

The Eastern Question:  
**THE LAST PHASE**

A STUDY  
IN GREEK-TURKISH DIPLOMACY

**Harry J. Psomiades**

Queens College and The Graduate School  
The City University of New York

With an Introduction by  
Van Coufoudakis

PELLA

THE EASTERN QUESTION: THE LAST PHASE

A STUDY IN GREEK-TURKISH DIPLOMACY

# The Eastern Question: The Last Phase

A STUDY IN GREEK-TURKISH DIPLOMACY

Harry J. Psomiades

*Queens College and the Graduate School  
The City University of New York*

*With an Introduction by*

Van Coufoudakis

PELLA

PELLA PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

New York, NY 10018-6401

This book was published for The Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies,  
Queens College of the City University of New York, which bears full editorial  
responsibility for its contents.

MODERN GREEK RESEARCH SERIES, IX, SEPTEMBER 2000

THE EASTERN QUESTION:  
THE LAST PHASE

Second Edition

© Copyright 2000

The Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies,  
Queens College of the City University of New York  
Flushing, NY 11367-0904

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Control Number 00-134738

ISBN 0-918618-79-7

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BY

ATHENS PRINTING COMPANY

337 West 36th Street

New York, NY 10018-6401

To

Kathy and Christine

## Acknowledgments

*The Eastern Question: The Last Phase* has been out of print for some years, although it has survived the test of time and continues to be widely quoted by scholars dealing with the vital decade of the twenties in Greek-Turkish relations. As a result of continued demand for the book and its usefulness for understanding the present in Greek-Turkish relations, it is being presented here in a second printing, but with a new introduction by Professor Van Coufoudakis, in the Modern Greek Research Series of the Queens College Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. The author is grateful to the Institute of Balkan Studies in Thessaloniki, Greece, for permission to reprint his original text and to Professor Coufoudakis for his timely introduction and for his encouragement to see this project through to completion. He is also indebted to Leandros Papathanasiou of Pella Publishing Company and to numerous scholars and individuals concerned with Greek-Turkish relations for their support and encouragement. He also wishes to acknowledge a very special debt to the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation and to the New York City Council and its president, Peter F. Vallone, for grants which helped to make this publication possible.



## Introduction

It is an honor to introduce the second edition of *The Eastern Question: The Last Phase—A Study in Greek-Turkish Relations*. Thirty-two years after the first edition, this incisive analysis of the Treaty of Lausanne retains its validity and its relevance for understanding contemporary Greek-Turkish relations and Turkish diplomacy. It should be noted that this seminal work was completed before many archival sources became available.

Harry J. Psomiades explains that the Lausanne treaty laid the foundation of peace in the region by settling outstanding territorial questions and establishing a new status quo after a decade of warfare. The treaty also marked the demise of the *megali idea*, rebuilt an ethnically cohesive Greece and established peace with Turkey at a significant cost to Greece. Greece faced a massive population exchange and resettlement, abandoned large property compensation claims, and more.

Psomiades attributes the Greco-Turkish detente during the last decade before the Second World War to a number of factors. These include the presence of strong governments headed by charismatic leaders on both sides of the Aegean; the benefits both countries derived by an improved ethnic composition, by domestic reconstruction and modernization, and the limitation of a costly arms race. The spirit of Locarno and Geneva also provided an environment conducive to detente. Finally, common security needs enhanced Greco-Turkish detente. Greece's position was vital for the defense of the straits and the Anatolian coast; Yugoslavia and Bulgaria were seeking access to the Aegean Sea, while Italy had expansionist aims in the eastern Mediterranean and Albania.

Common security needs became the foundation of post-World War II Greco-Turkish cooperation. The 1947 Truman Doctrine provided military and economic assistance to Greece and Turkey to fight the threat of communism. Both Greece and Turkey participated in the Korean War, joined NATO in 1952, formed the short-lived Balkan Pact with Yugoslavia in 1954, and signed bilateral defense cooperation agreements providing the United States with military facilities on their soil.

However, security considerations without other complementary conditions proved to be neither stable nor a permanent foundation for continued detente. The emergence of the Cyprus dispute in 1954 showed that each country assessed its vital interests on the basis of regional concerns, while American appeals for cooperation in view of the Soviet threat increasingly lost their impact on both countries.

The first clouds on the Greco-Turkish horizon actually appeared during the Second World War: first, with the imposition by the Turkish government of the *varlik vergisi*, the wartime tax whose discriminatory and abusive implementation contributed to the beginning of the decimation of the protected Greek minority; and second, because of Turkey's unwillingness to come to Greece's assistance in the aftermath of the 1940-41 Italian and German invasions, despite treaty obligations. Third, information reached the Greek government-in-exile, since then confirmed by archival records, that Greece's Aegean islands had become a bargaining chip in the attempt to draw Turkey into the war on behalf of either

the axis or the allies. In view of post- 1974 developments in Greco-Turkish relations, the political maneuvering over Greece's Aegean islands during the Second World War has had longterm implications for Greek-Turkish relations because it raised questions about Turkey's commitment to the legal status quo created by the Lausanne treaty in the Aegean Sea. The January 1996 Imia crisis has fully exposed Turkey's designs in the region.

Since 1923, Greek-Turkish relations have been through phases of confrontation as well as detente and cooperation. On numerous occasions between 1954 and 1999, Greece and Turkey were on the verge of conflict as a result of tensions over Cyprus, culminating in the 1974 Turkish invasion and continuing occupation of Cyprus. Other crisis points included the 1955 pogrom in Istanbul against the protected Greek minority, and Turkey's coordinated challenge in the Aegean over mineral rights, the delimitation of the continental shelf, the extent of Greek territorial waters and air space, the militarization of certain Greek Aegean islands and, in the aftermath of the 1996 Imia crisis, Turkey's challenge of Greece's sovereignty in "grey areas" involving numerous Greek islands in the Aegean. These issues were further complicated by command and control structures and areas of responsibility in NATO's southeastern flank; the Greco-Turkish arms race, which consumes 5-7 percent of each country's GDP; the expansion of Turkey's high technology defense industry; the Turkish-Israeli economic and military cooperation agreements of February-April 1996; Turkey's quest for membership in the European Union and access to its financial protocols; Turkey's interference in the affairs of the Muslim minority in Greece; the decimation of the protected Greek minority in Istanbul, Imbros and Tenedos and the restrictions placed by Turkey on the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul; and Greece's support of Kurdish minority rights, which culminated in the 1998-99 0<;alan affair.

Inevitably, the relations of the two countries with the United States, NATO and the European Union were negatively affected, because their response to the various Greco-Turkish problems has been determined by regional, political, strategic and economic considerations and the assumption that Turkey has greater strategic and economic value than Greece. Moreover, perceptions of Turkey's independent foreign policy, internal instability and the rise of nationalism and Islamic fundamentalism made the United States and its western allies more sensitive to Turkey's demands. In turn, Greece and Turkey evaluated their western ties through the prism of Greco- Turkish relations.

The crisis that dominated Greco-Turkish relations from 1974 to 1999 created a political consensus in Greece about Turkey's objectives that cut across ideological lines. This consensus was based on the fact that Turkey pursued revisionist objectives in the Aegean and in Cyprus, which presented a vital threat to Greek security and territorial integrity. Differences existed only on how to counter Turkey's policies, rather than on whether the objectives of these policies were revisionist. The dominant perception was that Turkey sought the revision of the status quo created by the treaties of Lausanne (1923), Montreux (1936), and Paris (1947), and the partition and annexation of the occupied areas of Cyprus. Despite rhetorical differences, both the conservative and socialist governments that ruled Greece between 1974 and 1999 chose policies of negotiation, patience, vigilance and readiness. The cycle of confrontation and

negotiation between Greece and Turkey has been a familiar one. However, despite domestic political pressures and ideological bravado, resort to force has been avoided, even though in 1974, 1976, 1987 and 1996 Greece and Turkey came dangerously close to war.

The closing of the twentieth century opened a new page in Greco-Turkish relations. Spurred by human tragedies caused by natural forces late in the summer of 1999, by opportunities offered for European cooperation and by Greek leaders willing to take political risks, Greece and Turkey embarked on a new attempt at reconciliation. The United States supported and encouraged these developments by hosting a meeting between the foreign ministers of Greece and Turkey, Papandreou and ^em, on June 30, 1999. Since then, the two countries have initiated a dialogue on issues of "low politics," including cooperation in the fields of trade, tourism, drug trafficking and the environment, while topics of "high politics," including the issue of terrorism, have been marginally addressed at the time of this writing. The Greek government also lifted its objections on the candidacy status for Turkey in the European Union at the December 1999 Helsinki summit. Consequently, the issue of Turkey's compliance with European Union standards and policies has now become a European Union problem rather than a problem conveniently attributed to Greece's "obstructionism."

The initiatives by the Simitis-Papandreou administration in Greece have contributed to the improvement of Greece's image in Europe and in the United States, where Greece was often blamed for the tensions in Greco-

Turkish relations. They have also created a new dilemma for Greek policymakers. How far is Greece prepared to take its dialogue with Turkey in view of the post-1974 consistent position that the only legitimate difference between the two countries in need of resolution was that of the delimitation of the Aegean continental shelf? The position of the United States remains that the two countries ought to negotiate all their differences regardless of their legal validity and to have recourse to the International Court of Justice over issues such as the status of the Imia islets. The December 1999 Helsinki European Union decision on Turkey's candidacy also calls for a negotiated settlement of Greco-Turkish issues and of the Cyprus problem.

Prime Minister Simitis and Foreign Minister Papandreou have taken important risks in advancing their moderate policies vis-à-vis Turkey. It is unclear, however, how far they are willing to take the current Greco-Turkish dialogue. Many in and out of the Simitis administration, including the military and traditional foreign policy elites, are skeptical about the outcome of these initiatives and about the implications of the downgrading of the role of the career diplomatic service in these critical discussions. The skeptics reflect the experience of the cycle of Greco-Turkish negotiations since 1974, where Turkey attempted to impose a revision of the Aegean status quo through political dialogue backed by the threat of force rather than through reliance on existing treaties and contemporary international law.

No one should underestimate the difficulties in the road ahead. Pragmatic necessity will bring about the continuation of the new Greco-Turkish dialogue in the aftermath of the April 9, 2000 Greek parliamentary elections. However, this dialogue will likely evolve along narrow legal points as the two countries approach issues of "high politics." This will likely be the case because while Turkey's subdued rhetoric marks a change of tactics employed since 1974, its objectives appear unchanged. The 1995 Turkish Grand National Assembly's "casus belli" resolution authorizing the Turkish government's use of force in the Aegean remains in effect; Turkey continues to promote the concept of "grey areas" in the Aegean requiring the redefinition of the sovereignty of numerous Greek Aegean islands; and Turkey continues to violate Greece's FIR and air space, while its Cyprus policy remains that of a confederation of two independent, sovereign, recognized states with Turkey's continued military guarantee.

Harry Psomiades, in this seminal book, argues that the Greco-Turkish detente of the interwar period could be attributed to a number of factors, including the presence of charismatic risk-taking leaders on both sides of the Aegean, the presence of common security needs, and the Locarno/Geneva climate of political cooperation and conflict management. Charismatic leaders willing to take risks, such as foreign ministers *£em* and Papandreou, may

have contributed to the post-1999 Greco-Turkish detente. Additional factors contributing to this detente include the post-Cold War international climate, NATO's new charter, the new dynamism of the European Union and the political and economic activism of the G8. But these developments have not been strong enough to allay fears when issues of sovereign rights and territorial integrity are at stake. In addition, post-Cold War Balkan developments have not contributed to regional stability or confidence building. Bosnia has been effectively partitioned, while Kosovo appears heading toward secession and/or partition in the aftermath of the 1999 NATO intervention. Moreover, the double standards in American foreign policy (i.e., Kosovo, the Kurdish issue, et al.) raise questions about the objectives of influential actors, such as the United States, in the region. Other elements distinguishing the post-Cold War period from the past include the revival of Turkish nationalism, the opening up of Turkey's political system, which has allowed the manipulation of public opinion toward nationalist ends, the growing reliance of Turkey's diplomatic elites on the strength of the military, and the commitment of successive governments to transform their country into a regional superpower, in order to address perceived internal and external threats.

Nearly eighty years after the Treaty of Lausanne and the proclamation of the Turkish Republic, the question remains whether the Aegean Sea can become a bridge of cooperation instead of being an arena of confrontation between the two countries. Harry Psomiades' work raises an important point. He concludes that the Greco-Turkish rapprochement of the interwar period:

... was essentially political and dictated by common defense problems.

It was a detente between two governments rather than between the two peoples... the one hundred years of hostility that characterized Greek- Turkish relations could not be overcome by the political rapprochement after Lausanne...

Psomiades' conclusion raises a major long-term challenge that will continue to confront the leadership and the people of both countries in the years ahead. History, since the conclusion of the Lausanne treaty, shows that detente and cooperation is based on more than security considerations. The challenge of Greco-Turkish coexistence is monumental, and no one should underestimate the difficulties ahead. Harry Psomiades' book is an important reminder of these challenges.

*Van Coufoudakis*

Dean, School of Arts and Sciences

Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne

## MODERN GREEK RESEARCH SERIES

The purpose of this monograph series is to promote and disseminate scholarly works on the history, institutions, and the culture of the Greek people. It is sponsored and edited by the Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, Queens College of the City University of New York (formerly jointly with the Greek Seminar of the Center for Mediterranean Studies of the American University). This is the ninth publication within the framework of the Modern Greek Research Project—Harry J. Psomiades, Professor of Political Science, Queens College of the City University of New York, Director.

## MODERN GREEK RESEARCH SERIES

- I. *Essays on the Cyprus Conflict*. Edited by Van Coufoudakis. 1976
- II. *Foreign Interference in Greek Politics: An Historical Perspective*. By T.A. Couloumbis, J.A. Petropulos, and H.J. Psomiades. 1976
- III. *Greek-American Relations: A Critical Review*. Edited by T.A. Couloumbis and J.O. Iatrides. 1980
- IV. *The Greek American Community in Transition*. Edited by H.J. Psomiades and A. Scourby. 1982
- V. *Education and Greek Americans: Process and Prospects*. Edited by S.D. Orfanos, H.J. Psomiades, and J. Spiridakis. 1987
- VI. *Greece, the New Europe, and the Changing International Order*. Edited by H.J. Psomiades and S. Thomadakis. 1993
- VII. *Greece and the New Balkans*. Edited by Van Coufoudakis, Harry J. Psomiades and Andre Gerolymatos. 1999
- VIII. *Greek American Families: Traditions and Transformations*. Edited by S.J. Tsemberis, H.J. Psomiades, and A. Karpathakis. 1999
- IX. *The Eastern Question: The Last Phase. Second edition*. By Harry J. Psomiades. 2000

## Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	xvi
<i>Preface</i>	xv
1. HELLENISM AND OTTOMAN-TURKISH IMPERIALISM	1
2. THE GREEK REVIVAL	9
3. THE END OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE	15

4.	THE TURKISH REVIVAL	23
5.	THE STRUGGLE FOR THRACE	31
6.	THE CONTEST FOR THE ISLANDS	43
7.	THE EXCHANGE OF MINORITIES	53
8.	THE STATUS OF MINORITIES EXCLUDED FROM THE EXCHANGE	63
9.	THE STATUS OF THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE	81
10.	THE LAUSANNE SETTLEMENT IN RETROSPECT	101
APPENDIX 1:	The Treaty of Lausanne, July 24, 1923	105
APPENDIX 2:	The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, January 30, 1923	113

*Bibliography* 121

*Index* 135

*Maps*

1. The Eastern Mediterranean
2. The Aegean Islands
3. The Greek-Turkish Frontier in Thrace

## Abbreviations

- BFSP Great Britain, Foreign Office, *British and Foreign State Papers, 1812*. London, 1829.
- BPPG France, Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Bulletin Périodique de la presse grecque*.
- BPPT France, Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Bulletin Périodique de la presse turque*.
- DBFP Great Britain, *Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939*. Edited by E.L. Woodward and Rohen Butler. London, 1947.
- DDF France, Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Documents Diplomatiques Français, 1871-1914*. Paris, 1934-1936.
- DDI Italy, Ministero degli Affari Esteri, *I Documenti Diplomatici Italiani*. Rome, 1952.
- EV *Eleftheron Vima* (Athens).
- LCNEA Great Britain, *Parliamentary Papers, 1923, Turkey*. No. 1, Cmd. 1814. "Lausanne Conference on Near Eastern Affairs, 1922-1923" (Proceedings). London, 1923.
- LNOJ League of Nations, *Official Journal* (Geneva).
- LNTS League of Nations, Treaty Series (Geneva).

MA *Le Messager d'Athènes* (Athens).

OM *Oriente Moderno* (Rome).

## Preface

In the vocabulary of English diplomacy, the "Eastern Question" held currency from the period of the Greek war of independence (1821-1829) to the period of the Turkish war of independence (1919-1922). It was defined broadly as the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the Ottoman empire from Europe, Asia and Africa. For a century the major powers of Europe believed that the collapse of the Ottoman empire was imminent and that it would alter the political relations within the European community. They, therefore, pressed for positions of paramount influence within the dying empire and strove either to hasten or to delay its demise, according to their interests.

The subject of this volume is the significant role played by Greece in the politics of the struggle for the Ottoman succession. Its purpose is to underline the meaning of the 1923 Lausanne settlement—that milestone in Greek-Turkish relations—for contemporary problems in the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean. The study may also be useful in efforts to deal with pressing boundary disputes and the problems of minorities that have emerged in recent years as a result of the multiplicity of new states—realizing, of course, that these problems differ in nature as well as in degree, from one continent to the next, from one region to another. It will certainly serve to place the contemporary Cyprus problem in perspective.

My obligations are so various, and many of them so tenuous, that I find them difficult to express; with a subject like this, one absorbs influences without being fully aware of them. But I must single out for mention professors J.C. Hurewitz and Tibor Halasi-kun of Columbia University. I am indebted to the Ford Foundation, the generosity of which made possible an extended stay abroad, mainly in Greece and Turkey. For the use of the facilities of the Library of Congress, the Columbia University Library, the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Turkish National Library and the Library of the Greek Parliament, I also owe a debt of gratitude.

My immediate obligations are to my wife, for helping me so often to find time to write in the midst of many distractions. And to professors Norman A. Bailey of Queens College, John C. Alexander of Columbia University and Basil Laourdas, Director of the Institute for Balkan Studies, and his colleagues at the institute, who have criticized my manuscript in detail. Needless to say, I assume sole responsibility for the views and opinions expressed herein.

