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ISSUES RELATING TO THE RECOGNITION OF
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

The Yugoslav crisis
The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe was seen as the dawn of a new era. On the ashes of the former totalitarian regimes, new democracies were expected to flourish. The dream of a new Europe, as a community of free nations from the Atlantic to the Urals, sharing Western democratic values, respect for the rule of law and free market economic principles appeared to be shaping on the horizon.

It was not meant to be. For almost half a century, totalitarian communist rule had shattered the material and spiritual foundations of Eastern European nations. The new political forces, emerging in these states, found themselves struggling first and foremost for the economic survival of their peoples. Social chaos brewed explosive situations. Worse yet, old inter-ethnic vendettas and claims, long suppressed, came to the foreground with the force of thunderstorms. The ugly face of nationalism challenged traditional state boundaries, thus jeopardizing one of the most sacrosanct principles of the post-World War II international order.

Nowhere were such developments so painful as in the former Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia. In less than a year, one of the most stable edifices of the 40-year old East-West Cold War, disappeared in ruins. In its place, five new states - and probably more in the future - are selfishly vying for the spoils. Civil war has erupted in three of them, and more are waiting in line. Human losses already number tens of thousands, the uprooted millions and the material losses are counted by billions of dollars. There is a general fear that worse is yet to come. Inevitably, the question is raised: What can be worse than the carnage in Croatia and the rape of Bosnia-Herzegovina?

Those who have a good knowledge of the region, of the people and their histories, focus their attention on two new potential, and by far more explosive, trouble spots. One is Kossovo and the other the former Yugoslav “Socialist Republic of Macedonia”. If trouble breaks out in these regions, then the whole Balkan area may come up in flames.

Whereas the independence of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina did not touch on the external boundary delimitations of neighboring states, Kossovo and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia might well. For economic, geopolitical, ethnological and historical reasons, neither of these regions can survive for a long time as independent entities. Either automatically - as in the case of Kossovo - or within a short time - as in the case of Yugoslav Macedonia - a struggle is bound to commence for the annexation of these regions to neighboring states.
Thus, external boundaries may be challenged and existing political and strategic balances may be upset. Ensuing conflicts and even guerrilla warfare may not be limited to the confines of the regions concerned but may well affect neighboring peoples, Albanians, Bulgarians, and Serbs. (MAP 1)

In the latter case, Greece, a member of the EC and NATO, could also be involved in one way or another. Such an involvement could be caused by an influx of uncontrolled numbers of Albanian and Slav refugees which would tax to its limits a vulnerable Greek economy already burdened by approximately 400,000 refugees and illegal foreign workers. If this influx were to continue over the next months or years, a new and serious situation might arise whereby neighboring countries could claim minority or even autonomy rights for these refugees for obviously self-serving purposes. Greece may also become involved as a result of attempts by neighboring states to alter existing balances in the region by violent means. The possibility of intervention by outsiders (foreign powers or Islamic fundamentalists) could similarly create intolerable situations. It may give rise within Greece to a perception of encirclement from the north as well as from the east.

Coping with the crisis

The premature recognition of some of the republics - Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina - instigated the bloodiest clashes on European soil since the Second World War. While Greece kept all lines of communication open with all belligerents, others tried to stop the conflict by pointing the finger in one direction. It was a convenient way of covering up their own mistakes and ignoring the true causes of the crisis. In summary, most peacemakers have
sought to reach an armistice; Greece, on her part, has strived for a settlement of a more permanent nature.

Regrettably, the same mentality still guides peacemakers vis-a-vis the two new potential trouble spots, namely, Kosovo and the former Yugoslav Republic (FYR) of Macedonia (also referred to as Skopje). As in the case of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, the nationalist leaders in both of these regions are receiving mixed signals from abroad.

**Kosovo**

In the case of Kosovo, recognition of independence could be tantamount to an open invitation to bloodshed. Kosovo borders on Albania; its population today is almost 90% ethnic Albanians and clammers for self-determination which is another way of saying that they seek independence and eventual union with Albania. Yet the Serbs consider Kosovo as the cradle of their nation and have stated repeatedly that they shall resort to arms rather than allow it to secede. The two positions are irreconcilable and tension grows by the day.

