеќисниот и научно-техничкиот потенцијал на класичната епоха; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активности и на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влијанието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на епохата на покретите на вулканските активностима на социјалните промени; ги проучување на влиянието на светските и духовните тенденции на еп.
### The 'Oppressed Macedonian Minority'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Line</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Macedonia in the 18th and 19th centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Balkan and Macedonian minorities under Ottoman rule (15th-18th centuries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>During the European military intervention (19th century) and Poverty, resistance, and military campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>The role of the international community and the eventual recognition of the Macedonian minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table: Novi Vek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Property</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Novi Vek (New Era)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Military and political era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Europe and the Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td>19th-20th centuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Znanje i sposobnosti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Property</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Intellectual and practical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Europe and the Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td>19th-20th centuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Подрачје 4: НаЗов Век

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значај и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Светот, Европа и Балканот во Праота светска војна</td>
<td>Европа во почетокот на XX век; Праота светска војна; Револуцијата во Русија и нејзиниот одраз во Европа; Балканските народи и држави во Праота светска војна; Париската мировна конференција</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија во Праота светска војна</td>
<td>Македонија и македонскиот народ во Праота светска војна</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Светот и Европа меѓу две светски војни</td>
<td>Меѓународните односи меѓу две светски војни; Готвка на фашизмот и криза на граѓанската демократија</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Балканските држави меѓу две светски војни
- Македонија меѓу две светски војни
- Светот во Втората светска војна
- Македонија во Втората светска војна
- Светот по Втората светска војна

- Два анализа односот на гонимите сили кон балканските народи и држави на Париската мировна конференција, да го објаснува политичкиот живот на балканските држави и положбата на маќедонската претстава во балканските држави меѓу две светски војни;
- Да ја споредува положбата на македонскиот народ под власта на различните балкански режими, да ја анализира денационализаторската и асимилаторска политика, да ги објаснува етничките промени, да зная за организациите и различните страни во македонскиот национално-осloboditelno движење меѓу две светски војни; да ги објаснува најразличните одговорности на македонските организации, дружини и покровители во формирането на македонската национална секта, јазик и култура;
- Да го објаснува причините за Втората светска војна, поводот за нејзиното започнување, нејзиниот тек и најважните престанички битки од 1939 до 1945 година, да ги оцени полицијата на земјите на Третиот сојуз, да ги објаснува последиците од Втората светска војна;
- Да ги објаснува организациите и поделбата на Македонија; да ги анализира подготовките за вооружениот противбор избегање на НОБ во вардарскиот дел на Македонија, да го проследува развојот на воената сила и организацијата на народна власт од до конституирањето на современата македонска држава на првоот заседание на АСНОМ; да го објаснува народноосlobodителното движење во пернискиот и егејскиот дел на Македонија и соработка со осlobodителното движење во вардарскиот дел на Македонија;
- Да го објаснува холокуството; да зная за најважните одлуки на Поранската мирна конференција и претставите на положбата за светлост; да го објаснува формированието на ООН и нејзините механизми за зачувување на мирот; да ги анализира причините за појавата на темата во политичката сцена.
**THE ‘OPPRESSED MACEDONIAN MINORITY’**

Ново тенденција и промени во светот; Деколонизација и неоколонијализам во светот по Втората светска војна

- Балканските држави по Втората светска војна
  Реформите на светската политика на балканските држави; Споставењето-економски и политички промени во балканските земји: Функционирањето на југословенската федерација, и причините за нејзиното распадање; Развој и криза на социјализмот во балканските земи

- Македонија по Втората светска војна
  Споставење-постижки и економски развој на Македонија 1946-1991; Создавање самојасна и независна Македонија; Македонската православна црква и другите верски заедници во Македонија; Образование, наука и култура; Положбата на Македонците во соседните држави; Миграциони процеси во Република Македонија

(НАТО и Варнашкиот договор); да го анализира споредуването на Маршаловот план и Трашковската декларација; да ја објаснува социјализмота на југословенските земји и најавата на Информбюро; да ја анализира појавата на кризи во социјализмот на држави и нивното преминување кон поевропскоста парламентарна демокрашија; да го објаснува процесот на деколонизација и функционирането на неоколонијализмот, да знае за европските интеграции и најважните европски асоциации.

- Да ги објаснува политичко-економските промени во балканските држави во повеќиот период; да ги спротивстави сличностите и разликите помеѓу уредувањата на балканските држави; да ги опишува Граѓанската војна во Грција, најважните последици и политичкото развој на Грција до крајот на XX век; да го објаснува развојот на Албанија, Бугарија и Југославија, навлегувањето во криза на нивните политичко-економски системи и почетоците на транзицијата.

- Да ја анализира положбата на Македонија во рамките на југословенската федерација; да ги опишува процесите, појавите и промените во политичката и економската сфера на РМ од 1945 до 1991 година; да го објаснува процесот на осамостојување на РМ и неразвојот развој до 2000 година; да го објаснува улогата на МПЦЦ, ВЗ и другите верски заедници во РМ; да знае за главните достигнувања на планот на развојот на образованието, наука и културата; да ја анализира положбата на Македонците во соседните држави и арми според со положбата на етничките заедници во РМ; да ги објаснува причините за миграциите на населението од Македонија; да ја објаснува миграцијата на село-град и исподувањето на граѓаните од Македонија во странство.

---

4. СПЕЦИФИКАЦИЈСКА МРЕЖА НА ИСПИТОТ

Спецификацијската мрежа го определува соодносот на подрачјата (соодржините) и на способностите (глобалните цели на испитот) изразен во проценти.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Способности</th>
<th>Подрачја</th>
<th>Застапеност (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p_1$</td>
<td>$p_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Застапеност (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$c_1$: знаење и разбирање
$c_2$: анализирање и откривање
$c_3$: проценување (вреднување)
$p_1$: Стар век
$p_2$: Среден век
$p_3$: Нов век
$p_4$: Најнов век
FYROM Ministry of Education High School & Technical College history exam syllabus.
On p. 6 are extended references to Macedonian history. On p. 9 the pupil is instructed to 'analyse Balkan states' policy of conquest towards Macedonia; their alliance and rivalry during the two Balkan Wars; and the outcome of the Balkan Wars for Macedonia and her people'. On p. 10 the pupil is instructed to 'give an account of Macedonia's status in talks between the Entente and the Central Powers' and 'describe the status of the Macedonian people in the conquered regions, and the part played by Macedonians in the various armies'. On p. 11 the pupil is instructed to 'give an account of the National Liberation Movement in the Pirin and the Aegean Part of Macedonia', during the Second World War.
ИСТОРИЈА
1. ВОВЕД

Согласно концепцијските и содржинските промени на гимназиското образование, направени се промени и во испитите на крајот на овој вид образование.

Воодушевувањето на централизирани испити на крајот од средното образование е во функција на контрола на квалитетот, а со тоа и на подобрание на наставата во средното образование. Имплементирањето на новите модели на испити во средното образование ја наметна и потребата од изготвување испитни програми.

Испитната програма за учливицата матура по историја за гимназиското образование е основан документ на кој се темели матурскиот испит по овој наставен предмет. Во овој документ јасно е дефинирана кои знаења, умевна и способности ке се проверуваат на испитот.

Испитната програма преисто не е наменета за учениците и наставниците, изготвуваачите на испитните материјали, организаторите на испитите, како и за други потенцијални корисници. Како официјален документ програма представува најважен елемент во обезбедувањето транспарентност на образовното систем.

Испитната програма е изготвена според наставните програми по историја за I, II и III година за реформирано гимназиско образование (каде што историјата се изучува како задолжителен предмет во I, II и III година со 2 часа неделно). Таа е наменета за учениците од гимназиското образование кои ќе го изборат предметот историја на нивно на учливица матура.

Испитната програма ги содржи следните компоненти:
- Општа цел на испитот
- Содржина на испитот
- Спецификација на подржајата (содржините) и способностите
- Конкретизација на целите (знаниеа и способности)
- Специфичнска мрежа на испитот
- Структура на испитот и оценување
- Опис на испитот
- Начин на оценување.

2. ОПШТА ЦЕЛ НА ИСПИТОТ

Успешното поглавје на учливицата матура, која го вклучува и предметот историја, ке значи добивање сертификат (диплома) за завршено средно образование.

Со матурскиот испит по предметот историја се врши заокружување, односно се дава завршна оценка на знаењата и способностите што учениците треба да ги имаат на крајот од четиригодишниот образовен процес.

Општа цел на матурскиот испит по историја е да провери дали ученикот:
- знае и разбира определен број историски факти, поими, настани, појави, процеси и личности од стар век, среден век, нов век и најнов век;
- е способен да анализира, открива, и објаснува причинско-следнички односи на историските појави и процеси;
- умее да спрепоредува у одредени појави, процеси, личности, епоки и историски локалитети;
- е способен да толкува, аргументира и нес заклучува за различни појави и процеси;
- умее да го разликува нормативното од реалното и декларативното од обективното во историските појави и процеси;
- е способен да проценува (вреднува) одредени историски толкувања, настани и процеси;
3. СОДРЖИНА НА ИСПИТОТ

3.1. Спецификација на подрачјата (содржината) и способностите

Програмски подрачја:
- Стар век
- Среден век
- Нов век
- Најнов век

Од ова се глобално дефинирами знаењата и способностите што треба да ги поседува ученикот.
За да го положи испитот ученикот треба да покаже дека:
- (C1) ЗНАЕ И РАЗБИРА определен прој историски факти, поми, настани, појави, процеси и личности.
- (C2) способен е да ги АНАЛИЗира И ОТКРИВа (објаснува) причинско-следничките односи на историските појави и процеси, да врши споредба помеѓу одредени појави, процеси, личности, епохи и историски локалитети, да толкува, аргументира и носи заклучања за различни појави и процеси;
- (C3) способен е да ВРШИ ПРОЦЕНИ (ВРЕДНУВАЊЕ) на одредени историски толкувања, настани и процеси, да го разликува нормативното од реалното и декларативното од објективното.

