

Upcoming Events

Adamantios Korais and Thomas Jefferson: The Authors of Two Revolutions

The above lecture of Sunday, April 3, 2022, was postponed by the lecturer because of urgent medical reasons.

Greece, Turkey and the Great Powers. National and International Aspirations, 1918-1922

On Sunday, May 15, 2022, at 2:00 pm US Central Time (10:00 pm Athens time), Hellenic Link–Midwest presents Dr. Nikos Nikoloudis, in an online lecture titled: “Greece, Turkey and the Great Powers. National and International Aspirations, 1918-1922” The Zoom link for this webinar is <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84552420867> and the webinar ID is 845 5242 0867 This lecture is supported by the [Hellenic Foundation, Chicago](#).

The end of WWI presented the Entente with a complex situation vis-à-vis the Ottoman Empire. According to article 12 of President Woodrow Wilson’s 14 Points, “*The Turkish portion of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Ottoman rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development*”. This statement was prompted largely by the commotion caused during the war by the Armenian genocide, but its phraseology allowed every Power with an interest in the Ottoman Empire to expect something different out of it. Thus, soon the Allies faced a variety of problems: conflicting economic interests in the area of the Empire; a diminishing American interest in promoting Armenian self-determination; serious difficulties in drawing borders between regions inhabited by ethnically mixed populations, etc. In this context of these complications, the treaty with the Ottomans (Treaty of Sevres) took longer than any other one related to the defeated Central Powers, and was only signed in August 1920, nearly two years after the end of the War. Moreover, the Treaty instead of opting for self-determination of non-Turkish minorities (as in the case of Austria Hungary), it resulted in a partition of the Empire among the Allies, involving the Dardanelles, Western and southern Asia Minor, as well as mandates over Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia.

Greece appeared as one of the treaty’s main beneficiaries. However, its policies were restricted by the constantly shifting priorities of Great Britain, France and Italy in Anatolia. Moreover, the Greek mandate over the sanjak (district) of Smyrna prompted a renewed nationalistic Turkish response, focused around Mustafa Kemal, a hero of WWI. Kemal’s regime managed to defeat its internal

opponents, come to terms with France and Italy, and continue with the genocide of Greeks and Armenians in the Pontus and Western Anatolia, while at the same time successive governments in Greece proved unable to both defeat the Turks on the battlefield and reach an understanding with the Great Powers about the future of the Greek presence in Asia Minor.

Doctor *Nicholas Nikoloudis* received his Doctoral degree at the Department (currently Center) of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, at King’s College, London. Subsequently taught history courses at the CYA (College Year in Athens), the Athens School for Tourist Guides and the YWCA, as well as at postgraduate seminars at ATINER (Athens Institute for Education and Research). His areas of research interest include, geographically, Greece (medieval and modern), Southeastern Europe, the Middle East and the Mediterranean, and thematically, military and sociopolitical history. He has served as Editor-in-Chief of *Historica Themata (Historical Themes)*, has co-authored two textbooks for the Hellenic Open University, and has published thirteen books and many articles.

In Brief

On the unwavering British plans to partition Cyprus

Sir Crispin Tickell, one of the principal architects of the unwavering British plans to partition Cyprus by any means, including the tragic Turkish invasion and occupation of Northern Cyprus, passed away on January 25, 2022.

Translation into English by Fanoula Argyrou of her original article “Απεβίωσε ο Sir Crispin Tickell, εκ των πρωτεργατών της διχοτόμησης”, published in Greek in the Cypriot newspaper Simerini on Sunday, February 13, 2022.

Sir Crispin Tickell, one of the pioneers of the partition of Cyprus, has passed away.

Sir Crispin Tickell, the second in line British “executor” of the Republic of Cyprus, died of pneumonia on January 25, 2022, at the age of 91. In Cyprus, Greece and the Greek diaspora, very few if any know about this top British Foreign Office high ranking official. He proved himself a “worthy” follower of the statement made by the British Colonial Secretary (Lennox-Boyd) on December 19, 1956, promising to the Turks and Turkish Cypriots that partition and separate self-determination for the 18% minority in Cyprus would not be excluded in a final solution of the Cyprus problem, as well as of the 1956/1957 partitionist plans of Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick (Permanent Under-Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs, British Foreign Office) and those of the Turkish politician Dr. Nihat Erim reported in 1956 (Plan delivered to Turkish Prime Minister Menderes in November 1956 on "*How to recapture Cyprus*").