Despite such grim prospects, voices on both sides of the Atlantic are increasingly encouraging the Kosovar Albanians to declare their independence. Until now, the Albanians have shown admirable restraint, even in the face of repressive Serbian measures. Foreign encouragement to the Kosovars to agitate for independence is suspected of furthering alien interests, not necessarily those of the Albanians however. Europeans and Americans would be wise to reject partisan advice, motivated merely by anti-Serbian exigencies. The prospect of a large-scale war, which could eventually involve Serbia-Montenegro and Albania, with further spillover effects, should not be taken lightly.

**The situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

As regards the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, its population is ethnically disparate with a predominant Slavic component (of just over 50%) an important ethnic Albanian minority (35-40%) and a sprinkling of other nationalities (Serbs, Turks, Gypsies, Vlachs and Greeks). The Albanians have a strong feeling of their distinct national identity, claiming descent from the ancient Illyrians. They are Muslims, whereas the Slavic-speaking population is Orthodox Christian. Politically, the Albanians seek autonomy within the boundaries of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, a claim that it wouldn't be too bold to construe as a first step towards self-determination and eventual union with Kosovo and Albania. The latter is of course supporting those claims.

As for the Slav majority, it was originally of Bulgarian ethnic affiliation but intensive communist propaganda, relentlessly conducted over half a century with utter disregard for the feelings of the people and historical truth, has to some degree succeeded in creating a sense of a “Macedonian” national consciousness. But ties with Bulgaria remain, as evidenced by the fact that the leading political party of the republic, the VMRO, (first in popular votes and parliamentary seats) is linked with Bulgarian nationalist circles. For that matter, Mr. Gligorov, the republic's President, is himself of Bulgarian descent.

**Bulgarian policy towards the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

Bulgarian nationalists by no means concede the existence of a separate “Macedonian” ethnicity. As a matter of fact, under their pressure, the Bulgarian government went so far as to reject it explicitly. When in January 1992 Bulgaria extended recognition to the new republic, its government was careful to distinguish between statehood and ethnicity. While recognizing the first, they specifically rejected the latter. In simple language, they told the Slav population of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: “You are not Macedonians. There is no such thing as a Macedonian nation. You are Bulgarians and don’t you forget it”. For whoever has the
international press and lobbying campaign, Skopje has hardened its position vis-a-vis EC resolutions, believing apparently that EC objections will be lifted and their republic will be unconditionally recognized.

What have been the European Community’s prerequisites for recognition?

On 16 December 1991, the Council of Foreign Ministers by the “Declaration on Yugoslavia,” asked Skopje to provide the necessary legal and political guarantees that it will nurture no territorial claims against an EC member (Greece), that it will abstain from any hostile

![Figure 1. The “Vergina Sun” emblem of the Royal Dynasty of Macedonia, engraved on King Philip’s larnax (4th century B.C.), and, underneath, Skopje’s new national flag reproducing the ancient Macedonian emblem.](image)

slightest knowledge of Balkan politics, this statement carries an ominous connotation of possible territorial claims in the near or not too distant future.

**European policy toward FYR Macedonia**

In the case of former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as in the case of Kossovo, voices in Europe and the United States are sending mixed signals to the leaders in Skopje. Repeatedly, the European Community has been on record that it will eventually recognize that republic, provided it meets certain prerequisites. All the countries of the world, with very few exceptions, have aligned themselves with the EC in withholding recognition. Nevertheless, following an active

![Figure 2. VMRO electoral poster (November 1990) portraying all Macedonian regions as a unified state. The poster is adorned with the Ancient Macedonian dynasty emblem (Vergina Sun). Text on map reads: “It’s fate is in your hands” (i.e. the fate of a United Macedonia is in the hands of the voters of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).](image)
Figure 3. Car sticker on sale in Skopje Kiosks, depicting all three Macedonian regions as a unified Macedonian state.