3.2. Конкретизација на целите (знаењата и способностите)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ПОДРАЧЈЕ 1: СТАР ВЕК</th>
<th>Знаењата и способностите</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Стар Исток: Стар Исток</td>
<td>Ученикот треба:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Превојувачки: Египетска држава; Културните достигања на народите на стар Исток</td>
<td>- да прави анализа на историски текстови и историски илустрации и да толкува историски документи;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Балканот во старот век</td>
<td>- да знае за формирањето на првите (речни) цивилизации и првите држави;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Стара Хелада - Спартата и Атина; Културата на Хелада; Илири</td>
<td>- да знае за настанокот и развојот на египетската држава; да знае за културите и цивилизациите преденици за човечеството од народите и државите на стар Исток.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија во старот век</td>
<td>- да ги општува природните услови и текот на создавањето на државите на Балканскиот Полуостров; да знае за Хомеровото време; да ги објаснува и ги споредува историските на уредувањето на грчките политици Спартата и Атина; да ги проценува значенчето и вредностите на културните достри на Хелада, да ја општува територијата на илричките племиња, множето специфичен начин на живот и обичаји; да ги објаснува процесот на создавање на Илирицкото царство; да знае за потапањето на Илириците и за културата на старот век.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Римскиот период</td>
<td>- Да ги објаснува специфичностите и карактеристиките во создавањето на старата македонска држава; да ги анализаи подемот на македонската држава во времето на Филип II и неговото залудување со хеленското свет; да ги објаснува прекласирането на Македонија во светска опара; да ги објаснува вредноста на Александар Велики и неговото место во светската историја; ги објаснува културните и политичките особености на старите држави.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Римскиот период</td>
<td>- Да знае за создавањето на римската држава и нерешени развои; да ги знае причините за пропаѓањето на Римското Царство; да ги објаснува велетоните и ширењето на христијанското учење, односот на обществениот и неговото пропагање за државниот религија.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија под римска власт: Ширење на христијанството во Македонија</td>
<td>- Да ги објаснува причините и текот на македоно-римските војни; да знае за почетокот на ширењето на христијанството во Македонија, формирањето на христијанските општини и улогата на апостол Павле.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Подрачје 2: Среден век

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значења и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Светот и Европа во ранити среден век</td>
<td>- Големата преселба на народите; Државата на Франките; Арабите и појавата на исламот; Источно Римско Царство (Византија); Балканот во ранити среден век</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија во ранити среден век</td>
<td>- Поживата и развојот на словенската писменост и култура; Дејноста на с. Климент и с. Наум во Македонија; Созиданењето на словенската држава - Самуилово царство; Изградување на државата и претвоарење на царство; Слободие на Македонија и пропагање на Сака кодложното држава, Охридската археолошка градина</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Светот и Европа во развиениот и доносот среден век до крајот на XVIII век</td>
<td>Средновековни градови; Хуманизам и ренесанза; Големите географски откритија; Култура и научна организация на Средноивековна држава</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија во развиениот среден век</td>
<td>Поглед на Македонија под османската власт</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Балканот и Македонија под Османската власт од XV век до XVIII век</td>
<td>Организација на османската држава и воспоставување на државата во Европа</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Подрачје 3: Нов век

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значења и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Светот и Европа од крајот на XVIII век до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Француската револуција и положбата во Европа во првата половина на XIX век; Созиданењето и изградувањето на САД, Европа во првата половина на XIX век и почетокот на XX век; Русија до Првата светска војна</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Балканот од крајот на XVIII век до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Социјално-политичкиот и социјално-политичкиот кризис на Балканскиот архипелаг во епохата на XIX век и почетокот на XX век</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија од крајот на XVIII век до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Развојот на политичката и социјалната организация на Македонија</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Развојот на Македонија до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Развојот на Македонија во XIX век и почетокот на XX век</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Подрачје 3: Нов век

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значења и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Светот и Европа од крајот на XVIII век до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Француската револуција и положбата во Европа во првата половина на XIX век; Созиданењето и изградувањето на САД, Европа во првата половина на XIX век и почетокот на XX век; Русија до Првата светска војна</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Балканот од крајот на XVIII век до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Социјално-политичкиот и социјално-политичкиот кризис на Балканскиот архипелаг во епохата на XIX век и почетокот на XX век</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Македонија од крајот на XVIII век до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Развојот на Македонија во XIX век и почетокот на XX век</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Развојот на Македонија до Првата светска војна</td>
<td>Развојот на Македонија во XIX век и почетокот на XX век</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ПОДРАЧИЕ 4: НАЈНОВ ВЕК

Содржина

- Светот, Европа и Балканот во Првата светска војна
  Првата светска војна: Балканските народи и држави во Првата светска војна; Париската македонска конференција

- Македонија во Првата светска војна
  Македонија и македонскиот народ во Првата светска војна

- Светот и Европа меѓу двете светски војни
  Меѓународните односи меѓу двете светски војни; Пораз на фашизмот и криза на граѓанската демокрација

- Македонија меѓу двете светски војни
  Македонија под власта на соединетите држави; Македонското националноослободително движение меѓу двете светски војни

- Светот во Втората светска војна
  Втората светска војна 1939-1941; Втората светска војна 1941-1943; Втората светска војна 1943-1945

Значење и способности

- Ученички проби:
  - да ги спроведува појавите, процесите и личностите од понатоа историјата; да толкува македонските политики во контекст на современите последици преку анализи на документи, карикатури и други историски извори, текстови и илюстрации за светот, Европа, Балканот и Македонија во периодот од 1914 до 2000 година;
  - да знае за пречките и за поводот за Првата светска војна; да знае за поважните моменти од војната и за најкратните последици; да го објаснува алегоријата на балканските држави во Првата светска војна и положбата на македонското население за време на војната; да ги пишува Македонската жртва; да ги објаснува последиците од војната за балканските земји и народи; да знае за најкрените одлуки на Париската македонска конференција и наследните последици;
  - да ги анализира политичките односи во Европа и во светот по Првата светска војна; да ги објаснува негативната економска криза и различните начини на излез од истата; да знае за карактеристиките на фашизмот;
  - да ги објаснува последиците на македонскиот народ под власт на соединетите држави; да ги објаснува и националните и националноослободителните структури во Македонија и наследните последици;
  - да ги објаснува последиците за Втората светска војна, најдимит тек и најкратните последици од 1939 до 1945 година; да ги објаснува и наследните последици за Втората светска војна.

- Македонија во Втората светска војна
  Фашистичката окупација и поделба на Македонија; НОБ и антифашистичката борба на македонскиот народ во вардарското дел на Македонија 1941-1944; Конституирање на македонската држава.

- Светот по Втората светска војна
  Холокастот; Меѓународните ощестно-економски и политички односи во светот по Втората светска војна; Македонските воено-политички кризи и формирање на нови држави во светот; Нови тенденции и промени во светот; Деколонизација и неколониализам во светот по Втората светска војна.

- Македонија во Втората светска војна
  Ощестно-политички и економски развои на Македонија 1946-1991; Состојување македонска и независна Македонија; Македонската правоослободуваца црнка и другите верски заедници во Македонија; Образование, наука и култура; Положбата на Македонија во соединетите држави; Македонското исклучително во Европа и во балканските земји.

- Да ги објаснува последиците на Втората светска војна, најдимит тек и најкратните последици од 1939 до 1945 година; да ги објаснува и наследните последици за Втората светска војна.
4. СПЕЦИФИКАЦИЈСКА МРЕЖА НА ИСПИТОТ

Спецификацијската мрежа го определува соодносот на подрачјата (содржините) и на способностите (глобалните цели на испитот) изразен во проценти.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Способности</th>
<th>Подрачја</th>
<th>Π₁</th>
<th>Π₂</th>
<th>Π₃</th>
<th>Π₄</th>
<th>Застапеност (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>55-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Застапеност (%)</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C₁ - знаање и разбирање
C₂ - анализирање и откривање
C₃ - проценување (вреднување)
Π₁ - Стар век
Π₂ - Среден век
Π₃ - Нов век
Π₄ - Нароов век

5. ОПИС НА ИСПИТОТ

Испитот по предметот история е писмен. Тој се сорти во решавање на тест на знаања.
Времетраенето на испитот по история е 90 минути.
Тестот ќе содржи околу 50 испитни задаци.

Методи на испитот се застапени три вида испитни задаци: задаци со повеќечлен избор (во ком ученот трбва да избере еден од понудените одговори), задаци со кратки одговори (во ком ученот трбва на означеното место да запише краток одговор) и отворени задаци (во ком се бара од ученот да даде пошироки разгледани одговори).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Тип на испитната задача</th>
<th>Опис на барањата на задачата</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Испитни задачи со повеќечлен избор</td>
<td>45 - 65 задачи. Ученот трбва да го разпознае точниот одговор и да го заокружува.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Испитни задачи со допомагање</td>
<td>20 - 30 задачи. Во празном простор на задачата ученот трбва да го напише барањот (исполнето) податок.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Испитни задачи од отворен тип</td>
<td>1 - 3 задачи. Задачите можат да бидат: задаци со директно прашање и одговор; задаци за анализа и вреднување на историски илустрацији и текстови (учениците добиваат задача од зададен текст, илустрација и сл. да извлекат сознавања за одредена историска појава, настан или личност, според поставените барања).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FYROM Ministry of Education High School history exam syllabus.
On p. 4 are extended references to Macedonian history. On p. 6 the pupil is instructed to ‘analyse foreign propaganda in Macedonia, and its aims’ and to ‘show knowledge of the effects of the Balkan Wars on Macedonia and her people’. On p. 7 the pupil is instructed to ‘describe the status of the Macedonian people under the rule of the various Balkan regimes’. On p. 8 the pupil is instructed to ‘give an account of, the status of Macedonians in neighbouring countries, and compare it with the status of ethnic communities in the Republic of Makedonija’.
ГЕОГРАФИЈА
1. ВОВЕД

Реформите во средното образование во Р. Македонија започнаа со донесување на Законот за средно образование во 1995 година. Во 1996 година беше усвоен документот Програмска структура на средното образование и образовните профили во средното стручно образование. Новиот Наставен план и програма во гимназиското образование што понача да се применува од учебната 2001/2002 година, со цел да се подигне квалитетот на образованието, претставува фундамент на кој се темели програмата за матурското испит по географија. Потребите од промени произлегаа од воочените слабости на постојниите завршни испити на крајот од средното образование, кои немаа повратно влијание на квалитетот на образовниот процес.