Sir Crispin Tickell completed the "work" of his predecessors in 1964. With his plan he paved out the work that had to be done in advance for Turkey to invade Cyprus unhindered by cutting the ties between Greece and Cyprus, and by using the American 6th Fleet and the British Royal Navy to stop any Greek help to Cyprus. His last act (regarding Cyprus) took place in 1990.

Let's look first at what the British press wrote about him.

In their obituaries, the British newspapers wrote about the career diplomat that he was—an advisor to four British prime ministers who "*had a tremendous intellect and showed perfect timing when he intervened in politics.*"

Tickell was born in London, the son of writer and historian Jerrard Tickell and his wife, Renée (née Haynes), also a writer. Their son was described early in his career as one of the smartest of his generation, attending Westminster school and graduating from Christ Church in Oxford in 1952 and serving in the Coldstream Guards before starting in the Foreign Office in 1954. His first job at the Foreign Office was in charge of the British Antarctic Territory ... Transfers to various British embassies followed ... His impressive understanding of detail was crucial in the UK's accession negotiations with the European Economic Community ... His last posting abroad was as Permanent Representative to the Security Council from 1987-1990 ... But he did not retire at all after leaving there ..." (The Guardian, 25.1.2022, Sir Crispin Tickell obituary)

Now back to the Cyprus issue.

I dare say that thanks to my research in the British National Archives in London, we now know that in 1964 behind the Foreign Office closed doors, Sir Crispin Tickell was the man who paved the way for the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. He was one of the promoters and designers of the "two constituent states" plan promoted by the British and the Turks - a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation in Cyprus and not only. He was also the man who foresaw exactly what had to be done ten years ahead. And he confessed that himself.

Apocalyptic - "shaping the world ten years ahead"

In an interview with Churchill College, Cambridge, on January 28, 1999, Sir Crispin Tickell revealed much about his role and service in British politics and diplomacy. He spoke about the plans they made in the Foreign Office Planning Department and said, among other things: "*We were writing long-term policy papers. E.g., we wrote about our future relations with the Soviet Union... with Cuba... I was the secretary of the working group for the Ministry for shaping the world 10 years ahead...*"

1964 - "The Future of Cyprus" - 10 years ahead!

Sir Crispin was the head of the planning team at the Planning Department between 1961–1964. The other two were Sir Michael Palliser and Sir Robert Wade-Gery—both with involvement in the Cyprus issue. Although in his interview with Churchill College he did not mention their plans in relation to Cyprus, nevertheless the rich British National Archives did not hide their plans. His three-page document, with his planning entitled "*The Future of Cyprus*", *Looking 10 Years Ahead*, bears his signature dated February 14, 1964. The plan referred to three possible solutions with territorial separation. Dividing Cyprus through a double union (between Greece and Turkey), dividing through a federation-confederation, perhaps, with special relations with Greece and Turkey respectively, or a federation dividing the island into cantons, of which one or two to be Turkish.

In his long-term strategic plan Sir Crispin envisaged that they had to cut the umbilical cord with Greece (relations between Greece and Cyprus) and that they would need the use of the 6th American Fleet and the British Royal Navy, to prevent Greek ships from crossing the Aegean in aid of Cyprus, coordinated effort with the allies (and pro-British elements in Greece) to minimize relations between the Greek government and Greek Cypriots and "*attacks against the Greek press and radio*" etc. The last paragraph of Sir Crispin Tickell's document concluded: "*The various courses of action suggested above would take some time to produce results. In one respect at least time is on our side in the island. Whatever happens it sees certain that the present redeployment of population will continue and the Turks will gather in the northern part of the island. The more complete this is, the more obvious and acceptable a solution of the kind described in paragraph 1 above*".

From Our History

Excerpts from the monumental work of the Byzantine historian, Speros Vryonis: "*The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*"

(Continuation from the previous Newsletter issue)

The Euchitai (Messalians), so-called because of the preponderant emphasis that they placed upon prayer at the expense of certain sacraments, apparently originated in the Mesopotamian region of Osrhoene, and by the second half of the fourth century entered Anatolia. During the course of the fourth and fifth centuries, the heresy appeared in Lycaonia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Cappadocia, and Pontus.

The great heresy of Mani also made its appearance in fourth-century Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and Lydia. Later Anastasius I and Justinian I took severe measures against the heresy, and by the eighth century the term is used to describe

other similar dualistic movements, in particular that of the Paulicians.

