THE WAR OF STATISTICS: TRADITIONAL RECIPES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE MACEDONIAN SALAD

by Iakovos D. Michailidis

Several reports by various International Organisations describing the situation of human rights in the Balkans have been publicised recently. Such reports on minorities and human rights hardly constitute a novelty nor are they the exclusive ideological by-product of post-cold-war diplomacy. They have been in circulation in the past, especially after the Final Act of Helsinki in 1975, mostly in the form of International Amnesty reports focusing on the situation of human rights within the domains of the former Eastern Block countries. The fall of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s led to a re-adjustment of the world order. The protection of minority rights all over the world became one of the top priorities in this "New Era" probably less for humanitarian reasons than for diplomatic exigencies. In any case, in this context N.G.O. (Minority Rights Group, Helsinki Watch etc.) or even the U.S. State Department reports grew of paramount importance. It has become clear by now that in a rapidly changing and unstable world reports on minorities strongly influence public opinion and are often used internationally as the most effective mechanisms to exercise diplomatic pressure.

In the case of the Balkans this interest is obviously related to the on-going diplomatic crisis which followed the break-up of Yugoslavia. The dispute between Athens and Skopje over the name "Macedonia" made Greece part of the Yugoslav crisis and attracted the attention of various organisations. Thus, a considerable part of their reports on the Balkans deals with the Slav-speaking population of Greece and its course through history. Reports like these would be indifferent to a historian, had they not directly referred to the demographic picture of Macedonia in the past as far as the eve of the Treaty of Bucharest; a Treaty which ended the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) and interrupted a lengthy diplomatic game, played since 1878 by Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and the Great Powers, concerning the demise of the Ottoman Empire and the future of Macedonia. The researcher is amazed at the realisation that estimates of the number of Slav-speakers in Greece today are not based on modern, official statistics but constitute a mere revival -a rather clumsy one though- of statistical "games" which were played long ago.

In this article an attempt will be made to review the current Balkan and European bibliography through a fresh reading of the already existing statistics and the use of newly found archival material. Despite what was generally acceptable until now, an effort will be made to:

(a) show that the basic problem of various statistical analyses referring to Macedonia from the end of the 19th century to this day is mainly a problem not of numbers but of terminology (i.e. the naming of various population groups);

(b) correct certain figures that have also acquired specific political content: mainly the number of Slav-speaking emigrants from Greek Macedonia to Bulgaria during 1912-1919 and secondly the size of the Slav-speaking population of Western Thrace in the early 1920s.

In general it will be argued that, as a rule, statistics on Macedonia's ethnic composition presented up until today are unreliable, since they have always been means for achieving various diplomatic aims.

According to the most moderate of the current reports Slav-speakers in Greece amount to 40,000 people, while the most extreme ones put them roughly at 200,000. This huge divergence is sufficiently explained only if the origins of Macedonian demography are followed at the time of the Balkan Wars and beyond. The last quarter of the 19th and the first two decades of the 20th century were marked by an abundance of statistical analyses concerning the Balkans in general and Macedonia in particular. Needless to say the interest for Macedonia was not purely scientific. The neighbouring Balkan states (Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia) had to
secure and enlarge their ethnic grips by all means available. At a time when the once mighty Ottoman Empire was expiring, statistics were considered the most effective weapon to support "ancient national rights" and to prove beyond any doubt the demographic superiority of the interested parties. Further, they were the most appropriate argument especially designed for consumption by European diplomats. Armed bands would do the rest...