Испитната програма за училишната матура по географија е документ во кој јасно е дефинирано кои знаења, умења и способности ќе се проверуваат на испитот. Истовремено таа претставува и значаен елемент во обезбедувањето на транспарентност на образовниот систем.

Матурската испитна програма се темели врз наставните програми за I и II година како задолжителни предмети во гимназиското образование.

Испитната програма првенствено е наменета за учениците, наставниците, изготвуваачите на тестовите, организаторите на испитите, како и за други потенцијални корисници.

Испитната програма ги содржи следните компоненти:
- Општа цел на испитот
- Содржина на испитот
- Спецификација на поданите (содржините) и способностите
- Конкретизација на целите (знаењата и способности)
- Спецификација мрежа на испитот
- Структура на испитот и оцениваче
- Опис на испитот
- Начин на оцениваче.

2. ОПШТА ЦЕЛ NA ИСПИТОТ

Општа цел на матурското испит по географија е да се провери колку ученикот е осовечен:
- да го пропозициона просторот на Република Македонија и светот;
- да ги објаснува природните појави и процеси од просторот;
- да ги презентира природно-географските и социо-економските карактеристики на континентите, регионите, поголемите држави во светот и Република Македонија;
- да покажува смерност при користење на својата географска писменост;
- самостојно да ги произвоа и класифицира објектите, појавите, процесите и постојните во просторот.
3. СОДРЖИНА НА ИСПИТОТ

3.1. Спецификација на подрачјата (содржините) и способностите

Содржини кои ќе бидат спратени на матурскиот испит:

- Природно-географски карактеристики на светот и Република Македонија;
- Социо-географски карактеристики на светот и Република Македонија;
- Економско-географски карактеристики на светот и Република Македонија.

Испитната програма е ориентирана кон проверка на географските знаења и способности на ученичот.

Подолу се групирани способностите (C1, C2, C3) кои ученичот треба да ги поседува за успешно решавање на испитните задања.

Ученичот треба:

- (C1) да има стекнато знаење и разбиране за природно-географските и социо-економските карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија (назоа, локација, идентификација, набројување, препознавање, имуњување, покажување, објаснување и дисквирање);
- (C2) да е осposобен за примената на своето картографско и географско знаење (препознавање, употребување, користување, демонстрирање, илустрување и подготвување);
- (C3) да е осposобен да прави анализи и синтези на објектите, појавите и сопстбите во просторот (разликување, споредување, класификување, дисквирање, заклучување, предлагање, коментирање, проценување, планирање и утврдување).

3.2. Конкретизација на целите (знаењата и способностите)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ПОДРАЧЈЕ 1: ПРИРОДНО - ГЕОГРАФСКИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА СВЕТОТ И Р. МАКЕДОНИЈА</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Содржина</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ВСЕЛЕНА И ВСЕЛЕНСКИТЕ ТЕЛА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Светлодари</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Сонечни системи</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Планети</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Сателити</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Месечината</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ЗЕМЈАТА КАКО ВСЕЛЕНСКО ТЕЛО</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Формата на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Димензиите на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ЗЕМЈЕНИ ДВИЖЕЊА И ПОСЛЕДИЦИ ОД ЗЕМЈЕНИТЕ ДВИЖЕЊА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Земјена ротација</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Земјена еволюција</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Последици од Земјените дизајни</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ФИЗИЧКО - ГЕОГРАФСКИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА ЗЕМЈАТА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Градба и состав на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Тектоника (ултрами и земјотреси)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ЛИТОСФЕРА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Геолошки состав на Земјената кора и R. Македонија</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Формирање на релјефот</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Релјеф во R. Македонија</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Почвени типови</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 6. Хидросфера и хидрографија на Р. Македонија
- Круженото движение на водата во природата;
- Распоред на водата на Земјата и Светското Море;
- Подземни и копнени води;
- Хидрографско-хидрологски одлики на Р. Македонија

- Да умееш да го идентификува кружното движение на водата во природата;
- Да го објасниш распоредот на водите и структурата на Светското Море;
- Да проценува значењето на подземните води;
- Да умееш да ги класификуваат копнените води на Земјата;
- Да ги покажуваат подземните реки и езеро во Р. Македонија;
- Да можеш да планираш како да се подобри водоснабдувањето на регионите, градовите и селата во Р. Македонија.

## 7. Атмосфера и клима во Р. Македонија
- Структура на атмосферата;
- Климатски елементи;
- Климатски фактори и нивното влијание на Земјата;
- Климатски појаси и климатски типови;
- Климатски типови во Р. Македонија

- Да ја имаеш структурата на атмосферата;
- Да умееш да ги препознаваш климатските елементи и фактори;
- Да умееш да дадеш објаснување за влијанието на климатските фактори на просторот;
- Да илустрираш за разместеноста на климатските појаси и типови во светот;
- Да е способен да ги дефинираш климатските типови во Р. Македонија;
- Да умееш да го процените влијанието на климатата во Р. Македонија за развојот на одреони земјоделски граници.

## 8. Биосфера
- Географска разместеност на растителниот свет;
- Географска разместеност на животинскиот свет;
- Растителниот и животинскиот свет во Р. Македонија

- Да умееш да ги поцираш растителните заедници и видови во светот;
- Да објаснуваш за разместеноста на животинскиот свет;
- Да ги класификуваш ареалните поденци;
- Да умееш да направиш анализ за територијалната разместеност на растителниот и животинскиот свет во Р. Македонија.

---

### Подраздел 2: Социо-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значење и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Географско-историски одлики и знаења за земјата</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Големите географски ограничувања |
- Епока на географски истражувања од 18 до 20 век |
- Етногеографски карактеристики на Македонија |
| |
- Ученикот треба да: |
- Да умееш да ги идентификуваат големите географски ограничувања |
- Да објаснуваат за географските истражувања во периодот од 18 до 20 век |
- Да дадеш свој заклучак за етногеографските карактеристики на Македонија. |
| 2. Население во светот и Р. Македонија |
- Бројното движение и природен прираст на населението |
- Миграциони движения - процеси |
- Разместеност и густина на населението |
- Етнички карактеристики на населението во Македонија |
| |
- Да умееш да го регистрираат бројното движение и природниот прираст на населението во светот |
- Да дискутираат за појавата на миграциите |
- Да дадеш свој заклучак за миграционите движения за разместеноста и густината на населението |
- Да дадеш структурата на населението во РМ. |
| 3. Населби |
- Типови населени места |
- Локација, типови градски населби |
- Населби во Македонија |
| |
- Да умееш само за да ги идентификуваат типовите на населби |
- Да објаснуваат за различните помеѓу урбани и рурални населби во светот и Р. Македонија |
- Да дадеш свој заключак за урбаниите населби во Р. Македонија. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значења и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. СТОПАНСТВО И СТОПАНСКИ ГРАНИЦИ ВО СВЕТОТ И Р. МАКЕДОНИЈА | Ученикот треба:  
- да умее да ги означи и групира стопанските граници;  
- да даде точно значење на стопанското и стопанските граници;  
- да прави точна класификација на стопанските граници;  
- да дискутира за стопанството во Р. Македонија. |
| 2. СТОЧАРСТВО | - Сточарството во светот, сточарски граници  
- Сточарството во Р. Македонија |
| 3. ШУМБАРСТВО | - Шумбарт во светот  
- Шумбарт во Р. Македонија |
| 4. ЕНЕРГЕТИСКИ ИЗВОРИ | - Енергетски извори во светот  
- Енергетски извори во Р. Македонија |
| 5. СУРОВИНИ / РУДНИ БОГАТСТВА | - Метални и неметални суровини во светот  
- Метални и неметални суровини и нивната територијална разместеност во Р. Македонија |
| 6. ИНДУСТРИЈА | - Индустријските граници  
- Индустријското производство во светот  
- Индустријското производство во Р. Македонија |

| 7. СООБРАЖАЈ | - Сообраќај во светот  
- Сообраќај во Р. Македонија |
| 8. ТРГОВИЈА | - Трговија, знацетрација и надворешна трговија  
- Трговски групи  
- Трговија во Р. Македонија |
| 9. ТУРИЗМ | - Туристичко-географски региони во светот  
- Туризмот во Р. Македонија |
4. СПЕЦИФИКАЦИСКА МРЕЖА НА ИСПИТОТ

Во следната шема е дадена процентуалната застапеност на подрачјата (темите) и способностите во тестот по географија.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Способности</th>
<th>Подрачја</th>
<th>( n_1 )</th>
<th>( n_2 )</th>
<th>( n_3 )</th>
<th>ЗАСТАПЕНОСТ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_3 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЗАСТАПЕНОСТ (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( C_1 \): знаење и разбиране
\( C_2 \): примена на знаењето
\( C_3 \): анализа и синтеза

П1 - Природно-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија
П2 - Социо-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија
П3 - Економско-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија

5. ОПИС НА ИСПИТОТ

Испитот по предметот географија е писмен. Тој се состои во решање на тест на знаења што ќе биде подготовен на државно ниво и ќе се спроведе на екстерен начин. Времетраењето на испитот по географија е 80 минути. Тестот да содржи околу 45 испитни задачи. Во тестот се застапени следните видови испитни задачи:

- задачи во ком ученикот треба да го потврди или негира понудениот искаж;
- задачи во ком ученикот треба да го з абсолютен точок одговор од понудените три или четири одговори;
- задачи во ком ученикот треба да го напише одговорот на познатите линии;
- задачи во ком ученикот треба да посвети или подреди термини кои настанал на иста појамена група од дадените;
- задачи од отворен тип во ком ученикот треба да реши задачи и да објасни за објектите, појавите, процесите и сопствените во просторот.
6. НАЧИН НА ОЦЕНУВАЊЕ

Вкупниот број бодови што можат да се освојат на испитот по географија изнесува около 80.