Thus, Byzantine Anatolia had, by the time of the losses to the Arabs of Syria, Egypt, and North Africa, enjoyed a respectable history of heresy. One is struck by the number of sects and also by the continuity of heresy in certain parts of Anatolia, but opinion has varied as to the degree the Anatolian population was heretical or orthodox. It is a question that cannot be answered definitively. Certainly, in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries heresies were numerous and common throughout many of the lands where Christianity was establishing itself, including Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor, but also North Africa, Italy, and other parts of the Western world as well. One must view the presence of heresies in Asia Minor at this time partially against this background. On the other hand, some of these heresies (Montanism, Novatianism, and Messalianism) seem to have persevered longer and to have left a more marked coloring on subsequent Anatolian heresies.

To what degree the presence of heresy can be related to the survival of non-Greek languages is yet one more of those "difficult" problems. The principle had been enunciated by Holl that the heresies in Anatolia were toughest to eradicate in those areas where the Anatolian languages survived longest. He stated, the heretical sects found support in the local languages. This is so general a statement that it glosses over many important points. First, all surviving tombstones of Anatolian heretics are in the Greek language. And yet, earlier pagan tombstones have survived which have been inscribed in Phrygian. Why then, have none of the early heretical Christian inscriptions, including those of the Montanists, been inscribed in one of the indigenous Anatolian tongues? If, in fact, Holl's dictum were strictly valid one would have expected to find epigraphical testimonial to this conjectured relation between the survival of heresy and that of indigenous languages. Obviously many of the pagan Anatolians were Greek-speaking (prior to their conversions to Christianity), and so were great numbers of Christian heretics. The process of Hellenization had been operative for a long time previous to the birth of the Christian religion. It is virtually impossible to substantiate Holl's thesis that the heretical and linguistic lines in central and western Asia Minor coincided to any significant extent. It is quite possible or even probable, however, that an indigenous sect such as the Montanists, and nonindigenous sects such as the Manichaeans and Messalians, had a marked effect on the subsequent religious development in Anatolia and that they left a rich legacy which was partially incorporated by later sectaries.

Heresy in Asia Minor during the middle Byzantine period is closely linked first with the Paulicians (and to a lesser extent with the Athinganoi and Iconoclasts) and then in the eleventh century above all with the Monophysites. The Paulician heresy, having entered Anatolia from Armenia, would seem to fit much more closely the pattern that Holl suggested in

the relationship of national language and heresy, though even here it would be wrong to describe it as a "national" heresy, for the Armenian church fought this sect with as much energy and violence as did the Byzantine church. Further, once the heresy entered Byzantine territory it also attracted segments of the Greek population. By the mid-ninth century the sect was strongly established as a border principality in the regions of Melitene, Tephrike, Pontic Phanaroria, and Coloneia. After the destruction of their state by Basil I, the Paulicians abandoned many of these regions and sought refuge farther to the east. It was not until the reign of John Tzimiskes that the Byzantine eastward drive incorporated sufficient numbers of them to cause further concern. At this later date many of them were transplanted to Thrace.

The Paulician heresy had also appeared in parts of Anatolia farther to the west. The Paulicians of western Anatolia survived as a sect for a considerable period, and they appear in the hagiographical literature of the tenth and eleventh centuries. St. Paul the Younger (d. 955) removed the most important and dangerous of these "Manichaeans" from the districts of the Cibyrreote theme and Miletus. A century later St. Lazarus of Galesium converted a village of heretics in the bishopric of Philetis (under Myra), and though the heretics are not mentioned by name, their geographical location (identical with that of the Manichaeans of St. Paul the Younger) and the fact that St. Lazarus converted a Paulician in his own monastery would seem to indicate that these heretics were also Paulicians. As late as the tenth century the Paulicians were numerous in the regions of Euchaita where they seem to have caused the metropolitan considerable difficulty.