*Harry J. Psomiades* New  
York City 1968

# Hellenism and Ottoman-Turkish Imperialism

## *The Imperial Legacy*

Modern Greek-Turkish relations in the Balkans and Anatolia were profoundly influenced by two imperial traditions, the Byzantine Christian and the Ottoman Islamic. Neither Byzantium nor its successor, the Ottoman empire, had a modern conception of the boundary as a negotiated line. The boundaries that they knew were not lines but zones or border marches. There was, however, a major difference in their outlook toward boundaries. While both as universal empires considered the march areas as temporary halting places eventually to be absorbed or pushed forward, the Byzantines, for a variety of practical reasons, came to impose limitations on the extent of their domains. From the mid-seventh century onward, Byzantium viewed the core of its empire as extending in the east through Anatolia to the Euphrates and in the west over the whole of the Balkans up to the Danube and the Sava. Its systems of military organization, civil administration, taxation, and land tenure were all geared to the need of defending or retaking its core territories.

On the other hand, the Ottoman state imposed no such limitation upon itself. In theory, at least, it considered itself in a permanent state of war with the non-Muslim world, and any treaty of peace signed was held to be only a temporary truce. It recognized no limits to the further extension of its frontiers. Moreover, it was a state born on the frontier between Byzantine Christendom and Islam. The open frontier provided work and recompense both for its soldiers, administrators and men of religion. Indeed, in a deeper sense, the maintenance of an open frontier was the very *raison d'être* of its statehood. Even when the state had evolved into an empire after the capture of Constantinople, its frontier traditions remained deeply rooted in its military, social and religious life. Ottoman institutions were geared to the needs of a society expanding by conquest and colonization into the lands of the infidel.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (London, 1961) 26-27; Majid Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam* (Baltimore, 1955); F.W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, 2 vols. (London, 1937); Fuad KÖprülü, *Les institutions juridiques Turque au moyen-âge* (Istanbul, 1937). For the significance of the frontier and of the frontiersman in Ottoman government and society, see Fuad Koprulu, *Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, 1935), and Paul Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1938).

The techniques employed by the Byzantines and the Ottoman Turks in pushing forward the frontier areas had much in common. Frontier districts were often organized as vassal principalities or as military communities rather than as provinces proper. Diverse ethnic groups were resettled in the border zones or in various provinces to improve the security of the state and to facilitate the process of assimilation. Constant attempts were made to convert the population of the newly conquered territories to the religion of the state and to influence the religious policies of the states or tribes on the other side of the frontier. The idea of universality and of the true religion gave both states their cohesion and bound together the many diverse races contained within them.

The modern politics of Greece and Turkey were not only influenced by the concept of fluid boundaries but also, and perhaps to a greater degree, by the imperial traditions that compelled generations of Greeks and Turks to claim essentially the same territory, not to mention the same imperial city—Constantinople—which was the natural center of that territory. The Balkans and Anatolia were the very core of the Byzantine empire. Unlike its other territories, these were bound together by the Greek language and the Greek Orthodox faith and by the common dangers and pressures of the barbarians in the north, Latin Christendom in the west, and the Persian and Muslim empires in the east. In other words, the life of Byzantium was deeply rooted in the soil of Anatolia and the Balkans.

Although the Ottoman Turks were to unite under their rule or bring under their influence the largest and most essential part of the Muslim world, stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf and from the Crimea to the horn of Africa, this hegemony was, on closer view, of only secondary importance to them. What mattered most were the provinces formerly ruled by Byzantium in Asia Minor and the Balkans. On these territories they developed over a period of centuries their first empire, which was never completely absorbed in the later and larger Muslim one.<sup>2</sup> The Ottoman state became a Balkan power before it became a Middle East power. It was already an empire rooted in the Balkans and Anatolia before it became a Muslim empire. It had formed its own peculiar political traditions and institutions long before its conquest in the sixteenth century of Arab Muslim lands. In short, Anatolia and the Balkans were the main reservoir of power for the Byzantine and Ottoman empires.

Greek and

Another important legacy was the peculiar distribution of the Turkish population in the Balkans and Anatolia. Prior to the twelfth century—a century disastrous to racial and religious minorities

the peninsula could boast of Turkish (Gagauz) speaking Christians and Greek (Cretan), Albanian, Bulgarian, Pomak, Romanian or Vlach (Meglen) and Serbo-Croatian (Bosnian) speaking Muslims. In addition, there were a large number of Turkish Muslim settlements in Macedonia, Thessaly, Thrace, eastern Rumelia (southeastern Bulgaria) and the Dobrudja. The non-Turkish minorities in the Anatolian peninsula included over four million Greek and Armenian Christians, many of whom used Turkish as their mother tongue (e.g., the Karamanlis) and over two million Kurdish Muslims. As the

---

<sup>2</sup> Wittek, 2-3.

connecting link between three continents, the Balkans and Anatolia became the home of varied ethnic, religious and cultural groups tossed about by the ebb and flow of military, religious and demographic conquests.

The forced deportations of peoples, varying birth rates, the influx of Turkish settlers and nomads, famines, wars, conversions to Islam and to Christianity, and economic and political opportunities accounted for the changing character of the Greek and Turkish population. For example, the recent research of Professor Halil Inalcik into Turkish population *defsters* or registers indicated that western Anatolia in the period 1260-1450 was mostly Turkified. A century earlier it was almost wholly Hellenized. The *defster* of Trabzon revealed that around 1490 the Black Sea city of Trabzon and its environment in the northeast corner of Anatolia still contained a Greek majority. Until the twentieth century Greeks continued to live in substantial numbers on the Black Sea coast of Anatolia, in Cappadocia, around Konya and along the Anatolian Mediterranean coast. These settlements antedated the Turkish conquest of Anatolia, and the Black Sea settlements go back to the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. In the sixteenth century, the Greeks were still in a majority in eastern Thrace, Cyprus and the Aegean islands. The Turks were a majority in Thessaly and formed substantial groups in Macedonia and western Thrace. After the conquest of Cyprus in 1571 and of Crete in 1669, the Turks in several periods formed a rather large minority on these two islands.<sup>3</sup>

The revival of trade opportunities for the non-Muslims of the Ottoman empire and the decline of Ottoman power in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries encouraged the movement of the Greek population. The growing economic importance of Smyrna (Izmir) and Thessaloniki, partly owing to the decline of the empire's Arab ports, attracted an additional Greek population into these cities. Greeks from the Aegean islands, the Morea and from the interior of Anatolia moved to the Aegean coast of Asia Minor. After the seventeenth century, so great was this movement of population, Smyrna became known as the city of the infidels. Greek became the language of the city. Indeed, next to Constantinople, it became the most important Greek center of the Ottoman empire. During the same period thousands of Greeks settled in Romania. The Greek population of Thessaloniki increased rapidly and there was scarcely a city in the Balkans without its Greek commercial community.<sup>4</sup>

3 Halil Inalcik, "The Land Surveys in the Ottoman Empire as a Source of Place-Names," *Belleleten* 20 (April 1956) 228-230. The Pontic Greeks of the Black Sea coast of Anatolia were not only the oldest Greek community of Anatolia but as an independent state outlived the Byzantine empire, which fell in 1453. The Greek empire of Trebizond lasted from 1204 to 1461. In spite of Turkish colonization of the area, up to World War I, the Pontic Greeks in the vilayet of Trabzon and the northern portion of the vilayet of Sivas, numbering about 485,000, formed 30-40 percent of the population in northeast Anatolia.

4 N.G. Svoronos, *Le commerce de Salonique au XVI<sup>e</sup> et au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1868); Stoianovich, "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant," *Journal of Economic History* 22 (1960) 234-313; D. Georgiades, *Smyrne et l'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1885); C. Iconomos, *Étude sur Smyrne et l'Asie Mineure* (Constantine Amantos, O *Ellenismos tis Mikras Asias* (The Hellenism (Athens, 1919).

The only major emigration outlet for the Greeks outside of the empire was Russia. Her geographic location, her common religion with the Greeks and the economic opportunities she offered attracted large numbers of Greek colonists. By the turn of the present century almost one million Greeks from the Ottoman empire had settled on Russia's Black Sea coast. In short, Greek-Turkish relations were profoundly influenced not merely by a historical memory but by the presence of a substantial Greek population interspersed with a substantial Turkish population in the Balkans and Anatolia. When the Greek war for independence broke out in 1821, there were perhaps more Greeks living in Anatolia and its off-shore islands than in the Balkans, excluding Constantinople. The modern problem of Greek-Turkish politics emerged to a large extent as a result of the failure of the Ottoman-Turks to assimilate completely the Byzantine elements, e.g., the Greek Orthodox Christians, of the empire. For the entire period of Ottoman rule the Greeks of the empire hardly ceased to think with ardent nostalgia of their Byzantine past. They were identified as one people, long before the rise of nationalism, by their common religion, language and laws (the Byzantine Hexabible of Harmenopoulos). It should be recalled however that until the age of nationalism there had been no "Greece." There were merely <sup>^</sup>living in different areas of the empire whose political consciousness <sup>^</sup> them not so much with the states of classical Greece as with the empire. The Greeks had for long given up the term Hellenes and called themselves "Romaioi" or Romans.

#### *Church and State*

After the fall of Byzantium, the few learned men who remained in that broken world gathered around the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople, and there laid the foundations of the new Greek life. The Turks did not attempt the mass conversion of the Greeks to Islam, but sought to govern the Christian population through its own church.

The Sacred Law of Islam provided protection to the *ahl-al-kitab*—the People of Revealed Books or Scripture, e.g., Christians and Jews—and ruled that polytheists and pagans must accept Islam or perish. In theory, at least, the status of the *ahl-al-kitab* residing within the Domain of Islam was regulated by a contract or *dhimma*, from which the term *dhimmi* or tolerated infidels is derived. By the terms of his contract with the *dhimmi*, the Muslim ruler allowed the *dhimmi* the exercise of their religion, and guaranteed their lives, liberties and to some extent their property. The *dhimmi* in return agreed to pay tribute (the special poll tax called the *cizya* or *harag*), to conduct themselves in such matters as dress and home and church construction so as to reflect their inferior status relative to the true believer, and to accept legal inequalities.

Thus Islamic law regulated relations of the *dhimmi* with both individual Muslims and the Muslim state. But how were the relations of the *dhimmi* with one another to be regulated, if the distinction between *dhimmi* and Muslims was solely a religious one? Falling outside the scope of Muslim sacred law, the "internal" relations of the *dhimmi* were charged to the guardians of their respective sacred traditions. Consequently, the Muslim ruler was inclined to deal with each *dhimmi* community as a whole; and the rights of the individual *dhimmi* derived exclusively from his membership in a protected community, which was held responsible for his behavior.

In Ottoman-Turkish usage the legally recognized religious communities were called

*millets*. They operated much as the Muslim *millet* institution, and enjoyed a number of fiscal immunities; the clergy and the religious institutions—churches, schools, monasteries and welfare foundations—were not subject to taxation. Eventually the officer responsible to the state for the administration of a *millet*, the *millet baŝı*, assumed the task of paying to the imperial government all taxes imposed upon his community. The amount of the taxes collected not only satisfied government demands but also supported the community's internal needs. The *millets* also enjoyed, especially on the local level, a considerable measure of self-government, and the Greek Orthodox or *Rum millet* had the privilege of using Greek as the official language in its relations with the state. Moreover, all questions of personal status such as inheritance, marriage, divorce, alimony and guardianship were

decided by the religious or community courts, whose judgments were executed by the civil authorities. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as the Ottoman administration progressively weakened, the jurisdiction of the non-Muslim *millet* courts expanded, at times from purely civil to commercial and even criminal cases, and the *millets* received authority to establish their own prisons. The responsibility for providing the elementary services of law and order had gradually devolved upon the corporate units of the empire, of which the *millets* were part.

In pursuing a policy of toleration the sultans set a pattern that protected the ethnic and traditional life of their non-Muslim subjects and had grave consequences for the future. For example, the leadership of the Greek Orthodox community or *Rum milleti* served as the focal point of Greek ethnic life. Its role in the defense of the Orthodox faith and its work in the maintenance and propagation of Greek letters, education and civilization during the Turkish domination proved invaluable to the development of modern Greek nationalism. On the other hand, it is incorrect to place the idea of national entities above religious distinctions in the *millet* system. Until a relatively late date the term *millet* referred exclusively to a religious community. In the empire there was a Muslim *millet*, but there were no Turkish, Arab, Albanian or Slav *millets*—, there were Greek, Armenian and Jewish *millets*, but these existed as distinct religious communities, not as ethnic nations. In the late eighteenth century, Greeks, Rumanians, Slavs, Arabs and Albanians alike formed part of the Greek Orthodox *millet*.

The Orthodox Christians of the empire were not always under the jurisdiction of the Greek patriarchate of Constantinople. It was not until the expansion of Ottoman power that the whole Orthodox Church was organized as a single *millet* under the Greek patriarchate. The Bulgarian patriarchate came to an end in 1393 and the Serbian patriarchate was abolished in 1459. The Bulgarian archbishopric of Ohrid remained as the only ecclesiastical center of the Balkan Slavs and retained a certain degree of autonomy. In the east, the Ottoman conquest of Arab lands in the sixteenth century resulted in the subordination of the three ancient patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria to the church of Constantinople. The supreme position of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople remained unchallenged until 1557, when the Serbian patriarchate of Ipek was established through the influence of the Grand Vezir Mehmet Sokolli, who was of Serbian origin. But the cooperation of the Serbian patriarchate with the Haps- burgs and the growing influence of the Greek element in Constantinople led to the abolition of the Ipek patriarchate in 1766 and the Ohrid archbishopric the following year.

The immense support given the Ecumenical Patriarchs was not governed

solely by religious prescription and tradition. Nor was it the result of incompetence or weakness on the part of the sultans. It certainly was not an act of altruism. By establishing the Greek Orthodox *millet* with special privileges, Mehmet the Conqueror (1451-1481) sought to maintain the loyalty of his Orthodox Christian subjects, who represented more than half of the population of his empire, and to stiffen their resistance to union with the Church of Rome. This act of statesmanship spared the empire serious internal dissension and reduced the likelihood of a successful religious crusade from the west. Although the wide authority granted the Greek Church ultimately proved fatal to the effective incorporation of non-Muslims into the Ottoman structure of society, its immediate results were advantageous to both parties.

### *The Influence of Nationalism*

It is not surprising that the Greeks were among the first people within the Ottoman empire to be influenced by the western theory of self-determination and to identify the nation with the state. The influences from the west and their dominant role in religion, literature, commerce, education and finance contributed to the early development of a distinct national feeling. The Greeks had for some time viewed themselves as a superior class of Christians forming a counterpart to the Ottoman-Turks. Greek separatism was further influenced by the steady decline of the Ottoman-Turkish administration. From Belgrade to Baghdad numerous semi-independent states and regions had emerged, by the turn of the nineteenth century, ruled by ambitious Muslim governors and Christian primates. The Ottoman government with its dissipated military establishment seemed powerless to check these local lords; and attempts to form a new army by Sultan Selim III (1789-1808) ended with the sultan's dethronement by the unruly janissaries.

It was the new spirit of Greek nationalism in the nineteenth century that in a very real sense marked the beginning of the end of the multinational Ottoman state. The demand that the cultural nation and the political state with its fixed frontiers should coincide became the source of endless domestic disputes and international strife. The success of the Greek war of independence (1821-1829) altered considerably the traditional relationship that had existed between Muslim and Christian, and eventually between Turk and non-Turk, within the empire. It created new tension between the Ottoman government and the minorities and provided further pretext for intervention in the affairs of the empire on the part of the European powers. The intrusion of nationalism in the Balkans and some decades later in Anatolia was to bring to an end a long historic association for both Greeks and Turks.

## The Greek Revival

The Greek war of independence did not result in the liberation of the Greek people but only in the creation of the tiny kingdom of Greece. The London protocol of February 3, 1830, restricted the frontiers of the new state to what was later called central Greece, the Peloponnese, and the islands of the Cyclades, the northern border being drawn from the Gulf of Arta to the Gulf of Volo. It was a state that was just viable and included only a small part of the Greek world: Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, the prosperous Greek islands along the Anatolian coast and the Ionian islands were left outside, all but the last under Turkish rule.

Because the settlement of 1830 left most of the Greek nation outside its boundaries and provided Greece with inadequate resources, the desire to expand, to liberate more and more Greeks from Turkish rule, was inevitable. The spirit that animated the Greeks could hardly have been permanently suppressed. Indeed, for almost one hundred years the Greek people were passionately attached to a foreign policy inspired by the *megali idea* (great idea): the independence and unification of all the Greeks. From the very beginning, the young kingdom undertook strenuous diplomatic activity aimed at achieving this goal. In its foreign office, departmental divisions were established corresponding to the provinces of the Ottoman empire to be liberated, notably Macedonia, Thessaly, Epirus and Crete.

### *The Megali Idea and the Great Powers*

For much of the nineteenth century, however, the major powers of Europe believed that it was in their interest to frustrate the aspirations of modern Greek nationalism. The reasons were twofold. The Greek question threatened a direct confrontation over the issue of the existence of the Ottoman empire. It was the principal concern of the statesmen of Europe to avoid such a confrontation and to act with caution over any political rearrangements in the Near East that would alter the balance of power in the European community. Secondly, the interests of the great powers in the area were such that Britain and France, the natural maritime allies of the Greeks, generally favored Turkey over Greece in order to contain Russian expansion; and Russia preferred a militarily weak Greece for the protection of her primary interests in Constantinople and on the Danube.

But the irrepressible urge for national unification would not be daunted by the lack of international support and by the disparity between the resources of the Ottoman empire and the truncated kingdom of Greece. Such was the enthusiasm of the Greeks for the freedom of their brethren under alien rule that they often refused the wise counsel of moderation that would have better served their cause. For example, during the Crimean war (1853-1856) the attempt to profit from the disagreements between France, Britain and Russia, who had helped to place Greece on the map, proved futile and humiliating. The ill-advised plan to attack Turkey provoked an Anglo-French occupation of Piraeus and Athens that compelled Greece to maintain a strict neutrality. The Greeks of Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia and Crete who had

rebelled were suppressed by the Turks. Again, in 1862, Greece acted against her best interests when she refused the British offer to cede the Ionian islands to her on the condition that she would refrain from any aggressive action toward Turkey.