Задачите во кои од ученикот се бара да го потврди или негира понудениот искаж се оцениваат со по 1 бод. На ваквите задачи ученикот може да освои најмногу около 10 бода.

Задачите на кои се бара ученикот да го избере точниот одговор или да напише кус одговор (еден до два збора) се вреднуваат со по 1 бод. На ваквите задачи ученикот може да освои најмногу около 25 бода.

Во задатките во кои се бара ученикот да покаже терминизи и поними секој точен одговор се вреднува со по 1 бод. Секоја од задачите може да носи 2 до 5 бода. Вкупно на овие задачи може да се освојат најмногу около 15 бода.

Задачите во кои од ученикот се бара да покаже пресметување и ориентирање се оцениваат со 3 до 5 бода во зависност од бројот на чекорите (фазите) што ученикот треба да ги покаже. На ваквите задачи може да се освојат најмногу около 15 бода.

Задачите во кои ученикот треба нешто да објасни или да даде решение за објектите, појавите, процесите и состојбите во просторот се оцениваат со 3 до 5 бода. Вкупно на ваквите задачи може да се освојат најмногу около 15 бода.

Вкупниот број бодови што можат да се освојат на испитот по географија изнесува 80.

Оценивањето кој се врши во училиштето врз основа на однапред изготвено упатство и усогласени критерии.

Минимален број на бодови за да се положи испитот по географија, како и распонот на бодовите за секој од позитивните оцени (достеген = 2, добар = 3, многу добар = 4 и одличен = 5) го утврдува Училишната матурска предметна комисија по географија, за секоја испитна сесија посебно.
ИСПИТНА ПРОГРАМА

ГЕОГРАФИЈА

ДРЖАВНА МАТУРА
ВО ГИМНАЗИСКО ОБРАЗОВАЊЕ

Испитната програма по географија за државна матура во гимназиско образование е донесена со решение на министерот за образование и наука
бр. 11-6815/2 од 10.11.2005 година.
1. ВОВЕД

Реформите во средното образование во Р. Македонија започнаа со доносување на Законот за средно образование во 1995 година. Во 1996 година беа усвоени документите Програмска структура на средното образование и образовните профили во средното стручно образование. Новиот Наставен план и програма во гимназиското образование што почна да се применува од учебната 2001/2002 година, со цел да се подигне квалитетот на образованието, претставува фундамент на кој се темели програмата за македонскиот ипспит по географија. Тоа ќе овозможи подобра подготоност за продолжување на образованието на учениците во високошколските установи. Потребите од промени произлегаа од вооценените слабости на постојните завршни испити на крајот од средното образование, кои немаа повратно влијание на квалитетот на образовниот процес и не беа дрвоходно добра основа за селекција при упис во високото образование.

Испитната програма за државната мatura по географија е документ во кој јасно е дефинирана кои знаења, умеења и способности ке се проверуваат на испитот. Истовремено таа претставува и значаен елемент во обезбедувањето на транспарентност на образовниот систем.

Матурската испитна програма се темели врз наставните програми за I и II година како задолжителен и III година како изборен предмет во гимназиското образование.

Испитната програма прилежно е наменета за учениците, наставниците, изготвуваците на тестовите, организаторите на испитите, како и за други потенцијални корисници.

Испитната програма ги содржи следните компоненти:
- Општа цел на испитот
- Содржина на испитот
- Спецификација на подршката (содржините) и способностите
- Конкретизација на целите (знавањата и способности)
- Спецификација на метода на испитот
- Структура на испитот и оценување
- Опис на испитот
- Начин на оценување.

2. ОПШТА ЦЕЛ НА ИСПИТОТ

Општа цел на македонскиот испит по географија е да се провери колку учиеник е способен:
- да го придонесува просторот на Република Македонија и светот;
- да ги претстави природно-географските и социо-економските карактеристики на континентите, регионите, поголемите држави во светот и Република Македонија;
- да покажува сигурност при користење на својата кардографска и географска писменост;
- да го проценува вливот на природните и општествените фактори кои предизвикуваат нарушување на животната средина;
- самоустоично набљудување и анализи на објектите, појавите, процесите и состојбите во просторот.
3. СОДРЖИНА НА ИСПИТОТ

3.1. Спецификација на подрачјата (содржините) и способностите

Содржини кои ќе бидат опфатени на матурското испит:
- Природно-географски карактеристики на светот и Република Македонија;
- Социо-географски карактеристики на светот и Република Македонија;
- Економско-географски карактеристики на светот и Република Македонија;
- Заштита и унапредување на животната средина.

Испитната програма е ориентирана кон проверка на географските знаења и способности на ученикот.

Подолу се групираат способностите (C1, C2, C3) кои ученикот треба да ги поседува за успешно решавање на испитните задачи.

Ученикот треба да:
- (C1) да има стекнато знаење и разбирање за природно-географските и социо-економските карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија (покрај, идентификува, набрзува, препознава, имнува, покажува и објаснува);
- (C2) да е оспособен за применува на своето картографско и географско знаење (употребува, користи, конструира, демонстрира, илустрира и подготвува);
- (C3) да е оспособен да прави анализи и синтези за објектите, појавите и состојбите во просторот (классификува, дискликува, заклучува, предлага, комбинира, проценува, планира и утврдува).

3.2. Конкретизација на целите (знаењата и способностите)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Подрачје 1: Природно-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Содржина</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Вселена и вселенски тела</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Сивеци</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Сонце и Сончев систем</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Планети</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Сателити</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Месечина</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Земјата како вселенско тело</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Формата на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Дневните на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Земјени движења и последици од земјените движења</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Земјена ротација</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Земјена револуција</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Последици од Земјените движења</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ПРЕСТАВУВАЊЕ НА ЗЕМЈЕННАТА ПОВРШИНА НА КАРТА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Глобус, меридијани и паралели / напредачки / географска ширина и должина</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Поделба на картите според државата и размерот</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Аполутна и равнинската височина</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ФИЗИЧКО-ГЕОГРАФСКИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА ЗЕМЈАТА</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Геолошка еволуција на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Градби и состав на Земјата</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Тектоника (кулми и земјотреси) во Р. Македонија</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. ЛИТОСФЕРА
- Геолошко состав на Земјата врз ГРФ
- Формирање на релјефот
- Генетиски типови релјефот
- Релјефот во ГРФ
- Положби типови

7. ХИДРОСФЕРА И ХИДРОГРАФИЈА НА ГРФ
- Кружното движение на водата во природата
- Распространение на водата на Земјата и Светското Море
- Подземни и копнени води
- Хидравлого-хидрологски одлики на ГРФ

8. АТМОСФЕРА И КЛИМА ВО ГРФ
- Структура на атмосферата
- Климатски елементи
- Климатски фактори и нивното влијание на Земјата
- Време, клима и прогноза на времето
- Климатски појаси и климатски типови
- Климатски типови во ГРФ

9. БИОСФЕРА
- Географска разместеност на растителниот свет
- Географска разместеност на животинскиот свет
- Растителниот и животинскиот свет во ГРФ

ПОДРАЧИЕ 2: СОЦИО-ГЕОГРАФСКИ КАРАКТЕРISTICИ НА СВЕТОТ И ГРФ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значење и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ГЕОГРАФСКО-ИСТОРИСКИ ОДЛИКИ И ЗНАЕЊА ЗА ЗЕМАТА</td>
<td>Ученикот треба да ги идентификува големите географски откриства; да ги раскажува за географските позабележувани во периодот од 18 до 20 век; да ги разбере карактеристиките на територијалното разделяне; да ги разбере карактеристиките на океанските и континенталните раздели во ГРФ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. НАСЕЛЕНЕ ИЗ СВЕТОТ И ГРФ</td>
<td>Да ги разбере карактеристиките на населението во светот; да даде прецизни информации за различните групи во населението во светот.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. НАСЕЛЕНИ</td>
<td>Да ги разбере карактеристиките на населението во светот; да даде прецизни информации за различните групи во населението во светот.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. КУЛТУРНО-ГЕОГРАФСКИ ОДЛИКИ НА СВЕТОТ</td>
<td>Да ги разбере карактеристиките на областите; да ги разбере карактеристиките на географските групи во светот; да ги разбере карактеристиките на географските групи во светот.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Подрачје 3: Економско-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Значење и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Стопанство и стопански граници во светот и Р. Македонија** | - Уникатен трговец: 
- да умее да ги означи и групира стопанските граници; 
- да даде точна и значајна земјоделска граница; 
- да прави точна класификација на стопанските граници; 
- да дарува мапи со стопанските граници во Р. Македонија. |
| **2. Сточарство** | - Да умее да ги идентификува сточарството како значајна земјоделска граница; 
- да преминува за значајната сточарска граница; 
- да ги добиени сточарските граници; 
- да опише развојот на сточарството и да даде мапи за сточиштата во Р. Македонија. |
| **3. Шумарство** | - Дрво и ги приведува за значајната шумарска граница; 
- да преминува за значајната шумарска граница; 
- да добиени шумарските граници; 
- да даде анализ за значајната шумарска граница и неговата неравен распределба во Р. Македонија. |
| **4. Енергетски извори** | - Да означи енергетските извори; 
- да преминува за значајната енергетска граница; 
- да даде анализ за значајната енергетска граница во Р. Македонија. |
| **5. Суровини / Рудни богатства** | - Да умее да препознае што се тоа сугени и како е значајната стопанска граница; 
- да умее да препознае значајната сугенина и неговата територијална значајност во Р. Македонија. |
| **6. Индустрија** | - Да ги преминува за значајната индустрија за стопанска размена на просторот; 
- да даде анализ на значајната индустрија во Р. Македонија; 
- да умее да прикаже значајната индустрија за стопанска размена на просторот; 
- да умее да има значајна индустрија во Р. Македонија. |

| 7. Сообраќај | - Сообраќај во светот; 
- Сообраќај во Р. Македонија; 
- Да умее да прикаже значајната сообраќајна грана во Р. Македонија. |
| 8. Трговија | - Трговија, аеродроми и надворешни трговија; 
- Трговски групи; 
- Трговски центри во Р. Македонија; 
- Да умее да прикаже значајната трговска грана во Р. Македонија. |
| 9. Туризам | - Туристичко-географски региони во светот; 
- Туристички региони во Р. Македонија; 
- Да умее да прикаже значајната туристичка грана во Р. Македонија. |
| 10. Културолошки, стопански и географски региони | - Да умее да прикаже значајната културолошка, стопанска и географска грана во Р. Македонија; 
- Да умее да прикаже значајната културолошка, стопанска и географска грана во Р. Македонија; 
- Да умее да прикаже значајната културолошка, стопанска и географска грана во Р. Македонија. |
### Подрачје 4: Заштита и унапредување на животната средина

