

**ETUDES HELLENIQUES**

**HELLENIC STUDIES**

**LA DIASPORA GRECQUE  
THE GREEK DIASPORA**

Edited by / Sous la direction de  
**Stephanos Constantinides**

With associate editor / Avec la collaboration de  
**Thalia Tassou**

Contributors / Contributions de  
**Jean Catsiapis**

**Stephanos Constantinides**

**Michael Damanakis**

**Dimitrios Filippou**

**Dionysia Kontoyiannis**

**Theodosia Michelakakis**

**Dimitrios Filippou**

**George Kanarakis**

**Alexander Kitroeff**

---

**Louiza Christodoulidou**

**Volume 23, No 2, Autumn / Automne 2015**

**2**

**ÉTUDES HELLÉNIQUES / HELLENIC STUDIES**



# Études Helléniques / Hellenic Studies

DIRECTEURS / EDITORS

**Stephanos CONSTANTINIDES**

Centre for Hellenic Studies and Research Canada-KEEK

**Michael DAMANAKIS**

University of Crete - Greece

**Panayotis TSAKONAS**

University of the Aegean - Greece

ÉDITEUR EXTERNE / EXTERNAL EDITOR

Kathryn RADFORD

McGill University - Canada

COMITÉ DE RÉDACTION / EDITORIAL BOARD

Ioannis ARMAKOLAS	University of Macedonia (Greece)
Paris ARNOPOULOS	Concordia University (Canada)
Jacques BOUCHARD	Université de Montréal (Canada)
Jean CATSIAPIS	Université de Paris X (France)
Georgia CATSIMALI	University of Crete (Greece)
Peter CHIMBOS	University of Western Ontario (Canada)
Van COUFOUDAKIS	University of Nicosia (Cyprus)
Marios EVRIVIADES	Panteion University (Greece)
Kostas GOULIAMOS	European University (Cyprus)
Maria HERODOTOU	La Trobe University, (Australia)
Antonios HOURDAKIS	University of Crete (Greece)
Kostas IFANTIS	University of Athens (Greece)
Joseph JOSEPH	University of Cyprus (Cyprus)
George KANARAKIS	Charles Sturt University - Bathurst (Australia)
Dimitrios KARAGEORGOS	University of Crete (Greece)
Alexander KITROEFF	Haverford College (U.S.A.)
George KOURVETARIS	Northern Illinois University (U.S.A.)
Konstantinos MAGLIVERAS	University of the Aegean (Greece)
George PAGOULATOS	Athens University of Economics and Business (Greece)
Theodoros PELAGIDES	University of Piraeus (Greece)
Ioannis PYRGIOTAKIS	University of Crete (Greece)
Ioannis PHILIPPOUSSIS	Dawson College (Canada)
Athanassios PLATIAS	University of Piraeus (Greece)
Nicholas SAMBANIS	Yale University (U.S.A.)
Dimitris XENAKIS	University of Crete (Greece)

Published twice a year (Spring - Autumn) by the **Centre for Hellenic Studies and Research Canada, -KEEK, the University of Crete, Centre of Intercultural and Migration Studies-EDIAMME, Department of Primary Education and the University of the Aegean Post-Graduate Program in «Political, Economic and International Relations in the Mediterranean», Department of Mediterranean Studies.**

Articles for publication, books for review and general correspondence should be addressed to Études helléniques/ Hellenic Studies:

**Centre for Hellenic Studies  
and Research Canada-KEEK  
C.P. 48571**

**1495 Van Horne, Outremont,  
(Québec), Canada, H2V 4T3**

**Tel: (514)276-7333**

**Fax: (514)4953072**

**E-mail: keekhellenic.studies@yahoo.com**

**University of Crete**

**Department of Primary Education, Centre of  
Intercultural and Migration Studies (EDIAMME)  
Rethymno University Campus  
Rethymno, 74100, Greece**

**Tel: +28310-77605, Fax: +28310-77636**

**E-mail: ediamme@edc.uoc.gr**

**http://www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr**

22Subscription orders, inquires, single orders and back issues should be addressed / could be obtained from this address also. *Études helléniques/ Hellenic Studies* is an interdisciplinary, bilingual (French - English) journal devoted to the study of issues prevailing among Greeks in both Greece proper and the numerous Greek communities abroad.

Subscription Rates/Frais d'abonnement	One year/Un an	Europe (par virement)*
Individuals/Particuliers	\$ 50.00	50 €
Institutions	\$ 70.00	70 €
Support/Soutien	\$ 100.00	100 €

\* Compte chèques postaux à Paris: CCP no 2846134E020  
IBAN FR72 2004 1000 0128 4613 4E02 057  
BIC PSSTFRPPPAR

Revue publiée deux fois par an (Printemps-Automne) par le Centre de recherches helléniques Canada-KEEK, l'Université de Crète(Centre d'études interculturelles et de l'immigration-EDIAMME du Département d'Education Primaire) et l'Université de la Mer Egée (Programme d'études supérieures de deuxième et troisième cycle, «Sciences politiques, économiques, et relations internationales dans la Méditerranée», Département d'études méditerranéennes).

Tous les articles, les recensions et la correspondance générale doivent être adressés aux **Études helléniques / Hellenic Studies**, C.P. 48571, 1495 Van Horne, Outremont, (Québec), Canada, H2V 4T3, Tel: (514) 276-7333, Télécopieur: (514) 495-3072 (E-mail: k12414@er.uqam.ca). Pour les abonnements, les informations, pour tout numéro courant ou ancien de la revue, prière de vous adresser aux **Études helléniques / Hellenic Studies** à l'adresse ci dessus.

**Études helléniques / Hellenic Studies** est une revue interdisciplinaire bilingue (français-anglais) consacrée à la recherche: elle a pour objet l'étude de l'hellénisme tant de la Grèce que de la diaspora.

**Gutenberg Publishing**  
**Didodou 37**  
**Athens 10680**  
**Tel.: 210-3808334**  
**Fax: 210-3642030**  
**e-mail: info@dardanosnet.gr**

Dépôt légal / Legal Deposit  
National Library of Canada  
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec  
2e trimestre 2007  
ISSN: 0824-8621

**Volume 23, No 2, 2015**

**Autumn / Automne 2015**

**Table des matières / Table of Contents**

**La diaspora grecque**

Stephanos Constantinides .....7

**The Greek Diaspora**

Stephanos Constantinides .....15

**L'éducation Grecque dans la Diaspora**

Michael Damanakis .....23

**A Global World Greek Lobby**

Stephanos Constantinides .....49

**Sir Basil Zaharoff (1849-1936). Le Mystérieux Grec-Ottoman**

Jean Catsiapis .....105

**The Transformation of the Greek American Press:**

**The National Herald 1915-1939**

Alexander Kitroeff .....125

**The Project "Greek Education Abroad"**

Michael Damanakis, Dionysia Kontoyiannis, Theodosia Michelakakis .....139

**Grecs et Philhellènes de France**

Jean Catsiapis .....163

**The Influence of Greek on other Languages**

George Kanarakis .....183

**Greek-Canadians write to Prime Minister Venizelos: Two letters from the Interwar Era**

Dimitrios Filippou .....193

**Les Notions de la Continuité et de Rupture dans le Post-Modernisme**

**Chypriote: Aspects de l'Antiquité dans L'œuvre Poétique de**

**Kyriakos Haralambidis**

Louiza Christodoulidou .....205

**Χρηστικό Λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας**

George Kanarakis .....223

**Poésie grecque**

.....227



# La diaspora Grecque

Stephanos Constantinides\*

Les Grecs constituent l'une des diasporas archétypales. Avec la diaspora juive et arménienne, la diaspora grecque a été considérée comme l'un des paradigmes de diasporas historiques. La diaspora grecque moderne apparaît après la chute de Constantinople (1453) avec la fuite d'un grand nombre de Grecs vers divers pays européens. Sur la base des différents critères, économiques, socioculturels, l'espace-temps et des critères surtout historiques, la diaspora grecque moderne peut être subdivisée en diaspora historique et diaspora migratoire. La première est recentrée sur la Méditerranée, l'Europe occidentale et la mer Noire, en particulier de la chute de Constantinople (milieu du 15<sup>e</sup> siècle), jusqu'à la catastrophe d'Asie mineure (1922), résultant d'événements et développements historiques. La diaspora migratoire (fin du 19<sup>e</sup> siècle jusqu'à présent) résulte des mouvements de population de l'État grec, principalement pour des raisons économiques (mais aussi des mouvements de la diaspora historique, principalement pour des raisons politiques) à l'Europe de l'Ouest, aux États-Unis, au Canada et en Australie.<sup>1</sup>

Toutefois, selon une classification plus traditionnelle, la période de 1453 à ce jour peut être subdivisée en période post-byzantine (1453-1830, le temps de la fondation de l'État grec) et la période moderne (1830- jusqu'à présent). Dans la période mentionnée ci-dessus, trois subdivisions sont introduites: de 1830 au début de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, à partir du milieu de la décennie de 1940 à 1980, ainsi que la période actuelle de nouvelle immigration en raison de la crise économique.<sup>2</sup>

La diaspora grecque a toujours été et continue aujourd'hui d'être une partie importante de l'hellénisme. En effet, les Grecs ont toujours été des gens diasporiques. Même lorsque la Grèce est devenue, un pays d'immigration à compter des années 1990, il y eu des Grecs, principalement dans les domaines de la science, qui ont choisi de faire carrière en dehors des frontières grecques.

\* Centre de recherches helléniques Canada-KEEK



Avec la crise économique de 2010 on assiste à la reprise d'une immigration massive des Grecs en même temps que le pays accueille des milliers de nouveaux immigrants et réfugiés.

Jusqu'à récemment, l'étude de la diaspora grecque était un domaine négligé par les sciences sociales, et même aujourd'hui encore, en dépit des progrès importants réalisés dans son étude, celle-ci est le plus souvent étudiée de façon fragmentée. Les universités grecques offrent des possibilités limitées d'étude de cette matière au sein de leurs programmes et peu d'institutions de recherche s'occupent de ce domaine. Certains instituts de recherche qui ont par moments produit un important travail dans ce domaine, ont échoué à survivre, essentiellement en l'absence de ressources financières. L'Etat grec officiel, malgré quelques efforts dans la période qui a suivi la chute de la dictature pour faire face de façon sérieuse aux problèmes de la diaspora par son étude, n'a jamais eu une politique systématique et à long-terme envers elle. Les scientifiques impliqués dans son étude et qui ont produit un travail important, l'ont fait plus pour leur propre intérêt et souvent en parallèle avec leur emploi scientifique principal. Des études importantes ont été également réalisées dans des pays hôtes par des scientifiques grecs de cette diaspora ou par des scientifiques nationaux dans le cadre de leurs études plus larges sur la migration dans leurs pays.

Sur le plan purement épistémologique et méthodologique de nombreux problèmes ont à peine été abordés, bien que ces dernières années on a vu se développer un intérêt relativement important à leur égard. Les problèmes épistémologiques et méthodologiques ne concernent pas seulement l'histoire de la diaspora grecque, mais dans une certaine mesure d'autres sciences sociales qui étudient divers aspects de la diaspora: la science politique lorsqu'elle étudie la diaspora grecque en tant que lobby, moteur de pression pour faire avancer les intérêts grecs, la sociologie par l'étude des problèmes d'assimilation et d'intégration ou encore les sciences pédagogiques lors de l'examen des méthodes d'enseignement de la langue grecque comme langue seconde aux enfants de la diaspora grecque. Même l'économie lorsqu'elle examine la contribution de la diaspora au développement global de l'Etat grec, soit dans la période de la post-indépendance à une époque où une grande partie de la bourgeoisie grecque opérait en dehors des frontières grecques, soit pendant le 20e siècle lors de l'examen de la contribution de la marine grecque, qui s'active

en dehors des frontières grecques. Cependant sans la résolution de problèmes, autant épistémologiques que méthodologiques dans le domaine de l'histoire, il est très difficile de faire face à des problèmes spécifiques dans le domaine des autres disciplines.

La science historique grecque s'est intéressée très peu au phénomène migratoire en soi et par extension à celui de la diaspora grecque. La référence au phénomène de la diaspora a plus à voir avec l'irrédentisme pendant la période de la formation de l'État national grec qu'avec la diaspora elle-même. Elle est liée à l'étude de la contribution des communautés grecques diasporiques dans la lutte pour l'indépendance nationale de 1821. Dans ce contexte, par exemple, on fait référence à la création de la Société Amicale-Philiki Etaireia, à Odessa et à la préparation de la révolution grecque par une bourgeoisie émergente grecque dans la diaspora. Dans le même contexte, on a étudié aussi le Mouvement des Lumières grecques dans la diaspora. En général, l'historiographie grecque a montré un intérêt certain pour les communautés historiques de la diaspora, dans la mesure où on étudiait leur important rôle pour la création de l'État national grec. Au contraire elle a montré peu d'intérêt pour les communautés migratoires de la diaspora, créées après l'indépendance.

L'étude de la diaspora grecque de nos jours, ne peut être faite qu'en référence aux pays dans lesquels les Grecs sont actifs comme citoyens. En d'autres termes, le phénomène de la diaspora grecque est relié tant avec la Grèce comme pays d'origine qu'avec les pays hôtes des immigrants grecs.

C'est ainsi qu'au 20<sup>e</sup> siècle et en particulier après 1922, on peut parler désormais de deux composantes de la diaspora grecque, la diaspora historique et la diaspora migratoire. Par diaspora historique on couvre l'hellénisme des communautés historiques et celui qui a survécu dans certains de ses foyers historiques (pays de la mer Noire, l'Épire du Nord, etc.). Par diaspora migratoire on couvre les communautés créées après la création de l'État grec et surtout la diaspora transatlantique au Canada et aux États-Unis, celle de l'Australie et celle de l'Europe occidentale.

Sur la base de ces observations, nous pourrions placer les débuts de la diaspora grecque moderne dans la période suivant la chute de Constantinople en 1453. La migration grecque de cette période à partir de l'Empire ottoman, a conduit à la création progressive des communautés grecques historiques formées entre

le 15ème et le 19ème siècle. Cette longue période qui comprend aussi une grande partie du 19ème siècle après la création de l'Etat grec, est celle de la diaspora historique. La seconde grande période de la diaspora grecque se situe après la création de l'Etat grec. Plus précisément, cette deuxième phase pourrait être située dans les deux dernières décennies du 19ème siècle, quand l'immigration grecque était dirigée vers le Nouveau Monde. Il s'agit de la diaspora migratoire qui a des caractéristiques complètement différentes de la diaspora historique des siècles précédents. Entre ces deux catégories, il y a une zone grise qui va de la création de l'Etat grec en 1830 jusqu'à la fin du 19ème siècle. Pendant cette période avant que ne commence la migration vers le Nouveau Monde, les immigrants Grecs se dirigent vers les centres connus de la diaspora de l'Europe occidentale et de la Méditerranée orientale, vers la Russie du Sud et la région du Caucase. Les communautés créées dans ces régions relèvent essentiellement de la diaspora historique, bien qu'elles présentent certaines caractéristiques que nous rencontrons plus tard dans les communautés de la diaspora migratoire.

À l'ère de la diaspora historique, quand le Centre national n'existait pas, les communautés grecques avaient réussi à maintenir un réseau dense de contacts grâce notamment au commerce. Les routes commerciales étaient simultanément des voies de communication pour les communautés grecques. Ce réseau des contacts est devenu encore plus important grâce à des intellectuels et des échanges culturels qui existaient entre les communautés. Celui-ci était renforcé également avec des journaux et des magazines qui étaient publiés dans plusieurs villes européennes, et étaient disponibles dans presque toutes les communautés. La même chose se manifeste aussi avec la publication des plusieurs livres en langue grecque. Outre les réseaux commerciaux et culturels qui reliaient de façon permanente les communautés de la diaspora grecque de cette période, il faut mentionner également le rôle important de l'Eglise qui a tenu ensemble les communautés entre elles et le Patriarcat œcuménique en tant que référence quasi nationale. Ce réseau ecclésiastique a continué d'exister même lorsque les intellectuels des Lumières avec leurs idées libérales sont venus en opposition avec l'idéologie conservatrice de l'Eglise. D'ailleurs, il y avait des membres du clergé qui n'ont pas hésité à embrasser les idées modernistes des Lumières.

Dans la diaspora migratoire les réseaux de contacts étaient beaucoup plus difficiles à créer en raison de sa distance avec le pays d'origine, à cause de sa

composition sociale et du fait qu'elle était principalement d'origine paysanne avec un niveau d'éducation très bas. Plus tard, cette diaspora a créé aussi des réseaux pertinents grâce à la puissance économique acquise et à son développement culturel. Aujourd'hui, à l'ère de la mondialisation et du cyberspace, les contacts entre les différents réseaux de la diaspora et le centre national sont devenus beaucoup plus faciles et abordables.

Dans ce volume il n'y a pas de thématique spécifique mais on aborde différents chapitres de la vie de la diaspora grecque, tels l'éducation, le lobby, la presse, les politiques du Centre envers la diaspora à l'époque de la crise, références et repères historiques de la diaspora etc.

Michael Damanakis dans son article dresse un tableau de l'éducation en langue grecque à la fois dans le cadre des structures communautaires des Grecs de la diaspora et dans les systèmes éducatifs officiels des pays d'accueil. Après avoir présenté un bref historique des politiques éducatives de l'État grec auprès de la diaspora, il s'arrête sur la situation actuelle et les problèmes provoqués par la crise économique grecque. Pour conclure, l'auteur se demande si l'éducation de la langue grecque dans la diaspora est menacée en raison de la crise traversée à l'ère actuelle par le Centre national.

Stephanos Constantinides dresse le portrait du lobby grec à travers le monde, en insistant plus particulièrement sur le lobby helléno-américain. Il examine sa structure et son fonctionnement et surtout sa contribution à faire avancer les intérêts grecs auprès de gouvernements de pays où s'activent d'importantes communautés grecques. C'est essentiellement le cas de l'important lobby grec aux États-Unis et secondairement dans d'autres pays, tels l'Australie, le Canada et l'Europe occidentale. L'auteur note en particulier la mobilisation de la communauté chypriote de Grande Bretagne en faveur de Chypre et contre l'occupation turque d'une partie de l'île.

Jean Catsiapis écrit sur Basil Zaharoff, le mystérieux Grec-Ottoman, le célèbre marchand de canons de la Première Guerre mondiale qui a vécu une vie pleine de mystères, et s'efforce de les décrypter. Ami des dirigeants politiques de la Grèce et de la France, il a su servir les intérêts de ces pays tout en réalisant des profits financiers personnels des conflits armés dans lesquels il s'est impliqué. Basil Zaharoff, considéré, à cette époque, comme l'homme le plus riche du monde, a su préserver toute sa vie le secret de ses origines et de sa vie personnelle.