The two territorial successes gained by the Greeks, the addition of the Ionian islands in 1864, and of one part of Thessaly and one district of Epirus in 1881, were hardly due to their own efforts. Nor were they the product of great power sympathy for their national claims. The first was the result of a change of dynasty in Greece; and the second was the outgrowth of the efforts of the great powers at the Congress of Berlin, 1878, to employ Greek aspirations as a bargaining medium in order to obtain satisfaction on other matters.

Following the expulsion of the Bavarian dynasty in Greece and the dethronement of King Otho (1832-1862) because of widespread discontent with his internal and foreign policies, the question of a successor became an immediate preoccupation of the Greeks. The choice of a candidate was limited by the understanding arrived at in 1830 by the "protecting powers"—Britain, France and Russia—that the Greek king should not be a member of one of their reigning houses. After successive failures to find a candidate agreeable to Greece and the "protecting powers," the choice fell upon Prince William George, second son of Prince, afterward King, Christian of Denmark. But as a condition for accepting the crown, the Danes insisted that definite arrangements be made for the annexation to Greece of the British-held Ionian islands. Thus, in 1863 Prince William became George I, King of the Hellenes, and in the following year the Ionian islands were formally ceded to his kingdom.

It is interesting to note that the proposed new title King of the Greeks, instead of the old title held by Otho I, King of Greece, caused a protest on the part of the Ottoman government. The Turks complained that the new title implied that the Greek king was the legitimate sovereign of all the Greeks, including those who were subjects of the sultan. A compromise was found in "King of the Hellenes," which satisfied the "protecting powers" and Turkey and still conformed with the translation of the decree of the Greek Assembly.

The Greeks of the Ottoman empire were referred to as "Rumlar" or "Romans." Those Greeks living in independent Greece or "Yunanistan" were referred to as "Yunanlar" or "Ionians." This fine distinction is even made today. The Greeks of Turkey and even those of Cyprus are called "Rumlar" and not "Yunanlar." To address them as "Ionians" rather than as "Romans" would amount to an admission that they belong to Greece rather than to Turkey.

The reward for Greek neutrality during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877- 1878 was an invitation to the Turkish government to cede parts of Thessaly and Epirus to Greece. This is all the Greeks received at the Congress of Berlin beyond the gratuitous remarks of Disraeli that with thousands of years of history behind them the Greeks could afford to wait a few more years to fulfil their territorial ambitions. Neither Russia nor Britain seriously wished to complicate negotiations by taking a stand on Greece's annexation of Thessaly and Epirus.

The Turks were naturally reluctant to act on the invitation to surrender their territory, and the Greeks were in no position to compel them to do so. But after three years of futile negotiations a settlement was finally reached in March, 1881, at a conference held in Constantinople between representatives of Turkey and the great

powers. Greece was not represented, and the award was less substantial than the cessions originally suggested by the powers in Berlin. Four months later the award was confirmed by a Greek-Turkish convention, and most of Thessaly and the district of Arta in Epirus passed to Greece.

These acquisitions represented the sum of Greek expansion to 1912, and the status of the solidly Greek-populated territories within the Ottoman empire remained unchanged, with two exceptions: the islands of Cyprus and Crete.

It was the threat to the Suez Canal from the Russian penetration into Armenia that led Britain to acquire Cyprus in 1878 as a base from which to assist Turkey in the defense of Asia Minor. The island was to be occupied and administered by Britain until such time as Russia restored to Turkey Kars and the other conquests made by her in Armenia during the war of 1877-1878.

The Greek Cypriots welcomed their new masters and, referring to Britain's gift of the Ionian islands to Greece, expressed the hope that she would also unite Cyprus with its motherland. But their demands for *enosis*

or union with Greece constantly met with the firm refusal of the British, on the plea that Cyprus continued to be under the suzerainty of the sultan.

In contrast with the calm developments in Cyprus, the history of Crete in the nineteenth century was that of recurring insurrection and bloody clashes between the island's Muslim minority and Christian majority.

In 1896 fresh trouble began in Crete, and in February 1897, the insurgents on the island decreed union with Greece. Although completely unprepared for any serious military ventures, Greece declared war on Turkey on behalf of Crete and was quickly and ignominiously defeated. The great powers then intervened and the boundary between Greece and Turkey was restored. The solution of the "protecting powers" for the troublesome Cretan question came in 1898. Under pressure from the powers, the last Turkish troops were dispatched from the island. Crete was given practical autonomy, under a high commissioner from Greece—Prince George, the King's second son—though the suzerainty of the sultan was expressly recognized. The powers refused to allow the Cretans to join Greece.

### *The Balkan Wars*

It was not until the appearance of Eleftherios Venizelos on the Greek political scene and the intrusion of the German problem as a new factor in the diplomacy of the Balkans and the near east that Greece could pursue, with reasonable expectation of success, the dream of the *megali idea*. Thanks to the formation of the entente between Britain, France and Russia, and the subsequent strengthening of German-Turkish ties, the goals of Greek foreign policy were no longer in complete conflict with the eastern policies of the "protecting powers."

The call for Venizelos from his native Crete in 1910 gave renewed impulse to the domestic and foreign policies of Greece. Alarmed at the imminent dangers to Greek interests caused by Bulgarian and Turkish nationalism, a concerted effort was made to lead the country out of political isolation, and reforms in economic, political and military institutions were inaugurated. Within two years the resources of the state were adequately mobilized and military-diplomatic

cooperation between the Balkan states was secured.

The great powers, sensing that a Balkan league was being formed to attack Turkey, expressed to the Balkan governments their disapproval of the plan—ignoring the warning, Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece declared war on the Turks in October, and to everyone's surprise rapidly defeated the Turkish forces. Anxious to protect their own interests in the Balkans and to prevent the war from spreading, the great powers intervened, and a peace settlement was signed in London in May 1913. The treaty confirmed the *Treaty of London* and limited Turkey's territory in Europe to Istanbul and a narrow strip along the straits. The remainder of her Balkan territory was ceded to the victors as a whole. Greece annexed Crete, which had declared union with the motherland in 1908, but the future ownership of the Aegean islands was left to the decision of the great powers.

The major contribution of the Greeks to the allied cause was at sea, where they established supremacy and blocked the transportation of Turkish troops from Asia. They also used their fleet to occupy all the Greek-populated islands off the Turkish coast except Cyprus and the Dodecanese, which, while under Turkish suzerainty, were held by Britain and Italy respectively.

The handiwork of the powers in the treaty was the creation of an independent Albania, a step deliberately taken by Italy and Austria to bar Serbia from access to the Adriatic and Greece from Valona. The Serbs accordingly demanded a greater share of the spoils in Macedonia than had been previously agreed upon with Bulgaria, and Greece pressed for an extension of her frontier in the southern area of the province. Bulgaria would not agree and in late June 1913 she attacked Serbia and Greece, only to be overwhelmed by the combined forces of her former allies and by those of Romania and Turkey. The Treaty of Bucharest ended the Second Balkan War in August, and in September a separate settlement between Bulgaria and Turkey restored Edirne to Turkey.

The net result was that in less than three years, Greek territory was almost doubled and a large Greek population liberated from Ottoman rule. Southern Epirus, a large portion of Macedonia, including the key city of Thessaloniki, Crete and most of the islands of the Aegean passed to Greece. Her territory increased from 25,014 to 41,933 square miles, and her population rose from 2,666,000 to 4,363,000.

At last, the majority of the Greeks were united under the Greek flag, and it seemed that the development of these extensive new gains would preoccupy Greece for at least a whole generation. About two and one half million "unredeemed" Greeks were left scattered in Bulgaria, Turkey, the Dodecanese and Cyprus, and only in the last two territories did they constitute a substantial majority. The limits of the modern Greek state appeared to be more or less set. Moreover, the need to preserve the newly acquired Macedonian territories from a Bulgarian *revanche*, the hardly concealed intentions of the Ottoman empire to recover the Aegean islands, and the general feeling among the great powers that the territorial integrity of the Porte should be maintained, seemed very likely to discourage Athenian dreams for fresh conquest beyond the Aegean. Venizelos, the Greek premier since 1910, "... having proved himself an eminently practical statesman with a keen sense of realities and a freedom from that visionary megalomania so prevalent



among the Greek politicians of the previous generations, was not the man to be attracted by a project which, at the moment, would have seemed a veritable wild-cat scheme.”<sup>1</sup>

---

I.A.A.Pallis, *Greece's Anatolian Venture—and After* (London, 1937) 13. several cases in which Venizelos refused to consider Greek expansion in 1914 (pp. 14-21).

an<

## The End of the Ottoman Empire

The decision of Greece to refrain from further expansion was short-lived. She could not remain indifferent to the war set off by the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo. Turkey's decision to side with Germany in 1914 had destroyed the traditional British policy of maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman empire. The belief, prevalent among the allies by the end of 1914, that the defeat of the central powers would lead to the partition of the Ottoman empire among the victors, coupled with promises by the entente powers to compensate Greece with territory in Asia Minor if she should enter the war on their side, seemed to have encouraged the further implementation of the *megali idea* in the mind of Venizelos. But a large segment of the Greek population supported King Constantine and many of the country's military leaders who insisted on the maintenance of Greek neutrality. A bitter and confused struggle ensued inside Greece over the question of intervention in which Venizelos and the allied powers were pitted against King Constantine. The issue was finally decided by blatant allied pressure. Greece entered the war in June 1917, and contributed substantially to the allied victory on the Balkan front. By the end of the following year, Greek forces shared in the triumphal entry of the allied army into Constantinople; and Greek warships were part of the allied fleet that sailed up to the Golden Horn. Venizelos outlined Greek claims to Ottoman territory for the peace conference scheduled to begin its work in Paris in January 1919.

### *The Secret Partition Agreements*

World War I produced essentially four secret agreements between the entente powers for the partition of the Ottoman empire. The first was the Constantinople agreement, which consisted of an exchange of notes over a five-week period from March 4 to April 10, 1915, between Britain, France and Russia. The agreement called for the culmination of a centuries-old Russian dream—the incorporation of Constantinople and the straits into the Russian empire. Russia, in return, agreed to respect scrupulously the special interests of Britain and France in the region of the straits, and assured the two powers that the realization of plans that they might frame on other

regions of the Ottoman empire or elsewhere would receive a sympathetic understanding. Russia also agreed that Britain might absorb into her own zone of interest the "neutral zone" established in Persia by the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907.<sup>1</sup>

In order to bring Italy into the war, the entente powers acknowledged certain Italian claims against the Ottoman empire and elsewhere. The Treaty of London, which they concluded with Italy on April 26, 1915, recognized her interests in the Adriatic, Africa and the eastern Mediterranean. She was to receive complete sovereignty over the Dodecanese islands, which had been occupied by Italian forces since May 1912. And in the event of a total or partial partition of Turkey in Asia, she was to obtain a "just share" of the Mediterranean region adjacent to the Anatolian province of Adalia (Antalya). If Britain, France and Russia should occupy any territories in Asia Minor in the course of the war, the Mediterranean region bordering on the province of Adalia would be reserved to Italy, who would be entitled to occupy it.<sup>2</sup>

As a result of French fears that British support of the Arab nationalists would work against French interests in the Levant, a third agreement was concluded. The Anglo-French agreement of May 16, 1916, and the French-Russian agreement of April 26, 1916, together formed the Tripartite (Sykes-Picot) Agreement for the Partition of the Ottoman Empire between Great Britain, France and Russia, April 26 to October 23, 1916. It provided that Russia would obtain the region of Erzurum, Bitlis, Van, Trabzon and further territory in southern Kurdistan; that Britain would obtain Mesopotamia; that France would obtain Syria, Lebanon and the province of Adana in Cilicia (Anatolia). The Arab lands further south of these areas of partition were to be reserved for an independent Arab confederation or empire, which, in turn, was to be divided into French and British zones of influence. Palestine was to be internationally administered.<sup>3</sup>

The Sykes-Picot agreement had excluded Italy from a "just share of spoils of war, which had been promised her by the Treaty of London. Italy's insistence, this deficiency was met by a new treaty concluded Italy, France and Britain, April 19 to September 26, 1917. The Treaty of Jean de Maurienne aimed at calming Italy's resentment and eliminating objections to the Sykes-Picot arrangement. It promised to Italy some square miles in Anatolia, including Adalia and Smyrna (Izmir). A vague

XTT 1956)

- 
1. J.C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East 2* (Princeton, 7-11.
  2. *Ibid.*, 11-12.
  3. *Ibid.*, 18-22.

of influence was to stretch northward as far as Konya.<sup>6</sup> The agreement was subject to the approval of Russia, which could not give her consent because of the disintegration of her internal situation and the repudiation of all tsarist international commitments by the Bolsheviks, who seized power in November 1917. However, although the treaty was technically null and void, France and Britain were apparently morally obligated to support Italian claims in Anatolia. At least, so the Italians thought.

### *French-British Rivalry*

The fulfilment of the entente wartime agreements on territorial spoils proved to be a difficult task. The French insisted that the secret agreements of 1916 should be the basis of the Anglo-French postwar negotiations, whereas the British hoped to clear the table for new negotiations, based on their commitments to the Arabs and on the preponderance of British military and naval power in the eastern Mediterranean. The crux of the problem was the basic contradiction between the Anglo-French wartime arrangements and Britain's not so clearly defined commitments toward the Arabs and the Amir Faysal and his provisional Arab government at Damascus. The British had led the Arabs to believe that in the event of the defeat of the Ottoman empire, they would endorse the plan for a united Arab empire with its capital at Damascus. On the other hand, they had led the French to suppose that in the event of allied victory over the Porte, they would support a plan for the partition of the Ottoman empire that would give Britain Baghdad and France Damascus.<sup>7</sup>

A rift in Anglo-French solidarity developed even before the Paris peace conference convened in January 1919. The wartime secret agreements were already *de facto* revised at French expense: the Amir Faysal appeared to be in popular control of Syria, and a considerable force of British troops occupied areas that the secret agreements had allocated to France.<sup>8</sup> The first blow to French authority and prestige was the armistice of Mudros (October 30, 1918). The British refused to share the business of the armistice with their French ally. "Having borne the brunt of the fighting against the Turks, the British were determined to have their own way in the fashioning of the peace."<sup>9</sup>

At the Paris peace conference, the British continued to oppose some of the French claims in the Levant and were particularly reluctant to hand over to France an enlarged Syria—a Syria that had been won by British arms and promised to the Arabs. The French raised the question of a serious conflict of interests with the British on the matter of the straits and Constantinople.<sup>10</sup> Thus, despite months of deliberation, an agreed settlement of the eastern question could not be found at Paris. It was not until the Second General Syrian Congress proclaimed, on March 8, 1920, the independence of Syria (embracing Lebanon, Palestine and

6 *Ibid.*, 23-25.

7 J.C. Hurewitz, *Middle East Dilemmas* (New York, 1958) 115-116; Harold Nicolson, *Curzon: The Last Phase, 1919-1925* (Boston, 1934) 105; Henry H. Cumming, *Franco-British Rivalry in the Post-War Near East* (London, 1938) 21-44.

8 *Ibid.*, 59-67.

9 *Ibid.*, 52; David Lloyd George, *War Memoirs 6* (London, 1936) 3313-3314.

10 Hurewitz, *Diplomacy*, 2:50-59, 75-76; DBFP, first series, vol. 1, 1919, pp.<sup>134</sup> 690ff.; Cumming, 68-75, 83-95.

what later became known as Transjordan) and named Faysal king, and the Arabs showed their opposition to the proposals for a Jewish homeland in Palestine by attacks on the Jews of Jerusalem in early April, that the British government finally felt the urgency of an immediate settlement of the problem. When the Supreme Council reassembled at San Remo toward the end of April, the British finally gave in to French demands for an enlarged Syrian mandate.<sup>11</sup> Once they settled their differences over the projected mandates, the Supreme Council was able, by April 26, 1920, to agree on the clauses of the Ottoman peace treaty. The treaty was signed at Sevres on August 10, 1920.

One of the interesting subjects of French-British negotiations concerned the disposition of the *vilayet* or province of Mosul. Originally, the province fell into the projected French zone of influence. Although the French agreed to turn over the area to the proposed zone of direct British administration in return for 25 percent interest in any concession that might exploit Mosul's oil resources—instruments to this effect were initiated on April 8 and December 21, 1919—France refused to confirm this arrangement until its further demand for a single French mandate over Syria as well as Lebanon was granted. As a result of the agreement at San Remo for an enlarged Syrian mandate, the Mosul district passed to the British mandate of Iraq.<sup>12</sup>

#### *Italian-Greek Rivalry*

Italy also found cause to complain over allied reluctance to fulfill the promises made to her in the wartime agreements. "Britain and France displayed a strange readiness to make light of the engagements which they had taken toward their Ally, and to regard the whole Near Eastern question as a

subject for a fresh settlement."<sup>13</sup> When Italian forces began to occupy the Adalia region of Anatolia on April 29, 1919, the act was immediately declared illegal, being taken without the authority and consent of the Supreme Council. The Italians were prompt to explain that since France occupied the Cilicia area in January 1919, they were automatically authorized to occupy the Adalia region in accordance with the secret wartime arrangements. Legally, the weakness of the Italian position arose from the British and French refusal to consider the agreement of Saint-Jean de Maurienne as binding, because it was not signed by Russia. Moreover, the Treaty of London, which brought Italy into the war, did not contain a precise definition of the territorial compensation for Italy in Anatolia.

When, on April 30, 1919, reports circulated that Italy was preparing to occupy Smyrna, a city promised her by the agreement of Saint-Jean de Maurienne, the Supreme Council minus Italy consented to awarding that city to the Greeks and to dispatching an allied expeditionary force, composed mostly of Greek troops, to Smyrna in order to forestall an Italian occupation. The whole affair was conducted with the utmost secrecy lest the absent Italian delegates should learn of it (Orlando had boycotted the peace conference because of the Fiume crisis), and on May 15, 1919, the Greeks occupied

11 Ibid., 102-111; The Earl of Ronaldshay, *The Life of Lord Curzon* 3 (London 1922) 265; H.W.V. Temperley (ed.), *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris* 6 (London, 1924) 134-163; Hurewitz, *Middle East Dilemmas*, 116-117.