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Содржина</th>
<th>Знанија и способности</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Природни и општествени фактори коме предизвикуваат нарушување на животната средина</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Природни фактори кои ја нарушуваат животната средина</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Човекот како фактор која нарушува животната средина</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ученикот треба:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да узее да ги поврзаните природните фактори кои најмногу ја загадуваат животната средина на глобално и локално ниво;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да дискусира како тие влијаат на нарушувањето на животната средина;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да проучи колку е згаѓањето на човекот во нарушувањето на животната средина.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Загадување и заштита на воздухот</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Природни и други фактори кои го загадуваат воздухот</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Защита на воздухот од загадување</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да регистрира најголемите загадувања на воздухот;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да објаснува како настанува процесот на загадување на воздухот;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Загадување и заштита на водите</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Природни и други фактори кои ги загадуваат водите</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Защита на водите од загадување</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да регистрира најголемите загадувања на водите;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да објаснува како настанува процесот на загадување на водите;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Урбаната средина и неурбаниата заштита</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Урбанизацијата како светски процес - мегаполиси</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Урбаната средина во Р. Македонија</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Защитата на урбаната средина од загадување</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да ја идентификува урбаниота средина;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Да селектира урбаниите од руралните центри</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Спецификациска мрежа на испитот

Во следната шема е дадена процентуалната застапеност на подрачјата (темите) и способностите во тестот по географи.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Способности</th>
<th>Подрачја</th>
<th>Застапеност (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>P₁, P₂, P₃, P₄</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Застапеност (%) | 35 | 15 | 35 | 15 | 100 |

C<sub>1</sub> - знаење и разбиране  
C<sub>2</sub> - примена на знаењето  
C<sub>3</sub> - анализа и синтеза  
P₁ - Природно-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија  
P₂ - Соци-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија  
P₃ - Економско-географски карактеристики на светот и Р. Македонија  
P₄ - Защита и унапредување на животната средина
The pupil shall come into touch with the concept and the region of Macedonia within its ethnic boundaries. He/she shall be familiar with the partitions of Macedonia and the creation of separate parts, one of which is the Republic of Makedonija. Teaching use will be made of ‘geographical maps (ethnic maps) of Macedonia, theme maps showing the geographical and historical partition of Macedonia’, and of ‘conversation with the pupils about the partitions of Macedonia, population (especially Macedonian population) transfers, a selection of texts, &c.’
Македонизам

Спогодбени убедности од Демократското Собрание на Република Македонија претставени на 27. декември 1998

Сидоров се одржава од 1. септември 1998 година на Софија, главната столица на Република Македонија, на 10,02 часот.

Сидоров се одржава и на септември 2008 година, кој бил претставен на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и од ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.

Сидоров се одржава на председателството на БМРО-ДМРО и на ДПА, како и на председателството на Собранието на Република Македонија.
'Looking after the status and rights of the Macedonian national minority in neighbouring countries is our natural right and obligation. We insist on the undeviating application of European rules about respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms, including the right to look after national, cultural and linguistic individuality'.

Excerpt from a speech by Branko Červenkovski, the Republic’s president, to the FYROM Parliament.

Parliamentary Minutes of the Session on 21 December 2006, as taken down in shorthand, p.5.
Issues of Voice of the Aegeans (Глас на Егејците), for 1 November 1950 and 17 June 1951. The articles refer to ‘terrorism against our fellow-nationals in Aegean Macedonia’.
Lazar Mojsov, Macedonians in Aegean Macedonia: the national minority in Greece, published in 1954, by the Institute of National History. As stated in the preface to the 1989 reprint (pp.5-6), the book 'was bunged into the basement of the Institute of National History, the intention being to destroy it and for the law of silence to prevail'. In the writer’s words, ‘the reader will come across incredible similarities between the era and the slogans of 1953 and of 1989’.

D.Zografski, G.Abatsiev, A.Mitrev, M.Keramichiev, Егеjска Македонија во нашата история [Aegean Macedonia in our history], 1951, published by the FYROM Institute of National History.

D.Zografski, G.Abatsiev, A.Mitrev, M.Keramichiev, Егеjска Македонија во нашата история [Aegean Macedonia in our history], 1951, published by the FYROM Institute of National History.
Macedonianism

Naum Pejov, Македонците и граѓанска војна во Грција [Macedonians and the Civil War in Greece], 1968, published by the FYROM Institute of National History.

Todor Šimovski, Населените места во Егејска Македонија [The Inhabited Places in Aegean Macedonia]. 1978, published by the FYROM Institute of National History. Reprinted in 1998 by the Soros Open Society in conjunction with the ‘Society of Child-Refugees from Aegean Macedonia, to mark the ‘2nd World Meeting of Child-Refugees’ at Skopje in 1998, funded by the FYROM Government. The main speaker at this event was the country’s president Kiro Gligorov.
from 1913 to 1923 the most widely used language was not the Greek language, despite its status of *langue Officielle* (official language). But after the great ethnographic changes (1913—1928) the Macedonian language loses the status of the most widely used language and becomes like the Macedonian people *la langue de la minorité* or *la langue de famille* (family language). At the same time the Greek language from a minority language and a family language becomes the most used language in the Aegean part of Macedonia.

The pressure of the new ethnographic reality was so strong that the Macedonian language started losing its physical integrity. Many Greek words started to penetrate the Macedonian language (in a Macedonian form) so that the so called phenomenon of dualism appeared, which has not nothing in common with the phenomenon of bilingualism. This penetration of foreign words into Macedonian is specific and appears mainly in the nationally enslaved nations and represents a state in the transition from one mother tongue into another. This penetration of foreign words into Macedonian language was becoming stronger, but in the period from 1913 to 1949 it did not treaten yet the status of the mother tongue of the Macedonian population. For the Macedonian people the Macedonian language was still playing the role of a primary language (mother tongue). It was learnt within the family which used it naturally. The Macedonian people gradually learnt also Greek, but this language was considered as a secondary (foreign) language. New phenomena appeared after the Civil War in Greece (1946—1949). Greek reached the status of a mother tongue for a part of the Macedonian population. In this way Greek reached the level of the psyche of consciousness and the process of the formation of another consciousness started. This is the final process in the assimilation of an enslaved minority.

— Stojan Kiselovski, *Гръцката колонизација во Егејска Македонија 1913-1940* [Greek colonial activities in Aegean Macedonia 1913-1940], published by the FYROM Institute of National History. ‘New phenomena appeared after the Civil War in Greece (1946-1949 [sic]). Greek reached the status of a mother tongue for a part of the Macedonian population. In this way Greek reached the level of the psyche of consciousness [!] and the process of the formation of another consciousness started. This is the final process in the assimilation of the enslaved minority’ (p.176).
Zuzana Topolinjska, Македонските диалекти во Егејска Македонија [Dialects of Macedonian in Aegean Macedonia], published by the FYROM Academy of Sciences & Arts.
THE ‘OPPRESSED MACEDONIAN MINORITY’

Lazar Koliševski, Πτυχές του μακεδονικού ζητήματος [Aspects of the Macedonian Question], 1986, published by Makedonska Kniga (in Greek). This is the Greek version of Аспекти на македонското прашање, published in 1962 (in Slavmacedonian).
Η ΣΟΣΙΑΛΙΣΤΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΕΛΕΙ ΤΟ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΓΑΣΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΜΑΚΡΙΩΝΟΥ ΑΤΩΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΛΑΟΥ*

Εκτός Του: Που αναφέρεται η σημαντική καθάριση των καθεστώτων του Βούλγαρου ΚΚ εντός της εθνικής οντότητας του μακεδονικού λαού και εναντίον της ΔΔ της Μακεδονίας;

Απάντηση: Δεδομένου ότι, ως οποιασοστά Σοσιαλιστείς, προκατασχούσαμε ειδικά ιστομόντα των λαών μας, δεν επιτρέπουμε την ιστορία αυτή σε μια εισάγηση από την βασική ιστορία της ουσιαστικής και αντιπαράθεσης του σοσιαλισμού, δεν είναι κατάλληλο παρέκκληση που η προκαταστάσεις του αιώνα έκλεισαν τους σοσιαλιστικούς διαμόρφωσης στη γενική καθήκοντα και με διαφορετικές εντοπίσεις της Γιογκομολοβίας ίδιων και εκπαιδευτικών εκδοτών, δηλητήρια και αρχές με διάφορες μηχανισμούς κατά έναν ενεργό και την ενεργία και την ενεργές συμμετοχή στη βλάβη της. Στατικά, βεβαιωθήκαμε και είναι δικαίως που έχουμε συνεχίσει να θεωρούμε σε γενική περιοχή τούς παραπάνω αρχές των επιθέσεων, την σημαντικότητα καθάρισης της Βουλγαρίας εναντίον του μακεδονικού εθνικού και της ΔΔ της Μακεδονίας, εναντίον της πολιτικής της Ευρώπης και της Ελλάδας η οποία τούτους της Γιογκομολοβίας στην ιστορία του εθνικού ζητήματος όπως ήταν οδηγητής και έναντι να υποδεχόμαστε κανένας της μεγαλύτερης γιόγκολοβιας*

* Αποτελούνται από την συνωνία με τις συνάντηση της της Πανελλήνια Ενότητα Μακεδονών στην Ιστορία της Ελλάδας της ΔΔ της Μακεδονίας, ενσωματώνοντας την ιστορία της Ελλάδας και της Ευρώπης και της Ελλάδας η οποία τούτους 4147 της 11 και 12 Οκτωβρίου 1958.