Alexander Kitroeff écrit sur la presse de langue grecque aux Etats-Unis, dans la première moitié du XXe siècle, créée par plusieurs personnes ayant de fortes affiliations avec les deux grands mouvements politiques grecs de l'époque, les vénizélistes libéraux et les pro-royalistes conservateurs. Initialement créés comme les organes de ces deux blocs idéologiques, les journaux ont peu à peu été adaptés aux réalités de leur environnement américain. En étudiant la correspondance de Demetrios Callimaque, le légendaire rédacteur en chef du quotidien *Ethnikos Keryx*, de langue grecque, basé à New York, l'auteur de cet article examine comment ce journal a essayé de s'adapter à la situation grecque américaine et en même temps de rester fidèle à ses racines idéologiques. Ce faisant, il révèle la façon dont un important journal grec-américain a fait sa transition d'une réflexion sur la Grèce vers celle des Grecs Américains.

L'article de Michael Damanakis, Dionysia Kontoyianni et Theodosia Michelakaki décrit le processus de mise en œuvre et d'évaluation du programme de recherche "Education en Diaspora" comme une tentative par le Ministère grec de l'éducation d'initier une politique de l'enseignement de la langue et de la civilisation grecques dans la diaspora, conformément à la loi n° 2413/1996. Le réseau de partenaires de cette action, la planification et la mise en œuvre de la politique, les difficultés et les problèmes qui sont apparus en route et les résultats de chaque action du programme, décrits et interprétés montrent la logique d'intervention de l'État grec dans la diaspora.

Le texte se meut dans la logique de l'évaluation d'un effort historique d'assistance de 15 ans pour l'enseignement de la langue grecque, à travers le regard des acteurs clés, en particulier du responsable scientifique, des collaborateurs issus de la diaspora et des administrateurs du programme.

Dans un article sur les Grecs de France, Jean Catsiapis insiste sur la faiblesse, la politisation et la division des Grecs de France qui forment une communauté forte de seulement 35 000 membres. Toutefois, on compte parmi ceux-ci beaucoup de personnes ayant acquis dans le domaine politique ou culturel une notoriété certaine. Ce sont cependant les Philhellènes de France, qui agissent le plus efficacement pour la défense de la Grèce affaiblie depuis plusieurs années par une crise économique sans précédent et afin d'assurer la sauvegarde de l'hellénisme, menacé notamment à Chypre.

George Kanarakis dans un article relatif à l'influence de la langue grecque sur les autres langues note que les linguistes acceptent qu'il n'y a pas de langues en contact qui sont complètement pures et libres des formes et des structures linguistiques transférées. L'influence de la langue grecque et sa contribution à d'autres langues est un phénomène historique et culturel d'intérêt international. Cet article met l'accent sur l'influence linguistique et socioculturelle diachronique de la langue grecque sur 28 autres langues dans le monde, comme l'illustre un travail collectif publié récemment. Les chercheurs ont éclairé nos connaissances sur ce sujet important et contribuent pratiquement à la planification et l'organisation de l'enseignement / apprentissage d'une langue seconde ou étrangère, fournissant un stimulus pour une exploration plus poussée et productive du sujet vital des contacts mondiaux interlangues et interculturels.

Dans un dernier article, Dimitrios Filippou présente deux lettres envoyées au Premier ministre grec de l'époque Eleftherios Venizelos, vers les années 1930, par deux immigrans grecs de Montréal, pour demander son intervention afin de résoudre des problèmes de la communauté grecque. Ces lettres montrent l'attachement que ces premiers immigrants grecs du Canada nourrissaient envers leur mère patrie, dont ils attendaient toujours une aide pour faire face à leurs problèmes et surtout pour conserver leur langue, leur culture et leur religion.

#### NOTES

1. Stephanos Constantinides, "Greek Diaspora and History", in Michael Damanakis, Vasilis Kardassis, Theodosia Mihelakakis, Antonis Hourdakakis, *History of the Greek Diaspora, Research and Teaching, Proceedings of the Conference on the Greek Diaspora*, vol. A, p.45-49 EDIAMME, University of Crete, 2004 [In Greek].  
Michael Damanakis, "The National Centre, the Diaspora and Education", *Études helléniques/Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Autumn 2005b): 27-62.
2. Among others, see J.K. Hassiotis, *Review of the History of Modern Diaspora*, Thessaloniki, Vaniis publishing 1993 [In Greek], Nikos Psyroukis, *The Neohellenic Community Phenomenon*, Athens: Epikairoitita, 1977 [In Greek].



# The Greek Diaspora

Stephanos Constantinides\*

The Greeks constitute one of the archetypal diasporas. Along with the Jewish and the Armenian, the Greek diaspora has been considered one of the paradigmatic historical diasporas. The Modern Greek Diaspora appears after the fall of Constantinople (1453) with the fleeing of large numbers of Greeks to various European countries. On the basis of the various economic, sociocultural, space-time and especially historical criteria, the period of the modern Greek diaspora can be subdivided in two. On one hand into the *historical diaspora*, focused on the Mediterranean, Western Europe and the Black Sea, especially from the fall of Constantinople (mid-15<sup>th</sup> century) mainly to the Asia Minor Catastrophe (1922), resulting from historical events and developments and on the other hand the *immigrant diaspora* (late 19<sup>th</sup> century until now) due to population movements from the Greek state, mainly for economic reasons (but also movements from the historical diaspora mainly for political reasons) to Western Europe, USA, Canada and Australia.<sup>1</sup> However, according to a more traditional classification the period from 1453 to this day can be subdivided into the *post-Byzantine period* (1453-1830, time of the foundation of the free Greek State) and the *Modern* (1830- to the present). Within the aforementioned period, other subdivisions are introduced: from 1830 to the start of World War II and from the middle of the decade of 1940 to the 1980s, as well as the present period of new immigration in relation to the economic crisis.<sup>2</sup>

The Greek diaspora has always been and continues today to be an important part of Hellenism. This is because the Greeks have always been a diasporic people. Even when Greece had become a country of immigration in the '90s, there were Greeks, mainly from the fields of science, who chose careers outside the Greek borders. With the economic crisis of 2010 and after, resumed a massive immigration of Greeks at the same time that the country welcomes thousands of new immigrants and refugees.

\* Centre for Hellenic Studies and Research Canada-KEEK



Until recently, the study of the Greek diaspora was a neglected area, but even today, despite the significant progress made in this area, the study of this field remains mostly fragmented. Greek universities offer limited study capabilities within their programs and extremely very few little research institutions are involved in this field. Some research institutes in the diaspora which produced important work occasionally, failed to survive in the absence mainly of financial resources. The official Greek state despite some efforts in the period after the fall of the dictatorship to seriously address the existence of the Diaspora, never had a long-term and systematic policy towards it. Scientists involved with the Greek diaspora and who produced important work did it more with their own interest and often in parallel with their main scientific employment. Important also studies of the Greek diaspora were done in several host countries by Greek scholars of that diaspora or foreign researchers through studies on migration in their countries.

In purely epistemological and methodological levels many problems have hardly been discussed, although recent years have seen a relatively strong interest around them. The epistemological and methodological problems concern exist not only for the history of the Greek Diaspora, but to a lesser or greater extent, and in other social sciences dealing with the diaspora. Political science, for instance, when considering the Greek diaspora as a lobby for the Greek interests, sociology when considering the problems of assimilation and integration, or pedagogical sciences when considering methods of teaching the Greek language as a second language to children of Greek diaspora. Even economics when considering the contribution of diaspora to the overall development of the Greek state, either in the post-independence period when a large part of the Greek bourgeoisie operates outside Greek borders, either in the present age when examining the contribution of Greek shipping, which is active outside Greek borders. But without solving epistemological and methodological problems in the area of history is very difficult to deal with specific problems in the field of other disciplines.

The Greek historical science was interested little in the migratory phenomenon in itself and therefore to the Greek diaspora at large, as a whole. The reference to the Diaspora phenomenon has more to do with the preparation of the struggle for independence, than by the diaspora itself. It is connected with the study of the contribution of the Greek diasporic communities in the national resurrection

of 1821. In this context it refers to the establishment of the Filiki Etaireia (Society of Friends) in Odessa and the preparation of the Greek war of independence, in the premises of the communities, by the emerging Greek bourgeoisie. In the same context the flourishing of Greek enlightenment in the area of the same communities has been studied and is studied. Generally the Greek historiography showed interest in Hellenism's historical communities, the historical diaspora, since their role was important for the creation of the Greek nation state. On the contrary the interest for migrant communities, the immigrant diaspora, created after the Greek independence was from limited to non-existent.

The study of the Greek diaspora nowadays can be done only with reference to the geographical areas in which Greeks are active citizens of Greek origin of these various countries. In other words, the Greek diaspora phenomenon is interrelated with both Greece as a country of origin or reference but also with the countries where the historical and immigrant Greek communities have developed under certain conditions.

We can speak of two components in the Greek diaspora, the historical one of the Greek Communities created out of the borders of the Ottoman Empire and the diasporic migration after the creation of the Greek State. By the term historical diaspora we cover the Hellenism of historical communities and that of the Greeks who survived in some historical foci (Black Sea countries, Northern Epirus, etc.). By the term migration diaspora we cover the communities created after the establishment of the Greek state and primarily the transatlantic diaspora in Canada, USA, Australia and Western Europe.

Based on these observations we could place, as it was previously mentioned, the beginnings of the modern Greek diaspora in the period following the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The Greek diaspora of this period led to the gradual creation of the historical Greek communities formed between the 15th and 19th century. In this long period, which includes a large part of the 19th century after the creation of the Greek state, developed the historical diaspora. The second great period of Greek diaspora is placed after the creation of the Greek state. Specifically, this second period relates to the last two decades of the 19th century when Greek immigration was more directed towards the so-called New World. It is the migration diaspora with different characteristics than that of the corresponding historical one of the preceding century. Of course between these

two categories there is a gray area that extends from the creation of the Greek state in 1830 until almost the end of the 19th century. In this period before starting the migration to the New World, Greeks are routed apart from the known Diaspora centers of Western Europe to the Eastern Mediterranean, South Russia and the Caucasus region. The communities created in these areas fall substantially in the historical diaspora although they present some elements that we find later in the communities of the migrant diaspora.

In the era of historical diaspora, when there was no national centre, the Greek communities had managed to maintain a dense network of contacts thanks mainly to trade. The trade routes were simultaneously communication paths of Greek communities. This networking became more important thanks to intellectuals and cultural exchanges that existed between the communities. It was also strengthened by the publication of newspapers and magazines in several European cities but which were available in almost all communities. The same was also happening with the important publishing activity in the book area. Apart from the commercial and cultural networks that kept a permanent and constant contact with the various elements of the Greek diaspora of this period, important was also the role of the Church which held together the communities among themselves and with the Ecumenical Patriarchate as a reference. This ecclesiastical networking did not stop even when the intellectuals of the Enlightenment came in sharp contrast to the liberal ideas of the conservative ideology that emitted the official Church. Besides, there were clerics who did not hesitate to embrace the modernist ideas of the Enlightenment.

In this diasporic migration the networking was much more difficult and because of the distances and because of the social composition, since these migrants were of agricultural origin. Later, of course, this diaspora has also achieved one relevant networking since it acquired economic power and cultural reach. Nowadays, in the age of globalization and cyberspace, contacts between the various diaspora networks and the national center have become much easier and affordable.

In this volume there is no specific thematic approach but different chapters on aspects of the Greek diaspora, such as education, the lobby, the press, the Centre's policies towards the Diaspora in the time of crisis, historical references and landmarks on diaspora etc.

Michael Damanakis in his article draws a picture of Greek language education both within the community structures of the Greeks of the Diaspora and the official educational systems of the host country. After a brief presentation of the history of educational policies of the Greek state towards the Diaspora, he addresses the current situation and the problems caused by the Greek crisis. To conclude the author asks if the Greek language education in the diaspora is endangered due to the crisis in the National Centre.

Stephanos Constantinides dresses a portrait of the Global World Greek Lobby with special reference to the Greek American lobby. The author examines its structure and functioning, and especially its contribution to advancing the Greek interests with the governments of those countries with large Greek communities. This is mainly the case of the important Greek lobby in the United States and secondarily in other countries, such as Australia, Canada and Western Europe. The author notes in particular the mobilization of the Cypriot community in Britain, for Cyprus and against the Turkish occupation of a part of the island.

Jean Catsiapis in his article presents Basil Zaharoff, the famous arms dealer of World War I who lived a life full of mysteries which the author endeavoured to decipher. As a friend of political leaders of Greece and France, he was able to serve the interests of these countries while achieving personal financial gain in the armed conflicts in which he was involved. Basil Zaharoff, considered in his time the richest man in the world, has preserved all his life the secret of his origins and his personal life.

Alexander Kitroeff presents the Greek language press in the United States in the first half of the twentieth century which was established by several individuals with strong affiliations with the two major Greek political sides, the liberal venizelists and the conservative pro-royalists. The newspapers, initially formed as the organs of those two ideological blocks, gradually had to adapt to the realities of their American environment. By examining the correspondence of Demetrios Callimachos, the legendary editor-in-chief of the New York-based Greek language daily *Ethnikos Keryx* this article examines how that newspaper tried to adapt to the situation Greek Americans faced and also remain loyal to its ideological roots. In doing so it reveals the ways one important Greek American newspaper began transitioning from a reflection of Greece into a mirror of Greek America.

The article of Michael Damanakis, Dionysia Kontoyiannis and Theodosia Michelakakis describes the implementation process and the evaluation of the research program “Greek Education Abroad”. The program is an attempt by the Greek Ministry of Education to implement education policy for Greek language in the diaspora, as envisaged in the Law. 2413/1996. The partner network development, planning and implementation, the difficulties and problems that emerged and the results of each action of the program, as described and interpreted indicate the outlines of the logic of intervention of the Greek State towards the diaspora.

The text moves within the logic of the historical evaluation of a 15-year assistance effort in Greek language education from the perspective of key players, particularly the scientific responsables and program managers.

The article of Jean Catsiapis on Greeks in France, which form a community of only 35 000 members, emphasizes their weakness, politicization and the division. However, amongst them many have acquired notoriety in the political or cultural field. These are the Philhellenes of France, who act most effectively to defend in recent years a weakened Greece affected by an unprecedented economic crisis and to ensure the safeguarding of Hellenism which is especially threatened in Cyprus.

Linguists accept, according to George Kanarakis, that no languages in contact are completely pure and free of transferred language forms and structures. The Greek language’s influence and contribution to other languages is a historical-cultural phenomenon of international interest. This article focuses on the diachronic linguistic and sociocultural influence of the Greek language on 28 other languages of the world as illustrated in the collective work *Η διαχρονική συμβολή της Ελληνικής σε άλλες γλώσσες* [The diachronic contribution of Greek to other languages]. The 34 studies by 32 participating scholars enlighten our knowledge on this important subject, contribute practically to the planning and organisation of second or foreign language teaching/learning, and provide a stimulus for further productive exploration of the vital subject of global interlanguage-intercultural contact.

In a final section, Dimitrios Filippou presents two letters to the Greek Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos, in the 1930s, by two Greek immigrants in Montreal, who ask for his intervention to solve the problems of the Greek

community. The letters show the commitment that these first Greek immigrants in Canada had to the motherland, still waiting for help to deal with their problems and especially to preserve their language, culture and religion.

### NOTES

1. Stephanos Constantinides, "Greek Diaspora and History", in Michael Damanakis, Vasilis Kardassis, Theodosia Mihelakakis, Antonis Hourdakos, *History of the Greek Diaspora, Research and Teaching, Proceedings of the Conference on the Greek Diaspora*, vol. A, p.45-49 EDIAMME, University of Crete, 2004 [In Greek].  
Michael Damanakis, "The National Centre, the Diaspora and Education", *Études helléniques/Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Autumn 2005b): 27-62.
2. Among others, see J.K. Hassiotis, *Review of the History of Modern Diaspora*, Thessaloniki, Vaniak Publishing 1993 [In Greek], Nikos Psyroukis, *The Neohellenic Community Phenomenon*, Athens: Epikairota, 1977<sup>4</sup> [In Greek].



# L'éducation Grecque dans la Diaspora

Michael Damanakis\*

## ABSTRACT

This article makes a synoptic presentation of Greek language education both within the community structures of the Greeks of the Diaspora and the official educational systems of the host country. After presenting a brief history of educational policies of the Greek state towards the Diaspora, the author stops at the current situation and the problems caused by the Greek crisis. At the end of the article the author wonders if the Greek language education in the diaspora is endangered due to the crisis in the National Centre.

## RÉSUMÉ

L'auteur de cet article dresse un tableau de l'éducation en langue grecque à la fois dans le cadre des structures communautaires des Grecs de la diaspora et dans les systèmes éducatifs officiels des pays d'accueil. Après avoir présenté un bref historique des politiques éducatives de l'État grec auprès de la diaspora, il se penche sur la situation actuelle et aux problèmes provoqués par la crise grecque. Pour conclure l'auteur se demande si l'éducation de la langue grecque dans la diaspora est menacée en raison de la crise traversée par le Centre national.

## Avant-Propos

Le but de cet article est de dresser un tableau de l'éducation en langue grecque à la fois dans le cadre des structures communautaires des Grecs de la diaspora et dans les systèmes éducatifs officiels des pays d'accueil.

Toutefois, les pratiques lancées par le ministère grec de l'Éducation, durant l'année scolaire 2010-2011 et entérinées par la loi 4027 de novembre 2011 (*L'éducation de la langue grecque à l'étranger* et d'autres dispositions, Journal officiel 233, section A, 04 novembre 2011), marquent la «fin d'une ère» pour les politiques éducatives du Centre envers la diaspora-mais pas pour l'éducation de la langue grecque dans la diaspora. On a jugé approprié de présenter un bref

\* Université de Crète



historique des politiques éducatives de l'État grec afin de comprendre comment on a pu arriver à la situation actuelle et ce que cela signifie pour l'enseignement de la langue grecque à l'étranger.

L'approche historique tentée dans la première partie de l'article est fondée sur le point de vue du Centre national. Au contraire, le tableau de la situation actuelle, dans la deuxième partie de cet article, est présenté à la fois du point de vue du Centre et celle des pays de la diaspora.

Le texte se termine par cette question: l'éducation de langue grecque dans la diaspora est-elle menacée en raison de la crise traversée par le Centre national?

## **Clarifications conceptuelles**

Pour une meilleure compréhension nous jugeons indispensable de clarifier les concepts suivants:

### ***Hellénisme migratoire***

*Hellénisme migratoire* ou hellénisme de migration vs. hellénisme de la diaspora: Les termes «apodimos ellinismos» hellénisme migratoire sont des termes administratifs, souvent utilisés dans les documents institutionnels. Au sens étroit et littéral ceux-ci se réfèrent et se limitent aux Grecs de la diaspora migratoire, suggérant même que ces Grecs peuvent être rapatriés. Néanmoins le même terme est utilisé conventionnellement pour se référer à l'ensemble de l'hellénisme à l'étranger. Inversement, le terme hellénisme de la diaspora se réfère à une situation déjà bien établie, qui est le résultat du déplacement des populations grecques depuis le milieu du 15<sup>e</sup> siècle à aujourd'hui, soit en raison des expulsions (transferts forcés) soit à la suite d'une migration «volontaire». Dans cet article, on a préféré l'utilisation du terme de diaspora.