12 Hurewitz, *Diplomacy*, 2:75-77.  
 217^ ^krecht-Carr6, *Italy at the Paris Peace Conference* (New York, 1938) 216-

Smyrna.<sup>14</sup>

Earlier, on February 3 and 4 of the same year, Venizelos had presented with great skill and persuasiveness the Greek claims to Smyrna before the Allied Territorial Commission. France and England viewed his claims favorably, whereas Italy strongly objected to them and almost withdrew from the commission. Venizelos claimed for Greece: Northern Epirus (southern Albania), Thrace, all the islands of the eastern Mediterranean and the western portion of Anatolia. He based his claims on the fact that the areas contained large Greek populations and were historically part of the Greek world.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, the Supreme Council seemed to have decided to award Smyrna to the Greeks even before the Italian advance toward that city. "As early as April 21, 1919, Clemenceau referred to Smyrna as falling to the Greeks."<sup>16</sup> French support of Greek claims was undoubtedly influenced by the promise of Greek troops for use in the campaign against the Bolsheviks in southern Russia. The Greek army was kept intact, while the allies were rapidly demobilizing. Lloyd George was most sympathetic to the Greek cause, and, as will be seen later, considered a greater Greece as the bulwark for the defense of British interests in the eastern Mediterranean. Wilson also recognized Smyrna as Greek, and appeared generally hostile to the Italians. Supported by Britain and France, Venizelos was able to win him over to the Greek occupation of the city.<sup>17</sup>

For two months after the landing of Greek troops in Smyrna, Greece and Italy disputed the border between their zones of occupation. Meanwhile, there were, in fact, several cases of armed conflict. Both parties came under severe criticism in the Supreme Council, which charged that the Greeks disobeyed their orders by extending their zone of occupation outside of Smyrna, and that the Italians were in Anatolia without authorization.<sup>18</sup> In order to prevent allied interference and to bolster their territorial claims, the two states finally settled their quarrel by the Secret Accord concerning the Eastern Mediterranean and the Balkan Peninsula, signed in Paris by Venizelos and Tommaso Tittoni, the Italian minister for foreign affairs (July 29, 1919). By this agreement, better known as the Venizelos-Tittoni agreement, Italy and Greece agreed to support each other's claims at the peace conference. Italy promised to support Greek claims in Thrace, northern Epirus, the Aegean islands and Smyrna. Greece, in return, promised to support Italian demands for a mandate over Albania, and a zone of interest in southwestern Anatolia. In the event that either country did not secure its claims in Asia Minor, it would be permitted to resume full freedom of action in regard to all the provisions of the agreement.<sup>19</sup> However, although Greece and Italy agreed upon their respective spheres of

14 Ibid., 219; Harold Nicolson, *Peacemaking, 1919* (London, 1933) 334; Count Carlo Sforza, *Makers of Modern Europe* (Indianapolis, 1930) 164.

15 Nicolson, 255-256; Temperley, 25; David Lloyd George, *The Truth About the Peace Treaties 2* (London, 1938) 1202-1250; and DDI, series 6, vol. 1, pp. 10\*444<sup>4</sup>;;

16 Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement!* (New York, 192-) 191-192; and DBFP, series 1, vol. 4, 1919, p. 660.

17 Ibid., 191-192; and DBFP, series 1, vol. 4, 1919, p. 660.

18 DBFP, series 2, vol. 2, 1919, pp. 83-136.

19 Martens, *Nouveau recueil general de traites*, series 3, vol. 12, pp. 575-578.

ro concessions in the Adriatic, Italy was prepared to give up the Aegean islands and to recognize Smyrna as Greek. It was Italian policy to dispose of other quarrels in order to concentrate her efforts in the Adriatic. This policy was repudiated by the Gioli-Sforza ministry the following year. Cf. Albrecht-Carrid, 243.

influence in Asia Minor, the Supreme Council specifically refused to recognize the Italian occupation and sphere of influence in Anatolia. As late as December 1919, it insisted that Italy had no right to go into Asia Minor.<sup>20</sup> But with the hope of lessening the Italian pressure in the Adriatic, it finally agreed, in 1920, to recognize an Italian sphere of influence in Anatolia. Moreover, Italian demands in Turkey could not be ignored if France was to be awarded a sphere of influence in southeastern Anatolia.

*The Treaty of Sevres*

The Ottoman peace treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920) provided for an autonomous Kurdistan and an independent Armenia in eastern Anatolia, and for a zone of Greek influence in Smyrna that would eventually lead to the annexation of that area by Greece. The treaty also allotted to Greece eastern Thrace and many of the islands in the Aegean, including Imbros and Tenedos at the entrance of the straits. Greece thus gained control of the entire Aegean coast and the approaches to Constantinople. The Dodecanese islands were ceded to Italy and, in accordance with the terms of the secret treaties, Britain and France received Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia as mandates. The treaty legalized Britain's hold over Cyprus and Egypt, and consolidated her primacy in the Arabian peninsula. Constantinople and the straits were all that remained of Turkey in Europe, and this was solely due to Russia's withdrawal from the war and her repudiation of the secret agreements. The straits, however, were demilitarized and placed under international control.<sup>21</sup>

On the same day that the Sevres treaty was signed, a tripartite agreement on Anatolia between Britain, France and Italy was also signed, recognizing southwestern Anatolia as the area of Italian and Cilicia as the area of French special interests.<sup>22</sup> Also on the same day, Greece and Italy signed an agreement whereby Italy renounced in favor of Greece the Dodecanese islands minus Rhodes, which would be given to Greece on the day Britain gave Cyprus to Greece, but in no case until fifteen years after the signing of the agreement.<sup>23</sup> Britain conceded to Italy and France zones of interest in Anatolia because she obtained the lion's share of the spoils by the Sevres treaty and in order to reduce their demands elsewhere. At the peace conference, Lloyd George tried to induce Clemenceau to give way on the Polish frontier question and to modify the harsh terms of peace that France wished to impose on Germany. And he tried to convince Orlando to surrender territory to Yugoslavia that was promised to Italy by the Treaty of London.<sup>24</sup>

The Ottoman delegation received the instrument, which reduced the empire to a rump of an inland state, in Paris on May 11, and reluctantly signed it in Sevres three months later. But the draconian treaty imposed on

20 DBFP, series 1, vol. 4, 1919, p. 733.

21 Hurewitz, *Diplomacy*, 81-87. The occupation of the Smyrna district by Greece was limited by the provision that although Greece would administer the enclave, its sovereignty would remain nominally with the sultan. But at the end of five years the local parliament of the district by majority vote could opt for union with Greece.

22 *Ibid.*, 87-89.

23 BFSP, vol. 63, 1920, pp. 1078-1080.

24 Harold Nicolson, *Curzon: The Last Phase, 1919-1925*, New Edition (London,

the Ottoman government was not to be ratified, and the allies were ultimately forced to negotiate a fresh settlement at Lausanne three years later. The failure of the allies to act quickly and in unison after the armistice of Mudros was to give birth to a new and vigorous Turkish nationalist movement superbly led by Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk). The delay between the armistice and the announcement of the terms of peace provided the crucial breathing spell for the formation of the resistance forces that were to redress the humiliating terms inflicted upon the Turkish people.

## The Turkish Revival

The partition of Anatolia and the presence of foreign troops over wide areas of the country was not envisaged by the Turks when they signed the Mudros armistice in 1918. The allied occupation of Constantinople in March 1920, and the subsequent Greek occupation of eastern Thrace and most of western Anatolia, swelled the ranks of the Turkish nationalists who, for almost a year, were fighting Armenian nationalist elements in the eastern provinces of the country. The allies had called on Greece in June 1920 to clear the zone of the straits of irregular nationalist bands. By the end of July, Greek troops moving out of the Smyrna enclave captured Brusa (Bursa) and joined the British line at Izmit.

The harsh terms of the Sevres treaty encouraged the growth of the nationalist movement and severely undermined the loyalty of the leading elements in the country to the sultan's government. Yet, for many Turks it was accepted as a necessary evil. It was the Greek occupation that was an affront that no patriotic Turk could endure. The Greek presence in Anatolia was absolutely unacceptable because it threatened to alter permanently the demographic character of the peninsula. The goal of Greece was no less than the rejuvenation of Hellenism in Asia Minor.

Without outside assistance the Turkish nationalists could not hope to successfully defy the Supreme Council and the Greek army, whose task was to enforce the Treaty of Sevres and promote the aspirations of Hellenism in Anatolia. The goal of Turkish diplomacy, therefore, was to seek direct foreign aid, to splinter allied solidarity and to render the Greek army in Asia Minor ineffective by isolating Greece from her allies.

### *Turkey and Russia*

The first step in the field of foreign policy of the provisional nationalist government, which was formed on April 23, 1920, was to make contact with the Soviets. The flirtation of the Bolsheviks with the Islamic peoples began as early as December 3, 1917, with the publication of the "Soviet Appeal to Muslim Workers in Russia and the East." Among other things, the Bolsheviks declared: .. that the secret treaties of the deposed Tsar as to the annexation of Constantinople, confirmed by the late Kerensky Government are null

and void . . . Constantinople must remain in the hands of the Mohammedans, and that the treaty for the division of Turkey and the subduction from it of Anatolia is null and void."<sup>24</sup> The eastern peoples were asked to lose no time in throwing off the yoke of the imperialist oppressors of their lands. At the Congress of the Peoples of the East, which convened in Baku in September 1920, the Russians delivered inflammatory speeches against the colonial policies of the western powers and promised Soviet aid to those people ruled by the imperialists.

Allied intervention in Russia through the straits and support of Greek aspirations in Asia Minor brought Moscow and Ankara closer together. The opposition to a common enemy cleared the way for a Russian-Turkish understanding over the Armenian question, which heretofore had constituted the main cause of friction between the two governments. As early as August 24, 1920, they agreed to establish diplomatic relations, and in November, Ali Fuad (Cebeşoy), the first diplomat of nationalist Turkey, was posted to Moscow. In the autumn Russia and Turkey commenced operations in Armenia and the Caucasus, and in December, General Kazim Karabekir defeated the Armenian forces. Thus, direct land communications with the Russians were established.

On March 16, 1921, they signed a treaty of friendship in which Russia recognized the territorial integrity of Turkey, as defined by the Turkish National Pact, which was framed on January 28, 1920, and adopted by the Grand National Assembly at Ankara on April 23, 1920. She renounced in Turkey's favor the northeastern Anatolian territories, e.g., Kars and Ardahan, which Russia acquired in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, with the exception of the district of Batum. She released Turkey from all financial and other liabilities based on agreements concluded between Turkey and the tsarist government. Both parties agreed not to recognize any treaty or pact imposed on either by force. Article 5 stipulated: "In order to assure the opening of the Straits to the commerce of all nations, the contracting parties agree to entrust the final elaboration of an international agreement concerning the Black Sea to a conference composed of delegates of the littoral States, on condition that the decisions of the above-mentioned conference shall not be of such a nature as to diminish the full sovereignty of Turkey or the security of Constantinople her capital."<sup>25</sup> On October 13, 1921, Turkey concluded the Treaty of Kars with the Transcaucasian states of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia\* delimiting their frontiers and confirming the provisions of the earlier Treaty of Moscow, in which the Transcaucasian republics did not participate. Batum was ceded to Georgia, and was to serve as a free port for Turkey.<sup>26</sup>

A friendly Turkey came to be regarded as crucial to the Soviets, and, for this reason, Lenin insisted on demarcating a frontier favorable to Turkey. The aim of the Soviet government, Lenin wrote, must be to "group around all the awakening people of the East and

24

Hurewitz, *Diplomacy*, 27-28.

25 For the text, see Hurewitz, *Diplomacy*, 2:95-97, and Martens, *Nouveau red\* gmiral des trails*, series 3, vol. 16, pp. 37ff. Russia was already forced to cede these ritories to Turkey by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, March 3, 1918.

3- For text of the treaty, see Martens, *Nouveau recueil general des traitis*, series 3, <sup>vo</sup>l. 30, pp. i7ff.

fight together with them against international imperialism.<sup>27</sup> The Soviet alliance and the economic and military aid that resulted from it raised both the morale and effectiveness of the Turkish nationalist forces.

### *France, Italy and the Turkish Nationalists*

No less important to the nationalist cause was the conclusion of separate agreements by the provisional Ankara government with Italy and France. The negotiations leading up to these agreements were conducted secretly and without consulting the British, and clearly indicated a rift between the allies, which became more pronounced as the days passed.

The success of Greek arms and the expansion of Greek claims in Anatolia, as well as Britain's preponderant position in the Near East, led France to be suspicious and Italy decidedly hostile to British and Greek aspirations in the region. Both powers reacted unfavorably to the idea of a greater Greece spanning all sides of the Aegean. France opposed the idea because it would strengthen Britain's already paramount position in the near east. Italy also opposed Greek claims because they threatened to disturb the power arrangements in the Balkans and because Greek territorial ambitions conflicted with their own. "In Italy, Mr. Lloyd George was bitterly denounced as having selected Greece to be the vessel and instrument of British policy in the Levant in order to put an obstacle in the way of Italian expansion, and Mr. Venizelos was execrated for offering himself as a political mercenary and tool of British hegemony."<sup>28</sup> Italian hostility to Greece began as early as the Balkan Wars when Italy tried to force Greece out of Albania, or northern Epirus, and proposed that the Aegean islands should not be given to Greece.

The defeat of Venizelos in the November 1920 elections, and the recall of King Constantine by a plebiscite held the following month, was for the allies a heaven sent opportunity of ridding themselves of that irksome moral obligation which they had incurred in regard to Greece.<sup>29</sup> In the Paris meeting of the Supreme Council on December 3, 1920, "it was decided to warn the Greek people that if, at their impending plebiscite, they voted for the return of Constantine they must expect thereafter no further support from their late Allies."<sup>30</sup> The French, in particular, pronounced energetically against Constantine's recall, which they considered injurious to French prestige—France took the initiative in driving Constantine out of Greece in 1917 for what she believed to be his Germanophile policies. The recall of Constantine not only weakened Greece's international position but practically crippled the effectiveness of the Greek military forces. Experienced Venizelist officers were relieved of their commands and replaced by officers favored by the king.

The deteriorating situation in the Near East, resulting from the formation and revolt of the Turkish nationalist forces, Greek ambition and disunity among the allies, compelled the Supreme Council to call a conference in London on February 21, 1921, to settle the problems

27 Louis Fischer, *The Soviets in World Affairs, 1917-1929* 1 (Princeton, 1951) 463.

• M.H. Macartney and P. Cremone, *Italy's Foreign and Colonial Policy, 1914-1938* (London, 1938) 173.

29 Nicolson, *Curzon: The last Phase*, new edition, 257.

30Ibid., 257.

arising in the Near East by modifying some of the provisions of the Sevres treaty in Turkey's favor. The conference, which lasted into March, solved nothing and led to independent negotiations by Italy and France with Turkey. On March 11 and 12, Bakir Sami, the Ankara representative at the conference, concluded separate agreements with Briand and Sforza, respectively, providing for the withdrawal of French and Italian troops from Anatolia. Moreover, Italy promised to support Turkey's demands for the restoration of Thrace and Smyrna, and France agreed to a Syrian-Turkish frontier south of that provided for by the Treaty of Sevres. In return for these concessions, France was to enjoy preferential concessionary rights in southeast Turkey, and Italy in southwest Turkey.<sup>31</sup>

Although the treaties were rejected by the Turkish Grand National Assembly, and Bakir Sami was accused of exceeding his authority over the question of economic concessions and compelled to resign his post of foreign minister, his mission to London was far from a failure. It resulted in the cessation of hostilities by Italy and France, and paved the way for the withdrawal of their troops from Anatolia and for the conclusion of a separate peace treaty between France and Turkey.

On October 20, 1921, the French signed an agreement, commonly known as the Franklin-Bouillon agreement, which provided for the evacuation of Cilicia and the cession of Syrian territory to Turkey as well as the restoration to Ankara of the Baghdad railway between Choban-Bey and Nisibin. Annexed to the treaty was a note promising that if all the questions relating to the sovereignty and independence of Turkey were solved, France would be granted concessions for the exploitation of minerals in Turkey and that French capitalists would have an opportunity to extend their activities in Turkish banks, ports, waterways and railways.<sup>32</sup> The British were naturally infuriated at the French for negotiating a separate treaty with the Turks behind their backs. The importance of the agreement—the first between the provisional Turkish nationalist government and a western European power—could hardly be exaggerated. It marked a definite line of cleavage in the policies of the two countries in the Levant.

The Greeks, to their misfortune, resumed the offensive against the Turks in June 1921, and two months later, the Supreme Council officially declared "strict neutrality" in the "Greek-Turkish conflict." The departure of the Italian and French troops from Anatolia, and the eagerness of the Italian and French governments to reach a friendly understanding with the Turks, weakened considerably the Greek and British positions in Asia Minor. "The Italians sold arms to Mustapha Kemal to fight the Greeks, which were paid out of money supplied by Moscow. France negotiated a secret treaty without the knowledge of Britain which enabled Kemal to withdraw all his forces from the Armenian and Syrian front and fling them against the Greeks."<sup>33</sup> Thanks largely to the success of Turkish diplomacy, which ensured a large flow of guns and money from the Soviets, Italy and France to the Turkish nationalist army, the Greek army in Anatolia, isolated and deprived of allied support, met with disaster the following year.

<sup>31</sup> Sforza, *Modern Europe*, 101-105.

<sup>32</sup> Text in LNTS54 (1926-1927) 177-193.

<sup>33</sup> David Lloyd George, *The Truth About the Peace Treaties* 2 (London, 1938) 1349.

*Turkey and Britain*

The defeat of the Greek Army in August 1922 and the occupation of Smyrna by the Turks in the following month left the defense of the straits to a handful of allied troops. Britain decided to deny Constantinople and Thrace to the Kemalists and on September 19, 1922, invited her allies of World War I to undertake joint military action against the Turks. The appeal for aid failed. France, Italy, Romania, Yugoslavia and the Dominions objected to a renewal of hostilities in Asia Minor. British public opinion feared that the struggle with Turkey might develop into "a Holy War" that would cause considerable unrest in India and other Muslim areas within the empire. Poincaré, who replaced Briand toward the end of December 1921 as Premier

of France, decidedly opposed British leadership in the Levant, and under no circumstances was he going to do anything that savored even remotely of rendering assistance to Greece. In September, he and Count Sforza recalled the French and Italian troops that were to reinforce the British lines at Chanak.

The situation, however, was saved by Britain's firm stand at Chanak and General Charles Harington's wisdom in not implementing the ultimatum instructions received from his government, coupled with Kemal's decision not to press the British too far. The mediation of France paved the way for an armistice agreement at Mudanya. Briefly, the talks at Mudanya once again found the allies split, with France and Italy supporting Turkish demands and Britain sympathetic to the Greeks and eager to maintain the strongest possible position on the issue of the straits. The Turkish view generally prevailed, and agreement was reached for a completely new settlement of the eastern question in Turkey's favor to be discussed at Lausanne.