Figure 4. (Below) Souvenir banknote issued in Skopje on 15 January 1992, depicting the “White Tower” of Thessaloniki.

propaganda against that member, and that it will not use a name for the republic implying territorial claims.

Skopje failed to comply. For six months, diplomatic efforts to convince the political leaders of that Republic that it was in their true interest to abandon once and for all territorial claims and propaganda tactics nurtured under the previous communist regime, bore no results. Thus, the 12 leaders of the EC at their Lisbon summit meeting of 27 June 1992, issued a new declaration reiterating their readiness to recognize the new republic, provided it did not use the term Macedonia in the state’s denomination. At the next meeting of the European Council at Edinburgh, on 12 December 1992, the European leaders in essence reiterated their Lisbon decision.

Skopje failed to comply, thereby delaying its own recognition.

Skopje’s attitude toward Greece
It is worth reviewing Skopje’s response to EC’s prerequisite for recognition.

Despite a legalistic amendment to the Skopje Constitution, which stipulated that the new
The republic would raise no territorial claims against neighboring states, basic points in the Constitution implying territorial claims (Preamble, Articles 3 and 49), have remained unchanged in substance.

On the issue of hostile propaganda, the government in Skopje has done absolutely nothing to indicate any intention of abandoning the 40-year old campaign against Greece. It continues to usurp Greek history and heritage, to manipulate Greek cultural objects, to monopolize the Macedonian name, to kindle hatred among its own people for Greece, to disseminate worldwide allegations of human rights violations by Greece, and to misrepresent even the bitter history of the Greek Civil War (1946-1949) in order to portray Greece (the victim of Tito’s aggressive designs) as the culprit of wrongdoing against the “Macedonians”.

President Gligorov has made repeated statements that the Slavs of Skopje are the descendants of the early Slav tribes that migrated to the southern Balkans in the 7th century A.D. and that they have no claims to the heritage of Ancient Macedonians, a Greek people. In spite of that, the Skopje parliament passed a resolution in August 1992, which the government endorsed, adopting as the flag of the republic, the emblem of the ancient Macedonian dynasty: a 16-point golden sun found a few years ago in the royal tombs in Vergina, Greece and dating back to the 4th century B.C. (Figure 1)

On the issue of territorial claims, the old ghosts of the 1940s have re-emerged. The leading political party of the republic, VMRO, conducted its election campaign on the slogan for the “unification” of all Macedonian regions, i.e. the annexation of Greek, Bulgarian and Albanian territory (Figure 2) VMRO’s popular following is increasing and so is its influence in government circles. Throughout the Republic, irredentist literature is fanning the flames of nationalism, encouraged by the government’s stand. In the course of 1992, numerous calendars, maps, tourist mementos, car stickers and other paraphernalia have appeared everywhere in the republic and foreign countries where emigrants

---

**Figure 5.** A 1992 calendar printed in Skopje showing Macedonia as a unified state and placing Greece’s southern border on Mount Olympus.
from Skopje live. (Figures 3,4,5,6)

Late in 1992, the government-affiliated publishing firm “Nova Makedonija,” published a new school map depicting the geographic and ethnic boundaries of Macedonia as encompassing the entire Greek Macedonian region including Thessaloniki, the monastic community of Mount Athos and Mount Olympus! (MAP 2)

That this mentality is not merely a popular whim, but is shared by responsible officials in Skopje, is evidenced by the fact that Gligorov’s government has refused to remove from the new constitution a concrete reference to a 1944 declaration by the then communist regime. That declaration clearly calls for the “unification” of neighboring territories in Greece and Bulgaria with the “Macedonian Republic”. (Appendix, Document A)

These are precisely the reasons why Greece has asked, and the EC has concurred, that the new republic should not use the Macedonian name, as a state denomination. But they are not the only ones having aspirations to Greek Macedonian lands. For more than a century, these lands have been the object of expansionist policies implemented by neighboring states.