### ***Diaspora***

Le terme diaspora signifie la dispersion spatiale des groupes ethniques qui sont coupés, mais pas nécessairement éloignés de l'origine du groupe / référence, ou le tronc ethnique commun, vivant comme des groupes ethniques dans une société culturellement différente, se déplaçant entre deux groupes de référence, entre deux systèmes culturels; et par conséquent leur identité est donc formée dans des conditions particulières.

La diaspora historique: ce terme se réfère à la diaspora des communautés commerciales historiques et généralement des communautés qui ont été créées pendant les années de l'Empire ottoman à sa périphérie, et comprend actuellement les vestiges de ces communautés (paroikies), principalement sur la mer Noire et dans le Caucase.

La diaspora migratoire ou de migration: ce terme se réfère à la migration de travail, ayant commencé vers 1890 et culminé dans les années 1960, et ayant abouti à la création de communautés de migration dans presque tous les continents.

## **Histoire des politiques éducatives du centre pour la diaspora dans le 20<sup>ème</sup> et 21<sup>ème</sup> siècle**

Comme on le sait, l'État national grec n'a pas le droit d'intervenir sur le territoire d'un autre État souverain et d'y exercer une politique éducative. Par conséquent, en vertu de la politique de l'éducation à long terme du Centre pour la diaspora cela signifie moins d'interférence directe organisationnelle-administrative mais plusieurs autres mesures du Centre qui peuvent affecter, directement ou indirectement, l'enseignement de la langue grecque dans la diaspora.

Dans les trente dernières années, par exemple, les politiques éducatives du gouvernement grec envers la diaspora se concentrent sur:

- l'affectation des enseignants
- le développement et l'envoi de matériel éducatif
- la nomination des conseillers pédagogiques auprès de la diaspora

Ces politiques visent moins à l'adoption de dispositions juridiques.

### ***1.1. Brève histoire jusqu' à la fin de la guerre civile (1900-1950)***

La Grèce avant les guerres balkaniques est encore dans le processus d'ethnogenèse, c'est-à-dire de récupération des territoires sous domination ottomane et de libération des Grecs du joug ottoman.

Les possibilités d'intervention du Centre national dans les politiques éducatives de la diaspora sont en vertu de cette situation limitées et même

inexistantes, et dans une certaine mesure inutiles en raison de la solidité financière des communautés commerciales et de l'hellénisme, en particulier celles de Constantinople (Polis) et des îles Ioniennes.

L'esprit qui prévaut à ce moment historique, et en matière d'éducation est celui de l'«irrédentisme», qui est corroboré par diverses sources, par exemple par l'organisation de la «Première Conférence éducative grecque» qui a eu lieu du 31 mars jusqu'au 4 avril 1904, à Athènes, et à laquelle ont pris part les délégués grecs, des territoires sous domination ottomane et de la diaspora en général.

Après les guerres balkaniques et l'intégration de nouveaux territoires à l'État national grec, se produit une introversion nationale qui s'explique par le fait que l'État-nation géographiquement élargi, essaie de forger une cohérence intérieure.

Dans le même temps, continue d'opérer la Grande Idée, qui, en combinaison avec le nationalisme turc agressif, conduit à la catastrophe d'Asie Mineure et à la contraction drastique de l'hellénisme de la périphérie.

L'issue de la seconde guerre mondiale et surtout le résultat de la guerre civile grecque ont créé de nouvelles circonstances et de nouveaux besoins. Plus précisément, l'hellénisme de l'Union soviétique a été négligé par le Centre national après la création de deux «blocs», Ouest-Est, et de la guerre froide qui a suivi.

D'autre part, les réfugiés politiques de la guerre civile ont créé de nouvelles communautés dans les pays socialistes d'Europe et ont renforcé avec des ressources humaines les communautés existantes dans le Caucase et en Transcaucasie. Les enfants de réfugiés politiques avaient des besoins éducatifs qui, cependant, pour des raisons évidentes, ont été ignorés par le Centre national (voir Th. Mitsopoulos, *Nous sommes restés Grecs- Les écoles grecques de réfugiés politiques dans les pays socialistes*, Athènes, 1979.)

Quant aux communautés de migration, soulignons que celles-ci, surtout après le «krach financier» à la fin des années 1920, qui a limité l'immigration, ne sont plus renouvelées et sont progressivement incorporées dans les sociétés des pays hôtes. Elles soutiennent, cependant, en utilisant leurs propres ressources, leur enseignement spécifique de la langue grecque. Nous faisons référence à deux exemples des écoles historiques (qui fonctionnent encore aujourd'hui), l'école Socrate à Chicago, fondée en 1908, et l'école Socrate à Montréal, fondée en 1909, avec le nom original Platon.

Pour résumer et présenter de façon succincte l'évolution de la diaspora grecque, nous pouvons soutenir que dès la première moitié du 20<sup>e</sup> siècle, les communautés commerciales n'existent plus. L'hellénisme régional a diminué jusqu'à disparaître, et dans la mesure où celui-ci existe encore se limite à la mer Noire et se trouve pratiquement oublié. Les communautés de migration existent, mais le Centre national ne traite pas avec elles parce que trop préoccupé par ses propres problèmes économiques, sociaux et surtout de politique interne. Si des mesures de soutien à l'éducation de la diaspora sont prises parfois, celles-ci sont occasionnelles et surtout liées à la formation des enseignants par le Centre ainsi qu'à leur mise à sa disposition.

### ***1.2. La grande émigration et les nouveaux besoins éducatifs (1952-1973)***

Dans la seconde moitié du 20<sup>ème</sup> siècle, la situation a radicalement changé en raison de la forte émigration. A partir de 1952 environ 1,5 million de Grecs ont émigré vers l'Australie, le Canada et les Etats Unis, et aussi après 1958 vers les pays d'Europe du nord et l'Europe centrale, l'Allemagne occupant la première place. La présence massive d'élèves d'origine grecque dans les écoles des pays d'accueil a créé de nouveaux besoins et défis éducatifs, pour les gouvernements des pays d'accueil et aussi pour la Grèce.

La Grèce a commencé, au milieu des années 1960, le transfert d'enseignants vers les pays d'accueil. Elle a aussi envoyé du matériel éducatif (le même que celui utilisé en Grèce, car il n'y en avait pas d'autre) et a nommé un conseiller pédagogique à l'ambassade de Grèce à Bonn, qui surveillait l'éducation de la langue grecque en Allemagne, et à un degré moindre dans le reste de l'Europe. Pendant cette période, les politiques éducatives du Centre ont été limitées à la diaspora migratoire. L'hellénisme de la diaspora historique en mer Noire est mis de côté en raison des conditions de la guerre froide et l'inclusion de la Grèce dans le «bloc occidental».

Dans tous les cas, cependant, on peut voir que, pendant cette période, le Centre adopte des mesures en matière d'éducation de la langue grecque dans la diaspora.

### ***1.3. La période de la dictature (1967-1974)***

Ces actions du Centre ont été marquées, cependant, par l'arrivée de la dictature en Grèce. Essentiellement, la première mesure législative, après le grand exode, est prise par le gouvernement de la junte en 1970. Avec le projet de loi 695/1970 sont entreprises une tentative de «transplantation» du système éducatif grec et l'exportation de l'idéologie de la junte dans les pays avec une présence massive de populations grecques.

Les gouvernements des colonels ont essayé de créer des têtes de pont «politiques» dans les pays ayant une présence massive des Grecs, en utilisant comme outil l'éducation. En particulier dans la zone de l'Europe ces opérations ont été très fortes et brutales. En Allemagne, par exemple, la junte a créé la fameuse «Association des Grecs d'Allemagne», et a tenté de transplanter le système éducatif grec là-bas, et d'y transférer des enseignants adeptes de l'idéologie du «21 avril». En outre, les colonels ont réalisé des choix arbitraires et fait admettre leurs adeptes de ce pays dans des écoles pédagogiques en Grèce en les plaçant ensuite dans les structures de l'enseignement de la langue grecque en Allemagne.

Généralement, la junte a laissé des blessures et des divisions, en particulier en Europe, mais aussi dans une certaine mesure au Canada.

### ***1.4. La période de recherches (1974 -1995)***

Les gouvernements démocratiques élus dans la période d'après 1974, ceux de la Nouvelle Démocratie (ND) d'abord et plus tard ceux du PASOK ont essayé de guérir les «blessures» laissées par les autorités de la junte.

La préoccupation des gouvernements de Constantin Caramanlis pour les Grecs de la diaspora se reflète de la manière la plus officielle à l'article 108 de la Constitution de 1975, qui garantit l'obligation du Centre à «veiller à la vie de l'hellénisme de la diaspora».

Dans cet esprit, le ministère de l'Éducation a cherché pendant la deuxième moitié de la décennie de 1970, la préparation d'un projet de loi pour l'enseignement de la langue grecque dans la diaspora (mise en place d'une Commission à cet effet), mais sans résultat.

La loi 2413/1996, qui a remplacé celle de la junte (695/1970), a été élaborée

et adoptée plus tard, par les gouvernements du PASOK et le ministre Georges Papandréou.

La période d'après la restauration de la démocratie jusqu'à la promulgation de la loi 2413 en juin 1996, peut être caractérisée comme une période de questionnement parce que les gouvernements des deux partis ne disposaient pas d'une stratégie claire et d'objectifs précis.

Les gouvernements de la N.D. oscillent entre une politique visant à favoriser la résidence à l'étranger et un effort de rapatriement des nouveaux immigrants grecs, notamment en Europe, ainsi qu'une recherche de solutions en direction d'une «éducation bilingue»; pour leur part les gouvernements du PASOK ont semblé privilégier le rapatriement, ce qui a été prouvé comme étant utopique. Cette orientation, cependant, les a conduit à la création d'écoles purement grecques - dans des pays européens, en particulier en Allemagne - écoles qui soi-disant aideraient le retour au pays- et qui fonctionnent encore aujourd'hui (voir Damanakis *Les écoles grecques en Allemagne: passé, présent, futur, Gutenberg*, Athènes 2011, en grec).

Quand Georges Papandréou était ministre de l'Éducation a été créé, en 1988, un comité qui a abouti à une proposition concrète de proposer un projet de loi de sur l'«éducation des Grecs à l'étranger». Le projet de loi a été discuté avec les représentants des organisations de la diaspora, du 9 au 11 mars 1989 à une conférence tenue au Zappeion Megaron à Athènes. Le projet de loi a été déposé au Parlement grec, mais les passions politiques de l'époque n'ont pas permis la discussion et son adoption.

L'esprit de ce projet de loi est passé de la logique de «soins» à la relation à sens unique subséquente entre le Centre et la diaspora, dans la logique de la «relation interactive et égale» entre les deux.

Cette logique «révolutionnaire», pour le temps, a été fortement soutenue par le ministre de l'Éducation et les gens de la diaspora eux-mêmes, même si elle n'était probablement pas encore la logique dominante au sein du parti au pouvoir, le PASOK.

La défaite du PASOK aux élections de novembre 1989, les passions politiques et l'instabilité politique de l'époque ont entraîné l'oubli du projet de loi pour l'«éducation grecque à l'étranger», puis pour y revenir en 1996 quand George Papandreou est redevenu ministre.

### ***1.5. La période de visions et de grandes attentes (1996-2009)***

En 1989, il y a eu des événements importants, qui peuvent être résumés dans la phrase «La chute du mur de Berlin.» L'effondrement du socialisme réel, en particulier en Union soviétique, a permis la restauration au premier plan de l'hellénisme de la diaspora historique. La «mère», la Grèce, a découvert ses enfants «perdus», qui avaient besoin d'aide, non seulement morale mais aussi matérielle. Cela a renforcé de facto la logique «privilegiée» de l'article 108 de la Constitution. Notez qu'en 1990 (loi 1893, article 8) a été instituée la «Fondation nationale pour l'accueil et la réintégration des Grecs rapatriés».

D'autre part, la «résurgence» de la diaspora historique rendait le terme hellénisme de migration politiquement inopportun et faible du point de vue de l'analyse. Ainsi, a été introduit progressivement le terme de diaspora, qui comprenait tous les Grecs de l'étranger, à l'exception de ceux de Constantinople et de l'Albanie.

La philosophie adoptée pour la première fois avec le projet de loi sur «l'éducation grecque à l'étranger» gagnait du terrain et devenait dominante, ce qui s'est traduit en 2001 au paragraphe 2 de l'article 108 de la Constitution, qui dispose: «*Questions relatives à l'organisation, au fonctionnement et aux pouvoirs du Conseil des Grecs de l'étranger, qui a la tâche d'exprimer toutes les forces de l'hellénisme dans le monde entier.*».

La période de deux ans 1995-1996 se caractérise par une activité législative intense du centre du fait que depuis ont été adoptées les lois suivantes:

1995 (13/06) Décret présidentiel 196/95, l'établissement et le fonctionnement du Conseil des Grecs de l'étranger.

1996 (18/03), Secrétariat spécial pour l'éducation des Grecs de l'étranger et de l'éducation interculturelle.

1996 (17/06), la loi 2413, L'éducation grecque à l'étranger, l'éducation interculturelle et d'autres dispositions.

1996 (17/06) Institut de l'éducation de la diaspora et d'éducation interculturelle (ÉDOPI).

1996 (08/07) Comité permanent spécial sur les Grecs à l'étranger du Parlement grec.

Ces mesures institutionnelles, combinées avec les assemblées solennelles du Conseil de Grecs de l'étranger (SAE), étaient l'expression de l'enthousiasme du Centre, touchant les limites d'un grand idéalisme et d'une sorte de tutelle, en particulier sur le SAE, qui avait par la suite des conséquences négatives pour son fonctionnement et son sort.

Dans le domaine de l'éducation trop de choses importantes se sont produites, en particulier après la promulgation de la loi 2413 «L'éducation grecque à l'étranger, l'éducation interculturelle et d'autres dispositions» (Gazette du gouvernement 124, vol. I, le 17 Juin, 1996).

Après l'effondrement du socialisme réel, la Grèce a reçu chaque année des milliers de «rapatriés Grecs» de l'ex-Union soviétique, mais aussi des immigrants en provenance des mêmes régions et des pays voisins des Balkans; ce qui a mis en évidence la question de l'éducation des élèves immigrants allophones dans le système éducatif grec. Ce problème est résolu par le chapitre I (éducation interculturelle) Loi 2413/96.

Bien sûr, le monde, après 1989 et la fin de la guerre froide, est devenu un autre monde et les Grecs de l'ex-Union soviétique ont vécu des situations qu'ils n'avaient jamais connues auparavant, traumatisantes dans certains cas en raison des guerres qui ont suivi. Dans le même temps, cependant, se sont offertes des occasions uniques pour promouvoir la langue grecque dans les systèmes éducatifs des anciennes républiques de l'Union soviétique, en particulier en Russie, en Ukraine et en Géorgie. Ces occasions, cependant, n'ont pas été saisies, parce que la loi 2413 ne contenait pas de dispositions à cet effet. La direction du ministère de l'Éducation de l'époque, dans sa course à la promotion de la loi au Parlement, a simplement complété le chapitre I et a omis de revoir le projet de loi 1989, à la lumière des nouvelles données de l'année 1996. Ainsi, le projet de loi a été mis à jour sur certains points - principalement administratifs- et a été envoyé au Parlement pour approbation.

Malgré l'omission sus citée, la nouvelle loi a ouvert de nouveaux horizons et de nouvelles perspectives. C'était une loi sur des horizons ouverts et extravertis. Grâce à sa mise en œuvre quatre programmes d'intervention «d'éducation interculturelle» ont été financés en 1997 - trois pour la Grèce en matière d'éducation a) des étudiants rapatriés et étrangers, b) des Roms et c) des musulmans et l'autre pour la diaspora grecque, «le programme d'éducation pour les expatriés (Παιδεία Ομογενών)».



Nous n'allons pas faire référence à l'«Éducation pour les expatriés» et à ses résultats, qui ont fait l'objet d'autres études, ensemble avec le matériel pédagogique produit spécifiquement pour l'enseignement de la langue grecque à l'étranger, et que l'on peut trouver sur le site du programme ([www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora)).

Nous notons, cependant, que cette loi est une «intervention» politique et éducative sans précédent de la part du Centre, dans la *logique de l'offre à la diaspora*.

Le Centre national par la loi 2413/96 s'est forcé lui-même à soutenir l'enseignement de la langue grecque dans la diaspora et à travers le programme «Éducation aux expatriés»; il a offert à l'éducation en langue grecque des cours spécialisés et des ensembles correspondants de matériel didactique pour l'enseignement du grec en tant que deuxième langue et langue étrangère et aussi des éléments d'enseignement de l'histoire et de la culture.

L'offre du Centre pour la diaspora ne se limitait pas, cependant, à la production et l'envoi de matériel didactique éducatif, mais incluait: le transfert de personnel enseignant dans les différentes institutions d'enseignement de la diaspora ainsi que la formation continue des enseignants détachés et expatriés, le placement des conseillers pédagogiques dans les ambassades grecques et les consulats, dans le monde entier - leur nombre a atteint les 25 - et aussi des programmes d'hospitalité des élèves.

Selon les déclarations de la ministre suppléante de l'Éducation au Parlement (Procès-verbal du 25 octobre, 2011), durant l'année scolaire 2009/10 le nombre d'enseignants détachés dans les écoles de la diaspora s'élevait à 2350 et le coût annuel de l'éducation hellénique à 106 millions d'euros.

En conclusion, nous pouvons affirmer que pendant les vingt années 1990-2010 la relation entre le Centre et la diaspora s'est caractérisé par l'euphorie et l'exubérance, alors quand est venu l'«effondrement» en 2010, le choc a été très grand.

### ***1.6. La période de «l'effondrement» et la réflexion souhaitée (2010-)***

Après le déclenchement de la crise en 2010 et l'imposition à la Grèce du «Mémoirendum», la direction du ministère de l'Éducation dans son effort

douloureux de réduire les dépenses pour l'enseignement de la langue grecque à l'étranger, n'a pas procédé seulement à la mesure familière de «coupures horizontales», appliquées déjà en 2010, mais aussi dans la hâte et sous la panique à la promulgation de la loi 4027/2011 (Education de langue grecque à l'étranger et d'autres dispositions, Journal officiel 233, section A, 4 novembre 2011).

Cette direction a aussi aboli l'Institut de l'éducation pour la diaspora et de l'éducation interculturelle (IPODE).

L'objectif économique de la loi 4027/2011 était de «réduire les coûts» et son objectif politique la «dépréciation des domaines d'action de l'État grec dans l'éducation de la langue grecque à l'étranger.

Plus précisément, dans les trois ans qui ont suivi, (2010-2013) le nombre d'enseignants détachés à la diaspora a dû être réduit à 1000, avec un maximum de 1100, et le coût de cet enseignement a été réduit à 55 millions d'euros.