#### *The Lausanne Conference*

The enthusiasm created by the military and diplomatic victories of the nationalist Turks under Kemal's leadership were dampened somewhat by the united front that the allies presented at Lausanne. The ill feelings that divided the entente powers at Mudanya were set aside before the opening of the long-deferred peace conference. Lord Curzon insisted that Italy and France should come to an agreement with Britain on all the issues placed on the agenda, and on November 18, 1922, the three states reached an agreement on the fundamental principles that were to guide the discussions at the conference.<sup>34</sup>

The role of the great powers at Lausanne will be explained, to some extent, in the presentation of the settlement of the Greek-Turkish issues. The issues that concerned the great powers most were the status of the straits, the Mosul problem, the acquisition of economic concessions in Turkey and the problem of the Ottoman debts. Britain was by far most interested in opposing Turkey's views on the issues of the straits and Mosul. France and Italy, being far less vitally concerned over the issues at stake, were prepared to give ground on the issue that interested them most—the acquisition of economic concessions in Turkey.

In spite of the favorable negotiations and agreements concluded with the Turkish government before the opening of the conference, France and Italy gained very little in the way of economic concessions from Turkey at Lausanne. On the issue of the straits, Britain succeeded in partly weaning Turkey

---

11. Cumming, 189; Nicolson, *Curzon*, 282-287; and DDI, series 7, vol.

away from her Russian ally, notwithstanding the agreement on the status of the straits concluded between Turkey and Russia in the Treaty of Moscow of 1921. The Turkish position on the straits was proclaimed in the National Pact:

The security of Constantinople—the capital of Turkey and seat of the Caliphate—and that of the Sea of Marmora must be sheltered from any attack.

This principle having been laid down and accepted, the Turkish nation is ready to subscribe to any decision which may be taken by common agreement between the Turkish Government, of the one part, and the Powers concerned, of the other part, with a view to ensuring the opening of the Straits to world trade and to international communications.<sup>35</sup>

During the early phase of the conference, Turkey agreed to the principle of freedom of passage, but rather reluctantly accepted the British proposal for an International Straits Commission (to include in addition to the Black Sea powers, Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Greece and Yugoslavia) and for a demilitarized zone around the straits. She embittered the Russians by supporting the British proposal that the straits should be opened to warships of non-Black Sea powers. Turkey felt that during the war she placed too much reliance on the Soviets and that, for a while at least, it was wise not to succumb to the temptation the Soviet solution proposed, namely, Turkish control over the straits.<sup>36</sup>

The one issue that, for a while, constituted the principal obstacle to the establishment of peace in the near east was the status of Mosul. The Turks refused to accept the British position that Mosul belonged to Iraq. "The Turkish Government cannot for a moment consider abandoning its sovereign rights over Mosul, which forms an integral part of the Turkish mother country."<sup>37</sup> The British, on the other hand, refused to give in on the Mosul question and were apparently prepared to fight for it. Their reasons for holding Mosul were that the area controlled the strategic route to India, it was the key to much of the near and middle east, it contained oil, and the majority of the population in Mosul were Kurds and not Turks. The Mosul issue proved to be such a problem that a settlement at Lausanne was impossible, and had to be postponed for a future solution between Turkey and Great Britain.<sup>38</sup>

The end result of the politics of the great powers in the near east was their disengagement from "the middle zone" e.g., Greece and Turkey. The British life-line moved southward to Suez, Palestine, Jordan and Iraq. French interests were confined to Danubian Europe, Lebanon and Syria. The Soviet Union, anxious to maintain friendly ties with Turkey, withdrew the historic Russian pressure on the straits and Turkey's eastern

35 LCNEA.127.

36 Ibid., 128-165; James T. Shotwell and Francis Deak, *Turkey at the Straits* (New York, 1941)113,117; P.P. Graves, *The Questions of the Straits* (London, 1931) 187-205; and for the text of the straits convention, see Hurewitz, *Diplomacy*, 125-126.

37 LCNEA, 372.

38 Ibid., 393,337-363.

provinces. For the first time in a century Greece and Turkey were left very much to their own devices in fashioning independent foreign policies.

## The Struggle for Thrace

In its last phase the eastern question was to be resolved, in large measure, by the ability of Greece and Turkey to arrive at a mutually acceptable boundary settlement. The zones of conflict were eastern and western Thrace, western Anatolia and the Pontic or Black Sea region of Anatolia, and the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean islands. The major Turkish resistance movement to the Sevres treaty developed in eastern Anatolia, where a Pontic Greek and an Armenian threat existed, and where the Turkish army was in the most advantageous position to act. The nationalists, rebels in the eyes of the Ottoman government at Istanbul, set as their aim the defense of the territorial integrity of the Turkish portion of the Ottoman empire, namely, Anatolia and eastern Thrace. Later on, they planned, "... if possible, to form a Turco-Mohamedan community that would include Western Thrace."<sup>39</sup> <sup>40</sup> At the Sivas congress, September 4-11, 1919, the title of the resistance movement, The Union for the Defense of the Rights of Eastern Anatolia," was changed to "The Union for the Defense of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia."<sup>41</sup>

Meanwhile, in eastern Thrace, Turkish patriotic societies, independent of the Anatolian movements, were also active. These societies had a longer tradition extending back to the Balkan wars of 1912-1913, when portions of Thrace were lost to Bulgaria and Greece. Their primary goal was the return of all Thrace to the Turkish motherland. In 1919, these groups included the Society for the Defense of the Rights of Western Thrace, the Committee for the Defense of Thrace-Passeli, the Eastern Thrace Committee and others;<sup>42</sup> they were not very effective, nor were they very efficient.<sup>43</sup> <sup>44</sup> <sup>45</sup>

On October 22, 1919, in a speech before the committee of the Union for the Defense of the Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia, Kemal declared his dissatisfaction with the patriotic societies of Thrace, which planned to turn that province into "a free and independent state—in reality, a foreign colony— which would practically mean that the whole of the territory up to the line Enos-Midia [Enez-Midya] in eastern Thrace would be robbed from us."<sup>46</sup> The committee

<sup>A</sup> *Speech Delivered by Ghazi Mustapha Kemal, October 1927* !<sup>29</sup> <sup>77</sup> ■

Hereafter cited «

speech.

<sup>40</sup> (Ank-ir ı~^y^d<sup>40</sup> &l> *Trakyada milli mücadele* (The National Struggle in Thrace) (Istanbul/Mq/tfw 1931194> *Atttitlrk'in soylev ve demeşleri* (Collected Speeches) I Eliot G M »<sup>71</sup> \*<sup>1</sup> <sup>^or</sup> <sup>l^c</sup> English text of the declaration of the Sivas congress, see formal deT^' . e r r <sup>Tu</sup> *key* (New York, 1924) 627-628. The document was the first Pact. The <sup>31</sup> <sup>7</sup> <sup>1101</sup> <sup>7</sup> die nationalists and the forerunner of the Turkish National considered <sup>araton</sup> of Sivas did not separate western and eastern Thrace; Kemal 3. Forinf <sup>oth</sup> <sup>3^c</sup> <sup>as</sup> <sup>3S</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>unit</sup> belonging to Turkey, izatiorr; c., <sup>ormu</sup> <sup>d</sup> <sup>on</sup> concerning the leaders, programs and activities of these organ-

<sup>43</sup> S h <sup>B,yiW.oglll</sup> <sup>123</sup> <sup>124</sup> .

May 9.14 i oin^p<sup>OWn</sup> conference of these societies was the Great Edirne Congress,

0. For extracts of the minutes of the congress, see Biyiklioglu, 248-291.

<sup>46</sup> *The Speech*, 203. Aside from ethnic considerations, the nationalists Thrace was based on military necessity. Thrace was essential for the defense of ^ stantinople and the

agreed that under no circumstances would it consent to the cession of Adrianople (Edirne) and the territory on the left bank of the Maritsa (Evros), even if the territory were to be established as an independent Muslim state.<sup>47</sup> Throughout January 1920, Kemal complained that there was not enough resistance being directed at the Greeks in Thrace.

On February 3, he presented his plan for Thrace to the committee. "To speak of a united Western and Eastern Thrace is bad policy. As for Western Thrace, this territory had once been ceded by treaty. Eastern Thrace can, at best, serve as a base of operation for those who are struggling for the liberation of Western Thrace."<sup>48</sup> Turkey lost most of western Thrace in the Balkan wars and on September 6, 1915, she gave Bulgaria the remaining portion of western Thrace as compensation for entering the war on the side of the central powers. In the Berlin Understanding, September 24, 1918, Turkey agreed that Karagach and Demotika would remain Bulgarian.<sup>49</sup>

Earlier, on January 28, 1920, the official Turkish position regarding western Thrace was declared in paragraph 3 of the Turkish National Pact: "The determination of the juridical status of Western Thrace, which has been made dependent on the Turkish peace, must be effected in accordance with the votes which shall be given the inhabitants in complete freedom."<sup>50</sup>

On July 20 of the same year, the Greek army landed a division in eastern Thrace at Tekirdag and proceeded to occupy, in the face of very minor resistance, all of Thrace minus Istanbul and a strip of territory deemed necessary for the defense of the queen city. Two weeks later the Treaty of Sèvres awarded eastern Thrace minus Istanbul to Greece. Although the Greeks were given most of Thrace, they were refused entrance into Istanbul by the entente even at a time when such an action would have improved considerably the situation of the Greek army in Anatolia.<sup>51</sup>

From March 1921 onward, the entente powers, having declared themselves neutral in the Greek-Turkish struggle for Anatolia, were prepared to call a conference for the revision of the Treaty of Sèvres in Turkey's favor. "They were resigned to allow them [the Turks] Constantinople and Eastern Thrace."<sup>52</sup>

### *The Mudanya Armistice*

The defeat of the Greek army in Anatolia in August 1922 led to the intervention of Great Britain, France and Italy. On September 5, Kemal wrote a note to the president of the Supreme Council asserting that as a basis for negotiation Thrace must be restored unconditionally to its

straits. *Atatürk'ün soylev ve demeçleri* 1:99.

47 *The Speech*, 210.

48 *Ibid.*, 351.

49 Biyiklioglu, 114-115.

50 Mears, 629-631; Biyiklioglu, 124-125, 194-195.

51 Nicolson, *Curzon*, 251; Biyiklioglu, 145-781, 303-378.

52 Jules Laroche, *Au Quai d'Orsay avec Briand et Poincaré, 1913-1926* (Paris, 1957) 159.

frontier of 1914 and that Greece must pay war damages. The allies agreed to open negotiations and set September 9 as the date for the talks; the meeting did not materialize.<sup>53</sup> On that day, the victorious Turkish army entered Smyrna. The British government then made it known that it was prepared to resist the Turks if they penetrated the neutral zone along the straits. And at the request of Lord Curzon, Poincaré asked Kemal to respect the neutral zone, but added that such an action would not prejudice the conditions of peace, "on which our sentiments are known."<sup>54</sup>

On September 23, the foreign ministers of the allies, in a note to the nationalist government, called for a peace conference and indicated that the desire for the restitution of Thrace as far as the Maritsa, including Adrianople, would be taken into consideration, on condition that the nationalists would not send troops into the neutral zone of the straits.<sup>55</sup> Twice, on September 29 and October 3, Kemal assented to a peace conference and chose Mudanya as the site for the armistice negotiations, but Thrace, he insisted, should be immediately restored to Turkey.<sup>56</sup> After a week of difficult negotiations, an agreement was finally reached at Mudanya on October 10, less than two hours before the British forces at Chanak were to engage the Turkish army. The armistice was signed the following day, and eastern Thrace was reincorporated into Turkey.<sup>57</sup> The armistice agreement called for the withdrawal of Greek troops to the west of the Maritsa in fifteen days. Civil power was to be turned over to Turkish authority thirty days after the Greek withdrawal, and no more than 8,000 Turkish gendarmes were to be stationed in eastern Thrace before the treaty of peace was signed. The allies were to occupy the neutral zone until the conclusion of the treaty arrangements.<sup>58,59</sup>

From the beginning, it was apparent that Greece would have no choice at Mudanya but to comply with the terms agreed upon between Turkey and the allies. The armistice terms were agreed upon before the arrival of the Greek delegation, which included General Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian, Colonel Panayotis Sarrigiannis and Colonel Nicholas Plastiras, and without its consent or prior knowledge.<sup>60</sup> When the allies told them that within fifteen

53 *The Speech*, 567.

54 Laroche, 162; General Ali Fuad Cebesoy, *Siyasi hatıraları* (Political Memoirs) (Istanbul, 1957) 74-75.

<sup>14</sup> *The Speech* > 569; Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian, *Apomnimonevmata* (Memoirs) (Athens, 1948) 308-309; Cebesoy, *Siyasi hatıraları*, 75-76.

56 Biyildioglu, 470; *The Speech*, 569-570.

57 Biyildioglu, 450-454; Davison, 198ff.; V. Potemkine, *L'histoire de la Diplomatie* <sup>3</sup> (Paris, 1947) 220; Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türkiye devletinin dış siyaseti* (Foreign Policy of the Turkish State) (Istanbul, 1942) 117-118; Sir Charles Harington, *Timington Looks Back* (London, 1941) 117-118.

odjN

59 Mears, 658-659; Amedeo Giannini, *IDocumenti Diplomatici della Pace tale* (Rome, 1922) 251-253; Cebesoy, *Siyasi hatıraları*, 83-101.

60 Mazarakis-Ainian, 312-313; Daphni, 1:27; Stylianos Gonatas, *Apomnimonevmata, 1897-1957* (Memoirs, 1897-1957) (Athens, 1958) 250. Colonel Gona president of the revolutionary committee ruling Greece from 1922-1923.

days they had to clear eastern Thrace of Greek troops, Colonel Plastiras answered that the allies should not forget that they were dealing with the revolutionary government. (In early September 1922, the Greek military under Colonel Plastiras organized a successful revolution, which had promptly reorganized the army for the defense of Thrace.) "The Turks have won in Asia Minor but not in Thrace. If they want it let them come and fight for it."<sup>61</sup> Before leaving the conference to discuss the situation with his government, Colonel Plastiras told the British representative at Mudanya, General Charles Har- ington, that the Greek army was ready for action in Thrace, and wired Venizelos that the army could hold eastern Thrace.<sup>62</sup>

Earlier, on October 3, Venizelos, who was appointed a special representative of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs to deal with the problems of the Turkish peace, wired from London advising the revolutionary government that since the allies would not support Greece, it had no choice but <sup>o</sup> give up eastern Thrace and Asia Minor. He assured the government that position of Greece was not impossible and that the reorganization of the *W*itary forces of the country would make it possible to defend western T <sup>ma</sup> and the Aegean islands from the Turks. If, he continued, the Turks <sup>^</sup> \* <sup>at</sup> cross the straits and enter eastern Thrace against the expressed will of <sup>r</sup>

Britain, the Greek army and navy should be ready to support fully the British military forces.<sup>63</sup>

The Greek representatives at Mudanya complained to the allies that they were, in effect, imposing decisions upon Greece. Greece, they advised, was willing to withdraw her troops to the 1919 Treaty of Neuilly line, but only after the peace had been signed would she evacuate Adrianople. They wanted at least one month and not fifteen days to withdraw from eastern Thrace in order to protect the Greek population, which, they warned, was in danger of attack and persecution by Bulgarian and Turkish irregulars, and by the proposed Turkish administration for that region.<sup>64</sup> Although the Greek government refused to approve the armistice agreement on October 10, it finally signed it three days later, on October 13.

Greece abandoned eastern Thrace in order to improve her diplomatic position at the coming peace conference at Lausanne. The continuous presence of Greek military forces in eastern Thrace would have jeopardized the allied position in the straits, isolated Greek military and diplomatic efforts and delayed the resumption of peace in the eastern Mediterranean. The cession of eastern Thrace to Turkey, after the Turkish victories in Anatolia, appeared inevitable.

61 Daphni, 1:26; John A. Peponis, *Nicholaos Plastiras sta gegonota* (Nicholas Plastiras in the Events of 1909-1945) 1 (Athens, 1947) 275.

62 Ibid., 276-277.

21- Venizelos to the revolutionary government, October 3, 1922, cited by Mazarakis-Ainian, 309-311; Daphni, 25-26.

64 General Mazarakis and Colonel Sarrigiannis to the allies, October 9, 19—, cited in Mazarakis-Ainian, 316-318. For the instructions of the Greek delegation at Mudanya see the letter of the minister of defense, A. Haralampis, to General Mazarakis, dated October 2, 1922, cited in Mazarakis-Ainian, 308.

The Turks were well aware of the significance of the reorganization of the Greek armed forces by the revolutionary government. Their eagerness to move into eastern Thrace was prompted by the program and activities of the revolutionary government in all of Thrace.<sup>65</sup> They were wary of the British government's decision to refuse them Istanbul and eastern Thrace until the final conclusion of peace.<sup>66</sup> The British decision, which was strengthened by the presence of the reorganized and effective Greek force in Thrace and the Aegean islands, was considered helpful to Greece. The absence of the Turkish army in Thrace and the growing power of the Greek army along the western bank of the Maritsa, it was believed, impaired the Turkish position at Mudanya and later at Lausanne: "In the opening of the Peace Conference our power on the shore of Rumelia was very weak and thus Turkey was unable to support her demands in Western Thrace. In this weak position, the most Turkey could do was to ask for a plebiscite in Western Thrace as outlined in

---

65 Biyiklioglu, 438,440-441; Gonatas, 250-251; Cebesoy, *Siyasi hatualari*, 89lt.

66 Jacques Bainville, *Journal, 1919-1926* (Paris, 1949) 153-154.

the National Pact.<sup>67</sup> Kemal had refused to press the issue of western Thrace in order to preserve his great victory against the Greeks and to use this advantage in the diplomatic negotiations at Lausanne.