Bulgarians proved to be champions and pioneers in the compilation of statistics. To be sure, they had good reasons. The firman for the institution of the Exarchate ceded by the Sublime Port in 1870 made it clear that only if the 2/3 of a community were registered as followers of the Independent Bulgarian Church, known as the Exarchate, that community would then be classified as Exarchist (i.e. Bulgarian). For the Greeks the task was exactly the opposite, while Ottoman authorities had to prove that Muslims outnumbered Christians, if Macedonia was to remain under the rule of the Sultan. The overwhelming majority of early 20th century available statistics is more an estimation based on birth books rather than constituting a proper census. They present their data by administrative area (Vilayet) and not by village. Exception to this are the detailed statistics prepared in 1900 by Vasil Kancov, Inspector of the Bulgarian elementary schools in Macedonia, and the 1905 official census ordered by Hilmi Pasha, General Inspector of Macedonia since 1902. In any case, before the Balkan Wars, all statistics were biased and reflected exclusively diplomatic concerns. Their authors were public servants hardly relevant to the subject they were called to examine. Kancov and Hilmi Pasha were not really exception to this rule. Kancov deliberately classified all Slav-speakers as Bulgarians, while Hilmi's census reflected the most turbulent years of the Struggle for Macedonia (1904-1905), when national affiliations changed whenever bands so demanded. In spite of the obvious shortcomings, their works, the only detailed statistics available, were not forgotten.

At the time of World War I two seemingly new statistics dominated the diplomatic scene representing the Greek and the Slav historical and political approaches respectively. The former was drawn by Vassilios Colokotronis, a high ranking official in the Greek Foreign Ministry, who argued, on the basis of data of the Italian Amadori-Virgilj published in 1908, that, on the eve of the Balkan Wars, 488,484 "Greeks" lived in Greek Macedonia compared to just 115,909 "Slavs". The latter was done by Jordan Ivanoff, geographer, historian and philologist, professor at the University of Sofia, who argued mainly on the basis of Kancov's statistic, that at that time 329,371 "Bulgarians" and just 236,755 "Greeks" lived in Greek Macedonia.

At first sight the gap between the two statistics seems impossible to bridge. A more careful study, however, reveals that it is nothing but a trick of the eye, a deliberate distortion of numbers through the use of different terms in order to support specific national causes. Cololotronis used the inhabitants' "national consciousness" as the most appropriate criterion for classifying populations. He considered as "Slavs" only the former Exarchist Slav-speakers, i.e. those who had been converted to the Bulgarian Exarchate in the early years of the 20th century, and thus were regarded as alien to the Greek nation. In the same manner, Patriarchist Slav-speakers, i.e. those who had remained firmly attached to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, were believed to have purely Greek sentiments and were accordingly classified as "Greeks". Ivanoff, on the other hand, like Kancov before him, preferred the mother tongue as a criterion. Based on this he considered every inhabitant of the Balkans speaking any Bulgarian dialect as "Bulgarian".

The methods employed by both were truly brilliant. If the language criterion was to be employed, Greece obviously would be pushed to the corner. Thus Colokotronis, representing the Greek interests, picked the "national consciousness", in his attempt to take advantage of the fact that numerous Slav-speakers had actively participated in the anti-Bulgarian Struggle (1903-1912). On the other side, Ivanoff rushed to exploit the obvious affinity between Bulgarian and the local Slav dialect. In this way he expected to easily avoid the question of national orientation of both "Graecomans", i.e. the Slav-speakers who supported the Greek side, and "Serbomans", i.e. the Slav-speakers who preferred the Serbs. His statistic was nothing but a version of Bulgarian irredentism and a desperate academic effort to support the territorial arrangements for a Greater Bulgaria put forward by the San Stefano Treaty (1878).
In terms of numbers the two statistics are very much alike. Greeks and Bulgarians as an aggregate were estimated at 604,393 according to Colokotronis and at 566,126 according to Ivanoff. Even this difference can be explained if two factors are taken into account: (a) the five year span between the two statistics (1900-1905) and (b) the difficulty to adjust pre-1912 statistics to the new Balkan borders.

Both Ivanoff's and Colokotronis' accounts are the ground on which all later estimates by Greek and Slav historians have been based. Every demographic survey of Macedonia appearing in subsequent years, even today, is nothing but addition or subtraction of data originating from the above two statistics. Formally Ivanoff and Colokotronis were replaced during the inter-war period by a new generation of analysts. The most important representatives were Alexandros Pallis and Vladimir Rumenov who were concerned with population exchanges that took place in Macedonia between 1913 and 1930. At that period Slav-speakers from Greece emigrated on two different occasions (a) during the Greek army advance in the Second Balkan War and (b) under a specific term of the Neilly Treaty (1919) providing for the mutual and voluntary exchange of Greek and Bulgarian populations.