Le désengagement d'un possible soutien de l'Etat grec à l'éducation de la diaspora a été une erreur cruciale de la loi 4027/2011, dont le leadership du ministère de l'Education a probablement pris conscience lorsque le projet de loi a été en discussion au Parlement. C'est pour cette raison que de petits changements ont eu lieu à la dernière minute, changements qui pour l'essentiel n'ont pas sauvé l'enseignement du grec dans la diaspora.

Pour des raisons de place on ne va pas analyser les contradictions et les faiblesses de la loi 4027/2011, et on se limitera à l'observation générale suivante: cette loi reste à ce jour lettre morte. La mise en œuvre des dispositions de la loi immédiatement applicables s'est accompagnée d'un coût politique, comme l'abolition des lycées grecs et essentiellement des écoles purement grecques en Allemagne (n. 4027/2011, article 5) qui a été reportée par décision ministérielle d'année en année.

D'autre part, l'objectif économique de «réduction des coûts» a été dans une certaine mesure déjà atteint avant la promulgation de la loi, par la réduction spectaculaire du nombre d'enseignants détachés dans la diaspora, puis a été complété par la suppression de leurs primes ainsi que par la «suspension» informelle, non-officielle, de l'impression et de l'envoi de matériel éducatif à l'étranger.

La loi 4027/2011 est phobique et défensive et ce qu'elle a fait a été pour

l'essentiel l'institutionnalisation de l'incapacité du Centre à soutenir l'enseignement de la langue grecque dans la diaspora. Elle ne propose rien de nouveau, n'ouvre pas des perspectives, et donc reste lettre morte.

## L'éducation de langue grecque dans la diaspora en 2014

Les analyses qui suivent s'appuient sur:

1. la recherche empirique mise en œuvre au printemps de 2011 pour quinze pays, dont les résultats ont été publiés dans un volume spécial intitulé *Education hellénique dans la diaspora: Les résultats d'une recherche empirique comme des conditions préalables pour le développement d'un environnement e-learning d'apprentissage*, sous la direction de M. Damanakis, E.DIA.M.ME, Rethymno 2014.
2. les rapports établis pour l'«Éducation interculturelle de langue grecque dans la diaspora», de nos collaborateurs (conseillers scientifiques) à l'étranger, au printemps de l'année 2014.

Les tableaux suivants montrent les exemples de la recherche empirique.

**Tableau 2.1.:** Echantillon d'unités d'enseignement par pays

A/A	Pays	Écoles	Unités des Cours de langue grecque
		N	N
1	Australie	4	15
2	Argentine	2	2
3	USA	6	11
4	Canada	2	12
5	Afrique du Sud	1	0
6	Allemagne	3	44
7	Suède	0	3
8	Ukraine	0	3
9	Russie	0	1

10	Turquie	3	0
11	Royaume-Uni	1	40
12	Belgique	0	6
13	Roumanie	0	5
14	Bulgarie	0	7
15	Albanie	8	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>149</b>

**Tableau 2.2.:** Exemples de parents, enseignants et élèves par pays

A/A	Pays	Questionnaires		
		Parents	Enseignants	Élèves
		N	N	N
1	Australie	300	51	1.074
2	Argentine	90	4	87
3	États-Unis	158	58	1.044
4	Canada	200	44	380
5	Afrique du Sud	233	17	128
6	Allemagne	523	60	907
7	Suède	40	1	77
8	Ukraine	-	43	160
9	Russie	122	14	123
10	Turquie	14	19	69
11	Royaume-Uni	127	38	237
12	Belgique	46	6	63
13	Roumanie	54	4	181
14	Bulgarie	17	9	
15	Albanie	-	17	164
<b>Total</b>		<b>1.924</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>4.694</b>

## Populations et échantillons

Le nombre réel de ces populations n'est pas exactement connu. Approximativement nous savons cependant que selon les statistiques du ministère de l'Éducation, durant l'année 2009/10 étaient en opération 1 249 unités d'enseignement avec 64 215 étudiants et 2 020 enseignants détachés.

Nos propres calculs, cependant, ont montré que le nombre d'étudiants est d'environ 25% plus élevé que celui affiché dans les statistiques du ministère de l'Éducation. Cependant, quoi qu'il arrive, la tentative de quantification précise de la population et de la sélection d'échantillons représentatifs est presque impossible.

Voilà pourquoi le choix de nos échantillons a été déterminé comme suit:

- a) les formes des écoles
- b) le nombre d'élèves
- c) le critère géographique.

Selon le premier critère ont été sélectionnés des pays qui disposaient autant d'unités scolaires autonomes - comme des écoles du jour, des écoles bilingues, etc. - que de cours de langue grecque à l'intérieur du système scolaire du pays d'accueil (cours de l'après-midi, du samedi etc...).

Sur la base du deuxième critère ont été sélectionnés des pays avec plus de 1000 étudiants.

Le critère géographique est venu, enfin, pour éviter l'exclusion de zones géographiques entières, tout simplement parce celles-ci ne répondaient pas aux deux premiers critères, et surtout n'étaient pas représentées dans les échantillons d'unités d'enseignement des centres urbains et des zones rurales.

Sur la base des critères ci-dessus ont été inclus dans cette étude les pays présentés dans le Tableau 2.1.

De ces premiers pays ont été comprises dans l'enquête, les unités d'enseignement qui faisaient déjà partie du réseau des écoles, qui a été mis en place sur la base des conclusions du premier atelier de travail de l'équipe du projet, rencontre qui a eu lieu le 11 et 12 mars 2011 à l'Université de Crète, à Rethymnon.

Ces unités d'enseignement ont été incluses dans l'enquête parce qu'elles agissaient comme des unités pilotes pour l'enseignement à distance (e-learning) et nous devrions donc avoir une image la plus complète possible de leurs potentiels en nombre d'élèves, d'enseignants, de programmes scolaires, de matériaux didactiques, de leur organisation et de leur infrastructure.

Voici les résultats les plus importants de cette enquête.

## ***2.1. Organisation - administration – finances***

### **2.1.1. Institutions et formes d'éducation**

Les organisations grecques qui dispensent l'enseignement du grec dans la diaspora peuvent être divisées en trois grandes catégories:

- a) les services éducatifs du pays de séjour
- b) les autorités éducatives du pays d'origine
- c) les services éducatifs de la communauté y compris ceux de l'église.

Des trois catégories des acteurs ci-dessus, la troisième est la dominante.

Alors que les formes dominantes de l'éducation de langue grecque sont:

- a) Les unités des cours de langue grecque
- b) Les écoles (de jour, bilingues, purement grecques, etc.).

**Tableau 2.3.:** Institutions et formes d’enseignement en langue grecque dans la diaspora

Organismes et formes	Organisations communautaires	Pays hôte	Pays d’origine	cours affiliés	
				Oui	Non
1. cours de l’après midi	X		X		X
2. cours affiliés dans le système local		X		X	
3. Les écoles grecques (pures)			X		X
4α. Écoles Bilingues (en grec)	X			X	
4β. Écoles Bilingues (mixtes)	X	X		X	

Quant aux organismes et aux formes d’enseignement, des changements sont observés ces dernières années. Par exemple, (selon le rapport de Michopoulos), aux Etats-Unis des changements sont constatés dans les organisations grecques dispensant des cours de langue grecque par l’apparition des écoles à charte publique qui sont en augmentation. Par conséquent, le rôle de l’archidiocèse grec orthodoxe comme un centre d’éducation hellénique unique recule progressivement.

Dans les pays européens, l’Allemagne en premier, sont également observés des changements dans les institutions dispensant des cours de langue grecque, parce que, après la réduction drastique des enseignants détachés et généralement les coupures dues à la crise en Grèce, les collectifs de parents ont commencé à travailler en tant que fournisseurs de cours d’apprentissage de la langue grecque.

Aussi dans les écoles purement grecques en Allemagne, il y a eu une tendance d’évolution de leurs programmes qui deviennent davantage bilingues. En Australie, les écoles de jour, principalement pour des raisons économiques, ont ouvert leurs portes à des étudiants allophones, en particulier en provenance des pays asiatiques. De façon générale dans les écoles de jour-dans de nombreux pays, en particulier au Canada- il y avait une tendance à la sécularisation.

### 2.1.2. Financement

Comme il a été déjà mentionné, le financement par l'Etat grec a été réduit de moitié. Mais même avant cette réduction le financement des diverses formes d'éducation de langue grecque était principalement fait par les parents et l'État du pays d'accueil.

L'État grec finance entièrement seules les écoles purement grecques en Allemagne, à Bruxelles et à Londres.

Les autres formes d'éducation sont principalement financées par les parents, les organisations communautaires à l'étranger et les organismes de l'État du pays d'accueil.

Plus précisément, la recherche que nous avons menée au printemps de 2011, a montré que les principaux bailleurs de fonds de notre échantillon de 30 écoles est l'État du pays d'accueil à hauteur de 62,5% et les parents eux-mêmes (37,5%), selon les déclarations des directeurs des écoles de l'échantillon (voir tableau 2.4).

**Tableau 2.4.:** Les Écoles selon leur financement par pays\*

Pays	L'agent qui finance l'école											
	Pays de résidence		État grec		Parents		L'agent de l'école lui-même		Autre agent		N'ont pas répondu	
	v	%	v	%	v	%	v	%	v	%	v	%
Australie (4)	3	75,0	0	0,0	3	75,0	2	50,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Argentine (2)	2	100,0	1	50,0	2	100,0	0	0,0	1	50,0	0	0,0
États-Unis (6)	3	50,0	0	0,0	1	16,7	3	50,0	1	16,7	0	0,0
Canada (2)	1	50,0	0	0,0	2	100,0	1	50,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Afrique du Sud (1)	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	100,0	0	0,0	1	100,0	0	0,0
Allemagne (3)	3	100,0	3	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Turquie (3)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	100,0	0	0,0
Royaume-Uni (1)	1	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Albanie (2)	2	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
<b>Total (24)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62,5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16,7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>37,5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25,0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25,0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0,0</b>



\* Les organismes de financement de l'école ne sont pas mutuellement exclusifs. Autrement dit, un administrateur pourrait déclarer que l'école était financée par plus d'un organisme de financement. Pour chaque organisme de financement de l'école (État du pays d'accueil / État grec, etc.) est indiqué dans les colonnes correspondantes dans le tableau, uniquement le nombre et le pourcentage des administrateurs qui ont noté cet organisme de financement. Donc, si on additionne horizontalement les taux (par exemple pour chaque pays) ceux-ci dépassent les 100%.

L'image est en train de changer en faveur des parents dans le financement de certains formes d'enseignement, comme le montre le tableau 2.5.

**Tableau 2.5.:** Les cours de Grec selon l'agent de financement

Pays	Agent de financement											
	État de résidence		État grec		Parents		L'agent lui-même		Un autre agent		N'ont pas répondu	
	v	%	v	%	v	%	v	%	v	%	v	%
Australie(15)	12	80,0	0	0,0	8	53,3	7	46,7	0	0,0	0	0,0
Argentine(2)	1	50,0	0	0,0	1	50,0	2	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Etats-Unis (11)	0	0,0	1	9,1	9	81,8	5	45,5	0	0,0	0	0,0
Canada (12)	3	30,0	0	0,0	5	50,0	2	20,0	2	20,0	2	16,7
Allemagne (45)	22	48,9	23	51,1	5	11,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Suède (3)	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Ukraine (3)	3	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Russie (1)	1	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Royaume-Uni (40)	7	17,9	6	15,4	27	69,2	17	43,6	8	20,5	1	2,5
Belgique (6)	0	0,0	5	83,3	0	0,0	1	16,7	0	0,0	0	0,0
Roumanie (5)	4	80,0	1	20,0	1	20,0	1	20,0	2	40,0	0	0,0
Bulgarie (7)	1	14,3	2	28,6	2	28,6	4	57,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
<b>Total (150)</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>36,7</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25,9</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>39,5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>27,9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8,2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2,0</b>

\* Les organismes de financement de l'école ne sont pas mutuellement exclusifs. Autrement dit, un administrateur pourrait déclarer que l'école était financée par plus d'un organisme de financement. Pour chaque organisme de financement de l'école (État d'accueil, État grec, etc.) est indiqué dans les colonnes correspondantes dans le

tableau, uniquement le nombre et le pourcentage des administrateurs qui ont noté cet organisme de financement. Donc, si on additionne horizontalement les taux (par exemple pour chaque pays) ceux-ci dépassent les 100%.

## ***2.2. Le personnel éducatif (Le personnel d'enseignement)***

Aussi bien dans le passé que dans le présent, et dans les différentes formes d'éducation hellénique on rencontre diverses catégories d'enseignants, détachés et expatriés (c'est-à-dire résidents permanents à l'étranger) professionnels et non-professionnels, qualifiés et non-qualifiés, à temps plein et à temps partiel.

À partir de 2010 le nombre de diplômés détachés est drastiquement réduit alors que croît le nombre de Grecs migrants diplômés qui, comme de nouveaux migrants cherchent un emploi dans les diverses écoles d'éducation hellénique à travers le monde entier.

En résumant, nous arrivons à deux conclusions concernant les enseignants par rapport au nouvel environnement d'enseignement à distance (e-learning), qui a été développé pendant la période 2011-2014 avec le financement de l'Union européenne et du ministère de l'Éducation de la Grèce.

Tout d'abord, les enseignants disent que, dans un grand pourcentage de cours (environ 40%) la mise en œuvre de l'apprentissage électronique est très difficile en raison de l'insuffisance des infrastructures (manque de laboratoire informatique, et manque d'accès à l'internet).

Deuxièmement, les trois quarts des enseignants ont besoin d'une formation ciblée et systématique dans l'utilisation des environnements d'apprentissage en ligne. Ils doivent, en d'autres termes, résoudre deux problèmes majeurs, dont le second est plus difficile.

## **Population Scolaire**

Il est maintenant admis que les trois grandes catégories d'élèves, qui étudient dans les diverses formes d'éducation de langue grecque à l'étranger sont:

1. D'origine grecque, de langue grecque
2. D'origine grecque, sans connaissance du grec
3. D'autres origines, de langue maternelle étrangère.

Ces catégories et groupes cibles n'ont pratiquement pas changé. Ces dernières

années, cependant, il y a eu un changement de leur composition quantitative pour les raisons principales suivantes:

En raison de la nouvelle migration et de l'entrée de plus en plus d'élèves dans les diverses formes d'éducation hellénique, qui ont le grec comme langue maternelle.

En raison de la croissance du nombre des élèves allophones, due à l'augmentation des écoles à charte aux États-Unis, à l'ouverture des écoles de jour de plus en plus nombreuses pour les allophones et généralement dans l'introduction lente mais régulière du grec dans les systèmes éducatifs des pays d'accueil.

En raison du rapatriement en Albanie des familles albanaises de Grèce, dont les enfants fréquentaient là-bas les écoles grecques bilingues.

Ces développements sont favorables à la langue grecque à l'étranger. Surtout les élèves nouveaux migrants sont censés «ensemencer» les écoles et les cours de grec.

Un autre développement important est la diminution spectaculaire de la population scolaire dans les cours de langue grecque où enseignaient des enseignants détachés, retirés après 2010 en raison de la crise économique. Cela est particulièrement vrai pour les pays européens et surtout pour l'Allemagne. Significatifs quant à ce développement sont les chiffres du tableau 2.6.

**Tableau 2.6.:** Réduction de la population scolaire de cours grecs en Allemagne

<b>Nombre d'élèves inscrits</b>	<b>L'année scolaire 2010/11</b>	<b>L'année scolaire 2011/12</b>	<b>L'année scolaire 2012/13</b>	<b>L'année scolaire 2013/14</b>
<b>Bureau de l'éducation Région de Munich</b>				
	1454 (100%)	1088	704 (52%)	939 (33%)
<b>Bureau de l'éducation Région de Stuttgart</b>				
	4.515 (100%)	3.952	2.352 (48%)	2.647 (41%)
<b>Ancienne région du Bureau de l'éducation de Francfort</b>				
	1.138 (100%)	1.086	604 (47%)	288 (75%)

Source: M. Damanakis, dans: M. Damanakis, S. Constantinides, A. Tamis, 2014

## **Programmes et Matériels Didactiques**

Dans nos études précédentes, nous avons constaté que dans la plupart des pays à travers le monde, environ 70% des besoins du matériel didactique pour les cours de grec, mais aussi dans les écoles de jour et les écoles à charte, étaient couverts avec le matériel pédagogique du projet «Education pour les Grecs de l'étranger», autrement dit avec le matériel pédagogique de l'Université de Crète.

Selon les rapports de nos partenaires à l'étranger, cette image semble changer légèrement en raison de la difficulté observée au cours des quatre dernières années dans l'impression et l'envoi de matériel éducatif du programme «Education aux Grecs de l'étranger».

L'abolition de l' «Institut pédagogique» (PI) et de l' «Organisation d'édition des livres pédagogiques» (OEDB) et le transfert de leurs compétences à «l'Institut pour la politique de l'éducation» et à «Diophante», respectivement, en combinaison avec la crise économique et les coupures budgétaires conséquentes, ont pratiquement annulé leurs procédés d'impression et de livraison de livres du programme «Education aux Grecs de l'étranger» aux écoles de la diaspora, depuis environ trois ans. C'est seulement avec l'année scolaire 2014/15 «Diophante» qu'a commencé l'impression à nouveau des livres du programme Education aux Grecs de l'étranger «et à les rendre disponibles pour les institutions de l'éducation en langue grecque à l'étranger.

Mais en dépit de ces difficultés et la petite baisse ultérieure de l'utilisation de matériels pédagogiques du programme «Education aux Grecs de l'étranger», certains organismes, et les enseignants avec le soutien des parents, sont à la recherche de matériel éducatif dans le Site Web du Programme ([www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora)), le reproduisent, et le mettent à la disposition des élèves.

Le problème pour ce matériel est que les premiers livres produits ont déjà 15 années de vie. Il est donc nécessaire de les mettre à jour et de les renouveler, ce qui est souligné par les éducateurs, les conseillers scolaires et nos partenaires à l'étranger.

## **Y a-t-il une menace de l'éducation de langue grecque dans la diaspora en raison de la crise en Grèce?**

La réponse est «non», car en dehors des pays européens, notamment l'Allemagne, l'enseignement de la langue grecque est organisé et financé principalement par les parents, les organismes communautaires et les États de résidence.

La contribution de la Grèce a porté jusqu'ici, et devrait continuer à l'avenir,

- a) à la production et la distribution de matériel éducatif
- b) à la formation des enseignants de la diaspora
- c) au détachement rationnel d'enseignants de la métropole

La politique récente de la Grèce, par

- a) les «économies» (à moins de 50%) et
- b) «l'atteinte des domaines d'action de l'Etat grec», conformément à la loi 4027/2011, marque la «fin d'une époque» pour la politique éducative du Centre national envers la diaspora, mais pas la fin de l'enseignement de langue grecque dans la diaspora.