The history of the Paulicians of Byzantine Anatolia becomes complicated and obscure in the eleventh and twelfth centuries with the appearance of the term "Bogomil" in the lexicography of the Greek theologians and historians. Euthymius, a monk from a Constantinopolitan monastery, records that he had been present at a trial of certain heretics in Acmonia of Phrygia sometime between 976 and 1025. He relates that these sectaries were known by two names: in the theme of the Opsicon they were called Phundagiagitai, but in the Cibyrreote they went by the name of Bogomils. It is possible that these Phundagiagitai and Bogomils of western Anatolia were either the older Paulicians under a new name, or else they represent a mutation resulting from the grafting of Balkan Bogomilism onto the Paulician sect in a manner paralleling the relation of Paulicianism and Bogomilism in the Balkans. In 1143 the Constantinopolitan synod condemned Clement of Sasima, Leontius of Balbissa, and the monk Niphon for spreading Bogomil practices in Cappadocia. The terms Bogomil and Messalian, however, had come to be used as exact and interchangeable equivalents in the twelfth century so that the question is once more obscured. In any case it is probable that the Paulician tradition in Asian Minor played some role in the movements variously referred to as Messalian and Bogomil at this later date.

(To be continued)

From the Riches of Our Cultural Heritage

Poetry by Dionysios Solomos

ΣΧΕΔΙΑΣΜΑ Β' (από το *Ελεύθεροι Πολιορκημένοι*)

Ενώ ακούεται το μαγευτικό τραγούδι της άνοιξης, οπού κινδυνεύει να ξυπνήσει εις τους πολιορκημένους την αγάπη της ζωής τόσον, ώστε να ολιγοστέψει η αντρεία τους, ένας των Ελλήνων πολεμάρχων σαλπίζει κρίζοντας τους άλλους εις συμβούλιο, και η σβησμένη κλαγγή, οπού βγαίνει μέσ' από το αδυνατισμένο στήθος του, φθάνοντας εις το εχθρικό στρατόπεδο παρακινεί έναν Αράπη να κάμει ό,τι περιγράφουν οι στίχοι 4-12.

«Σάλπιγγα, κόψ' του τραγουδιού τα μάγια με βία,
Γυναϊκός, γέροντος, παιδιού, μη κόψουν την αντρεία».
Χαμένη, αλίμονον! κι οκνή τη σάλπιγγα γρικάει·
Αλλά πώς φθάνει στον εχθρό και καθ' ηχώ ξυπνάει;
Γέλιο στο σκόρπιο στράτευμα σφοδρό γεννοβολιέται,
Κι η περιπαίχτρα σάλπιγγα μεσουρανίς πετιέται·

Και με χαρούμενη πνοή το στήθος το χορτάτο,
Τ' αράθυμο, το δυνατό, κι όλο ψυχές γιομάτο,
Βαρώντας γύρου ολόγυρα, ολόγυρα και πέρα,
Τον όμορφο τρικύμισε και ξάστερον αέρα·
Τέλος μακριά σέρνει λαλιά, σαν το πεσούμεν' άστρο,
Τρανή λαλιά, τρόμου λαλιά, ρητή κατά το κάστρο.

4

Μόλις έπαυσε το σάλπισμα ο Αράπης, μία μυριόφωνη βοή ακούεται εις το εχθρικό στρατόπεδο, και η βίγλα του κάστρου, αγνή σαν το χάρο, λέει των Ελλήνων: «Μπαίνει ο εχθρικός στόλος». Το πυκνό δάσος έμεινε ακίνητο εις τα νερά, όπου η ελπίδα απάντεχε να ιδεί τα φιλικά καράβια. Τότε ο εχθρός εξανανέωσε την κραυγή, και εις αυτήν αντιβόησαν οι νεόφθαστοι μέσ' από τα καράβια. Μετά ταύτα μία ακατάπαυτη βροντή έκανε τον αέρα να τρέμει πολλή ώρα, και εις αυτή την τρικυμία.

Η μαύρη γη σκιρτά ως χοχλό μες στο νερό που βράζει.

- Έως εκείνη τη στιγμή οι πολιορκημένοι είχαν υπομείνει πολλούς αγώνες με κάποιαν ελπίδα να φθάσει ο φιλικός στόλος και να συντρίψει ίσως τον σιδερένιο κύκλο οπού τους περιζώνει· τώρα οπού έχασαν κάθε ελπίδα, και ο εχθρός τούς τάζει να τους χαρίσει τη ζωή αν αλλαξοπιστήσουν, η υστερινή τους αντίσταση τους αποδείχνει Μάρτυρες.

5

.....Στην πεισμομένη μάχη
Σφόδρα σκιρτούν μακριά πολύ τα πέλαγα κι οι βράχοι,
Και τα γλυκοχαράματα, και μες στα μεσημέρια,
Κι όταν θολώσουν τα νερά, κι όταν εβγούν τ' αστέρια.