Pallis, a public servant responsible for the relief of refugees in Macedonia during the 1910s and a member of the Mixed Greek-Bulgarian Committee in charge of the exchange procedures after 1919, argued that 15,000 "Voulgarizontes" had left the districts of Kilkis and Goumenissa. With this term he denoted only those Slav-speakers who had in the past been affiliated with the Exarchic Bulgarian Church. Thus, by 1920 "Voulgarizontes" in Greece had been reduced to 104,000 people. Moreover, by the end of 1924, 27,000 of them had left making use of the Neilly Treaty terms. In this way the number of the remaining "Voulgarizontes" had shrank to 77,000 people. In a later study in 1929, i.e. after the Greek and Bulgarian emigration had been completed and the ethnological composition of Macedonia had changed utterly, Pallis changed the number of 77,000 "Voulgarizontes" to 82,000 "Bulgarians", probably to match with the 1928 official census.

The same group of people was re-baptised by Pallis once more in the late 1940s. This time they were called "Slavophones". Although in his interwar studies he had clearly argued, carrying on Colokotronis' tactics, that the "Voulgarizontes" lacked Greek national consciousness, two decades later, as the Greek Civil War raged and the Macedonian Question surfaced anew, he apparently succumbed to the temptation to defend in a more substantial way Greek national rights. I argue that this seemingly innocent act of renaming this group was actually a deliberate manoeuvre. Since 1919 the term "Slavophones" had been used to refer to Slav-speakers with a Greek national consciousness or in any case to those who had not openly been opposed to Hellenism. Consequently, the number of those who had hardly ever been attached to the Greek state, i.e. those whom Pallis had once called "Voulgarizontes" or "Bulgarians", was then automatically expected to be lower than the actual 82,000.

Rumenov, also a member of the Mixed Greek-Bulgarian Committee, took his turn by arguing that 86,582 "Bulgarians" had emigrated from Greece during the 1913-1928. Then he extracted this number from the 329,371 "Bulgarians" who lived in Macedonia until 1912 (according to Ivanoff's estimate) and concluded that after the completion of the population exchanges the remaining "Bulgarians" in Greek Macedonia were no fewer than 242,789 people.

The statistical analyses by Pallis and Rumenov strongly influenced the subsequent Greek and Slav historiography. Actually they created two schools of writing:

(a) the Greek school, which reproduced Pallis' statistical data, includes studies as George B. Zotiades', The Macedonian Controversy, Dimitris Pentzopoulos', The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact upon Greece and Evangelos Kofos', Nationalism and Communism in Macedonia. Needless to say the use of the term "Slavophones" by the above historians reproduced the confusion Pallis had created and facilitated the use of historic evidences for post-war diplomatic needs.

(b) As far as the latter school, i.e. the Slav, is concerned things turned slightly different. The reason was the progressive drop of Bulgaria's interest in Greek Macedonia which inevitably affected the post-war re-writing of national history in that
country. After 1945 the vacuum left by Bulgaria was gradually filled by the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (S.R.M.). The struggling effort of this Yugoslav federal republic for the construction a national myth necessitated the renaming of Ivanoff’s "Bulgarians" of Macedonia to simply "Macedonians". This "mutation" is actually the only noticeable difference between the writings of Bulgarian historians and their colleagues in S.R.M. Both Ivanoff's and Rumenov's data remained untouched ever after.

Following the example set by President Dimitar Vlahov, historians in S.R.M., professionals and amateurs alike, have argued that in 1930 the "Macedonians" in Greek Macedonia were still as many as 260-280,000. This tactic can be easily explained: since 60-80,000 Macedonians are estimated by the same authors to have fled to the Communist countries after the end of the Greek Civil War, S.R.M. might still claim a 200,000 strong "Macedonian minority" in Greece.