#### *The Lausanne Conference*

On November 22, 1922, the territorial and military commission of the Lausanne conference opened with a discussion of the Thracian frontier between Greece and Turkey. Ismet (Inonu), the head of the Turkish delegation, asked that the Turkish boundary in eastern Thrace extend from the Black Sea to the Maritsa River, as defined in article 7 of the Treaty of Constantinople (April 29, 1913). In addition, he pleaded that a plebiscite be held in western Thrace to pave the way for an autonomous regime in that area. His claim included the Karagach-Demotika section of the right (western) bank of the Maritsa, which Turkey had ceded to Bulgaria in 1915.<sup>68</sup>

Venizelos, the chief of the Greek delegation, warned that the cession of eastern Thrace to Turkey was a voluntary act and the Turks should not press their ambitions too far. "The army, which had refused to fight in Asia Minor," he said, "in its return to Athens had carried out a revolution and reorganized itself with the object of saving eastern Thrace." He informed the commission that he accepted the position as representative of Greece at the conference "on condition that the Greek government accept the grievous sacrifice of eastern Thrace in compliance with the wishes of the allies," and that Greece would not accept a further sacrifice by recognizing Turkish claims on the right bank of the Maritsa and by holding a plebiscite in western Thrace. He reminded the commission that only the Treaty of Sevres was in question and not earlier treaties; western Thrace was obtained from Bulgaria by an earlier treaty and therefore could not be a subject of discussion.<sup>69</sup> Ismet's reply <sup>was</sup> that a plebiscite was needed in western Thrace for the protection of the large Turkish minority living there and for the security of eastern Thrace.<sup>70</sup>

Yugoslavia (the kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) and Romani<sup>3</sup> firmly supported the Greek position, and Lord Curzon reminded the Turkish delegation that the three allied governments (British, French and Italian) and Turkey had agreed in an exchange of notes prior to the conference t<sup>3</sup> Turkey was to recover Thrace as far as the Maritsa River and Adrianop<sup>e</sup>.

The question of western Thrace did not admit of doubt or dispute; the point had been settled by the Treaty of Neuilly [November 27, 1919], subject to the article that gave Bulgaria access to the sea. The area did not belong to Turkey before the war; Turkey had voluntarily surrendered it. The Greeks could not fairly be asked to give it up, not only because they were in legal occupation, but also because the area was absolutely necessary in order to enable them to

---

67 Biyikhoglu, 470, 472.

68 Cebesoy, *Siyasi hatıraları*, 187-189; LCNEA, 21.

69 *Ibid.*, 25.

70 *Ibid.*, 26.

accommodate the enormous influx of refugees who had gone there from eastern Thrace and elsewhere. The inviting powers were united in this and could not let the matter be reopened. There was no more case for a plebiscite in this area than in any other area outside the Turkish frontier.<sup>71</sup>

The final allied proposals on Thrace were presented to Turkey on January 31, 1923. They recognized the resumption of full sovereignty for Turkey over all of eastern Thrace, and provided for the safety of her frontiers on both flanks, e.g., against Bulgaria and against Greece, by the creation of demilitarized zones on both sides of this frontier. Turkish military forces were to be limited in eastern Thrace, including the garrison of Istanbul. As regards western Thrace, the allies refused to upset the conditions established by the Treaty of Neuilly or to agree to a plebiscite of the population. The territory lying on the right bank of the Maritsa was to remain with Greece.<sup>72</sup>

Four days later the Turks agreed to accept these terms with slight modifications. In return for the abandonment by the powers of a restriction on Turkish military forces in eastern Thrace outside of the demilitarized zone, Turkey gave up her demands on the Adrianople suburb of Karagach (Karaagaç) or the railway line running from there to Kuleli-Burgas or Pythion—in a word, the frontier of 1913.

It is almost impossible to gather correct data on the ethnic composition of Thrace before the Lausanne settlement. The figures given by both the Turks and Greeks are somehow controversial and vary considerably from year to year. Those persons recorded as Turks or Muslims included, besides Turks, many Bulgarians, Albanians, Bosniaks and others. Many of these persons fled from Bosnia, Macedonia and Bulgaria to Thrace as a result of the turmoil in the Balkans from 1908 to 1914. It appears, however, that the majority of the persons listed as Turks or Muslims were, in fact, Turks. The figures given for the Greeks in Thrace included Bulgarian, Albanian and other Eastern Orthodox Christians who were listed as Greeks by the statistical office of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. These figures were also affected by the forced movement of Greeks to regions outside of Thrace as a result of the Balkan wars and World War I. In 1913, Bulgarian Christians in eastern Thrace were exchanged for Turks from Bulgaria. It appears, however, that the majority of those persons listed as Greeks were in reality Greeks.

Taking these factors into account, the figures presented below and those presented at Lausanne by the Greek and Turkish delegations, the settled population of western Thrace at the turn of the century was probably 40 percent Turkish, 30 percent Bulgarian and 25 percent Greek. The population of eastern Thrace, excluding Istanbul, was probably 35 percent Greek, 35 percent Turkish and 20 percent Bulgarian. In neither portion of Thrace could any one ethnic group claim a majority. Islam claimed more adherents in western Thrace than in eastern Thrace, and Orthodox Christianity was more widespread in eastern Thrace than in western Thrace. Islam was in a minority in both areas, excluding Istanbul.

---

71 *Ibid.*, 37-38.

72 *Ibid.*, 431.

TABLE I  
*Population of Western and Eastern Thrace, March 14, 1914\**

Group	Greek Statistics		Turkish Statistics	
	W. Thrace	E. Thrace	W. Thrace	E. Thrace
Greeks	305,000	268,008	86,255	224,680
Turks	265,000	249,000	362,445	360,417
Bulgarians	73,000	67,000	68,656	-
Armenians	—	—	—	19,888
Others	-	—	5,000	26,109

\*Source: Biyiklioglu, 248.

The refusal of Turkey to accept all the allied peace proposals resulted in the suspension of the conference on February 4, 1923, and reopened the issue of the Greek-Turkish frontier. Turkey firmly rejected the economic and financial regime offered to her by the allied powers. Ismet insisted that a traces of the capitulations be eliminated, and suggested that Turkey ready to conclude peace for the point on which agreement had been reached > the unresolved issues would be discussed with the powers concerned a later date. So the Conference broke up, but in an air of unreality, since no one seemed to doubt that it would be reopened.<sup>73</sup>

However, encouraged by the split between Turkey and the allies, and confronted with a Turkish demand for reparations, Greece seriously considered the possibilities of resuming hostilities against Turkey.<sup>74</sup> When the conference reopened on April 23, 1923, and a settlement between the allies and Turkey seemed certain, the insistence of the Turkish delegation for payment by Greece of reparations for damages inflicted by the Greek army in Asia Minor precipitated a serious crisis. The Greek delegation threatened to leave the conference unless Turkey withdrew its demands, which it felt it could not meet and with regard to which it would not undertake any obligations for the future.<sup>75</sup>

The allies became worried over this turn of events, and although some of them warmly supported Greece, they refused to be dragged into a new war. They felt that the bellicose attitude of Greece was mostly a bluff to appease internal opinion, but were troubled lest renewed hostilities in Thrace would involve other Balkan states and bring on another world war.<sup>76</sup> Many felt that the British had encouraged the Greeks in order to strengthen their own

73 Neville Henderson, *Water Under the Bridges* (London, 1945) 116.

74 Daphni, 1:21,43-46; Mazarakis-Ainian, 329-332; Apostolos Alexandris, *Politikafinanniseis* (Political Recollections) (Patras, 1947) 80-81.

75 Department of State, *Monthly Political Report*, serial no. 2, no. 9, May 1923 (Washington, D.C., 1923) 11; Letter from Venizelos to his wife, May 13, 1923, published in *Vima* (Athens), December 15, 1954, p. 1; Ali Naci Karacan, *Lozan konferansi ve Ismet Patja* (Istanbul, 1943) 332; *The Speech*, 621-622.

76 MA, July 6, 1923; Montagna to Mussolini, May 9 and 10, 1923; DDI, series 7, vol. 2,

position in Mosul.<sup>77</sup> There is also evidence to indicate that Italy was interested in perpetuating the Greek-Turkish feud. In June 1923, Mussolini told Apostolos Alexandris, the Greek foreign minister, that eastern Thrace should have gone to Greece and that the Italian army would have supported Greece if hostilities had been renewed.<sup>78</sup>

The danger of war brought forth a compromise solution from Britain. It was suggested that if Turkey would renounce its demands for reparations, Greece would cede to her Karagach and vicinity, which would be important to Turkey as a railway junction. Venizelos was willing to support the solution at the risk of losing his popularity in Greece. The war party, under General Theodore Pangalos, threatened to upset his diplomacy and even tried to replace him at Lausanne. The Greek government came under a great deal of pressure from the opposition in the country to withhold its signature from the final peace settlement with Turkey. Venizelos, however, successfully exerted his influence upon the Athens government for a more moderate stand and the acceptance of the allied compromise solution. The government informed Venizelos that if the Turks did not accept the compromise solution, arms would decide the Greek-Turkish conflict.<sup>79</sup>

Meanwhile, on May 19, Ismet consulted his government for instructions. Rauf, the president of the Council of Ministers, opposed the compromise solution and held up the instructions to him. On May 24, Ismet again cabled his government for instructions and warned that if the Greeks did not receive a decision from Turkey in two days, they would leave the conference. He pleaded that if the Greek offer of Karagach was not accepted, Turkey would get nothing or war, and the conclusion of peace with the allies would be endangered. On May 25, Kemal intervened and wired Ismet to get a complete settlement. Greece alone, he said, was not a problem and reparations were a minor issue. He ordered Ismet to accept the offer of the Greeks "not from fear of a resumption of war with Greece but because Turkey needs time to settle her other problems."<sup>80</sup> In the final solution, Greece recognized its obligations to pay reparations. Turkey renounced the payment and in return received the railway junction at Karagach (articles 2 and 59, Treaty of Lausanne).

The dispute over the Thracian frontier continued after Lausanne. The Greek-Turkish Boundary Delimitation Commission could not agree on the interpretation of the provisions concerning the Thracian frontier provided for by the Lausanne settlement. In February 1926, Greece took its case to the Council of the League, requesting that it be turned over to The Hague Court. Turkey insisted that the court had no jurisdiction in the matter and that only the Mixed Boundary Delimitation Commission appointed under the Treaty of Lausanne could decide the frontier issue. Briefly, Greece explained that the territory between the two branches in the delta of the Maritsa River formed part of Greek national territory and therefore could

docs. 28 and 31.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 23; Joseph G. Grew, *Turbulent Era* (Boston, 1952) 529; Cebesoy, *Siyasi hatıraları*, 234-235.

<sup>78</sup> Alexandris, 103.

<sup>79</sup> <sup>3</sup> <sup>9</sup> <sup>269</sup> <sup>270</sup>; Daphni, 1:44-47; Alexandris, 78, 93-97; Della Torretta, I <sup>ist</sup> <sup>Vo</sup> <sup>W</sup> <sup>SSadornilondon</sup> <sup>90</sup> Mussolini, May 27, 1923, DDI, series 7, vol. 2.

<sup>80</sup> *77ie Speech*, 627-628, 631-634; BPPT, no. 30, October 22, 1923, p. 2: C<sup>ch</sup> *Siyasi hatıraları*, 252ff.

not be included in the work of demarcation as contended by Turkey. The league refused to take the case to The Hague but returned it to the delimitation commission.

It was not until the overthrow of the Pangalos regime in Greece, which was extremely anti-Turkish, that the Turkish government agreed to the Greek position and recognized the eastern branch of the Maritsa River as the principal stream separating Greece from Turkey in Thrace. Consequently, the dispute over the islets in the western branch of the river ended in Greece's favor. On November 6, 1926, a protocol between the two states on delimiting the Greek-Turkish frontier was signed, awarding the islets in dispute to Greece.<sup>81</sup>

Special agreements had also to be concluded between Greece and Turkey concerning the portion of the old "Oriental Railways" that leaves Bulgarian territory at Svilengrad and enters Greek territory on the right bank of the Maritsa, passes to Turkish territory at Karaagach, reenters Greek territory and again leaves Greece at Pythion (Kuleli-Burgas) for Turkish territory across the Maritsa at Oziinkoprli.<sup>82</sup> Article 107 of the Treaty of Lausanne provided a solution for the unusual situation resulting from the territorial settlement of the same treaty: "Travellers and goods coming from or destined for Turkey or Greece and making use in transit of the three sections of the Oriental Railways included between the Greco-Bulgarian frontier and the Greco-Turkish frontier near Kuleli-Burgas, shall not be subject, on account of such transit, to any duty or toll nor to any formality of examination in connection with passports and customs."<sup>83</sup> It further provided for a commissioner to be selected by the Council of the League of Nations who, with the assistance of a Turkish and Greek representative, was to ensure that transit rights would be honored. Greece and Turkey agreed to abide by the majority decision of the league council in cases where they could not resolve their differences by direct negotiations. The final paragraph of article 107 provided that:

In the event of Turkey constructing later a railway line joining Adrianople [Edirne] to the line between Kuleli-Burgas [Pythion] and Constantinople the stipulations of this Article shall lapse in so far as concerns transit between the points on the Greco-Turkish frontier lying near Kuleli-Burgas and Bosna-Keuy located a few kilometres south of Edirne respectively.... Nevertheless, it remains understood that the stipulations of paragraph one shall remain in force for transit over the two sections of the Oriental Railways between the Greco-Bulgarian frontier and Bosna-Keuy.

The above provisions proved to be inadequate for the running of the line, but it was not until November 25, 1937, that Turkey and Greece prescribed in detail regulations for the

---

81 BPPG, no. 80, April 30, 1926, p. 6; MA, November 6, 1926; LNOJ (1926)511-516,529-530.

82 LCNEA, 21, 91-92, 838; F.A. Vali, *Servitudes in International Law: A Study of Rights in Frontier Territory*, 2d ed. (London, 1958) 115-118. A similar situation exists along the Syrian-Turkish frontier. Cf. "Agreement (Ankara) for the Promotion of Peace: France and the Provisional (Nationalist) Government of Turkey, October 20, 1921," in LNTS 54 (1926-1927) 178-193.

83 LNTS 28 (1924) 91-92.

application of the provisions of article 107. These agreements have been faithfully adhered to and are still operative.<sup>84</sup> Until Turkey builds a railroad line from OzlinkoprU to Edirne (Adrianople) on the left bank of the Maritsa, she will be dependent upon Greece for rail transportation to Edirne. The number of incidents on the Maritsa railway between the Turkish and Greek authorities were few, and generally occurred at a time when the relations between the two countries were strained.

The most serious incident occurred in November 1927. On the occasion of the anniversary of the capture of Edirne by the Turks, a parliamentary delegation left Ankara for Edirne. The wagons occupied by the delegation were covered with Turkish flags. As the train entered Greek territory, the Greek military commander at Kuleli-Burgas demanded that during the trip through Greek territory the flags be removed. The Turks refused and the commander declined to allow the train to proceed. After the usual flare-up in Athens and Ankara, the incident was closed. Turkish flags could not be displayed on trains passing through Greek territory.

---

42.LNTS 195(1938) 137-143.The position of the neutral commissioner has been abolished and its functions transferred to a Greek-Turkish commission. The sector or 109.3 miles of standard gauge from Alexandroupolis (Dedeagach) up the Maritsa valley to Svilengrad was bought from its French owners by the Greek government in 1954. During the occupation of Greece by Germany, all Turks had to get permission from Germany to travel from Istanbul to Edirne.

## The Contest for the Islands

The Aegean Sea washes over 500 miles of rugged Anatolian coastline, and less than twenty-five miles from this coast is a string of densely populated Greek-inhabited islands beginning with Samothrace in the north and ending with the Dodecanese islands and Rhodes in the southeast—a distance of about 300 miles. Two-thirds of this string of islands is less than fifteen miles from the Turkish coast. That portion of the Aegean that lies between these islands and the Turkish mainland became the principal boundary separating Turkey from Greece.

A glance at the map will show that the main cities and towns of the Aegean islands face toward Anatolia. In former times, before the exchange of populations, the islands were closely tied to the economic life of western Anatolia. Many of the inhabitants of the islands owned land and conducted commercial enterprises on the Turkish mainland, and developed a market there for their olives, olive oil and fish. The islands, in return, served as the summer location of many of the Christian inhabitants of the Anatolian coast and provided refuge for them during periods of communal unrest.<sup>85</sup> “Along the Aegean Coast of Turkey, between Rhodes and Samos, the sea carves its way into the land in a series of deep gulfs: The Doric, the Ceramic, the Mendelian. It is a seascape where the islands begin to dominate the mainland, and where indeed the mainland, with its long narrow promontories, has itself the aspect of a series of islands, making a geographical unit of the whole.”<sup>86</sup>

### *The Aegean Islands*

On November 25, 1922, the delegates at Lausanne took up the question of the Aegean and Mediterranean islands off the coast of Turkey. While it was admitted that the Greeks formed an overwhelming majority on all the islands, the chief of the Turkish delegation reminded the other powers that

Turkey had a very special interest in their future. Ismet cautioned that the islands, which depend geographically on Asia Minor, were of grave importance to the peace and security of Anatolia. He asked that Turkish sovereignty be recognized over Imbros, Tenedos (Bozcaada) and Samothrace, and that a neutral and independent political existence be established for Lemnos, Mytilene, Chios, Samos and Ikaria, as these islands were of vital importance to Turkey's security and because it was an economic necessity for them to be united to Asia Minor. Ismet accused the Greeks of using them as bases for aggression in their bid to establish a Greek empire in Anatolia.

Venizelos agreed to the demilitarization of the islands in order to satisfy Turkey's

---

1. Karl Dietrich, *Hellenism in Asia Minor* (New York, 1918) 49-50; Great Britain, *Handbook Series, Naval Intelligence Division, Turkey 1* (London, Aprn 86 347; S.K. Karatzas, *Smyrnis Tragedies* (Smyrna Tragedies) (Athens, 19 )  
• Lord Kinross, *Europe Minor* (New York, 1956) 75.

security requirements but pleaded that all the islands, including Imbros and Tenedos, should remain Greek. He denied that the islands were used as military bases by the Greeks in the Asia Minor campaign. At which point, Ismet rejoined that the sovereignty of Turkey over Imbros and Tenedos was not a subject for discussion at the conference.<sup>87</sup> Lord Curzon later replied that, on the contrary, only the sovereignty of these two islands and none other was subject to the negotiations at Lausanne.<sup>88</sup>

On February 14, 1914, the great powers agreed to return the islands of Imbros and Tenedos, which, along with the other Aegean islands minus the Dodecanese, had been occupied by Greek forces during the Balkan wars, to Turkey. Turkey, at the time, refused to accept the offer lest it mean recognition of Greek sovereignty over the other Aegean islands. Imbros and Tenedos had been awarded to Greece by the defunct Treaty of Sevres.