Nos études montrent que c'est surtout pendant les deux premières années de la crise, que le choc politico-éducatif a été aussi accompagné par la «colère» des institutions. Au fil du temps, cependant, les institutions d'éducation de langue grecque ont commencé à passer de la logique de la «colère» à celle de la logique de la restructuration. La Grèce ne peut pas faire plus: «nous allons voir ce que nous pouvons faire nous-mêmes», soulignait l'ancienne directrice de l'école SAHETI à Johannesburg.

L'expérience historique montre que le Centre national a toujours travaillé comme de façon complémentaire et non comme un protagoniste sur les questions de l'éducation en langue grecque. Les politiques «pléthoriques» dans la deuxième moitié des années 1990 et pendant la décennie 2010, ont créé l'illusion comme si l'enseignement du grec était de la responsabilité de la métropole et a conduit à une forme de «mollesse» des organismes de la diaspora.

Nous estimons que la réflexion qui a suivi l'éclatement de la crise, va ramener, si ce n'est pas déjà fait, la régularité dans l'éducation de la langue grecque dans la diaspora.

Et selon l'expérience de l'histoire, la régularité du modèle testé, est que les institutions et organisations de la diaspora, en coopération avec les autorités éducatives des pays de résidence, organisent, financent, administrent et généralement font promouvoir les différentes formes d'éducation de langue grecque à l'étranger alors que la Grèce agit de façon complémentaire dans leurs efforts.

## SOURCES ET BIBLIOGRAPHIE

**SOURCES:** Rapports de nos associés de recherche de la Diaspora,  
Année 2014

**États-Unis:** A. Michopoulos et B. Selountou

**Canada:** Stephanos Constantinides

**Argentine:** S. Rousallis,

**Australie:** A. Tamis et M. Tsianikas,

**Afrique du Sud:** A. Krystallidou,

**Royaume-Uni:** E. Filippaki, M. Luca

**Allemagne:** M. Damanakis,

**Albanie:** G. Kapsalis,

**Russie:** E. Alepova,

**Ukraine:** A. Chatzipanagiotidou et E. Prodi

## BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Belia E. (1995), *De l'éducation et de la politique irrédentiste. Le cas de Thrace de 1856 à 1912*, Thessalonique, Institut d'études de la Péninsule Balkanique.

Constantinides Stephanos (2001), *L'enseignement de la langue grecque au Canada*, Rethymno, E.DIA.M.ME.

Damanakis M., B. Kardasis, Th. Michelakakis, A. Hourdakakis (eds.) (2004), *Histoire du grec moderne dans la diaspora. Recherche et enseignement*. A et B Vol. Actes de la conference, 4-6 Juillet 2003, Rethymno. E.DIA.M.ME.

Damanakis M. (ed.) (2011), *Les écoles grecques en Allemagne: passé, présent, futur*; Gutenberg, Athènes (En grec).

Damanakis M. (2012), «Les politiques éducatives en temps de crise économique. Le cas de l'éducation en langue grecque dans la diaspora» dans: *Science Education (Ancienne école et la vie)*, n° 1-2012 (pp. 195-215).

Damanakis M. (. Éd) (2014), *L'éducation de la langue grecque et l'e-learning dans la diaspora: Les résultats d'une recherche empirique comme des conditions préalables pour le développement d'un environnement e-learning*, E.DIA.M.ME, Rethymnon (En grec).

Michael Damanakis, Stephanos Constantinides, Anastasios Tamis (2014) (ed.), *Une nouvelle migration vers et depuis la Grèce*, Université de Crète, KEME / Éditions Alexandrie, Rethymnon, Athènes (En grec).

Fotiadou A. (1998), «Première conférence hellénique sur l'éducation, Athènes, Mars-Avril 1904», *La contradiction de revendications en éducation dans la première décennie du 20e siècle*, Thessalonique, Kyriakidis frères.

Fotiadis K., Eliadou-Tachou S. (2014), *L'éducation dans la mer (1682 à 1922)*, Thessalonique, Kyriakidis frères.

Hatzidakis A., Spantidakis I., Anastasiadis P. (éd.) (2014), *L'éducation de langue grecque et l'e-learning dans la diaspora: conception et développement de l'apprentissage en ligne*, Rethymno, EDIAMME.

Hassiotis I. K. (1993), *Vue d'ensemble de l'histoire de la diaspora grecque moderne*, Thessalonique, Vantias (En grec).

Karanikolas A. (1982), La «Première Conférence éducative grecque» et son importance (31-Avril Mars 4, 1904). Tiré à part du magazine «Politeia», numéro 3.

Konstantinos Haris (2004) *L'éducation grecque de la diaspora*, Athènes, Ellinika Grammata.

Loukasvili N. (2014), *L'éducation de langue grecque en Adjarie (1850 à 1938)*. Thèse de doctorat, Département de l' Education, Université de Crète.

Mark G. (2011), «Le cadre institutionnel et éducationnel», in Damanakis M.

(2011): *Les écoles grecques en Allemagne: passé, présent, futur*, Gutenberg, Athènes.

Michelakakis Theodosia (2001), *La politique de l'éducation de la Grèce pour les enfants d'immigrés grecs en Allemagne (1975-1985)*, Rethymnon E.DIA.M.ME.

Michelakakis Theodosia (2007), *L'institution du conseiller de l'éducation pour l'enseignement du Grec à l'étranger*, Thèse de doctorat, Université de Crète, Département de l'enseignement primaire.

Mitsopoulos Th. (1979), *Nous sommes restés Grecs - Les écoles grecques de réfugiés politiques dans les pays socialistes*, Athènes.

Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Secrétariat pour les Grecs à l'étranger (2001), *L'Hellénisme à l'étranger*, Athènes.

Papakostas I. (2010), *Pour l'Association de l'hellénisme dans le monde entier. Hellénisme et les lettres grecques au début du XXe siècle*. Athènes, Société pour la diffusion des livres utiles.

Tamis A (2001), *L'éducation de langue grecque en Australie. La situation actuelle de la Grèce*, Rethymnon, E.DIA.M.ME.

Tsoukalas K. (1977), *Dépendance et reproduction: Le rôle social des mécanismes éducatifs en Grèce (1830-1922)*, Athènes, Themelio.





# A Global World Greek Lobby

Stephanos Constantinides\*

## RÉSUMÉ

L'auteur de cet article dresse le portrait du lobby grec à travers le monde, en insistant plus particulièrement sur le lobby helléno-américain. Il examine sa structure et son fonctionnement et surtout sa contribution à faire avancer les intérêts grecs auprès de gouvernements de pays où s'activent d'importantes communautés grecques. C'est en premier lieu le cas de l'important lobby grec aux États-Unis et en second lieu les communautés d'Australie, du Canada et de l'Europe occidentale. L'auteur souligne en particulier la mobilisation de la communauté chypriote de Grande Bretagne en faveur de Chypre et contre l'occupation turque d'une partie de l'île.

## ABSTRACT

The author of this article depicts the Global World Greek Lobby with special reference to the Greek American lobby. The author examines its structure and functioning, and especially its contribution in advancing Greek interests with the governments of countries with large Greek communities. This is mainly the case of the important Greek lobby in the United States and secondarily in other countries, such as Australia, Canada and Western Europe. The author underlines in particular the mobilization of the Cypriot community in Britain against the Turkish occupation of a part of the island.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### *The Diaspora*

The Greek diaspora is the continuation of Hellenism in the five continents and represents a serious political force that could help Greece to promote the Hellenic Culture and give the necessary support for its national issues. Article 108 of the Greek Constitution refers to the Greek diaspora and uses the term 'Hellenes Abroad'. With the revision of the constitution in 2001, this article has even been completed, with reference to the obligations of the Greek State to the

\* Centre for Hellenic Studies and Research Canada-KEEK

Greeks abroad (care for the “maintenance of ties with the motherland” and “for education and social and professional advancement of Greeks working outside the country”) and a reference to the “organization, function and responsibilities of the Council of Hellenes Abroad” has been added.

1. The State shall care for emigrant Greeks and the maintenance of ties with the motherland. It will also ensure education and social and professional advancement of Greeks working outside the territory.
2. A law provides for the organization, function and responsibilities of the Council of Hellenes Abroad, whose mission is to express globally the Greeks abroad.<sup>1</sup>

The fact that this article refers to the «Greeks abroad» creates several problems at the practical level, as well as in the scientific study of the matter itself. Conceptually, expatriate Greeks are those who emigrated abroad. But hardly could be identified as expatriate Greeks those of the historical communities abroad, who are living in historic cradles of Hellenism for many centuries or even those of the second and third generation immigrant diaspora in countries like the U.S., Canada and Australia. In fact the term “diaspora” may cover better the various components of this Hellenism outside the Greek territory but does not mean that it doesn’t also present difficulties on a conceptual and practical level. Even so, the study of the Greek diaspora raises a number of epistemological problems in dealing with sciences like history, sociology, political science etc. A key problem is that of its definition. Nowadays, the Greek diaspora can be defined only in relation to the Greek national state. The fact that the Greek diaspora exists before the creation of this state, certainly puts into question this definition, as the same happens with other variances of diasporas that occurred prior to the nation-state building, as the Jewish and Armenian. These issues are discussed through the study of enlightenment, which creates the conditions for the nation-state building.<sup>2</sup>

### *The Lobby*

The creation of the Greek state, the issue of irredentism, the issue of the historical Greek communities outside the Ottoman Empire, are complicating the notion of diaspora. These problems however relate more to the history today. So as for the Greek lobby we will limit ourselves to the current reality. After the

Asia Minor Catastrophe we can talk about historical and immigration diaspora. The term historical diaspora covers the Hellenism of the historic communities (what has survived), such as the Greeks of Egypt and the Hellenism that survived in some historical centers (Black Sea countries, Northern Epirus, etc.). The term immigrant diaspora covers the communities created after the establishment of the Greek state and especially those of USA, Canada, Australia and Western Europe. The diaspora that has been more studied in the form of the lobby is of course the Greek-American one. However, the Greek-Canadian and the Greek-Australian diasporas present also a special interest when acting as a lobby for the Greek interests in their respective countries. Hence all Greek communities abroad under certain specific circumstances get involved in lobbying, in favor of the Greek interests.

There is a whole ‘mythology’ about the role of the Greek lobby, especially the Greek-American one which hinders proper understanding of its role. Although there have been some remarkable studies showing the limits of its influence, its shortcomings and successes, the fact remains that its “canonization” prevented the cold sociological study of this important phenomenon. It should of course be said here that the study of large national lobbies and their role in shaping international relations is a relatively recent phenomenon.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the role of the Greek lobby, and especially the Greek-American one, can not be an “emotional” case, it should be seen and studied in the context of the triadic relationship that every national lobby develops, involving itself, the country of origin and the host country. Its study and assessment must be done by political criteria and based on the methodological rules of the social sciences.

In this context, the effectiveness of the lobby, as seen from the Greek perspective, depends on the integration within a broader strategic plan for Greece’s international relations. Since there is not such a national strategy, but more improvisations in Greek foreign policy, any successes, failures and weaknesses should be viewed also from this angle.

### *The “National Centre”*

Another serious problem concerns the relationship of this diaspora with the Greek state, what is usually called the “national center”. There are basically two philosophies for this relationship: One is “Hellenocentric” considering that the “national centre” has the primary role in coordinating the activities of the

diaspora. The other is the theory of the Milky Way which sees the Greek communities as autonomous from the “national centre” and goes back to a romantic quest of communitarianism of the period of Ottoman domination. This is an idealised approach which is not supported historically. The Community Mechanism of that period, oligarchic and without democratic structures, was serving more for the collection of taxes from the rayah on behalf of the Ottoman administration.<sup>4</sup>

But in today’s assimilative societies without the support even of this distorted and entrenched numb Athenian state, without coordinating with it, the Greeks of diaspora will resemble one day with this community that Cavafy described once with great flair in his historical poem *Poseidoniatatai* (*The Poseidonians*) based on the inscription of Athenaeus (*Deipnosophistai*, Book 14, 31A [632]), about the Greek city Poseidonia in the Tyrrhenian Gulf: “εκβαρβαρώσθαι Τυρρηνοίς ή Ρωμαίοις γεγονόσι και την τη φωνήν μεταβεβληκέναι, τα τε πολλά των επιτηδευμάτων». (They have been submitted to Tyrrhenians and Romans forgetting their language and traditions). The only thing that remained to them was a Greek festival every year “εν ή συνιότες αναμμινήσκονται των αρχαίων ονομάτων τε και νομίμων» (during which the participants remind the ancient names and the traditions, and then finish and go “with weeps and tears each other” («απολοφυράμενοι προς αλλήλους και δακρύσαντες»). Based on the above inscription Constantine Cavafy, the great modern Greek Poet, wrote on the fate of Poseidonians:

The Poseidonians forgot the Greek language  
after so many centuries of mingling  
with Tyrrhenians, Latins, and other foreigners.  
The only thing surviving from their ancestors  
was a Greek festival, with beautiful rites,  
with lyres and flutes, contests and wreaths.  
And it was their habit toward the festival’s end  
to tell each other about their ancient customs  
and once again to speak Greek names  
that only a few of them still recognized.  
And so their festival always had a melancholy ending  
because they remembered that they too were Greeks,  
they too once upon a time were citizens of Magna Graecia;

and how low they'd fallen now, what they'd become,  
living and speaking like barbarians,  
cut off so disastrously from the Greek way of life.<sup>5</sup>

Certainly the notion that Hellenism may be limited within territorial limits is dangerous and will be the last and perhaps fatal decline that will occur after so many others. If the theory of galaxy has a meaning, it is because it still insists on the idea of Ecumenical Hellenism. Historically Hellenism never has been closed in a state or geographical boundaries. Nevertheless it has always had one or more centres that could support the universality of its tentacles.

The theory of the Galaxy is another form of the Great Idea, a modern version bothering no one, once it doesn't refer to territorial ambitions and a change of borders, but to a cultural universality. But to enable it to survive, the universality needs to be removed from the utopia of the free communalism without national center. But the concept of a national center is not a one way concept. If the recognition of its importance for the survival of the Ecumenical Hellenism is a *sine qua non*, this does not mean it has a monopoly of decision over his faith. The national centre should not be Rome within a papal sense of infallibility. But there may be Athens - in the sense of the classical era - and Alexandria - in the sense of the Hellenistic era. The future of the Ecumenical Hellenism and its survival depends on the common goal which will be the result of the dialectical synthesis of the diversity of views expressed by the communities of the diaspora and those of the national centre.

Ultimately communalism would lead to «εκβαρβαρώσθαι Τυρηνοίς ή Ρωμαίοις», to the loss of identity, but dependence of the Athenian contemporary Greek State would lead also to “spiritual decline, stagnation and eventual extinction”<sup>6</sup> of the diaspora and of course its universality. This does not mean ghettoization of the diaspora communities. As rightly argues Professor Harris Psomiades “Greek interests may be better served by a diaspora which is integrated into and participates fully in the political, economic and social life of the country in which it is endemic.”<sup>7</sup> But the only way in this case to maintain the minimum of the culture of origine<sup>8</sup> which connects the universal Hellenism is the development of Greek culture and education in the widest sense. Simultaneously the production of culture from both the diaspora and the metropolitan centre in a dialectical relationship is always an issue and remains a challenge.

Regarding especially the Greek-American lobby, one has to note the deep crisis inside the Greek Community because of the conflict that resulted when the Greek Orthodox Church in the U.S. tried and finally succeeded to place all community institutions as such under the direct control of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, a movement successfully inaugurated by Archbishop Iakovos in the 1960's. One also has to note the conflict between Archbishop Iakovos and the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew after Iakovos supported a move by 29 bishops towards the administrative unification of Eastern Orthodox churches in America which eventually would lead to an autocephalous Orthodox Church in America. He was forced to resign in 1996. In order to reaffirm his authority over the American Greek Orthodox Church Bartholomew, in 1996, proceeded to the split of the one Archdiocese, dividing the administration of the American continent into four parts (America, Canada, Central America, and South America) and leaving only the territory of the United States for the Archdiocese of America. Even inside this territory he limited dangerously the authority of the Archdiocese in order to exercise his absolute control over the Greek American Orthodox Church.

## **II. THE GREEK AMERICAN LOBBY**

### ***In the Footsteps of the Greek-American lobby***

#### **The First Steps**

The first steps of the Greek-American lobby, have been made with reference to the Cyprus problem in the period immediately after World War II and the Cold War in full intensity.<sup>9</sup> From the outset it was clear that the Greek Americans access to the U.S. executive was difficult contrary to the legislature that was more affordable.

In the 1950s AHEPA which was - and remains today - the largest Greek-American organization tried with the Church to raise the Cyprus issue through the U.S. Congress. Although these efforts did not produce any results - especially at that time the legislature had very limited influence in shaping American foreign policy - the lobby gained valuable experience and confirmed that Congress was a more accessible target for the action concerning the Greek national issues.

Besides Congress, efforts were made to mobilize for the Cyprus cause the local elected leaders in various states and cities, governors, mayors, etc. Typical example was the case of the mayor and the governor of New York. The emphasis was placed at the anti-colonial struggle and the principle of self-determination. Greek-Americans understood that they could not present the Cyprus issue as a matter of union with Greece to the American politicians. The mobilization should be based on international law and UN principles such as the principle of self-determination.

But it should be noted that the Greek-American lobby has avoided to exert any straight pressure on President Eisenhower and Secretary of Foreign Affairs Foster Dulles. It seems that the climate of that time was not appropriate because ethnic lobbies had been very little developed and on the other hand there was a common line, mostly on foreign policy, between the two major parties as it was the era of the Cold War. It has been also supported that the AHEPA, which was basically an expression of the Greek-American lobby at that time, did not want to create tension in relations with the U.S. leadership. So it continued its annual meetings, its ceremonial visits to Eisenhower and the “photo opportunity”.<sup>10</sup>

Of course one should remember that in the 1950's the Cyprus problem did not directly concern the U.S. It concerned Britain of which Cyprus was a colony. So the Americans wanted to present themselves as neutral and to ask their stakeholders allies involved - Britain and Greece at the beginning, but also Turkey afterwards - to find a peaceful solution. In fact, both at the UN and the diplomatic field in general, Americans will support Britain. Their concern was mainly the weakening of the south-eastern flank of NATO and the role of the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc in general supporting the principle of self-determination for the people of Cyprus. But it is obvious since then that the Americans-in contrast with the British who following the beaten track and offering Cypriots self-government but with all the partitionist elements under incubation-favor a kind of division beneath the mantle of the Union.

### *The Cyprus Crisis of 1964*

The Cyprus crisis of 1963-64 reactivated the Greek-American lobby. This time, unlike the 1950's, the Americans are directly involved and seek to impose the solution of the double union - that is to say partition of the island between Greece and Turkey - with the Acheson Plan, named after the former U.S. Secretary of Foreign Affairs Dean Acheson.



The Greek American leadership raised again the principle of self-determination for Cyprus as well as general principles of law to which is committed the American people. But it acted very carefully not to come in a vertical rift with the U.S. Government and particularly with President Johnson. Especially as the Greek Americans are generally supporters of the Democratic Party.