It was almost impossible for Europeans to escape from this labyrinth of data created by Balkans diplomats and academics. In 1913 the Carnegie Committee appointed to investigate the crimes committed during the Balkan Wars tended to adopt Professor Ivanoff's statistics, while in the interwar period, in 1926, the League of Nations accepted without any reservation the Greek views as presented by Pallis. In the 1950s Professor Wilkinson was the first to dispute the authority of all past demographic statistics on Macedonia and partly revealed the hidden political intentions. Another critical approach was presented in 1993 by Vemund Aarbakke but it was limited only to pre-1912 statistics. However, these critics have only superficially affected modern European analysts. Most of them today reproduce, probably out of ignorance, the Slavic school. This is a tendency which has also been espoused by all NGOs which have presented reports on Greek Macedonia during the previous four years.

Despite such odds it is still possible to have a more accurate estimate of the Slav-speaking population of the region identified today as Greek Macedonia on the eve of the Balkan Wars without completely disregarding the above views. Colocotronis is the only writer who gives a specific number for Slav-speaking Exarchists in Macedonia: 115,909 in all. D. Michef, Secretary of the Bulgarian Exarchate, better known as D.M.Brancoff, on the other hand, provides us with a figure for Slav-speaking Patriarchists: 145,936. Since both writers had good reasons to present their opponents' demographic strength as limited as possible, it is reasonable to argue that Slav-speakers, Exarchists and Patriarchists together, in Macedonia around 1905 must have been at least 260,000. This figure is also supported by an 1912 unofficial and unpublished census found in the papers of the first Greek Governor-General of Macedonia, Stefanos Dragoumis.

The following step is to calculate the number of Slavophone emigrants who left Greek Macedonia, chiefly from the central and eastern parts, during the Balkan wars. According to Pallis, departures from the regions of Kilkis and Goumenissa (Central Macedonia) were as many as 15,000 but no figures are available for western and eastern regions. Even though any attempt to precisely estimate their number is by definition impossible, since the exodus took place amidst violent war battles and not according to any plan, departures seem to have exceeded 15,000, perhaps as many as 35,000-40,000 people, as archival sources indicate. Most of them came from eastern and central provinces of Greek Macedonia, 20,000 from the former and 13,000-14,000 people from the latter, where the Bulgarian Exarchate had had its most committed followers, and to a lesser, almost insignificant, extent from western Greek Macedonia (1,604 refugees).

The above observations allow us to presume that the total number of Slav-speakers in Greek Macedonia in the early 1920s must have been roughly 220,000 people. In fact, this argument is enhanced by certain confidential inter-war statistics recently found at the Historical Archive of the Greek Foreign Ministry. These documents shed some light on the dim demographic scenery of Greek Macedonia and allow us to form a more complete picture. In early 1923 the Governor-General of Macedonia, Achilleas Lambros, conducted an ethnological survey of this region. According to Lambros, the statistical data came (a) from the official Greek census of 1920, (b) from another census conducted at about the same time on behalf of
the Foreign Ministry and (c) from information derived from various local officials. This information, however, concerned only western and central Macedonia. Data regarding eastern Macedonia were collected from other sources: i.e. from statistics prepared by the General Staff of the Greek Army for the district of Serres\textsuperscript{31} and similar ethnological researches conducted by the Governor-General of Thrace for the districts of Drama and Kavala.\textsuperscript{32} On the basis of all these sources it has been calculated that Slav-speakers in Greek Macedonia at the early 1920s, i.e. before the Neilly Treaty, were 215,567 people: 57,359 of them were considered former Patriarchists and 158,208 former Exarchists.

A few years later, in 1925, i.e. when the population exchange had been completed, Governors-General of Macedonia and Thrace conducted fresh ethnological statistics.\textsuperscript{33} According to these the number of Slav-speakers in Greek Macedonia had decreased to 162,506, of whom 76,098 were considered "former Patriarchists" and 86,408 "former Exarchists". Such a division does not necessarily imply that the former had a Greek national consciousness and the latter had not. The term "Patriarchist" did not necessarily mean "of Greek consciousness" nor the term "Exarchist" always identify with the term "Bulgarian minded". Peasants' identity could easily change, either due to opportunism or pressure, as circumstances demanded. In any case, the transition from the religious groups of the early 20th century to the interwar national states was not a smooth process at all.\textsuperscript{34}