The issue of the islands was often raised in the sessions at Lausanne concerned with the control and organization of the straits. While Imbros and Tenedos guard the Aegean entrance to the straits, the remaining islands form a series of chains that could effectively close the Aegean to outside shipping. On December 20, 1922, Ismet denounced the demilitarization of the straits as jeopardizing Turkey's security, because "Greece is being enabled to raise soldiers among the inhabitants of the islands immediately opposite the demilitarized zones... if Greece is authorized to utilize on the spot contingents from the islands in question, it really amounts to her being allowed to have as many soldiers as possible on these islands." He reasoned that "ImbroSi Tenedos and Samothrace, which form an integral part of the Dardanelles should be restored to Turkey."<sup>89</sup>

On the last day of January, Lord Curzon presented the allied proposals for the Aegean islands to the Turkish delegation. He explained that for »' defense of the straits the Turkish delegation had asked for the demilitarization of the islands of Imbros, Tenedos and Samothrace, and that the allies, of their own accord, had added the island of Lemnos. Although, he continued, the island of Imbros contained no Turkish population whatever (6,762 Greeks) and the island of Tenedos contained a small Turkish minority (1,631 Greeks), and although the islands had been for nearly ten years in the possession of Greece, they were offering, in view of the proposals made in 1913- 1914, to restore them to Turkish sovereignty. He added that, at the request of the Turkish delegation, stringent provisions were introduced into the treaty by which the central group of Aegean islands, e.g., Mytilene, Chios, Samos and Ikaria, would be demilitarized so that they could not possibly be made the base of military, naval or air attack upon Turkey.<sup>90</sup> On February 4, Turkey accepted these proposals and agreed to establish a local administration on the islands of Imbros and Tenedos.<sup>91</sup> The Treaty of

87 LCNEA, 95-100.

88Ibid., 169.

89 Ibid., 280-281.

90 Ibid., 432-433  
(article 13, Treaty of Lausanne).  
...

91 Ibid., 838 (article 14, Treaty of Lausanne). Note of Venizelos to the allied powers, January 29, 1923, DDI, series 7, vol. 1, doc. 482. Venizelos asked the allies to guarantee a special regime for the Greeks of Imbros and Tenedos when the islands were reverted to

Lausanne enjoined Turkey to provide the islands with a special administrative organization composed of local elements; to furnish every guarantee for the native non-Muslim population in regard to local administration and the protection of persons and property; and to ensure the maintenance of order by a police force recruited from among the local population and responsible to the local administration. In September 1924, these provisions were placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

*The Dodecanese Islands and Castellorizo*

The Dodecanese islands, located off the southwestern coast of Anatolia and inhabited almost solely by Greeks, were seized by Italy in its war with the Porte, 1911-1912. The Italian-Turkish Treaty of Ouchy (Lausanne), October 18, 1912, provided that the Italian occupation of the islands would continue until Turkey fulfilled its pledge to Italy to evacuate Tripolitania and Cyrenaica. Although the Turks kept their part of the agreement, the Italians did not. This action prevented Greece from occupying all the Aegean islands during the Balkan wars (1912-1913).

Italy was promised complete sovereignty over the islands by article 8 of the secret Treaty of London, April 26, 1915. France and Britain honored the agreement in article 122 of the abortive Sevres treaty.

At the 1920 London conference, Lord Curzon acknowledged the receipt of a letter from Venizelos before the conference laying claim to the island of Castellorizo (Mais Ada). Venizelos wrote that Greece occupied the island in 1912 and that it had declared its union with Greece. Its 12,000 inhabitants were Greek and enjoyed an autonomous regime under the Ottomans. Nitti, the chief Italian delegate, objected to the Greek claims and insisted that the island remain Turkish and part of the Italian sphere of influence since it was very close to the Adalia (Antalya) region in southwestern Anatolia. The allied powers, for a change, were especially anxious to please the Italians, and agreed to uphold the Italian position. They maintained that the status of the island was decided in 1913, when the Greeks were ordered to return the island to Turkey because it was too close to that country's coast.<sup>92</sup> (Castellorizo was occupied by the French during World War I.) But Italy was soon to reverse her position. In March 1920 she insisted that the island be placed under Italian sovereignty and suggested that since Italy was going to hand over to Greece eleven islands, the retention of the tiny island of Castellorizo was a mere trifle. The Italians also asked that Italy be given title to the Dodecanese islands before handing them over to Greece.

The reader will recall that the Dodecanese islands and Castellorizo were awarded to Italy by the Treaty of Sevres, August 10, 1920, but in a special agreement concluded between Greece and Italy on the same day, Italy promised to cede to Greece all the Dodecanese islands minus Rhodes. This island was to enjoy a large measure of autonomy, and a plebiscite to determine the future of the island was to take place, under the auspices of the League of

---

Turkey.

92DBFP, series 1, vol. 7, March 18, 1920, pp. 528-29, 541-542.

Nations, on the day Britain made a decision to give Cyprus to Greece. In any case, no plebiscite would take place until fifteen years after the date of the Sevres treaty.

There was very little question at Lausanne as to the disposition of the islands. On October 8, 1922, after the Greek defeat in Anatolia, Italy repudiated the agreement to give Greece the Dodecanese islands and announced its intentions to keep them. Within a week, the British government joined Athens in protesting the Italian action as it was taken without consultation with the other allied powers. On November 3, 1922, Mussolini wrote Lord Curzon that as the Treaty of Sevres was no longer operative, Italy would keep the islands. Public opinion in Italy, he declared, would not allow him to hand them over to Greece.<sup>93</sup> A few months later, he told Alexandris that Italy's stand on the Dodecanese was not aimed at the Greek people, but was needed to strengthen Italian national interests in the eastern Mediterranean.<sup>94</sup>

Turkey also resisted the cession of the islands to Greece. Although it was apparent that Italy had no intention of giving them to Turkey, Ismet told the Italian delegate at Lausanne, C. Garroni, that under no condition would Turkey want the cession of the Dodecanese islands to Greece." Although Turkey felt uncomfortable over the prospects of having a strong and ambitious power at her doorstep, she preferred Italy to Greece in the Dodecanese, as such an arrangement left the door open for future negotiations over the disposition of the islands. But if Greece were in possession of them, the Greek character of the islands would make it less probable that they would be taken away from her and given to Turkey.

In order to facilitate the negotiations at Lausanne, and perhaps to acquire Italian support and a united front, Greece approved the cession of the Dodecanese from Turkey to Italy but insisted that her rights in the islands still remained and that it was a question of a later settlement between Italy and Greece.<sup>95</sup> On February 4, 1923, Ismet accepted, in its entirety, the proposal regarding the islands of the Dodecanese, which had not until then figured in the agenda of the conference and in regard to which no discussion had taken place.<sup>97</sup>

However, a few weeks later, the Turkish delegation received orders from Ankara to insist upon the return of the Dodecanese islands to Turkey. The Turkish delegation tried to bind Italy into an agreement not to cede the islands to Greece in the future, nor to fortify them, and to prevent their use by smugglers, who often violated Turkey's coastline. Italy, with allied support, refused to be bound by such an agreement, and refused to discuss the islands at the conference with Turkey.<sup>98</sup> In the end, Turkey renounced in favor of Italy all rights and title over the Dodecanese islands, Castellorizo and the islets dependent thereon.<sup>99</sup>

93 Mussolini to Lord Curzon, November 3, 1922, DDI, series 7, vol. 1. doc-7U\*  
94 Alexandris, 101.

95 Garroni to Mussolini, November 29, 1922, DDI, series 7, vol. 1, doc. 171.

96 Note of Venizelos, January 29, 1923, DDI, series 7, vol. 1, doc. 171.

97 LCNEA, 838.

98 Letter of Montagna to Grew, April 23, 1923. Montagna told Grew that Italy was primarily interested in retaining the island of Castellorizo as a question of prestige. Cited in Joseph G. Grew, 557, 565.

99 Articles 15 and 16, Treaty of Lausanne, July 24, 1923.

After Lausanne, Greece continued to claim the islands as part of its national primony and complained bitterly over Rome's undisguised attempts to Italianize their Population. The

---

verbal struggle for *enosis*, or union with Greece, was <sup>ca. 1940</sup> thousands of Dodecanesian refugees who fled to Athens from the fascist tyranny. Turkey also complained of the Italian presence in the Aegean, but for other reason! She felt directly threatened by the determination of Italy to establish a foothold in the <sup>east</sup>. The construction of Italian naval bases in the Aegean, especially at Leros, and the concentration of Italian troops at Rhodes could not be taken lightly.

## Cyprus

The Greek-inhabited island of Cyprus, just forty miles off the Anatolian coast, was occupied by England in 1878, in return for her services in securing, for the future, the territory of the Ottoman empire against its enemies, mainly Russia. The occupation was to continue until such time as Russia restored to Turkey Kars and the other conquests made by her in Armenia during the Russia-Ottoman War of 1877-1878, e.g., Batum, Ardahan, Bayezit, and their immediate environs. Sovereignty over the island was to remain with the sultan. During the Balkan wars, Greece was prevented from occupying the island because of the British occupation, and when hostilities broke out between Britain and Turkey in World War I, the island was annexed to the British crown by an Order in Council, November 5, 1914.

As early as 1913 the Greeks and British studied the possibility of exchanging Cyprus for the port of Argostolion in Cephallonia, one of the Ionian islands. However, the project did not pass the planning stage. A more serious opportunity for the union of Cyprus with Greece presented itself in October 1915 when the island was offered to Greece on the condition that she enter the war and render immediate assistance to Serbia. The Greek government

The defeat of Italy in the Second World War made possible the union of the Dodecanese and Castellorizo with Greece. In June 1946 the foreign ministers of Britain, France, the United States and the Soviet Union unanimously voted in favor of awarding the islands to Greece. The treaty signed in Paris on February 15, 1947, confirms this agreement and stipulated that the islands should be demilitarized. A month later a Greek military government took over from the British at Rhodes, and within a year the islands were officially annexed to their motherland.

Turkey, at that time, did not contest the award. Indeed, as early as <sup>q44</sup> 1917 Ambassador Enis Akaygen of Turkey most categorically assured Premier Papandreu of Greece that it was official Turkish policy to have no territorial claims and that Turkey had no objection to the claim of her friend and ally, Greece, on the Dodecanese. Stephen Xydis, *Greece and the Great Powers* (Thessaloniki, 1963) on the whole, the Turkish press was silent on the matter. Cf. *Ayin Tarihi* 153 (S 1946) 85-87; 160 (March, 1947) 122-123. Although disturbed by the Greek civil and communist penetration in that country, Turkey was in no position to oppose Greek claim to the islands. Her neutrality during the war was not fully appreciated by the allies, whose friendship she was anxiously seeking to cultivate. It is only in a few years and in connection with the Cyprus issue that the Turkish press has had their thoughts on Greece in the Dodecanese. The Greeks are criticized for not having been awarded the islands with Turkey. It is certain that had Turkey come out of the war as a strong and favored ally of the west, Greece would not have received all of the islands. The Turkish claims would have been based on the proximity of the islands to

In 1947 and on the 6 percent Turkish minority in the islands' population. In 1947 about 7,000 of the islands' 115,000 inhabitants were Turks, most in Rhodes and Cos, which had a total population of about 60,000 and 20,000 respectively. Between 5 to 8 percent of the population on these two islands was T

rejected the offer, wishing at that time to preserve its neutrality, and the offer was subsequently withdrawn.

In the secret Sykes-Picot agreement, Britain agreed not to open negotiations for the cession or alienation of Cyprus without the previous consent of France.<sup>100</sup> This was publicly confirmed in article 4 of the French-British convention of December 23, 1920.<sup>101</sup> In the Treaty of Sevres, articles 115-117, Turkey recognized the annexation of Cyprus proclaimed by the British government on November 5, 1914, and renounced all rights or title over or relating to Cyprus. These provisions were reaffirmed, without opposition, in articles 16, 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Lausanne.

During the 1920s there was much agitation in Greece for the union (*enosis*) of Cyprus with the motherland. Rumors in 1929 that Britain might cede the island to Greece caused unrest in Turkey. The Turks seemed content with the status quo, but if changes were to be made, it was a foregone conclusion that they would demand a say in the negotiations. The presence of a large Turkish minority on Cyprus made the situation there different from that in the Dodecanese, where the Turkish population formed less than 5 percent of the total. According to the British census of 1911, there were 274,108 persons living in Cyprus, of whom 20.6 percent were Muslims and the remainder mostly Greek Orthodox; 78.9 percent (216,310) were Greek speaking and 20.1 percent (55,213) Turkish speaking. By 1931, of the 347,457 inhabitants of the island, 79.5 percent (276,533) considered themselves Greeks and 18.5 percent (64,238) Turks.<sup>102</sup>

The possession of the Dodecanese islands and Cyprus by Italy and Britain, respectively, was recognized by Greece and Turkey partly because the former needed the support of the Great Powers at Lausanne and partly because domestic issues in that country were considered more vital than the issue of these islands. Turkey agreed to the arrangement over the islands because Italy and Britain were not prepared to give them away and because the islands did not contain a Turkish majority.

### *The Straits*

As Greece was neither a great power nor a littoral state of the Black Sea, the Turkish delegation at Lausanne found it inadmissible that she should be

---

<sup>100</sup>Letter of Grey to Combon, par. 4, May 16, 1916, in DBFP, series 1, vol. 4, pp. 241-251.

<sup>101</sup>Great Britain, Foreign Office, Historical Section, no. 65.

<sup>102</sup>WUMO, Great Britain, Colonial Reports, *Annual Report of the Statistical and Economic Commission of the People of Cyprus, 1931*, no. 1574 (London, 1932) 5-6.

represented on the straits commission. The great powers, on the other hand, agreed to admit Greece to membership on the commission on the basis that she was one of the chief users of the straits and that she was directly involved in the defense of the Aegean entrance of the Dardanelles. The straits convention provided that the Aegean islands of Samothrace, Lemnos, Imbros (Imroz) Tenedos (Bozcaada) and the Rabbit Islands (Tevcan) were to be demilitarized.<sup>103</sup> The first two islands were Greek and the remainder, which were under Turkish sovereignty, were inhabited primarily by Greeks.

The defense of the straits is not only dependent upon the islands mentioned in the straits convention but upon all the islands of the Aegean as far south as Crete. Cemil Bilsel, the well-known Turkish professor of international law, explained the importance of these islands to the security and usefulness of the straits during World War II. "If aid to Russia is not being sent by way of the Straits," he said, "this is due to the facts that the Aegean Islands are occupied by the Germans and that ships destined for Russia are prevented from reaching the Straits. All of which goes to show that the *question of the Straits forms one with those of the Aegean, the Mediterranean, and the entrance to them.*"<sup>104</sup>

The security of the straits and the free passage of merchant vessels through its waters are of great importance to Turkey and Greece. For Turkey, the straits provide for the maximum use of the cheapest and most efficient means of transportation between its long Black Sea coastline and its Aegean and Mediterranean territories. It is the lifeline that connects Turkish Thrace and Anatolia. The interest of Greece in the straits is primarily commercial. Prior to the Balkan wars, the merchant marine of Greece came second in the list of those passing the straits.<sup>105</sup> During the interwar years, more Greek merchant ships were in transit through the straits than those of any foreign power. Greece ranked third in total net registered tonnage using the straits for the same period; Italy ranked first, followed by England. The annual number of Greek ships plying to Istanbul during the period of Greek-Turkish animosity (1923-1930) averaged less than 65. From 1933 to 1939 this number reached over 250. Meanwhile, Italy and England, the main users of the port of Istanbul, maintained steady annual averages for the entire period: over 400 for Italy and 200 for Britain. The rise in Greek shipping was apparently influenced by the improved relations between Greece and Turkey and also, in part, by the improved situation of the Greek minority in Istanbul, which plays a significant role in the commercial life of the city and its harbor.<sup>106</sup>

---

, 19. Great Britain, *Parliamentary Papers, 1923*, Treaty Series no. 16, cmd. 1929, p. 121. The provisions for the demilitarization of the Aegean islands remained unaltered. The conclusion of the Montreux Convention of July 20, 1936, gave Turkey permission to remilitarize the straits and to assume the powers and responsibility of the straits commission. SIA, 1936, pp. 584-651

104 Cemil Bilsel "International Law, and Turkey," *America Journal*

donIMO 205 44 553r + tabCS addedl RR GraV6j 7, r

ofie

21. LCNEA, 275.

106 LNOJ (July 1926) 951-974; *Rapport de la Commission des Droits et Libertés des Nations* (Constantinople, 1929-1935); République Turque, Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Rapport Annuel sur le mouvement des navires à travers les détroits de Bosphore et de Dardanelles entre la Méditerranée et la Mer Noire*

On the whole, vessels passing through the straits seldom encountered any difficulties with the Turkish authorities. Nevertheless, Turkey was never pleased with the formation of the International Straits Commission and its dissolution in 1936 was welcomed. It was natural that in the beginning there should be some conflict between the straits commission and the Turkish government, which considered the international body as an intrusion upon its sovereignty. In the 1920s the straits commission often complained that the sanitary dues that the Turkish authorities collected from the vessels passing through the straits were exorbitant and that the Turkish government forced its pilots on many of the vessels when none were necessary or solicited. The Greek members of the straits commission often complained that the Turks were holding up Greek ships that were merely in transit through the straits for destinations in the Black Sea.



## The Exchange of Minorities

The most drastic remedy prescribed at Lausanne for reducing the potential for future friction between Greece and Turkey was the compulsory exchange of population. Despite the painful effects of this remedy on the lives of the refugees and its disruptive role in the economic and political life of the two states, the separation of Christians and Muslims considerably enhanced the possibilities for an eventual Greek-Turkish entente. The transfer of population not only served to transform Greece and Turkey into homogeneous national states but also helped to lessen future conflict over the minorities excluded from the exchange and to stabilize the political boundaries between the two countries. The exchange agreement finalized the surrender of *irredentism* by Greece and the definite abandonment of the *megali idea*. It was the final major step in the solution of the nationality aspects of the eastern question.

### *Early Minority Exchange in the Balkans*

The idea of an exchange of population to prevent further political entanglements was formulated in a protocol annexed to the treaty of peace between the Ottoman empire and Bulgaria, September 29, 1913.<sup>1</sup> It was the first interstate treaty in modern history providing for an exchange of population. It provided for the voluntary exchange of Bulgarians and Muslims within a fifteen-kilometer-wide zone along the Turkish-Bulgarian frontier. The convention was mainly a recognition of a *fait accompli* since most of the people involved had already left this zone during the upheaval of the Balkan wars of 1912-1913. But it did allow an effective means of forcing the transfer of the few remaining groups left on the wrong side of the border; the Turkish government was particularly anxious to expel its Bulgarian minority, whose property was being sequestered by Turkish refugees from western Thrace. In all, approximately 48,500 Muslims moved from Bulgarian territory to Turkey compared with 46,700 Bulgarians who moved to Bulgaria from Turkish Thrace. The success of this exchange subsequently led the Turks to attempt to solve the much more significant problem of the large

#### 1. BFSP 107:713-714.

Greek minority in Turkey by legal ratification of another *fait accompli*.