Η ΜΗ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΡΙΣΗ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΗΣ ΜΕΙΟΝΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΣΤΙΣ ΓΕΙΤΟΝΙΚΕΣ ΧΩΡΕΣ ΕΠΕΝΔΥΤΙΚΗ ΑΦΟΡΜΗ ΓΙΑ ΣΧΕΔΙΕΡΕΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΜΦΕΡΟΝΤΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΒΑΛΚΑΝΙΚΩΝ ΛΑΟΥ*

Ως άλλος μείον λέει ότι το ευδοκή και ομοιόμορφο του μακεδονικού λαού για την ανάπτυξη μείον καλά επιδιωκόμενη συνεργασία μεταξύ των βαλκανικών λαών, δεν είναι μικρότερο από έναν συνοικισμό άλλου γεωπονικού λαού. Εκτός του άλλου, το τμήμα αυτή της Γιογκομολοβίας συνεργάζεται με προς χάμη και ο λαός μας καταλήγει βεβαιά στη σημαντική της προοπτική του στην προσέγγιση των γιογκομολοβίων λαών με τους λαούς των γειτονικών χωρών. Γι' αυτό σκοπεύει και πως αναγνωρίζουμε ιδιαίτερα αποτελέσματα που έχουν επιπτώσεις και της Γιογκομολοβίας από τη θάλασα και την Ελλάδα και την Βουλγαρία παρά τον μείον μόριο. Υπογράφηκαν συμφωνίες και συμβάσεις για τη διατήρηση των σκετικών μερών ανταλλαγών, για συνομιλίες, τεχνοτροπία και πολιτικό συνεργατικό, για τη κάθε περίπτωση μείον καθαρός και πολιτικός συνεργατικός, για την ανάπτυξη μείον καθαρός και πολιτικός συνεργατικός. Αυτό ανοίγει δυναμικές για την ανάπτυξη της συνεργασίας στη βάση των μακεδονικών συμφερόντων.*

* Από την επιστροφή στο 1ο Συνέδριο της Συναγωγής Εισβολής των μακεδόνων λαών της Μακεδονίας, την έδωσε στο 1ο Συνέδριο της Ελλάδας της ΔΔ της Μακεδονίας, 9 Οκτωβρίου 1958.
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ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΝΙΣΜΟΣ

...
Η ΑΝΑΠΤΥΞΗ ΚΑΙ Η ΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΗ ΤΗΣ ΣΟΥΛΑΖΙΣΤΙΚΗΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ ΕΝΙΣΧΥΕΤΙΚΟ ΤΟ ΑΙΣΘΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΘΕ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΟΝ ΟΤΙ ΑΝΗΚΕΙ ΣΕ ΑΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΕΘΝΟΣ, ΑΝΕΞΑΡΤΗΤΟ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΝ ΤΟΠΟ ΔΙΑΜΟΝΗΣ ΤΟΥ

Η εξερεύνηση της ανεξαρτησίας μας και της εθνικής ακαρτονήσης ήταν κάντα και παραμένει μόνο έναν χρόνο μας. Οι ορίζοντες της εποχής του πολέμου, ήταν και σημαντικά, αντιδοτικά στην προσωπικιστική και άλλη δραστηριότητα των εξωτερικών δυνάμεων και την αντιστάθμιση τους, έμειναν μόνο μίας και της ανεξαρτησίας μας και της εθνικής ακαρτονήσης μας. Γι’ αυτό η πραγματοποίηση της ανάλυσης της ημέρας, έπεκαν μία επιπλέον επιπλέον αντιδράσεις. Τον ίδιο τον ίδιο τον, αυτή της ανάλυσης της ημέρας, έπαιξε μία επιπλέον αντιδράσεις. Τον ίδιο τον, αυτή της ανάλυσης της ημέρας, έπαιξε μία επιπλέον αντιδράσεις.

Τέλος, μία άλλη ημέρα μεγάλη σημασία στην ανάπτυξη της συμπεριφοράς σχέσεων με όλους τους λαούς, εκπλήρωσε της, αποτελεί μόνο ενδιαφέρον και το συμπέρασμα της οικονομικής και πολιτικής. Η χώρα μας ανεξάρτητοι έδειξαν μεγάλη σημασία στην ανάπτυξη της συμπεριφοράς σχέσεων με όλους τους λαούς, εκπλήρωσε της, αποτελεί μόνο ενδιαφέρον και το συμπέρασμα της οικονομικής και πολιτικής.

* Αποκτάται και με τον τύπο που εφάπτεται στην 11 Οκτωβρίου 1973 στη συνέντευξη του Κλεφάτα.

Trpko Bitsevski, Македонски народни песни од леринско [Macedonian national songs from Lerin [Florina]], 1995, published by the FYROM Institute of Folklore.
Liljana Panovska, Terrorism in the Aegean Part of Macedonia 1941-1944, 2003, published by the FYROM Institute of National History.

Kornelija Pejovska, Proofs of Greek terrorism in the Lerin [Florina] area 1945-1949, 1998. The book was published by Matitza Macedonska to coincide with the ‘2nd World Rally of Child-Refugees’, funded by the FYROM Government, at Skopje in 1998. The main speaker at the rally was the country’s president Kiro Gligorov.

Kole Mangov, За Македонците човечки права [On Macedonian human rights]. Publication was funded by FYROM State Radio. The blurb on the back cover is by Vlado Popovski, a former Minister of Justice, and Professor at the Law School. It states that the author ‘makes contemporary democratic values his starting-point’.
The book was published by the ‘Society of Child-Refugees from Macedonia’, to coincide with the ‘2nd World Rally of Child-Refugees’, funded by the FYROM Government, at Skopje in 1998. The main speaker at the rally was the country’s president Kiro Gligorov.

Vladimir Ortakovski, Межународна положба на малцинства [The international status of minorities], 1996, published with funding from the FYROM Foreign Ministry. The book reappeared in English as Minorities in the Balkans.
Naum Peyov, A Conspiracy against Macedonia, Skopje, 1998. Published, with funding from the FYROM Foreign Ministry, by Matica na Iselenici od Makedonija, to coincide with the '2nd World Rally of Child-Refugees', funded by the FYROM Government, at Skopje in 1998. The main speaker at the rally was the country’s president Kiro Gligorov. The excerpt below from the book was forwarded by 'Aegean' organizations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

‘After the Second Balkan War, Greece began practicing genocide and terror upon the Macedonian population in the Aegean region, with the sole purpose of changing the ethnic composition in its newly occupied territories’ (p.75).
Ljiljana Panovska,
Krajot na edna illusion: the Civil War in Greece and the Macedonians [End of an illusion: the Civil War in Greece and the Macedonians], 2003, published by the FYROM Institute of National History.

Gligor Todorovski,
Демографските процеси и промени во Македонија од почетокот на првата балканска војна до осамостојувањето на Македонија [Demographic developments and changes in Macedonia, from the start of the First Balkan War to the Independence of Macedonia], 2001, jointly published by the Institute of National History and Matitsa Makedonska.
Mišo Kitanovski & Gjorgi Donevski, "Деца бегалци од Егеjска Македонија во Југославија [The Child-Refugees from Aegean Macedonia who are now in Yugoslavia], 2003, published by the ‘Society of Child-Refugees from Macedonia’.

Sokrat Panovski & Ilija Lafazanofski, "Прогонство што трае [The long exile], Skopje 2005."
Незаборав ['I do not forget!']. The magazine of the 'Union of Societies of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia'.
Глас на Егејците [Voice of the Aegeans]. Reissue of the newspaper published in the early 1950s by refugees from Greece.
As regards the minorities issue in the Balkans, my view is that there is no better development for the [minority] organizations than for the countries in which they are living to become, or to desire to become, members of the European Union. The Macedonian minority in Greece, for example, is better off than it was twenty years ago. Its situation may not be ideal – as Rainbow, for instance, claims – but it is slowly and surely being improved. This is because these organizations have learnt to use the mechanisms recommended by the European Union. However, in her bilateral relations with her neighbours, Macedonia can and should take an interest, with dignity and without any intention of provoking conflict or unease, in encouraging neighbouring states to meet all the European criteria as regards minority rights. This will be the policy of our government.
‘The majority of the population of Greece (87%) are Greeks. Northern Greece is the home of Macedonians, Bulgarians, Turks, and Albanians. Macedonians are the largest minority in Greece and are today fighting for their civic rights’.

Gjorgji Pavlovski, Atse Milenkovski, Nikola Panov, Risto Mijalov. Географија за VII одделение (Junior School Grade VII Geography textbook), Skopje 2003, p.42.
From 1946 onwards, virtually all the Constitutions of SDM and FYROM make reference to the Republic’s right to ‘concern itself with the status and rights of members of the Macedonian people in neighbouring countries’. (Article 48 of the 1991 Constitution).

Pripadnicite na nacionalnostite imaat pravo slobodno da gi izrazuvaat, neguvaat i razvivaat svojot identitet i nacionalnite osobenosti.

Republikata im ja garantira zaftitata na etni~kiot, kulturniot, jaz~niot i verskiot identitet na nacionalnostite.

Pripadnicite na nacionalnostite imaat pravo da osnovaat kulturni i umetni~ki institucii, nau~ni i drugi zdu`enija zaradi izrazuvawe, neguvawe i razvivawe na svojot identitet.