Demographical problems in Thrace are not as complex as in the case of Macedonia. This region was under Bulgarian Command from 1913 until May 1919, when the Entente Powers took over the administration. Just a year later, on May 1920, the region was finally signed over to Greece. A month before leaving, the French Allied Command of Western Thrace conducted an ethnological survey. The results were never published officially thus causing a lengthy dispute between Greek and Bulgarian historians.\textsuperscript{35} The dispute that continued for many years due to the Bulgarian aspirations to this territory ended just in 1978, when the Bulgarian historian Boin Bozinov dug up from the French archives the official statistic and had it published, eventually justifying Greek views: "Greek" inhabitants were 56,114 and "Bulgarian" 54,092.\textsuperscript{36}

The withdrawal of the French army led to a massive emigration of Slav-speakers from Western Thrace. It is estimated that about 32,000 Slav-speakers in all left Western Thrace between the withdrawal of the French army and the establishment of Greek rule.\textsuperscript{37} Thus, it appears that, at the time when Greece annexed Western Thrace, about 22,000-24,000 Slav-speakers were still living in this territory. This is also confirmed by an unpublished confidential report according to which Slav-speakers in Western Thrace were 22,800 in all.\textsuperscript{38} At the end of 1923 though, i.e. when the Neilly Treaty was implemented in Thrace as well, Slav-speakers had been reduced to roughly 20,000. This was due to the emigration of 2,500 individuals to Bulgaria,\textsuperscript{39} a movement instigated by fear and insecurity following the selective deportations conducted during 1923 by the Greek administration. Emigration escalated after the enforcement of the Neilly Treaty in Western Thrace in October 1923.\textsuperscript{40} Despite Bulgarian counter arguments,\textsuperscript{41} the statistical data from the League of Nations leave no room for disagreements.\textsuperscript{42} At the end of 1925 the area had been completely evacuated from the Slav-speaking population.\textsuperscript{43}

The above touring through the inter-war statistical labyrinth was an attempt to show that figures were nothing more than a weapon in the diplomatic arsenal. High ranking public servants, bureaucrats, and clergymen from both sides tried to convince the international community that Macedonia rightfully belonged to "them" rather than to the "others". In this effort they did not hesitate to use statistical data selectively, to distort terms and "play" with numbers accordingly. Of all these methods employed it was the choice of terms which chiefly determined the course of the Macedonian Question. The name of the peaceful, rural and pastoral masses of the Macedonian countryside became an apple of discord. Different versions, such as "Patriarchists and Exarchists", "Greeks and Slavs", "Bulgarians", "Bulgarisants", and "Schismatics" reflect nothing more but the agony of the rival Balkan states in search of national minorities or majorities in Macedonia. However, it was the same "genius" strategic trick, the selective use of terms, that in the long run became their "soft spot". Old terms were not always appropriate as the diplomatic setting in the Balkans changed rapidly. Moreover, archival evidence as it gradually became available to diplomats and historians, made clear that
something was wrong with published data. This sense fed back to feelings of insecurity and unjustifiable secrecy but also a strong desire to "reveal" historical "scandals" and cause public embarrassment.

Not surprisingly, Slav-Macedonians in F.Y.R.O.M. after 1944 followed exactly the same path previously trodden by Greeks and Bulgarians. But instead of adding something new to the recipe of the salad, they preferred to warm up the same ingredients: i.e. the early 20th century and inter-war Bulgarian statistics with the exception of course, that "Bulgarians" were mutated overnight into "Macedonians". This paper is not to question the right of self-determination nor to make a case for the on-going diplomatic dispute between Athens and Skopje. But it can not fail to observe that the old recipe has recently tempted International Organisations as well. The use of such over-used data for diplomatic purposes without proper historical knowledge is an extremely awkward coincidence: at the very moment that historical research has eventually clarified the complicated and artificial means employed in the past to mix-up the Macedonian salad, International Organisations re-address the same problem using outdated and mostly wrong terms and figures. In this way they unfortunately legitimise the exploitation of history to meet modern diplomatic and humanitarian concerns.
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