The expansion of Greece during the Balkan wars into the Aegean islands off the Anatolian coast could not be tolerated by the Young Turks. They refused to agree to the Greek occupation of the islands on the grounds that they were necessary for the defense of Asia Minor and uncomfortably close to the large and powerful Greek communities in Anatolia.<sup>107</sup> Apparently, they were prepared to protect themselves from Greek aggression by initiating a preventive war. In December 1913, they entered into an alliance with Bulgaria directed against

---

<sup>107</sup>  
(Lon  
don, 1957)608.

Luigi Albertini, *The Origins of the War of 1914*, tr. and ed. I.M. Massey, 3

Greece: "The alliance with Bulgaria was important for us, for it was certain that sooner or later, we should have war with the Greeks. It was impossible for us to leave to Greece the islands of the Aegean like Lemnos, Mytilene and Chios."<sup>108</sup>

The Young Turks also suggested to the Greek government an exchange of population similar to the agreement reached with Bulgaria. "With a view to having no internal difficulties if we sooner or later come to blows with the Greeks (that was inevitable owing to the question of the islands), it was suggested to the Greek Government, that there should be an exchange of these Greek nationals for the Mussulman nationals who had been left behind in Greek Macedonia and wished to emigrate to Turkey."<sup>109</sup>

In order to force the consent of the Greek government to an exchange of the Greeks on the western coast of Anatolia for the Muslims living in Greece, the Young Turks began to expel the Greeks from the Aegean coast region and Turkish Thrace. The refusal of the Greeks to accept the Ottoman counterproposals for the future of the Aegean islands also intensified the persecution of the Greeks living in Asia Minor.<sup>110</sup> Indeed, the Ottoman government declared that the failure to reach an agreement with Greece over the sovereignty of the islands would necessitate the elimination of the Greek population from the coast of western Anatolia.<sup>111</sup> And European agents confirmed » their reports to their governments the forced exodus of the Greeks of Thrace and Anatolia. They also reported that Turkey was prepared to attack the Greek islands at the slightest pretext.<sup>112 113</sup> In spite of repeated protests from Athens, by early 1914 the Ottoman government had forced 150,000 Greeks to leave the Aegean coast of Asia Minor for Greece, and some 50,000 other Greeks were deported into the interior of Anatolia.<sup>114</sup>

Following the expulsion of these Greeks from Asia Minor, the Ottoman minister at Athens, Calib Kemali (Soylemezoglu), expressed to Venizelos his personal opinion that it

108 Djemal Pasha, *Memories of a Turkish Statesman, 1913-1919* (London, 1904) Djemal Pasha was an active member of the Young Turk movement and the minister of public works, December 1913-February 1914

109 Ibid., 71.

110 Albertini, 3:627.

111 DDI (1871-1914) 10:762.

112 Ibid., 538,541,545-546,41-42,244-247; *Diegrosse Politik*, 36a:75,95-96; *B" Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914*, vol. 9, part 2, "The Balkan War"

114 Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey* (New York, 1932) 21; Greece, Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Les persécutions anti-grecques en Turquie de 1908 à 1921* (Athens, 1921)63; Ettore Rossi, "Lo scambio obbligatorio delle popolazioni tra la Grecia e la Turchia," *Oriente Moderno* (September 1930) 400. Rossi records that as a result of the Balkan wars, 119,938 Greeks fled Thrace and 154,349 Asia Minor. During the European war, 96,191 fled Thrace and 387,012 fled Asia Minor. By 1917 a total of 274,287 Greeks fled Thrace and 483,212 fled from Asia Minor; Tevfik Biyiklioglu, *Trakya'da millî mücadele* (The National Struggle in Thrace) I (Ankara, 1955) 92-93. The author stated that over 200,000 persons were displaced as a result of the Balkan wars; Turkish sources report that 100,000 Greeks left Turkey for Greece in this period and that a fountainhead of rebellion was eliminated. U. Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk millî tarihî* (History of the Turkish Reform), vol. 2, part 3 (Ankara, 1951) 251-252.

would be a good idea to exchange the Greeks of Thrace and the Greek rural population of the region of Smyrna (Izmir) for the Muslims of Greek Macedonia. He presented this suggestion in his official capacity in a note to the Greek government dated May 18, 1914. Four days later, Venizelos replied that his government would accept the proposals for an exchange of populations, provided that the free and spontaneous character of the emigration was secured and that the properties of the emigrants were properly appraised and liquidated.<sup>115</sup> A mixed commission for the limited exchange of populations was established in June 1914, at Smyrna (Izmir), but the empire's entrance into the world war (November 1, 1914) suspended the work of the commission.<sup>116</sup>

### *World War I and the Question of Minorities*

After the Balkan wars Venizelos had declared that "for a whole generation Greece would have to be occupied in the extensive development of her doubled domain, and during this period of development she must either hope that the Greeks in Turkey would find a tolerable *modus vivendi* under the existing system, or else be certain that, when the time came for the break-up of the Turkish empire, a leading place would be taken by a strong Greece, strong enough to solve by her own effort the problems which await a national solution."<sup>11</sup> But external events allowed little time for internal development, and compelled Greece to renew her bid to extend her frontiers and to protect the "unredeemed" Greeks in Turkish Thrace and Anatolia.

With the outbreak of World War I, Venizelos urged that Greece join the war against Turkey in order to save Hellenism in Asia Minor and to make it possible for the Greek refugees to return to their homes in Anatolia. He wrote his king that "Turkey is destroying Hellenism in Asia Minor, she will not recognize our sovereignty over the islands given by Europe and at the first chance she will try to retake them. 250,000 Greeks have already been expelled from Turkey."<sup>12</sup> In another letter to King Constantine he reiterated that Greece had to join the war against the central powers. If, he insisted, the central powers win the war, Turkey, with the aid of Germany (the Young Turk minority policy received German encouragement), will destroy Hellenism in Anatolia and retain the islands. "The driving away in masses of hundreds of thousands of Greeks living in Turkey will not only destroy these, but drag down in financial ruin the whole of Greece."<sup>13</sup>

At the Paris peace conference, Venizelos not only put forward claims to Ottoman territories inhabited by Greeks but also presented a scheme for an exchange of population. He asked that the Turkish government be compelled to purchase the immovable property belonging to the Greeks in Turkish territory who might want to emigrate to Greek Asia Minor. The Greek government, he said, would do likewise for the Turks in Greek territory. "There

115        Sdylemezoglu, *Hatiralan* (Memoirs) (Istanbul, 1946) 102-103, usu i 'me Bayur, 233-275

116        ' Ladas, 22; A.F. Frangulis, *La Grier, son slam international, son histoire diplomatique*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1934).

would thus be set up a current of mutual and voluntary migration, thanks to which it might be hoped that in the course of a few years the people remaining in the Turkish state would be composed exclusively of MohamedanSi whilst the Greek element would become overwhelming in Greek territory."<sup>14</sup> In a secret letter to Lloyd George dated October 27, 1919, Venizelos urged that only by the voluntary exchange of co-nations between Greece, Armenia and Turkey could national minorities be saved from extermination, and the position of Greece and Armenia in Anatolia assured.<sup>15</sup>

Venizelos' plans did not materialize—at least not in the form he envisioned. The occupation of Ottoman territory by the Greek army and its subsequent defeat seriously compromised the position of the Christian pop'

ed. (Lo<sup>^</sup>don<sup>^</sup>M<sup>111</sup> S<sup>1</sup> ForS<sup>111</sup> \* *Shm H'SKry* o<sup>^</sup>M<sup>111</sup> Gre<sup>1</sup> IS2h,956<sup>1</sup> ^, ne G<sup>1</sup>nk<sup>1</sup> m<sup>1</sup> α *Booh* Diplomatic Doco<sup>1</sup>

^SSS<sup>^</sup>DC<sup>1</sup>1943)863\_866\*867\_875<sup>1</sup>, ulation in Anatolia and eastern Thrace and eliminated the possibility of establishing Greece on the eastern coast of the Aegean. The bitterness engendered by the events after 1908—such as the mass deportations and persecutions of the Christians in the Ottoman empire for “security” reasons—and the Greek Anatolian venture and counter-reprisals against the Turkish population for the purpose of protecting the Christian population of Turkey—created an unbridgeable gulf between Greek and Turk. The defeat and departure of the Greek army from Anatolia and its withdrawal from eastern Thrace was the signal for the mass emigration of the local Christian inhabitants, who would otherwise have fallen prey to the vengeance of the advancing Turkish army and the local Muslim population. As a result, the number of persons who left Turkey for Greece after 1912 reached almost one million.<sup>117</sup>

It should be noted that while Greece was pressing for a population exchange with Turkey, she had successfully concluded a population agreement with Bulgaria. The Convention Concerning Reciprocal Emigration between Greece and Bulgaria was signed at Neuilly-sur-Seine on November 27, 1919, at the same time that Bulgaria was required to cede western Thrace to Greece. Unfortunately, the voluntary character of the agreement was ignored. It was almost impossible to prevent direct pressure from being applied to individuals to make them leave when they did not wish to do so. When only a few elected to leave voluntarily, both countries began strong agitation to force them out. In the end some 50,000 Greeks were exchanged for about 100,000 Bulgarians.

### *The Origins of the Greek-Turkish Compulsory Population Exchange, 1923*

On January 27, 1923, during the session of the territorial and military commission of the Lausanne conference, Lord Curzon, in response to the plea of Venizelos that the exchange should be voluntary, noted that all the delegates viewed with abhorrence and almost with dismay that principle of compulsory exchange, and that “the conference had only yielded to

the demand that the exchange should be compulsory because all those who had studied the matter most closely seemed to agree that the suffering entailed, great as it must be, would be repaid by the advantage which would ultimately accrue to both countries from a greater homogeneity of population and from the removal of old and deep-rooted causes of quarrel."<sup>18</sup>

The origin of a compulsory population exchange between Greece and Turkey was somewhat vague. Stephen Ladas felt that when the discussion on this problem began at Lausanne, the Greek government had based a decision to favor a compulsory exchange upon the assumption, which was not proven, that the Turks would not permit the return to Turkey of the refugees.\* Another expert on this question, Basil Artemiades, believed that the initiative for the obligatory exchange came from the west. He admitted, however, that there was a great deal of disagreement on this matter by many authorities, and that the proceedings of the Lausanne conference did not tell the whole story. Artemiades wrote that Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, who was appointed by the league to investigate the refugee problem, told Venizelos that Turkey would not allow the refugees to return. Venizelos wanted an optional exchange, but the Turks would not agree. Venizelos did not consider the obligatory exchange an equitable measure but was compelled to accept the Nansen proposition in order to facilitate the success of the Lausanne conference.<sup>19</sup> Venizelos explained the exchange as follows: "The expulsion of the Asia Minor population has not been a consequence of the Exchange Accord, but had been already an accomplished fact—in it I merely received the consent of Turkey to move the Turkish Muslims from Greece in order to help to reestablish the Greek refugees." He insisted that even without the accord, the Turks would not consent to the return of the refugees to Anatolia.<sup>20</sup> Michael Theotokas, the Greek legal adviser at Lausanne, wrote that Venizelos tried to regain the former position and rights of the Anatolian Greeks, but that the allies opposed him and that from the beginning they agreed with Turkey on a compulsory exchange.<sup>21</sup> Sir Horace Rumbold, delegate of Great Britain at Lausanne, reported that the idea of a population exchange came from Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, but that it was the Turkish government, through its representative Hamid Bey, that insisted that an exchange could only take place upon a compulsory basis.<sup>22</sup> According to another authority, the decision for a compulsory population exchange rested wholly with Turkey. Her refusal to allow the return of the refugees made any other solution impossible.<sup>23</sup>

The Turks demanded a compulsory population exchange in order to suppress Greek irredentism, and being short of manpower welcomed the Turks from abroad.<sup>24</sup> It is difficult to criticize them for insisting on a compulsory

18. Ladas, 335-352.

( q u e s t i o n des rtfugies en Grfccc," *Les Balkans*, nos. theouestin f  
 1914, 385. DnNansen was entrusted by the League of Nations <sup>refueek</sup> from the Gcish TM

^ iS #rika meh, >ma,a (Lega and HiSt0riCal Sccd

23 *TTI ? reece and Gree k Refugees* (London, 1931) 51 -52- ^4,

24 *Cebe^v ? ^ T\* Sthlo and N/al Minorities* (London, 1934)  
 <~^cesoy, *Siyasi hatiralan*, 200-201.

population exchange and for refusing to readmit the refugees who left Turkey in the decade preceding Lausanne. Although the Greeks opposed the compulsory exchange principle, their

actions and pronouncements from the Balkan wars to Lausanne served to support Turkey's determination to eliminate Hellenism from Asia Minor. The Turkish position was also reinforced by Kemal's desire to establish a nation-state and a Turkish Anatolian father-land. The presence, therefore, of large non-Turkish or non-Muslim minorities, especially Greek and Armenian minorities with a strong sense of nationalism and deep Anatolian roots, could not be tolerated. Greece felt compelled to accept the decision because most of the Greek population of Turkey had already fled to Greece, and the removal of her Turkish minority would make room to house her landless refugees. In any case, she was powerless to extract from Turkey a voluntary exchange, and the great powers refused to support the return of the Greek refugees to Asia Minor.

### *The Exchange Agreement and its Implementation*

The convention providing for the compulsory exchange of population was signed at Lausanne on January 30, 1923,<sup>119</sup> and was to come into force only with the ratification of the treaty of peace. This was signed in July and ratified in August 1923. One of the most telling aspects of the convention was its demonstration of the confusion of concepts and loyalties prevailing at the time. In spite of the nationalistic and patriotic ideas expressed on both sides, the two states based the exchange upon religious affiliation rather than upon linguistic and racial considerations. The exchange provided for the compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion established in Turkish territory, except those established in Constantinople before October 30, 1918 (Armistice of Mudros), and of Greek nationals of the Muslim religion except those of western Thrace. This distinction, it is believed, brought large numbers of ethnic Turks to Greece and ethnic Greeks to Turkey. It is assumed that most of the Greek-speaking Muslims of Crete were Greeks who converted to Islam. They knew little or no Turkish, but spoke Greek as their mother tongue—and wrote it in the Turkish-Arabic script. The ethnic origins of the Turkish-speaking Greek Orthodox Christians of Anatolia, e.g., the Karamanlis, who knew no Greek, spoke Turkish and used the Greek alphabet in writing Turkish, is a matter of controversy. A western observer, accustomed to a different system of social and national <sup>tion</sup>, might conclude that this was no repatriation at all, but two eport ions into exile—of Christian Turks to Greece, and of Muslim Gre Turkey.<sup>120</sup> This point, however, should not be belabored. The Muslims involved in the exchange were considered to be Turks, and the Orthodox Christians, Greeks. The exchange was based on religious consideration because of the stronger loyalty of the Muslim refugees to

119 LNTS 32:76-87.

120 B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 348-349; Sir Harry Luke, *The Old Turkey and the New* (London, 1955) 211; Cami Bey, *Osmanlı İnkılabında Hıristiyan*

(Ottoman Territory) (Constantinople, 1938); M. F. R. E. W. of the Faculty of

"Eckmann" "Anadolu Karatnamlı agzilarına ait araştırmalar"

Si r'n'g the, Karamanli Dialects), *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Bölümü* Language, History and Geog-

Orthodox Church "Severien^atoilleandEngineD'AI; Karamanlis and the Turkish Orthodox Church movement see below, pp 84ff

Islam rather than to the Turkish state. It is interesting to note that nowhere in the Turkish National Pact is the word Turkish mentioned, whereas the term Ottoman-Muslim is used throughout. The Greeks, one can assume, agreed to the exchange based on religion because the Christians of Anatolia were part of the Byzantine legacy, which Turkey rejected outright and which Greece claimed as her own.

There should be no doubt, however, that Kemal was determined from the beginning to establish a Turkish nation-state and that the task of making Turks out of Muslims would be comparatively easier than making Turks out of Christians. Moreover, the Christian minorities had a greater sense of loyalty to the Greek state than did the Muslims to a Turkish state that had not yet been molded. The Greeks were willing to retain a Muslim minority if Turkey would allow its Greek Orthodox Christians to remain in Anatolia and Thrace. But the proposal was unacceptable to Kemal because it would create difficulties for his plans to create an independent Turkish state and impede his efforts to develop a vigorous Turkish nationalism.

The convention also provided for a mixed commission whose duties were to supervise and facilitate the emigration as set forth by the convention and to carry out the liquidation of the movable and immovable property of the exchanged persons.<sup>121</sup> In view of the fact that the mixed commission was consulted and met for the first time on October 8, 1923, the two governments agreed that the exchange was to take place as from May 1, 1924. The mixed commission thus had seven months to prepare for the transfer of populations. Meanwhile several thousand Greeks and Turks were transferred under the auspices of the mixed commission and with the approval of the two governments throughout 1923 and 1924. From 1923 to 1925 over 188,000 Greeks were transferred to Greece under the direction of the mixed commission and over 355,000 Muslims transferred from Greece to Turkey. Between 1912 and 1914 some 135,000 Muslims left Greece for the Ottoman empire to take the place of the Greeks who were removed from the Aegean coast of Asia Minor. Between 1912 and 1922 about one million Greeks left Asia Minor and Thrace for Greece. In the same period over 100,000 Greeks from Bulgaria, Russia, Albania, Yugoslavia and the Dodecanese settled in Greece.<sup>122</sup>

By the end of October 1924 the vast majority of refugees were transferred, often under very difficult circumstances, to their new homes. From that date the chief task of the mixed commission was to liquidate the property left behind and to pay compensation to the refugees. This was to be accomplished for the 1.2 million Greek refugees who departed from Turkey since 1912 and the almost 400,000 Muslims who left Greece in the same period.

The liquidation of such vast properties proved to be an extremely difficult task. The mixed commission could not agree on the value of the property and on a plan to indemnify the refugees, and in the end both governments agreed that the only solution to compensation was by direct negotiation. The impasse was finally overcome by the Convention of Ankara, June 10, 1930.<sup>123</sup>

---

121LCNEA, 817-827.

122 Ladas, 420-442.

123 "Actes, decisions, sentences arbitrales relatifs & l'change des populations grecques et turques" Commission Mixte pour l'change des populations grecques turques, vol.

---

1 (Istanbul, 1933); LNTS 108 (1930) 235-237.

League and Turkey," doc. 29,98,279,281.