Φοβούνται γύρου τα νησιά, παρακαλούν και κλαίνε,
Κι οι ξένοι ναύκληροι μακριά πικραίνονται και λένε:
«Αραπιάς άτι, Γάλλου νους, σπαθί Τουρκιάς μολύβι,
Πέλαγο μέγα βράζ, ο εχθρός προς το φτωχό καλύβι».

6

Ένας πολέμαρχος ξάφνου απομακραίνεται από τον κύκλο, όπου είναι συναγμένοι εις συμβούλιο για το γιουρούσι, γιατί τον επλάκωσε η ενθύμηση, τρομερή εις εκείνη την ώρα της άκρας δυστυχίας, ότι εις εκείνο το ίδιο μέρος, εις τες λαμπρές ημέρες της νίκης, είχε πέσει κοπιασμένος από τον πολεμικόν αγώνα, και αυτού επρωτάκουσε, από τα χείλη της αγαπημένης του, τον αντίλαλο της δόξας του, η οποία έως τότε είχε μείνει άγνωστη εις την απλή και ταπεινή ψυχή του.

Μακριά απ' όπ' ήτα, αντίστροφος κι ακίνητος εστήθη·
Μόνε σφοδρά βροντοκοπούν τ' αρματωμένα στήθη·
«Εκεί 'ρθε το χρυσότερο από τα ονειράτά μου·
Με τ' άρματ' όλα βρόντησα τυφλός του κόπου χάμου.
Φωνή 'πε: - Ο δρόμος σου γλυκός και μοσχοβολισμένος·
Στην κεφαλή σου κρέμεται ο ήλιος μαγεμένος·
Παλικαρά και μορφονιέ, γεια σου, Καλέ, χαρά σου!
Άκου! νησιά, στεριές της γης, εμάθαν τ' όνομά σου. —
Τούτος, αχ! που 'ν' ο δοξαστός κι η θεϊκιά θωριά του;
Η αγκάλη μ' έτρεμ' ανοιχτή κατά τα γόνατά του.
Έριξε χάμου τα χαρτιά με τς είδησες του κόσμου
Η κορασιά τρεμάμενη.....

Σ' εχθρούς πολλούς, πολλ' άξιους, πολλά
φαρμακωμένους·
Να μείνεις, χώμα πατρικό, για μισητό ποδάρι·
Η μαύρη πέτρα σου χρυσή και το ξερό χορτάρι».
«Θύρες ανοίξτ' ολόχρυσες για την γλυκιάν ελπίδα».

7

Χαρά της έσβηε τη φωνή που 'ν' τώρα αποσβησμένη·
Άμε, χρυσ' όνειρο, και συ με τη σαβανωμένη.
Εδώ 'ναι χρεία να κατεβώ, να σφίξω το σπαθί μου,
Πριν όλοι χάσουν τη ζωή, κι εγ' όλη την πνοή μου·
Τα λίγα απομεινάρια της πείνας και τς αντρείας,
Γκόλφι να τα 'χω στο πλευρό και να τα βγάλω πέρα
Που μ' έκραξαν μ' απαντοχή, φίλο, αδελφό, πατέρα·
Δρόμ' αστραφτά να σχίσω τους σ' εχθρούς καλά
θρεμμένους,

Κρυφή χαρά 'στραψε σ' εσέ· κάτι καλό 'χει ο νους σου·
Πες, να το ξεμυστηρευτείς θες τ' αδελφοποιτού σου;
Ψυχή μεγάλη και γλυκιά, μετά χαράς σ' το λέω:
Θαυμάζω τες γυναίκες μας και στ' όνομά τους μνέω.
Εφοβήθηκα κάποτε μη δειλιάσουν και τες επαρτήρησα
αδιάκοπα,
Για η δύναμη δεν είν' σ' αυτές ίσια με τ' άλλα δώρα.
Απόψε, ενώ είχαν τα παράθυρα ανοιχτά για τη δροσιά,
μία απ' αυτές, η νεότερη, επήγε να τα κλείσει, αλλά μία
άλλη της είπε: «Όχι, παιδί μου· άφησε να 'μπει η
μυρωδιά από τα φαγητά· είναι χρεία να συνηθίσουμε·
Μεγάλο πράμα η υπομονή!
Αχ! μας την έπεμψε ο Θεός· κλει θησαυρούς κι εκείνη.
Εμείς πρέπει να έχουμε υπομονή, αν και έρχονταν οι
μυρωδιές·
Απ' όσα δίν' η θάλασσα, απ' όσ' η γη, ο αέρας».