President Lyndon B. Johnson called to Washington the prime ministers of Greece and Turkey in mid-June 1964 and tried to impose the American view of the double union for a permanent solution to the Cyprus problem. The effort for a solution failed but at least prevented a Greek-Turkish conflict. Johnson had sent his famous letter to Turkish Prime Minister Ismet Inonu on June 5, 1964 which effectively was forbidding Turkey military landing in Cyprus as threatened. At the same time the Americans have brought unbearable pressure on the Greek side to accept a double union—partition that would satisfy Turkey itself. Johnson himself threatened Greece and Papandreou, leaving clear innuendos for the April dictatorship that followed.<sup>11</sup>

Throughout this period the role of the Greek-American lobby is almost non-existent or very low-key.

### ***The Period of the Military Dictatorship (1967-1974)***

During this period the official Greek American leadership, headed by Archbishop Iakovos took position essentially in favor of the dictatorship. But anti-dictatorial organizations had been established in the grassroots of the Greek-American communities, trying to promote the condemnation of the military regime in Athens. Once again the attention of these anti-dictatorial organizations turned to Congress. There some senators and representatives were taking stand against the dictatorship, in contrast to the official American policy.

This attitude of the Church, the visits of Iakovos to Athens and his meetings with Papadopoulos and the other leaders of the junta are well documented and need not be stressed too much. Some people claimed that he was forced to maintain some kind of relationship with the regime - but at the very least he could ask to stop the mistreatment of political prisoners and violation of the basic human rights. The attitude of the official secular Greek-American leadership was not different of that of Iakovos. In fact it was not the question of the necessary “formal relationship” with the mother country but the wholehearted “embracement” of the junta.

This led to a schism within the very Greek-American communities. The split was much more deep in places where lived first-generation Greek immigrants like New York and Canada and places where were active Greek students and academics.

Under these conditions of course the effectiveness and efficiency of the lobby against the dictatorship has been limited, although it should be credited the fact that voices never stopped to be heard in favour of democracy in Greece, both in Congress and among academic and more generally the liberal circles of the American public opinion.<sup>12</sup>

### *The Greek-American Lobby Comes of Age*

The invasion of Cyprus by Turkey in 1974 served as the catalyst to awaken the Greek American community and led to the age of the maturation of the Greek-American lobby. Moreover, many - if not most who dealt with the study of the Greek-American lobby - place its very birth in 1974. This view is not based on reality. The Greek-American lobby existed before – in a very weak form is true and without self-consciousness of its role. Moreover, the fact is that neither the conditions of the American politics favored the very existence of ethnic lobbies in the previous period, nor political science has shown interest to study the ethnic lobbies before the 1970's, if not the 1980's.

In 1974, the conditions are ripe for the development of an effective lobby. There is first the challenge of the Turkish intervention in Cyprus. In this respect, the Greek Americans are united. There is secondly the democratic Greece which realizes for the first time the need to promote national issues in Washington through an organized lobby. Finally, there is the development of a favorable climate for ethnic lobbies in the U.S. The policy of the melting pot has failed, the McCarthy era has passed, U.S. citizens of various ethnic origins defend the interests of their countries of origine in an effort to connect with their American counterparts and with the principles of democracy and international law.

Within this context will be initiated and developed the Greek-American lobby in this period. It is the period (1974-1978) of the great successes and the birth of the mythology surrounding its role and influence in Washington. It is its “heroic” age of the imposition of the embargo by Congress on arms sales to Turkey.

To understand the success of the Greek-American lobby, one should be transferred to the political climate prevailing in Washington at this time. It is the time of the Watergate crisis, the weakening and ultimately the resignation of President Nixon. The foreign policy has actually been exercised by Henry Kissinger. Moreover, the Congress for the first time in the postwar era claims a major role in shaping U.S. foreign policy, especially after the trauma of Vietnam.

In the first stage -1974, early 1975- the reaction against the Turkish invasion of Cyprus was of a spontaneous nature. In fact there is no lobby.<sup>13</sup> The traditional American leadership, that of the Church and AHEPA, is overtaken by the popular reaction inside the Greek Community. Several committees in support of Cyprus sprang through the Greek American Community and in fact refused to follow the traditional leadership considered too conservative, while blaming it for having cooperated with the military regime in Athens and being responsible for the Cyprus tragedy.

Simultaneously in Washington, Eugene Rossides who served in the Nixon administration, founded the American Hellenic Institute (AHI), which could be considered the first Greek-American professional lobby. To avoid losing control of the situation Archbishop Iakovos will create in Chicago through Andrew Athens, the Hellenic American Congress.

At the same time a small group of senators and representatives which included those of Greek origin, all of the Democratic Party, reacted to the Turkish invasion before it barely mobilized the Greek American community. The same group had also reacted to the coup of the junta against Makarios when the official American leadership, and particularly Archbishop Iakovos, remained silent. The group met with Foreign Minister Henry Kissinger in August (1974) and complained about the passive U.S attitude toward the Turkish invasion. After the second round of the Turkish invasion, the number of protesting members of Congress rose and for the first time was put forward the idea of the embargo on arms sales to Turkey.

The foundation of the American Hellenic Institute, AHI by Eugene Rossides was an attempt to coordinate actions, both of AHEPA, the Archdiocese of America, and the other Greek-American organizations, while at the same time being their link with the group of Congress.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, Rossides knew the weakness of these organizations to act as an effective lobby, if not their reluctance to do so.

The Greek-American lobby on Rossides's insistence and in accord with the players of the congressional team senators Brademas, Rosenthal and Sarbanes moved its efforts on the legal level, stressing that Turkey illegally used U.S. weapons in its military intervention in Cyprus.

It appeared from the beginning that many senators and representatives were very sensitive to issues of law enforcement. They also had the experience of its breach during both the Vietnam war and the Watergate scandal. Under U.S. law the weapons the U.S. supplied to Turkey could not be used unless for defense only and not for operations against another country which was not at all threatening it. Kissinger questioned on August 19, 1974 on this issue said that a group of jurists of the legal section of the State Department was studying the issue, whether Turkey's intervention in Cyprus had violated U.S. law. Two weeks later, however, it was revealed that there was already a legal advice from this group of the State Department on this issue and that the reason it was not disclosed was Kissinger's attempt to alter it in favor of Turkey's interests.

Senator Thomas Eagleton addressing the Senate in September charged that President Ford had been ill-advised or misinformed of the legal implications of his inaction over the Cyprus crisis. Making even an apparent reference to Watergate, he warned: "We have learned that the policies created in ignorance or in spite of the law are doomed to failure." Later he confronted Kissinger who was addressing the Democratic caucus in Capitol Hill, with the words «Mr. Secretary, you do not understand the rule of law».<sup>15</sup>

From now on, the whole effort will continue on the same basis, the same principle, respect of the law, "the rule of law". Since the end of September 1974 a series of measures steps had been adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives, that ultimately led to the February 1975 embargo imposed on Turkey (5 February 1975).

There is no doubt that the Greek American community mobilized and deployed its efforts for this purpose. On the other hand it is obvious that all this effort paid off because it got into the hands of a small group in Congress who believed that the U.S. law was not respected. Therefore the Greek-American lobby succeeded because its goals coincided with those of a legislature, anxious about the promotion of a U.S. foreign policy that violated the famous principle imposing «the rule of law». Of course, this sudden ethical consideration of the

American politics hides a deeper conflict between the legislative and executive power because of the trauma of Vietnam, where the legislature had been overridden. The Congress also feels strong enough after Nixon's resignation –another traumatic experience– to impose its will on the executive in matters of foreign policy or at least to define the framework of its implementation. It is therefore clear that the weakness of the executive during this period in conjunction with the struggle of the legislature to regain lost power, helped the Greek-American lobby effort to impose an embargo on Turkey.

For Cyprus of course and the Greek interests, the presence of President Ford in this critical period at the head of the Chief Executive was probably a misfortune –as well as the transitional period of conflict for the impeachment of Nixon– given that Henry Kissinger, known for his positioning in favor of the military regime in Athens and his tolerance of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus –that others presented as a favourable position towards Turkey and others as a wrong strategy–<sup>16</sup> had in his hands almost the exclusive management of U.S. foreign policy for this period.

Naturally, the Greek-American lobby had been “credited” the success of the embargo. The mythology of a “powerful” lobby took shape. Paradoxically, to the creation of this mythology contributed Kissinger himself who wanted to show that the pro-embargo group in Congress team was not promoting “the rule of law” but the interests of one ethnic group, which in addition were contrary to the broader U.S. strategic interests. Public commentators painted a picture of an all-powerful Greek-American lobby. *The New York Times* for example wrote on July 21, 1975: “Individual congressmen have been pressed hard by the so-called Greek lobby to reaffirm previous House votes and prevent Turkey from receiving further American arms until it makes significant concessions to the Greek-Cypriotes”. In the same newspaper, a senior journalist, Cyrus Sulzberger, writing from London where Ford and Kissinger were attending a Nato summit, noted, on June 4, 1975, that “The Administration realizes that in all these foreign policy matters its position is being weakened by special ethnic groups in Washington” which included “the splendidly organised ‘Greek Lobby’”.

Nevertheless, the organization of the lobby was poor at that time. It is worth noting that the Greek-American Congress of Andrew Athens –created as stated by Archbishop Iakovos to have his own “moderate” voice– was founded in Chicago in the summer of 1975, six months after the imposition of the embargo.<sup>17</sup>

With the exception of some Greek-American experienced politicians such as Sarbanes and Rossides, the Greek-American lobby didn't have the "wisdom" to realize that the embargo should not be presented as either a "pro-Greek" or as an "anti-Turkish" activity, but exactly what was presented to Congress, "the rule of law". Otherwise –and that what's happened at the end– the Greek-American lobby would fall into the trap of Kissinger who was insisting that an ethnic group could not even steer American foreign policy, nor endanger American interests in such a critical strategic area such as the Eastern Mediterranean.

Of course, the responsibility for this lies not only on the Greek-American lobby, but on Greece and Cyprus as well, which not only did not properly guided it, but encouraged "triumphalism", if not "winning" paeans, in Athens and Nicosia.

The American press and various commentators in the meantime, did not cease to refer to a "powerful" Greek-American lobby and talking about the damage that it could cause to U.S. interests.<sup>18</sup>

The accusations of sabotage of the American national interests by the Greek American lobby intensified in the summer of 1975 while Kissinger was making an effort to achieve at least a partial lifting of the embargo.<sup>19</sup> Among other things it was stated that the lobby was financed by Greece, that members of Congress were placed intolerable pressures, etc. Meanwhile, the executive was putting pressure on Congress highlighting the Turkish threats to close the American bases in Turkey.

Within this charged atmosphere and unbearable pressure in early October 1975 (2 October 1975) the Congress decided to partially lift the embargo, with some vague promises by the executive that it would promote a "fair" settlement of the Cyprus problem. The compromise achieved allowed Turkey to get weapons that had been ordered before the embargo and was letting the American government other possibilities to give military assistance to enable it to fulfill its commitments to NATO. In practice, of course, the embargo ban was never implemented because Turkey was taking weapons through NATO and third countries. But it had a strong political symbolism and created problems both in Ankara and Washington.

### *The Interim Period*

Despite the partial lifting of the embargo the Greek-American lobby was still believing in its potential success. This time, efforts focused on the presidential election campaign in order to convince the candidates to commit to maintain the embargo and to press Turkey to withdraw its occupation troops from Cyprus. Attention focused particularly on the Democratic candidate Jimmy Carter who promised to maintain the embargo until the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus.

When Carter won the election in November 1976, the enthusiasm in Athens and Nicosia was so great because Ford and Kissinger would finally be leaving and a “philhellene” president would take over the reins of power in Washington, that in Nicosia the bells of churches rang joyfully and the world celebrated the victory as its own! And of course, because American foreign policy –like any other serious foreign policy– is not decided by emotional criteria or forced election promises, the «Philhellene» Jimmy Carter found out later that Turkey was a valuable ally that did not deserve to be punished by the embargo.

Moreover with the rise of Carter in power, data and balances between the various power centers in Washington changed. The presidency and the executive generally will recover the ground lost to the Congress by Nixon and Ford. Carter will present the American Foreign policy guided by new moral principles in contrast to those put forward by Nixon-Kissinger. These new moral principles seek to respect the American law and promote the democratization of the friendly to U.S brutal dictatorships in the world. Thus these new moral principles in U.S. foreign policy were even concerning human rights. This phraseology sounded positive in Congress, especially in its democratic majority which now had to face not a Republican president, as in the Nixon and Ford era, but a Democrat one.

Nevertheless, the battle for the embargo will be given in the Congress in the summer of 1978, and will be lost for the Greek-American lobby with a narrow majority which decided to lift it. The pressure to lift the embargo was strong and in terms of the executive and by vested interests. It also appears that the Caramanlis government in Athens was convinced by the Americans to accept the lifting of the embargo in exchange for the known ratio of U.S. military aid 7: 10 to Greece and Turkey. Moreover, the battle moved back to the issue that ethnic lobbies can not determine the Foreign Policy of America.<sup>20</sup> It is



characteristic what wrote the *Wall Street Journal*, known for its huge influence and connections with the various power centers which stated “that the only reason for maintaining the embargo is that there are more Greek voters than those of Turkish origin for the election of members of Congress”.<sup>21</sup>

At the same time the MP in the House of Representatives Paul Fiendly stated that the embargo was decided because “the Greek-Americans have a strong presence in each constituency for the Congress.”<sup>22</sup> Certainly this is not at all the case actually. As noted by Professor Nicholas Stavrou, “the average population of Greek origin in the 435 constituencies voting for the Congress is about 0.08%. Only in ten regions the ethnic Greek population (voting) is more than 1%. In practice this means that the Greek vote is not decisive anywhere except in case of very tiny difference (of votes) between the candidates, as happened in the presidential election between Carter and Ford in 1976. Stavrou even notes that the four regions with the largest population of Greek origin (New York, Michigan, Illinois and California) are less successful in the election of Greek-Americans in various offices, while there are also among them elected officials with strong positions in favor of Turkey.”<sup>23</sup>

Yet the myth of the “powerful” Greek-American lobby –which does not withstand serious analysis– seems to serve the executive which was using it to exercise pressure on Congress considering that it was accepting the influence of an ethnic lobby instead of supporting the reasonable American interests. It seems also to serve a certain Greek-American leadership that could be presented both in Washington, Athens and Nicosia, with serious claims, or influence - particularly in the formulation of the Greek Foreign policy, and developments in the Cyprus problem - or to serve other interests as it is going to be shown in the analysis that will follow.

A part from the mythology that was created –and the fact that Athens and Nicosia sometimes enticed it– for the first time the Greek-Americans realized that they possessed a political force. And whether these lobbies were until then dominated by amateurism, they began to appear various kinds of professional lobbyists –who are often just as amateurs– trying to sell the products of their art in Washington and in Athens. Thus was born the industry of the Greek-American lobby that has little to do with the masses of Greek-Americans, the Greek community -*omogeneia*- whose interest in Greek affairs, welfare and progress of Greece remains high and unquestionable.



### ***The Decades 1980, 1990***

After the failure of 1978, will begin slowly the decline and retreat of the Greek-American lobby. Although this decline is evident to every serious observer and scholar, the mythology of the ‘powerful’ lobby, is still alive, not only in Greece and Cyprus but also in the various Greek communities of the diaspora.

Three things characterize the last two decades: At the organizational level, the governments of Greece and Cyprus have intervened to help create new structures, at the level of activity the “professionalism” makes its appearance, while we experience a strongly reverse influence phenomenon, the activity of the lobby influencing the formulation and conduct of the foreign policy of the country of origin in favor of U.S. interests. Even on the organizational level, the cards are redistributed again in recent years with the various interlaced interests to seek to be present and heard at the level of the Greek-American lobby.

### **Interventions of Greek and Cypriot Governments**

First, the Cyprus government, following the difficult situation created by the Turkish invasion and occupation of northern Cyprus, will try to create a global network of the Cypriot diaspora to support the cause of Cyprus. Thus, it was created in the late 1970s, the World Federation of Overseas Cypriots-POMAK and the International Coordinating Committee Justice for Cyprus-PSEKA. POMAK is based in London, as in Britain are established most expatriate Cypriots, while PSEKA headquartered in New York because in the U.S. takes place the largest effort to promote the Cyprus issue, and the action of any serious lobby. In particular, the hegemonic position of U.S. in the post-Cold War era, is justifying the effort to influence U.S. foreign policy.

Somewhat belatedly, the Greek government moved in 1995 to the creation of the Council of Hellenes Abroad-SAE (*Symvoulío Apodimou Ellinismou*) to coordinate the activities of the Greek diaspora (December 1995, Thessaloniki). The SAE is a world wide umbrella organization of which the presidency was for a long time based in the USA. The SAE of America which included until 2006, apart from the U.S., Canada and Latin America, is the most important component of this new global organisation. After the international meeting in Thessaloniki in December 2006 and under the new law 3480/2006, Latin America and Canada became separate regions.

If the initiative of the Cypriot government did not create big problems, since related only to the Cypriots and the Cyprus question, the same didn't happen with the initiative of the Greek government with the creation of SAE.

The first reaction came from the Church, especially by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which considers the Greek diaspora –more the orthodox of the Greek diaspora– as its flock, under its own responsibility and jurisdiction. Previously, with Prime Minister Constantine Caramanlis, the Greek Orthodox Church of America under the Patriarchate had opposed even the creation of the State Secretariat for Greeks Abroad. The situation was further complicated because at the same period that SAE was established the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I ordered Archbishop Iakovos to resign, while the Greek government provided him support. The paradox in this story is the alliance of Iakovos with the Greek government, as it is known that the Archbishop not only collaborated with the junta, but also fought PASOK when it was in opposition.<sup>24</sup> But it is a fact that Iakovos reversed the negative climate that existed in PASOK towards him in the early years of its governance, and soon became the “official” interlocutor of the government, as happened with the military regime, and the Caramanlis government. It has been reported by many that Andreas Papandreou, who knew Iakovos and his role in the period of dictatorship, had to reconcile with him hoping in the support of the Greek-Americans in a difficult era for Greece. The settlement with Iakovos restored a degree of unity in the Greek American community, but also left a bitter taste to those who stood by Papandreou in other difficult times –the period of dictatorship– most of whom were demobilised by the lobby. It is very likely that Papandreou has succumbed to the myth that managed to establish Iakovos as a major player, that he was exercising his influence on American decision-making centers. In a stunning declaration, a partner of Iakovos for many years, Metropolitan Anthony of Dardanelles of the Diocese of San Francisco, said on this topic: “Everything that has been said or written about the power and influence exercised by Iakovos at the White House is a legend created by the media. “Iakovos, Anthony continues, “was a master conductor in public relations and this was necessary because the power of the Diaspora is probably exaggerated”. The same Metropolitan concluded that over the last thirty years the Greek-American lobby has not achieved many things, and that the so-called access to the White House led to the exploitation of the Diaspora.<sup>25</sup> These estimates of Antony may be too

excessive, but they partly coincide with similar assessments of other observers as will be shown later in this analysis.