A HISTORICAL EXCURSUS

The Legacy of San Stefano

To take Bulgaria first. This country gained its independence in 1878 at the successful conclusion of the Russo-Turkish war, which was sealed by the Treaty of San Stefano. The victorious Russians saw an opportunity to solve the Eastern Question in their favour and gain access to the Mediterranean, albeit through a client state. Thus Greater Bulgaria was carved out of the European possessions of the Ottoman Empire. To the South the boundaries of the new state extended to the shores of the Aegean and included the better part of the Ottoman vilayets (provinces) of Monastir (Bitola) and Thessaloniki. But Greater Bulgaria was not to be. The European powers reacted and, at the Congress of Berlin (July 1878), the Bulgarian borders were pushed back to the Balkan mountain range and the continuity of the European section of the Ottoman Empire was restored (MAP 3). The Treaty of San Stefano was dead. But its memory lingered on....

Ever since the Treaty of Berlin, Bulgarian foreign policy has aimed at recuperating the San Stefano lands i.e. the greater part of what is known as geographical Macedonia. This policy

---

Figure 6. A 1991-92 Christmas card by the so-called Macedonian National Liberation Army, demanding the annexation of the Greek Macedonian province to a unified Macedonian state.
MAP 2

A 1992 edition of a map issued by a government affiliated publishing house in Skopje depicting a large part of Greece as well as districts in Bulgaria, Albania and Serbia, as part of a “greater Macedonia”.

remains constant during the latter part of the 19th and all of the 20th century, but its implementation adopts a twofold approach: Whenever international conditions are propitious, the outright annexation of these territories is sought by force of arms. When these attempts are frustrated, the creation of an autonomous or independent “Macedonian” state at the expense of neighboring countries, is advanced in the hope that, in time, such a state would become a client of Bulgaria and may even be absorbed by her.

Thus, during the last decade of the Ottoman rule (1902-1912), the Bulgarians sought to prepare conditions for acquiring full control over the whole geographical region of Macedonia, by instigating uprisings and persecuting other ethnic groups in the region inhabited mainly by Greeks.

During the first Balkan war (1912), Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro expelled Turkey from most of her possessions in Europe, thus liberating the region of Macedonia after
Parts of present-day Greece as well as of former Yugoslavia and Albania, assigned by the Russians to a "greater Bulgaria" state.

500 years of Ottoman rule. The Bulgarians, however, unsatisfied with the division of formerly Ottoman-held lands, attacked their allies, but were defeated (1913).

Once again, during the First World War, Bulgaria attempted to annex the Macedonian regions of her neighbors, Greece and Serbia, by espousing the cause of the Central Powers and Turkey. Indeed, she managed to occupy Greek Eastern Macedonia where ethnic cleansing-type tactics were applied against the Greek population. (MAP 4). The defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary terminated Bulgarian occupation. Having failed to annex the coveted territory, Bulgaria subsequently sought to promote the idea of an autonomous Macedonian state.

During the Second World War, Bulgaria allied herself to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and was given in exchange the right to occupy large parts of Greek Macedonia and Thrace all the way to the Aegean coast, as well as of Yugoslav Macedonia (MAP 5). Once again the Bulgarian occupation authorities reverted to their familiar policy of ethnic cleansing. The collapse of the Axis terminated the second Bulgarian occupation of Greek Macedonia.

The legacy of Stalinism

It is interesting to note that this was not only the policy of the Bulgarian ruling elites of the time, but also that of the Bulgarian Communist Party, thus assuming the character of a truly national policy. Indeed, during the inter-war
MAP 4
During the First World War Bulgaria aligned with the Central Powers and Turkey occupied parts of Northern Greek territories.

period, the Soviet Union, under Stalin, through the Comintern, endorsed a proposal by Bulgarian Communists for a united and independent Macedonian state in the framework of a Balkan Communist Federation. (Appendix, Document B)

In 1944 Tito, a Croat by birth, set up the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia. The federal form of the state was meant to solve the problem of quarreling nationalities and ethnic minorities within Yugoslavia. It was also designed to cut Serbia down to size. Hence the boundaries between the federated republics were drawn arbitrarily. Thus came into being the “People’s Republic of Macedonia” (formerly known as the “Province of the Vardar”), essentially as a province of Yugoslavia.