Pripadnicite na nacionalnostite imaat pravo na nastava na svojot jazik vo osnovnoto i srednoto obrazovanie na na~in utvrden so zakon. Vo u~ilitata vo koi obrazovanieto se odviva na jazikot na nacionalnosta se izu~va i makedonskiot jazik.

▲ From 1946 onwards, virtually all the Constitutions of SDM and FYROM make reference to the Republic’s right to ‘concern itself with the status and rights of members of the Macedonian people in neighbouring countries’. (Article 48 of the 1991 Constitution).
Source: Detailed Junior School Education Syllabus, Grade V history syllabus, Skopje, 1998.

For lessons on prehistory, the Syllabus provides for the use of the Historical Atlas and the Map of Ethnic Macedonia.

In the Syllabus, one of the aims of the unit ‘Macedonia in ancient times’ is for the pupils to ‘underline the similarities and differences between the ancient and modern Macedonians’, ‘to explain the origin of Macedonia and its name’, and ‘to define the individuality of the Macedonian people, its language, religion, and art, and to compare it with its neighbours’.
For lessons on the history of ‘Macedonia in the late 18th century’, the Syllabus provides for the use of the Map of Macedonia and its ethnic boundaries, and the Map of the Neguš (Naoussa) Rising.


Source: Detailed Junior School Education Syllabus, Grade VI history syllabus, Skopje, 1998.
There is a separate unit on ‘The National Liberation Movement in the Aegean Part of Macedonia (1941-1944)’. There are separate units on ‘The status of Macedonians in other parts of Macedonia’. In the sub-unit ‘The Aegean Part’, pupils are taught about ‘Macedonians in the Civil War’, ‘National and cultural rights during the Civil War’, and ‘Persecution and oppression, the Exodus, and lack of respect for civic and minority rights in Greece’. 

Ministry of Education & Sport
Source: Detailed Junior School Education Syllabus, Grade VIII history syllabus, Skopje, 1998.
(p.49) There is a separate unit on ‘The National Liberation Movement in the Aegean Part of Macedonia (1941-1944)’.
(p.53) There are separate units on ‘The status of Macedonians in other parts of Macedonia’. In the sub-unit ‘The Aegean Part’, pupils are taught about ‘Macedonians in the Civil War’, ‘National and cultural rights during the Civil War’, and ‘Persecution and oppression, the Exodus, and lack of respect for civic and minority rights in Greece’.
One of the aims of the unit ‘Macedonia in early Prehistory’ is, according to the Syllabus, for the pupils to ‘be familiar with the struggle of the Macedonian people against Bulgarian and Byzantine rule’.
Such strategic orientations [of Balkan countries] significantly influence Macedonian thinking about and practice of strategy, seeing that from the very foundation of the young Macedonian state until the present time there have been three acts of aggression (агресирана).

[NOTE: The two first ‘acts of aggression’ were the withdrawal of the Federal Army, and the mass settlement of refugees from Kosovo. The third (was) by Greece, with the action of economic and political boycott (the second is still ongoing) as a result of the adoption of the Constitution by virtue of which the expression ‘Republic of Makedoniija’ was preferred as the name of the state. The economic boycott is interpreted as an aggressive action in ‘an ad hoc war’ with the same aim as the ‘Hot War’, but realized not by armed means, but by subtler non-military economic means].

‘Besides our neighbours’ aggressive actions and measures, other pressures and actions should be taken account of that, above and beyond the recognition of the state by its constitutional name (Greece apart), leave traces of the strategic aim that for a given period of time and in a given place it would be possible to effect. The commonest of these are:

[...] Greece: the issue of the constitutional name of the Republic of Makedoniija, the status of Macedonian refugees, the national minority, and the non-recognition of the Macedonian Orthodox Church’.

Reports examined at Committee Sessions: […]

Report of the Society of Refugees from the Aegean Part of Macedonia on massive infringement of the rights of Macedonians expelled from the Aegean Part of Macedonia in 1949, after the Civil War’.

1. During the period under review, the Standing Committee on Protection of Citizen Rights & Freedoms held three sessions. The issues discussed were: Ways and means of assuring full human rights for Child-Refugees and other citizens expelled in 1949, after the Civil War; […] Reports examined at Committee Sessions: [...] Report of the Society of Refugees from the Aegean Part of Macedonia on massive infringement of the rights of Macedonians expelled from the Aegean Part of Macedonia in 1949, after the Civil War.
Starting forth from the historical truth that Macedonia and the Macedonians were made perpetuated by Holy Scripture (the Bible); and having due reverence for the fact that it is in the holy biblical and sanctified land of Macedonia that Christianity has been taught since the time of the Holy Apostle Paul, who founded the first Christian communities and bishoprics in Macedonian cities including Filipi [Philippi], Solun [Thessaloniki], and Ver [Beothoea];
And taking into account the work of the Holy Apostles Gaius and Aristarchus [Acts xix.29] and the Macedonian churches [bishoprics] in the age of the Apostles [II.Cornithians viii.1-5] and thereafter in the age of Justiniana Prima, and also the work of the Panslavic Macedonian enlighteners Cyril and Methodius, and in particular the work of their gifted pupil Clement of Ohrid, the Miracle-Worker, bishop of the Macedonian province of Dremvitsno the Great (893-916), who bequeathed the Holy Scriptures and liturgical texts in the Old Macedonian tongue to the Macedonian people, as a foundation upon which was later built the Archbishopric of Ohrid;
Setting out from the excellent results of the Archbishopric of Ohrid in fortifying Christianity among the Macedonians and other peoples, and in the enlightening mission of the School of Ohrid – the first University in the Balkans and in Europe;
Acknowledging that in the tenth century, in the Macedonian state of Samouil, the Archbishopric of Ohrid was elevated to a Patriarchate;
In virtue of the fact that the Archbishopric of Ohrid was never voided in canon law (but only the Turkish sultan, as heathen governor of Macedonia, did, in 1767 by Proclamation obstruct its independent action; And seeing that the Macedonian people did, in its long struggle for Orthodox ecclesiastical and pedagogical, spiritual, cultural, national, and social freedom, and for existence as a state, proceed with the renewal of the Archbishopric of Ohrid in the person, in canon law, of the Macedonian Orthodox Church’.
Note that Premin, the official church magazine, is funded by the Ministry of Culture. [Source: Ministry of Culture Programme for 2007].
Announcement of the 11th Conference of the Jugoslav Union of Communists, 1978. ‘The successful progress of relations with the Greek Republic would have developed still more amicably, unimpededly and multilaterally, had the country alluded to taken steps to resolve the status of the Macedonian national minority in a positive manner. This would have been to the benefit of further development of good-neighbour relations and cooperation between our two countries in all sectors’.

Communiqué from the Office of Prime Minister Vlado Butskovski, 24 April 2006.

‘On the invitation of the ‘Union of Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia’, Prime Minister Butskovski today attended the 12th Easter Rally, celebrated in the traditional manner in the village of Brest near Radović. “I was happy to accept the Union’s invitation to join you in this festival and to present the awards for all that the Union has done of past years for the rights of the 120,000 Child-Refugees from Aegean Macedonia”, said Prime Minister Butskovski. Over the last few years (he added), the Government had held talks with Karamanlis and Papandreou and had opened up political dialogue for the permanent solution for the problems of Macedonians in the Aegean Part of Macedonia, and for the question of The Name. “Property problems and problems about freedom of movement should be no bar in today’s Europe”, emphasized Butskovski. He hoped that Greek pragmatism and the European spirit would win the day, and there could soon be another such meeting the other side of the borders. Stojan Dimkov, coordinator of the ‘Society of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia’, welcomed the Prime Minister’s attendance at the event. He also said that the day’s Rally was being attended by Macedonians from all sections of Macedonia, and that this showed that the Macedonian spirit was deathless’.

Source: Official website of the Social-Democratic Union.
ФИЛИП ПЕТРОВСКИ - ЛЕТАРГИЈА, НЕСПОСОБНОСТ ИЛИ СЕ' ЗАЈЕДНО

Егзодусот на Македонците од егејскиот дел на Македонија (сега северен дел на Грција), има свој повеќедецениски историјат. Првите знаци на менување на етничкиот состав на оваа територија почнуваат со Првата балканска војна и скултувањето на Букурешкиот договор во 1913 година. Крајот на Првата светска војна и последователниот Нејски договор за размена на население помеѓу Грција и Бугарија во 1919-та, како и Лозанскиот мировен договор во 1923-та, скулчен помеѓу Турција и Грција, претставуваат континуитет на оваа појава. Процесот на етничко чистење на Македонците од Егејска Македонија кулминира за време на граѓанската војна во Грција водена помеѓу прозападните монархисти и комунистичките републиканци во периодот од 1946 до 1949 година. Во оваа војна, во која активно учествувале егејските Македонци на страната на ДАГ (Демократска армија на Грција), загинаа двестиница илјади Македонци и беа протерани над 200.000, најголемиот дел од нив засекогаш. Поради отказувањето на поддршката од Титова Југославија и затворањето на границата кон Грција, ДАГ беше осудена на пораз, а Македонците беа изиграни и препуштени самите на себе.

Прашањето на протераните Македонци во рамките на СФРЈ воопшто не е третирано на политичко ниво, освен во ретки искушуци за пропагандни интерни цели (на пр. написи во “Нова Македонија” еднаш на пет години). Како резултат на идеолошкиот континуитет, игнорантскиот однос кон ова прашање на македонската власт и дипломатија, продолжува и по 1991 година, до денес.

Се поставува прашањето зошто досега не се направи ниту обид, барем и во популарни цели, да се отвори ова прашање на ниво на јавна дебата, интелектуално разменување на ставови, барање можни решенија итн. Наспроти тоа се соочуваме со континуитет на затскривање на проблемот. Ваквиот пасивен однос запрепстува доколку се земе во предвид фактот дека се работи за значителен број на македонски државјани, кој што се брутално откорнати и протерани од своите огништа и лишени од сопственоста создавана со поколенија.