Thus, in December 1995, Iakovos who was still archbishop –but on the point to resign– supported the effort for the creation of the SAE and in return his confidant Andrew Athens became the president of the organization. Unlike Iakovos, Archbishop Stylianos of Australia boycotted the effort of SAE and the church communities, –parishes in reality– of Australia are not represented in the organisation. Of course the case of Australia and the role of Stylianos is a fairly complex issue with which we are not going to deal.

The Patriarchate, despite its cautious stance and some representations, didn't take any dramatic decisions which would cut the bridges with the Greek state. Nevertheless it proceeded through the replacement of Iakovos, and took no account of the advice of the Greek government to give him the chance to stay at least for a time in position, nor its advice on choosing his successor.

Then, the traditional institutions of the Diaspora in the U.S., and personalities with an influence did not accept the leadership of SAE. Over the years, SAE gives the impression not to be the coordinating body of the Diaspora, but of an additional organization among those which claim a guiding role. Moreover, it is striking that even during minor events –not to mention the important ones– SAE participates as one of many organizations.

Many of these reactions were of course related to personal ambitions or interests. Generally, however, the whole way they faced SAE has to do with the philosophy of Greek Americans of the second and third generation who can hardly accept the fact that Greece –which for them is only the land of their parents or grandparents– comes with a presidential decree to impose an agency - coordinating body for their various activities. There are even formal-legal problems for the operation of SAE in the USA, difficulties in facing things from the same perspective, different priorities, etc.

For the first-generation Greek immigrants –as is particularly the case in Canada – there are other serious issues such as representation, and the favorable treatment of the Church from the Greek state at the expense of large communities and other urban organizations. In Canada, for example, Greek-Canadians created their own umbrella organization, the Hellenic Canadian Congress. With many weaknesses, it is true, but it exists and all the major communities are represented in it, the

church parishes and various other organizations. The Greek state, however, which is defining the number of the representatives for the SAE Assemblies, has essentially distributed them equally between the Congress and the Church. It is strange that a government like that of PASOK facing problems with the Hellenic Church, was strengthening the Church abroad at the expense of the civil organizations.

Thus, it appears that the efforts of the SAE didn't deliver the expected results. An indication of this is the fact of creating new structures among Greek-Americans – this is the case of the fabulously rich Angelo Tsakopoulos who created his own group - the intense debate within the American Greek Orthodox Church and its circle as well as the ambiguous attitude of the then Greek Prime Minister Costas Simitis towards a creature he inherited from Andreas Papandreou.<sup>26</sup> The government of Costas Karamanlis remained trapped in the same policy. The recent crisis in Greece put in practice an end to SAE activities.

As for the Cypriot organizations POMAK and PSEKA they have been reduced over time to inefficient bureaucratic organizations.

### **The Professional Lobby**

In practice, the current Greek-American lobby is professional, regardless of its quality.

The American Hellenic Institute - AHI was perhaps the first professional lobby among Greek-Americans (founded in 1974) but not in the strict sense, namely the creation of a business lobby, but in the sense of working to address the issues of the lobby. Its work is considered among the most serious and is surrounded by scientists and professionals.

The Company «Manatos and Manatos» founded by Andrew Manatos is the case of a purely professional - business lobby. The company was receiving for a quite long period funds from the governments of Greece and Cyprus. Andrew Manatos has been a consultant to the president of SAE Andrew Athens and the organizer of the annual conferences of PSEKA in Washington, and the activities of the United Hellenic American Congress of Athens (UHAO). So the Manatos Company acts as the major professional lobby for government funded organisations of the Diaspora.

Likewise considered the Western Policy Center-WPC of the fabulously rich

sponsor of President Clinton, Angelo Tsakopoulos, may be considered professional as well. It was founded in Sacramento, California - minor body in the beginning, in 1995 - before being transferred to Washington in 1998. This organization joined the Woodrow Wilson International Center in 2004. Later it was totally absorbed by the Woodrow Wilson International Center. The WPC stated “as its objective purpose the promotion of the geopolitical interests of U.S. and the Western values to the South-Eastern Europe and the settlement of the Greek-Turkish and south-balkan problems”. In promoting its objectives, especially those in developing “close U.S. relations with Greece and Turkey, it does not consider the issue of Turkish presence in Cyprus as an obstacle to the development of these relations.”<sup>27</sup> Under these circumstances one wonders if WPC is a Greek-American lobby promoting Greek interests in Washington or instead a lobby to promote American interests by exerting pressure on Athens.

Even in recent years the Greek and Cypriot governments, sublet the services of lobby companies for the promotion of Greek interests. Such kind of hiring have brought significant benefits to Turkey which uses these professional companies – due to the lack of a significant Turkish presence in U.S.- in a planned and long term fashion way. For the Greek interests these companies have not been successful because they have not been used in a planned or rational way nor in a broader strategy.

In general, the professional business lobby has replaced the old one, often spontaneous mobilization of the Diaspora. The quality of this professionalism is often questionable judging from the results, but also by the detailed breakdown analysis of certain activities.

### **The Chronological Periodisation**

Chronologically, we can delimit the decades 1980, 1990 and 2000 into five periods: the period of the Reagan presidency (1981-1988), that of the Bush presidency (1989-1992), that of the Clinton presidency (1993-2000), that of the Bush's son presidency (2001-2008) and that of Obama (2009-).<sup>28</sup>

#### ***The Reagan Period (1981-1988)***

During this period the U.S. interest for the Cyprus and Greek issues in general is reduced. The Reagan administration will further enhance its relations with Turkey and even will try to reverse the ratio 7: 10 for military assistance to

Greece and Turkey. As already mentioned, this ratio - based on a law of the Congress passed in 1978 in exchange for lifting the embargo - provides that for every ten U.S. dollars military aid to Turkey would be granted seven to Greece. The purpose of this ratio is to maintain a relative military balance between the two countries. In recent years this ratio has basically lost all meaning, given the realised cuts.

The reasons for this downgrading of the Cypriot and Greek issues in Washington for this period, are associated with the strong anti-communist policy of the Reagan administration and the perception that Turkey was for this purpose, a valuable ally. It coincided also with the arrival of PASOK in power in Greece. The anticommunist hysteria in a climate of new Cold War affected the bilateral relations, while Washington was accusing Greece of tolerance for terrorism and independent policy within NATO. It is significant that Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense - who was second in command at the Pentagon - and amid the most enthusiastic supporters of Turkey along with Defense Minister Caspar Weinberger, left the government in 1988 and created a private company - lobby which took on the promotion of the Turkish interests in Washington.

Another reason for the deterioration of the Greek issues in Washington is the creation of a truly powerful lobby in favor of Turkey in response to the mobilization of the Greek Americans in previous years. As Turkey had not a strong Turkish American community to mobilize in Washington, the Turkish lobby went through public relations professional brands, retired generals and representatives of the military industries. At the same time was created a network to promote Turkish interests in the academic community. Turkey had also funded the Institute of Turkish Studies in Washington which works directly for the development of this academic network.

The Turkish lobby in the period of the Reagan presidency will achieve connection with the executive, particularly the Pentagon and the State Department. Further, it will manage to find supports in Congress, especially among Republicans.

Without underestimating the efforts of the Greek-American lobby over this period, one notes a countdown over the period 1974-1980 that had a 'monopoly' presence, particularly on the Cyprus question. The effectiveness of the Turkish lobby will retrograde to the second rank the Greek-American lobby.

### ***The Bush Era Period (1989-1992)***

It is known that George Bush won the election in November 1988 over the Greek-American Michael Dukakis, candidate for the Democratic Party. Dukakis's candidacy had created high expectations in the Greek American Community but also in Greece and Cyprus. Dukakis himself was very attentive during his campaign and did not give specific pledges on Greek themes, unlike previous candidates of the Democratic Party like Carter or Clinton. Although one can only do hypotheses in this case, knowing the mechanisms and decision-makers in Washington, it is doubtful whether the U.S. foreign policy would change at all with Dukaki's election. But the fact that a son of Greek immigrants arrived so close to the highest office of the most powerful country in the world, gave special pride to the Greek Americans who started realizing their potential. At this juncture, Archbishop Iakovos supported essentially Bush.

The Bush presidency coincides with the end of the Soviet Union and the Gulf War. These major events had shaken the Cold War climate of the Reagan era, especially the first four years.

In this new climate and with the Mitsotakis government in Athens, the Greek-American relations got better. The Greek-American lobby became more active, and President Bush, during his visit to Greece and Turkey in July 1991, announced his intention to work towards resolving the Cyprus problem. This effort did not work, despite the good personal relations of Mitsotakis with the U.S. President. Neither the U.S. policy to consider Turkey as a key factor of stability in the region to serve their interests will change. It was a confirmation of the priority of geopolitical and geostrategic interests on any personal relationships.

Meanwhile the Greek-American lobby is required now in Washington to support new Greek themes: the Macedonian question and the Greek minority issue in Albania. So, next to the Greek-Turkish problems are now added and the Balkan issues.

### ***The Clinton Era (1993-2000)***

In the presidential election campaign of 1992 a Greek-American still claims the nomination as candidate for the Democratic Party, former Senator Paul Tsongas. Finally Bill Clinton will get the Democratic nomination, and be elected U.S. president, against George Bush.



As Greek Americans generally vote for Democratic candidates so far, and this time they still supported Bill Clinton on whom they placed many hopes. They were expecting that the new president, if not supporting the Greek positions, at least he would be closer to a policy of respect for human rights and principles of international law, which would facilitate - with some pressure on Turkey - a solution to the Cyprus problem and Greek-Turkish disputes.

In fact, the program of the Democratic Party before the elections reiterated a standing American position that the U.S. would work to find a solution to the Cyprus problem in accordance with UN resolutions. It pledged to bring the matter to the agenda of American diplomacy. For the Macedonian question, it was promised that it would be sensitive to the Greek concerns with the name Macedonia.

Clinton himself as a candidate, in a letter to Angelo Tsakopoulos, who was chairman of a group of his Greek-American supporters, said that the Cyprus issue would be a priority, and that it “should put an end to the illegal Turkish occupation of Cyprus”.<sup>29</sup> He had given promises even to Cypriot U.S personalities sounding similar to those of Carter.

The election of Clinton, however, has not changed the substance of U.S. policy on Cyprus. There was certainly a mobility all the years of his presidency, but the priority of U.S. policy remained the same: first Turkey and close relationship with her. Thus, although the Greek-American lobby players were going and coming all these years in the White House-and Greek parliamentarians and politicians as well - it was more a question of public relations for Clinton and some Greek American actors (as well), with lots of photos rather than promoting Greek issues. The situation was such that the explosive exuberant Foreign Minister Theodoros Pangalos - beyond any diplomatic caution and civility - called Clinton a liar and caused the wrath of Americans. Certainly the Americans were waiting him in the corner, and with the Ocalan case he was dismissed from the Foreign Ministry, while the new minister who took over the Greek foreign policy, George Papandreou, was favored by Washington. Later on, Pangalos, with his well known inconsistencies, tried to have a *rapprochement* with Americans, particularly with the support he gave to the Annan plan, but his efforts were rather unsuccessful.

Unlike the public relations of the Greek-American lobby - with at least the exception of the AHI of Eugene Rossides - the Turks have obtained far more



from President Clinton, than from any previous president: the alliance with Israel, support for their European candidacy, recognition essentially of the merits of the Turkish presence in Cyprus, the support in the persecution of the Kurds, military and economic assistance, praise for the repression by the Turkish military establishment, which was presented as a contribution to the fight against terrorism and support for construction of the major pipeline Baku-Ceyhan.

As for the Macedonian question and the problems with Albania, the only thing American policy achieved was to play a mediating role for appeasement, and led the parties to the negotiating table.

There was so much frustration from the Clinton policy - at least for those interested in and beyond public relations and photography at the White House, or even the overnight stay in the Lincoln bedroom - that even a prelate, Metropolitan Anthony of Dardanelles, of the Diocese of San Francisco, stated: The visit of President Clinton in Greece was for the sake of Hillary who was then preparing to claim the seat of New York Senator. The Metropolitan went on saying that he hoped that Hillary will lose, because Clinton, while he is "going through the end of his second term of four years, and while he had made many promises to Greek Americans, did not fulfill them. "Anthony even suggests that, instead of making contributions to candidates who take advantage of the Greek-American community, the money should be given "to create institutions and foundations in order to support future generations." And as an example he cited the Vryonis Centre for the Study of Hellenism, "which is worth one hundred visits to the White House."<sup>30</sup>

This fatigue with promises, with visits and smiles at the White House is reflected into the views expressed by many young Greek-Americans through the Internet, where there is confusion about the Greek foreign policy of *rapprochement* with Turkey which they see as ineffective, given that only Greece is constantly backing down - at least as they perceive things - while Ankara is always uncompromising.

The disappointment is reflected also during this period, in discussions with many Greek Americans, in comments to radio broadcasts, newspapers etc. There is a strong feeling that U.S. foreign policy is favoring Turkey and that the leadership of the Greek-American lobby is not operating properly nor has the skills and the necessary political stature to oppose the U.S. plans favoring Turkey.

### ***The Era of George Bush's Son Presidency (2001-2008)***

This period has nothing significant to present in terms of activation of the Greek-American lobby. To the contrary it shows most weakened than ever. First, the Greek influence on the Republican Party has always been very limited. The exception is the relationship maintained by the Bush family with the Greek-American businessman Alex Spanos but whose interest in Greek subjects are from limited to nonexistent.<sup>31</sup> Some have also talked about relations of Bush's father, former President of the USA, with the shipowner Latsis' family, whom they hosted several times in the Greek islands. More serious is the case of Senator Olympia Snowe, who together with Michael Bilirakis in the House of Representatives are the two Republicans in Congress who defended occasionally the Greek issues. The Greek presence in the executive branch with John Negroponte certainly does not affect U.S. foreign policy in favor of the Greek issues. Besides, it would be illusory to believe that the presence to the executive of people of one or another ethnic origin beyond a certain symbolism can change the direction of U.S. policy in favor of one country or another.

The traditional Greek-American lobby continued also during this time its routine activities, but without significant results. The visits to the White House for the 'traditional' photography continued, although not with the same frequency as in the Clinton era. With a strong pro 'Turkish' team around Bush, especially at the Pentagon, the U.S. policy tended to be even more close to Ankara. As to the Cyprus question particularly, support was given to the Turkish claims over the Annan plan. Even the Americans have brought unbearable pressure on the Cypriots to accept the plan - including funding groups that supported it on the eve of the referendum - and after its rejection at the referendum of April 2004, they made efforts to upgrade the occupation regime in Cyprus.

### ***The Obama Era***<sup>32</sup>

The traditional Greek-American lobby continued also during the Obama era its routine activities, but without significant results. In Washington for all practical purposes, the supposed Greek lobby is considered as "the fading Greek lobby" with diminishing clout in foreign policy. Even if Obama can still count on a strong majority of the self-identified Greek vote, in fact he got a pass from the Greek lobby. The priorities of his external policy to fight terrorism and in the same time to realise an opening to moderate Islam upgraded Turkey. In one way

or another Turkey is a strategic asset for the USA. The importance of Greece is in a way secondary for Americans compared to Turkey, but also is taken for granted. In the Balkans American interests don't coincide with these of Greece.

Another inconvenient is the absence of leading Greek-Americans in the Congress after the retirement of Paul Sarbanes and Olympia Snowe. With Senator Snowe's retirement in the elections of 2012 and Shelly Berkley's narrow loss in the Nevada Senate race, there is no longer a single Hellene in the U.S. Senate. It's a notable loss for the Greek lobby on the Senate side of the Capitol. For over three decades, there has been a Hellene in the United States Senate.

Nevertheless the main problem for the Greek lobby in Washington, regardless of objective difficulties due to the direction of U.S. foreign policy, is its inability due to the lack of effective structures, lack of capable leadership, lack of clear objectives and lack of coordination with Athens and Nicosia.

### *The Countdown*

The impression a Greek citizen has when we talk about the Greek-American lobby is of course that it works for the promotion of Greek interests in Washington. That was true at the good old times. The countdown has begun long ago. Today the triadic relationship Greek-American lobby, Washington, Athens (and of course Nicosia) implies that the Greek-American lobby also promotes American interests in Athens. This may sound strange but this is the reality that has long been noted by those who follow and study the evolution of the Greek-American lobby.<sup>33</sup>

Professor Vangelis Coufoudakis already mentioned in the '70s and '80s two cases, where the Greek foreign policy changed because of the influence of Greek-American lobby, one of which dates back to 1976 – it concerned the defense cooperation agreement between Greece and U.S. - and the other at the beginning of the PASOK government, and it was regarding the restoration of the statue of Truman as a goodwill gesture to the Americans. Always according to Coufoudakis – who writes in the early 1990's - and in a series of other issues, the Greek-American lobby influenced the PASOK government to change its policy, but stresses that it was not the deciding factor for this change. He refers, for example, to the more “pragmatic” foreign policy of PASOK since 1986 and the lowering of tones of anti-American rhetoric, the negotiations on the American bases and the decision on the issue of Palestinian “terrorist” Mohammed Rashid.<sup>34</sup>

For this period one could indicate also the restoration of friendly relations between the government of PASOK and Archbishop Iakovos. Although we are unable to know to what extent Iakovos influenced Papandreou to meet with Ozal in Davos, it is certain that the Archbishop had at that time cordial relations with both. It is the time that he still aspired to reach the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and to this end he has developed close relations with Ozal. Iakovos' close relationships with the centers of American power throughout this period are also well known. Whether one can not argue that the contribution of Iakovos was decisive to the *rapprochement* between Greece and Turkey that led to the meeting in Davos - other more important interests of both countries, and ambitions of their leaders, were more decisive factors - it would be naïve for anyone not to see a certain influence of the triadic relationship of the Archbishop with the interested parties.

The tendency of some persons of the Greek-American lobby to promote American interests more than the Greek ones increased in the '90s. A typical example of this tendency is the case of the Western Policy Center, founded by the Greek-American businessman Angelo Tsakopoulos, to which reference has already been made.

All the Greek Governments tried to avoid conflict with the Greek-American lobby. Even the PASOK Government in the early years in power and despite its anti-American rhetoric, restored cordial relations with Iakovos, despite his past-junta's support, hostile attitude towards PAK but also towards the PASOK during the years it was in the opposition. Although it was repeatedly stressed that the Greek foreign policy was decided in Athens, on the other hand all the governments reiterated that they were listening attentively to the views of Greek Americans. Thus, despite any tensions at times, the relations were held to a level of mutual understanding. Some discords on the Greek minority in Albania or the Macedonian question do not change this picture. Above all, these discords-criticism of Greek foreign policy on these issues—were coming from regional organizations such as the Panepirotiki or Pammakedoniki and not from the Church, or the main lobby groups. Moreover, the contradictions within the Greek-American lobby gave the possibility of some kind of maneuverability to the Greek Governments.