This artificial creation was to serve also another purpose, namely the territorial access of Yugoslavia to the Aegean sea through the port of Thessaloniki (Appendix, Document C). This was to be brought about by the incorporation into the “People’s Republic of Macedonia” of Greek and Bulgarian territories, allegedly inhabited by a “Macedonian” population. (MAP 6)

From 1944 to 1948 the Soviet Union supported the irredentist territorial claims of its two Balkan communist clients: those of Yugoslavia on the Macedonian regions of Greece and Bulgaria, and those of Bulgaria on Greek Western Thrace. This inspite of the fact that the coveted Greek regions in addition to their native Greek element had been settled by hundreds of thousands of Greek refugees, evicted from Turkey and Bulgaria, by virtue of international agreements for the exchange of populations. The Greek Civil War of that period was fomented by Tito, among other things, with
During the Second World War, Bulgaria aligned with Nazi Germany and fascist Italy, occupied large parts of Greek Macedonia and Thrace.

a view to annexing Greek Macedonia to Yugoslavia. Bulgaria, then under the rule of Georgi Dimitrov, consented to the cession of its own part of Macedonia (the Pirin district) to Yugoslavia. It received in return blanket Soviet and Yugoslav support for its claims on Greek Thrace. (Appendix, Document D)

With the break of Tito with the Soviet bloc and his expulsion from the Cominform in 1948, Bulgaria reverted to its traditional policy with regard to Macedonia and pursued it actively until the death of Stalin.

The lesson to be learned from this short historical review is that all attempts by neighboring states to dispossess Greece of her northern provinces were carried out with the active military and political support of non-Balkan Powers intent upon furthering their own selfish designs. (Czarist Russia in 1878, the Central Powers in 1917-19, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy in 1941-44 and again the Communist Soviet Union in 1946-49).

Moreover, when not pursued in the form of outright annexation, these attempts were made by proxy in the name of an alleged autonomous or independent “Macedonian” state purportedly inhabited by a fictitious “Macedonian” nationality.

If the international community were to now recognize the existence of such a state under the name “Macedonia”, it would be laying the foundations for the destabilization of the whole
During the Greek Civil War, Tito’s Yugoslavia tried to get hold of most of Greek Macedonia, as also of the Macedonian regions of Bulgaria and Albania.

Balkan area in the short and longer term, in spite of its profession to the contrary. For it would be conferring unwitting legitimacy to past and future “irredentist” claims against Greece, a NATO and EC member, thus opening a Pandora’s box of calamitous developments.

The lethal ingredients are already in place. Albanian and Bulgarian revisionist designs are all too obvious and it is most unlikely that recognition by itself would make them vanish overnight into thin air. They have been nurtured for too long and Balkan passions are known to die hard.

Should the international community throw an additional destabilizing factor into an already explosive witches brew? Would it not be wiser to give a clear and unequivocal message of international backing for stabilizing policies and for honest efforts towards peaceful coexistence?
APPENDIX: DOCUMENTS

Document A: Proclamations of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM), Skopje, August, 1944
MANIFEST ISSUED AT THE FIRST SESSION OF THE ANTI-FASCIST COUNCIL OF NATIONAL LIBERATION OF MACEDONIA TO THE PEOPLE OF MACEDONIA
August 2, 1944
Macedonians under Bulgaria and Greece,
...The unionization of the entire Macedonian people depends on your participation in the gigantic anti-fascist front. Only by fighting the vile fascist occupier will you gain your right to self-determination and to unification of the entire Macedonian people within the framework of Tito’s Yugoslavia, which has become a free community of emancipated and equal peoples. May the struggle of the Macedonian Piedmont incite you to even bolder combat against the fascist oppressors.