Еден од најголемите појавни облици на низата проблеми на егејските Македонци, правото на приватна сопственост кое не можат да го остварат, драматично ескалира во последно време. Сведоци сме на еден процес на несправно и организирано распродажување на имотите на македонските граѓани во Република Грција, без нивно знаење и согласност, кој има за цел промена на сопственичката слика, а со тоа и менување на етничката реалност и наследство на тие простори. Правото на приватна сопственост е неприкосновено и не може да се поврзува со националната припадност на сопственикот. Ова право, покрај правото на живот и правото на слободно мислење и дејствување, претставуваат основен фундамент на кој почиваат западните демократи. Покрај овој факт, сложеноста на проблемот ја намаува податокот дека повеќето македонски граѓани, од чија сопственост Република Грција бесправно ги лишува, поседуваат документи издадени од грчката држава. Познато е дека имотно-правните спорови не застаруваат, и граѓаните некогаш ќе можат да бараат остварување на овие права. Освен тоа целокупното јавно мислење е
Passages from an article by Filip Petrovski, party cadre of IMRO-DPMNE, on the Party’s official website

‘The Exodus of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia (now the northern part of Greece) has a long history… The process of ethnic cleansing of Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia culminated at the time of the Civil War in Greece…. We have been witnesses to a criminal procedure, the organized sale of the property of Macedonian citizens in the Greek Republic, without their knowledge or approval, a procedure intended to alter ownership status, and thus alter ethnic reality and inheritance in this area…. The Foreign Ministry should take the following steps forthwith:

• Collect and authenticate files kept by citizens.
• Set up an ad hoc commission to give legal aid to citizens and inform Macedonian public opinion about the size and gravity of the problem, with realistic figures.
• Send an immediate appeal to the Court of Human Rights in Strasburg for a ruling to ban sale of Macedonian citizens’ property in the Greek Republic while the matter is sub judice.
• Inform all the states concerned and the various international human rights organizations (the European Parliament, the Helsinki Watch…).
Editorial from the magazine Незаборав ['I do not forget!'], dealing with the '2nd World Rally of Child-Refugees', funded by the FYROM Government, at Skopje in 1998. The main speaker at the rally was the country’s president Kiro Gligorov.

"Skopje, capital of the Republic of Makedonija, throws wide its gates as it awaits the participants and guests of the 2nd World Rally of Child-Refugees from the Aegean Part of Macedonia. Our own free part of our motherland is demonstrating yet once again, for the umpteenth time, its hospitality, kindliness, and warmth, as it awaits its sons and daughters, scattered across the world, to embrace them with maternal, liberation-loving passion...".

Source: the magazine Незаборав, No.16 [September 1998].
On Easter Monday, to mark the 50th anniversary of the Exodus of Macedonians from the Aegean Part of Macedonia, the ‘Aegean’ Society of Štip held its 5th Easter Rally, at the Monastery of St Panteleimon in the village of Brest near Štip. The official guests included representatives of the Ministry of Those Abroad, Junior Minister Risto Šanev, and the president of the Council for Those Abroad, Stavre Tsikov, who welcomed those present. Also on Easter Monday, the villagers of Tri Česmi near Štip were celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of their village, ‘born’ in the summer of 1948, when twenty-two families from the Edessa region settled there after leaving their birthplace at the height of the Civil War in Greece. Among the many visitors was the Republic’s president Kiro Gligorov.

Source: the magazine Незаборав, No.18 [June 1999].
‘We must realize, once and for all, that there can be no distinctions in our ranks; that we need to join forces to attain our goal’, said Sideropoulos. He called for unity and spoke of ‘a national platform about ways to further the struggle for the recognition of the national rights of Macedonians in Greece, Bulgaria and Albania, and what direction this struggle should take’. ‘We should not permit Macedonia to be enslaved by neighbouring countries a second time’, he said, and this was why he was asking for a Committee to be set up ‘to produce a programme for further action in the Republic of Makedonija and in the Parts [of Macedonia] under Occupation in Greece, Bulgaria and Albania’. ‘All Macedonians must be made aware, and fear must disappear’, said Sideropoulos, ‘if we are to get results in the holy war for Macedonian national, human and religious rights in this part of enslaved Macedonia’.

Source: the magazine Незаборав, No.18 (June 1999).
Even during the slavery of five centuries under the Turks, the Macedonian people enjoyed church rights and they had their Macedonian churches, for the Turkish ruler respected the Orthodox beliefs of the Macedonians. Today we have the opposite. Not only is the Greek Orthodox Church unwilling to grant us our church rights, it does everything within its power to obstruct our demand for worship in Macedonian churches and in the Macedonian tongue. From the Turkish yoke we have been freed, but who knows when we shall be freed from Greek ecclesiastical slavery.

Source: the magazine Незаборав, No.18 (June 1999).
THE SYMBOLS, AND THE APPROPRIATION OF THE HISTORICAL PAST
Photo of the cover of Risto Andonovski’s Јужна Македонија од античките до денешните Македонци [Southern Macedonia from the ancient Macedonians to the Macedonians of today].
Alexander the Great. From Facts about the Republic of Macedonia, published by the FYROM Information Secretariat.
Alexander the Great. From Facts about the Republic of Macedonia, published by the FYROM Information Secretariat.

Stamp with ‘Aleksandar III’ [i.e. Alexander the Great]. Issued by FYROM State Post Offices in 2002.

▲ Ilinden Uprising commemorative coin. Among the places named are Neveska [Nymfeo], Kitsura, and Vici [Vitsi].
FYROM souvenir banknote of the 1990s, showing Solun [i.e. Thessaloniki] and its emblem, the White Tower.

Liquor bottle label, with a picture of the White Tower.
Ло Грчките Закани
Презимето на Александар летна од аеродромот

Владини извори сега ђодат дека не било планирано аеродромот „Скопје” да се пременува во „Александар Македонски”, туку во „Александар Велики”.

„Александар Велики”, а не „Александар Македонски” ќе биде новото име на скопскиот аеродром, одлук Владата на завершваната седница. Името на аеродромот ќе се смена по иницијатива на заместникот на заместникот на аеродромски услуги (ЈЛАУ).

- Владата ја претстави последната иницијатива на ЈЛАУ за пременување на аеродромите во Скопје и во Охрид во „Александар Велики” и „Св. Павле” - изјави „Дневник” министерот за надворешни работи Антонио Милошовски.

Неговото објавување дека се работи за добронамерна иницијатива на ЈЛАУ и го чест на почит кон историска величина, личност што е почитувана во многу земји, панофила од Македонија, Грција, Бугарија, Турција, Индија... Порекле во Грчките медиуми, Милошовски вели дека ниту во одлуката на Владата ниту во иницијативата на ЈЛАУ немало намера за монополизирање на името или на личноста. Според шефот на антиманипулативната, втората причина што е одбрано ова име, е подобрување на имињот на земјата, но и намерата аеродромот да добие поголем значење. Со ова, вели Милошовски, брзошто станува „видлив”.

На пременувањето на аеродромот во Скопје реализира грчки политичари.

Во сила е веќе денешноста, но било најдоброто да се избегнува активност што може да биде непријатно за тукашната било во Скопје, ниту таква информација стигнала до гркото МНР.

- Се уште е веќе денес било променета сподобба и било најдоброто да се избегнува активност што може да биде непријатно за тукашната било во Скопје, ниту таква информација стигнала до гркото МНР.

Според Милошовски, Владата кога го прифатила предлогот на ЈЛАУ размислува дали со предлогот за промена на името на аеродромот се крие промената сподобба. Според него, и до сега имало пременувања на улици во Скопје и во неколку други градови, кои го добиле името „Александар Македонски”, но од грчка страна немало реакција.

Ставот на Милошовски е дека не би требало да има реакција бидејќи станува збор за личност што може да не зближив со соединетите земји, а не да не го разделува.

- Не сакаме од ова да правиме случај и стигнаме дека това е благородна идеја за почит кон историска личност, која му припаѓа на светот - вели министерот.

Извори од грчката МНР, еднак, вче се беа оптимистки дека нема да има „случај”. Оттука потсетуваат дека на менувањето на улиците не се реагирало и то е работено во внатрешно прашање, а во случај че се работи за меѓувладинаерен аеродром и Атина во тоа гладо провокација.

Истите извори не исклучуваат дека Грција ќе се обиде да го попречи регистрирањето на новото име на скопскиот аеродром.

Но, домашниот эксперт велат дека регистрирањето на аеродромот во Меѓународниот совет на аеродроми (АДИ) се врши со пријавување на одлуката на управниот собир на ЈЛАУ и дека нема процедурна на гласање. Вче се облекла и грчката европопуларништвен настапите, тој побара од Владата да ќе прекине поддршката на европопуларништвото на Македонија. Според него, на Владата во Скопје требало Да веќе јасно дека не може да покине без поддршката од Грција, која до сега покажа добра волја и нито не добила од тоа. Како што пренесуват грчките медиуми, Каринас еднаков да „неговата партија нема да дозволи во грчкиот парламент како било криминал поради немането реакција или поради заборовеност што се реагира на нешто”.

Грки извори вче се исклучуваат дека неможеб и да се облекат и и грчката црква.

- Грчкото архиепископо Христодулос неодржо во Батикан се сретна со папата Бенедикт Шенапесети од кого добил потврда дека грчката црква е најстара во регионот и дека токму свети Павле е основач на Грчката православна црква - велат нашите извори.

▲ Statue of Alexander the Great, outside Skopje Airport.
Greek statues outside the FYROM Government building, with the provocative message ‘Statues stand outside the seat of power in Athens too’. 
A road sign to the ‘Aleksandar Veliki’ (Alexander the Great) airport at Skopje.

Programme of a conference at Bitolj (Monastir), 27-28 April 2007, under the auspices of the municipality, with the title ‘Perseus – Last King of Ancient Macedonia’.
△ The golden chest and bust of Alexander the Great, featured on the cover of Aleksandar Trajanovski’s History of Macedonia.