PROCLAMATION TO THE PEOPLE OF MACEDONIA ISSUED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF MACEDONIA
August 4, 1944
People of Macedonia!
...In the course of three years of combat you have achieved your unity, developed your army, and laid the basis for the federal Macedonian state. With the participation of the entire Macedonian nation in the struggle against the fascist occupiers of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece you will achieve unification of all parts of Macedonia, divided in 1915 and 1918 by Balkan imperialists.

Source: The University of “Cyril and Methodius”, Documents on the struggle of the Macedonian people for independence and a nation-state, volume two (Skopje, 1985)

Document B: Declaration of the 6th Balkan Communist Conference (March 1924) issued under the directives of the Comintern for a United Republic of Macedonia and Thrace
A united and autonomous Macedonia is now the slogan of the Macedonians in all corners of their Fatherland, which is covered with ruins. It is under this slogan that they are organizing and conducting the struggle....
In setting up the ideal of a workers’ and peasants’ government, the communist parties and the Communist Federation of the Balkans declare that the Federal Republic of the Balkans will assure peace, independence and liberty of development of all the peoples of the Peninsula that it will be a voluntary union of independent Balkan Republics, including the Republic of Macedonia and Thrace.

Source: Text in International Press Correspondence, May 1, 1924

Document C: Confidential circular sent by Secretary of State Edward Stettinius to U.S. missions (December 26, 1944) considering talk of a “Macedonian” nation or state to be “unjustified demagoguery” and a cloak for aggressive intentions against Greece.
The Secretary of State to Certain Diplomatic and Consular Officers
The following is for your information and general guidance, but not for any positive action at this time.
The Department has noted with considerable apprehension increasing propaganda rumors and semi-official statements in favor of an autonomous Macedonia, emanating principally from Bulgaria, but also from Yugoslav Partisan and other sources, with the implication that Greek territory would be included in the projected state. “This Government considers talk of Macedonian “nation”, Macedonian “fatherland”, or Macedonian “national consciousness” to be unjustified demagoguery representing to ethnic nor political reality, and sees in its present revival a possible cloak for aggressive intentions against Greece”.
The approved policy of this Government is to oppose any revival of the Macedonian issue as related to Greece. The Greek section of Macedonia is largely inhabited by Greeks, and the Greek people are almost unanimously opposed to the creation of a Macedonian state. Allegations of serious Greek participation in any such agitation can be assumed to be false. This Government would regard as responsible any Government or group of Governments tolerating or encouraging menacing or aggressive acts of “Macedonian Forces” against Greece. The Department would appreciate any information pertinent to this subject which may come to your attention.

Stettinius
Source: U.S. State Department, Foreign Relations vol.viii Washington, D.C., Circular Airgram, (868.01/26 Dec.1944)

Document D: Stalin’s views, for the unification of Macedonia under Tito and the annexation of Greek Thrace by Bulgaria.
Excerpts from the minutes of conversations at the Kremlin (June 7, 1946), between delegations of the Soviet Union (Stalin, Molotov, Zdanov), Yugoslavia (Tito, Rankovic, Neskovic), and Bulgaria (Dimitrov, Kolarov, Kostov), (Translation from Bulgarian).

Stalin to the Bulgarian delegation (on Macedonia):
“Cultural autonomy must be granted to Pirin Macedonia within the framework of Bulgaria. In view of the present situation no haste should be displayed in this regard... You do not want to grant autonomy to Pirin Macedonia. The fact that the population has yet to develop a Macedonian consciousness is of no account. No such consciousness existed in Belorus either when we proclaimed it a Soviet republic. However, later it was shown that a Belorusian people did in fact exist” ....

Stalin to the Bulgarian delegation (on Bulgarian access to the Aegean):
“We and the Americans were not parties to the drawing of the borders [in 1919] and do not recognize them as just. You should demand territorial access to the Aegean, and if this is not accepted, you should demand economic (access). You have the right to demand territorial access, but it is difficult to count upon obtaining it today. Such demand can be fulfilled only through the use of force. But in any case you should prepare yourselves for the future”...

Source: The text of these minutes was taken from the Archives of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria. It was published in the Sofia newspaper Otechestven Vestnik, June 19, 1990.