From the side of the third partner in this triadic relationship, the U.S., the interest to use the Greek-Americans to lobby for changing the policy of Athens and Nicosia was always intense. The various power centers in Washington used *ad*

*nauseam* the Greek-American lobby for this purpose, but it is true with a very discreet way more often and in the form of friendly recommendations. Usually, these centers were presenting to the Greek-American lobby, some ideas regarding the relations of Greece with Ankara or even with its Balkan neighbors, that they would promote and ask Athens or Nicosia to “help” these efforts of mediation, their “understanding” or to show “flexibility and good faith”. Thus, the Greek-American lobby was transferring the pressure of Washington to the governments of Athens and Nicosia. Furthermore, it was becoming an “advisory” body to the two Governments that certainly was nothing but a kind of pressure.

If this triadic relationship –Greek-American lobby, Greece (Cyprus), US– operated somewhat balanced for some years after 1974, due to the charged atmosphere of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and because of the compromised relationship of the traditional Greek-American leaders with the junta, but also because of the pressure of the masses on the grassroots of the Diaspora, things have changed gradually against Greek interests. In recent years especially, more pressure is exerted on Greece and Cyprus –it is really discreet– to make concessions, instead of exercising pressure against Turkey which remains adamant in its positions both in Cyprus and the Aegean. Greek-American organizations are visiting Greece, Turkey and Cyprus, visits organized by the U.S. services –for example the case of AHEPA in April 1998– transferring the American positions, mediators on Cyprus succeed one another and are presented as the successes of the Greek-American lobby, regardless of their missions’ outcome. Greek-American big businessmen are increasingly matching all the more openly to American positions on the Greek issues accompanying even American officials on their visits to Greece, while the SAE and its President Andrew Athens see only positive initiatives undertaken by the U.S.

While in the past, frequent visits of Greek politicians to the U.S. were bothering the Greek American leadership since they came into contact with the masses of the Diaspora, today they are usually the official guests of this leadership and a series of photographs at the White House is also part of their tour.

Professor Nicholas Stavrou wrote a few years ago ironically that “after 25 years of illusions, the ‘Greek lobby’ has found a new way to be helpful. It redefined its influence from Washington to Athens. Now instead of putting pressure on the State Department and the White House to stop the hypocrisy and support the enforcement of international law in Cyprus, the Aegean and the

Balkans, Greek American leaders are rushing to Athens, either by opening the door to ‘Special American Envoys’ or escorting them.<sup>35</sup>

Eugene Rossides said himself that “today there is even a group, whose positions on various ethnic issues are close to those of Turkey”.<sup>36</sup> Rossides photographs the Tsakopoulos group –the Western Policy Center– of which the director John Sitalides with lectures at various universities becomes the forerunner of American ideas and views on Greek issues.

The other view which promotes constantly the Greek-American lobby in Athens is the economic and political stability and improvements in the investment climate by reducing tensions in the region. This position is of course the one promoted firmly also by the State Department supporting by all means the Greek-Turkish *rapprochement*, but without putting any real pressure or even making any suggestion towards Turkey for concessions from its intransigent positions.

There is no doubt that during the Greek-Turkish *rapprochement* –as part of the “earthquake diplomacy”– a portion of the Greek-American lobby has played an important role. It is mainly the Tsakopoulos group, some Greek-American businessmen, the SAE and the Church. But there are significant differences among them as expressed by the Greek American Hellenic Institute of Rossides and even AHEPA. Finally and yet, strong opposition to this policy is expressed by the grass roots of the Diaspora. Not of course to the Greek-Turkish *rapprochement* to which no one objects, but in fact to the leveling of everything, where the occupation of Cyprus is presented as something almost secondary to the improvement of investment climate and to the prevention of tensions in the Eastern Mediterranean.<sup>37</sup> In the same context notable is the pressure exerted by the Greek-American lobby towards Athens about the so called terrorism issues. In essence this lobby was adopting the American position on these matters drawn up for years by Washington, that the Greek government did not pay the necessary efforts to dismantle terrorism.

As for SAE –although its role was confined for a long time more to create “medical centers” by Andrew Athens in the former Soviet republics– it is also a channel diffusing American positions and opinions in Athens and Nicosia. If we analyze the statements and views expressed at times by the SAE we will find out a flaccidity of the kind “Americans do everything they can”, so do

Greece and Cyprus, it remains to convince Turkey that it is in its interest to appear more willing to make some compromises, in order to find solutions to all Greek-Turkish differences.

Indeed, the Greek-Turkish rapprochement and the “earthquake diplomacy” adopted by George Papandreou in 1999 is approved by a proportion of the Greek-American lobby which has interests and important links to the American centers of power and interrelated interests in Athens. On the contrary at the grassroots of the diaspora exists a great concern, since Turkey has not made the slightest gesture of goodwill. Even on an issue such as the Theological School of Halki, for which there is virtually no cost to Turkey, and despite repeated promises by the Turkish officials since the Ozal era, it has done absolutely nothing.

There is no doubt that the triadic relationship evolves slowly in favor of U.S. interests, rather than Greek. This situation, which is likely to deteriorate over time against Greece, is explained by two main reasons: the first is Americanization, assimilation of Greek Americans who are now members of the second, third and fourth generation. It is natural for them to feel as Americans first and less as Greeks. Most of them keep more of a folk-emotional relationship with Greece. The Greek-American community ceased now to be renewed with new immigrants from Greece and the balances that existed within and among new immigrants and the generations of Greek-American born in the U.S. are overturned. Probably in the future we will talk more about philhellenes rather than Greeks.

The second reason for the change of balance in the triangle Greek-American lobby, Greece (Cyprus), USA in favor of the USA, are the Greek-American big businessmen interests. Greece is now a door of their entry to Europe and the Balkans. This of course requires to avoid tensions in the region and improvement of investment climate.

To these two reasons, one should probably add also the role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate with which powerful Greek-American businessmen maintain close relationships. The relaxation of tension in the area allows the Patriarchate a certain freedom of movement and of course –even under the constant Turkish pressure– it is seeking to defuse tension in the Greek-Turkish relations, even with sacrifices in Cyprus and the Aegean.

Certainly it would be wrong to underestimate the reactions to this course of the triangle relation within the Greek-American community. These reactions



may come even from young people of the second, third or fourth generation who at some time discover their roots and react strongly to Americanization. Currently there is such a movement in the Greek American community, although it is too weak to be able to reverse the balance. Reactions may come even-and they already exist but they are weak-from Greek-American scholars who have a different perception of Greece. It shouldn't also be underestimated the likely grassroots reaction of the Diaspora, especially if at some point the Greek or the Cypriot Government are forced to react to possible pressures from the Greek-American lobby. Finally, the differences that exist either on the ideological or in the practical level, either on the level of interests between the different groups of the Greek-American lobby, is another factor maintaining the balance hampering at the moment, the full reversal of equilibria in the triadic relation.

Of course, much depends on the policy that will be followed by Athens (and Nicosia). Athens can - but discreetly - influence in its favor the balance inside the Greek-American lobby. It can support those forces that support Greek interests. It can invest properly in the academic community as Turkey has done with a lot of success. It can above all integrate the theme of the lobby in a national strategy it had never had on the national issues.

However, this issue of the triadic relationship is the expression of a momentum for each ethnic lobby, not only the Greek-American. Sociologists who study the issue find that it is a complex issue both in terms of interest and on the emotional level. In general, however, as the agents of the ethnic lobby draw away from the first generation of migrants, interests outweigh the emotional factor.

### ***A Neglected Parameter: The Field of American Education***

Usually when referring to the Greek-American lobby is stressed the Turkish penetration in U.S. universities and the strong efforts of Turkey to create a foothold in the field of American academia. It is true that Turkey has shown considerable success in this area and has spent large sums for this purpose. Even in occupied Cyprus, some American universities have entered into relationships with the so-called Turkish Cypriot universities which are either annexes of those of Turkey or created more for political propaganda purposes rather than to fulfill the actual needs of the Turkish Cypriots.

But, apart from the academia, there is the general area of American education



in which the various ethno-cultural communities have made great efforts in the postwar era to influence in their favor the new curriculum that were created.

As it was noted in a communication to the Third World Congress of the Research Institutes of Hellenism in Montreal in May 1999<sup>38</sup> by the well-known Greek-American scholar Speros Vryonis, the revolutionary changes in postwar American education system went unnoticed by both the Greek-American community and Greece itself. Even when we have seen these changes, said Professor Vryonis, little has been done to study the phenomenon and its effects in shaping the whole personality of American citizens, their political attitudes and choices. Because these new curricula have changed the whole historical and cultural context of American education, they edify the American people through a new historical-cultural proposal.

What has essentially been done was the removal of classical education from the curriculum and its strengthening with cultural elements associated with the new postwar reality. For example, the emphasis was on African American culture, the techno-utilitarian orientation of education and its enrichment with cultural references that reflect more the composition of American society on the ethnocultural level.

Other ethno-cultural communities, particularly the Jewish, Armenian and African American, not only intervened in the process of reforming the educational programs, but also created chairs in the universities, scholarships institutions around the production of a sufficient number of teachers in all levels of education who can teach elements of their culture and history. And all this in a long-term planning in order to be able to form through education the American public opinion. And in particular in order to form through education the American elite, which will be later in the decision-making positions affecting the shaping of U.S. foreign policy.<sup>39</sup> Even the Turkish government has invested huge sums in the field of American education in recent years with the result to manage slowly to create a positive image of Turkey in American public opinion.

However, neither the Greek-American community, neither Greece saw this matter in a methodical and serious planning in this regard. Some “investments” made at (the) university level, were convulsive, made without study and planning. The same, unfortunately, is done in other countries like Australia and Canada. The result is devastating and the situation will be even worse in the

future. The new strains of American diplomacy, of academia, the key decision makers, will not have any knowledge of Greek culture beyond some stereotypes.

Previously they had at least some knowledge of ancient Greek culture as taught at various levels of the American education system. Once again the Greeks, due to their mistakes, they lost an opportunity to seriously invest in a so sensitive area. They will continue, however, to blame for all these, in a manichean way, the Americans, as usual, ignoring their own responsibilities.

We know, however, that Greek-Americans have one of the highest levels of education. And as Professor Speros Vryonis put it “this is a contradictory phenomenon in that the Greek-Americans have been classified as one of the two highly educated groups in the nation” (e.g. in the U.S.) regardless their indifference to influence the new curriculum. He will stress, however, immediately that in fact this education (of the Greek-Americans) is in technical areas and not in the broad education “. Which means - and it is established - that the Greek-Americans have turned themselves more to the so-called liberal professions, and there is a tremendous deficit in the social sciences, teachers in areas of primary and secondary education, in the arts and in general in the field of letters and humanities. The human groups, however, societies and communities in general, that do not have to show achievements in these fields, are doomed. From these fields is popping culture, civilisation more broadly, the ideological-political choices of the various societies and communities. Here there is indeed a clear distinction between the concepts of education and training.

So under these conditions, both Athens and the Greek-American community would have to incorporate this issue within their broader strategy and to address it directly whether they want to have some positive results in the future.

### ***The Structures of the American Lobby***

As already mentioned, the Greek-American lobby has a multiple fragmentation, disjointed structure, without a central coordinating body. For many years the Orthodox Church was a sort of link, a kind of relay despite intense criticism and pressure from other groups in the Diaspora. The charismatic personality of Archbishop Iakovos contributed greatly to this role of the Church, as also the close relationships he developed over time with the American, the Greek, and sometimes with the Turkish, Governments.

The policy of the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew to force the resignation of Iakovos and divide the Greek Orthodox Church of America in four districts - Canada, USA, Mexico, Latin America - with his unfortunate continuing interventions, has weakened the Church and now undergoes a deep crisis. The heirs of Iakovos, Spyridon and Dimitrios, didn't have the same strong personality as him. In addition because they received the undermining from friends of the former Archbishop, and the stranglehold of Bartholomew and that of his Greek-American friends, they failed to keep the Church in the forefront. Even in the U.S., the Archbishop's position has weakened with the upgrading of bishoprics to metropolises. So the role of the Church seriously degraded in recent years.

The foundation of the SAE, which aimed to create a central coordinating body also failed and the body is far less important than some traditional organizations such as AHEPA.

The way in which SAE was created by the Greek state, the way in which it operates, lack of capable leadership, leaves many questions about the Greek state's vision and shows a lack of strategic and long-term planning for such a serious matter.

Some believe that AHEPA remains the most important organization of the Diaspora, with the greatest influence.<sup>40</sup> Surely AHEPA has a history - it was founded in 1922 - some of its activities marked the Greek-American community, but as a lobby actor it is doubtful whether it can be seen as the most important organization. Surely it is also the agency with branches throughout the U.S. and Canada, and in that only the Church with its parishes can compete with it, with a major organizational structure in comparison with other organizations, but it never claimed the leadership in Greek-American lobby. Neither, however, refused to contribute to its efforts. On the other hand, it remains a deeply conservative institution, it tolerated or even supported the dictatorship in Greece and in some occasions it embraced the American options on the Greek-US relations.

The American Hellenic Institute - AHI - founded by Eugene Rossides in 1974 is perhaps the most professional team, as already mentioned, of the Greek-American lobby, which has a serious work planning with constant positions. In contrast to the AHEPA, it is not a mass organization, but a group of businessmen, professionals and academics. The conservative Rossides's past - he served as Undersecretary of trade in the Nixon administration - and his relations with the

Republican Party, even the sympathy or tolerance he showed for the dictatorship in Greece, are considered by many to be the weak point of the American Hellenic Institute. The AHI was strongly opposed to the creation of SAE and has refused any cooperation with it, while it worked occasionally with AHEPA and the Church, and other Greek-American organizations.

The United Hellenic American Congress (UHAC), a creation of Archbishop Iakovos in 1975, who placed at its head Andrew Athens, was actually a kind of ‘secular’ political expression of the Archdiocese of America. Following the promotion of Athens as the president of SAE and the departure of Iakovos, the UHAC remains a minor organization in the Chicago area.

The National Council of America is another umbrella organization of various clubs, associations and individuals which participate in the SAE where it unsuccessfully opposed the promotion of Andrew Athens in the office of president. Its activities on the lobby level are limited. And its whole appearance is not at all convincing.

After 1974, especially the first years after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, several organizations and committees had been created, which over the years disappeared. These were teams coming from the grassroots of the Greek-American community with significant participation of academics and students. In many cases they came as the transformation of groups that fought the dictatorship in Greece. They were quite radical, with intense anti-Americanism, and often they clashed with traditional conservative organizations and the Church. Their presence, however, helped to mobilize Greek Americans for Cyprus and forced the traditional conservative organizations to adopt more advanced positions under pressure from the mass protests of those organizations.<sup>41</sup>

The Cypriot organizations are heavily involved in the PSEKA, as already mentioned, which has at its head Philip Christopher (Philippos Christoforidis, first-generation Cypriot who Americanized his name). Many criticisms have been made from time to time for PSEKA, especially its president and the way it operates. PSEKA has always worked closely with Andrew Athens and the “Manatos and Manatos” Company. For a long time its Secretary was a senior government official in Nicosia.

Finally, there are some significant federations consisted from local ethnic clubs representing a region of Greece. Those who are mainly active at the lobby level

are the *Pan-Epirotic Union of America (Panepirotiki)* for the Greeks of Albania and the Greek-Albanian relations and Pan-Macedonian (*Pammakedoniki*) for the Macedonian question. Also the Pan-Pontian Federation of USA and Canada is struggling for the recognition of genocide of Greeks of Pontos and of Asia Minor. This Federation has obtained recognition of the Pontian genocide by the governors of New York, George Patakis and of New Jersey Jim McGreevy. The second has even «instituted the September 9, 2001 as a day of remembrance of the destruction of Smyrna and the genocide of Greeks of Pontos and Asia Minor».<sup>42</sup>

The American academic community - or at least part of it - is also involved in the activities of the Greek-American lobby, as well as the student world. Assistance to certain institutions and their presence in them is always positive, though often these institutions overridden by the businessmen are not always able to appreciate their role.

The Greek-American Press is another element in the structure of Greek-American Community, which certainly affects the course of Greek-American lobby. In New York - which is always the heart of the Community - is published *The National Herald (Ethnikos Kyrikas)*, the oldest Greek daily newspaper in the U.S. In the same city was still published till 2001 a second Greek-language daily newspaper, *The Morning (I Proïni)*. There are still dozens of weekly newspapers. It is also important the presence of Greek newspapers in English which deal with Greek subjects. For example, the weekly *Hellenic Chronicle* of Boston which has now been closed was claiming the largest circulation among Greek Americans. Its publisher Peter Agkris was received in 1975 by President Ford and Kissinger in an attempt to mitigate criticism of U.S. policy in Cyprus after the Turkish invasion. There is generally a rise of English-speaking Greek-American press and a fall of the Greek-speaking one.<sup>43</sup> There have been published also bulletins of certain organizations such as AHEPA and AHI, which are sent selectively to those who hold important positions in American society – on the political, economic and academic levels.

Nowadays the role of the social media such as Websites, blogs, facebook is also important, since it keeps many organisations in contact. Among them the American Hellenic Media Project, sought to present a balanced picture of Greece, and to respond to articles in the American press which distorted the Greek reality. This effort was stopped because it was not supported.

After all, the fragmentation and lack of coordination, remains one of the weaknesses of the Greek-American lobby.

### ***Prospects***

In a revealing article entitled ‘Dead End: The Decline and Fall of the Greek Lobby in America, in *Odyssey* magazine (November-December 1995), a Washington-based well known British journalist and activist Christopher Hitchens, made a brief but impressive anatomy of the Greek-American lobby.<sup>44</sup> Noting that the success of the embargo in 1974 was the result of a broad coalition of many forces, not just «a few legislators with Attic name-endings», he refers to the fact that it was Kissinger who used first the term “Greek lobby” in order to present it as narrowly ‘ethnic’ one. He emphasizes the principle that the Greek affairs went well when they were identified with the rule of law and justice. But he notes that this line was not always followed and refers to two typical cases which caused damage to the Greek affairs.

The first case is a public statement by Philip Christopher, President of PSEKA, in August 1994 in Nicosia, before President Clerides and other officials, according to which if Cyprus had spent 50 million U.S. dollars annually for three years in support of the lobby in America, the Cyprus problem would be solved! How is it possible, asks Hitchens, a man in which Cyprus has entrusted the case of the lobby in U.S. to make such cynical statements publicly, without causing damage? We know of course that the financing of election campaigns in the U.S. is part of the political game and each lobbyist who respects himself deals also with the financial support of presidential candidates, senators, etc. But here, inversely, applies the well-known saying about Caesar’s wife, who may well not be honest – as long as the U.S. law is not grabbing her - but she must, at least, appear as such. Moreover, there is an excessive cynicism to believe that a small country can cope with this kind of competition with Turkey, which has always the possibility, says Hitchens, to spend much more. A strong financial contribution to an election campaign may ensure for some fabulously rich Greek Americans to sleep in the “Lincoln bedroom” in the White House, but certainly not the solution to the Cyprus problem!

The second case refers to the publication-revelation in the *Wall Street Journal* of January 10, 1990 of a letter sent by Andrew Athens to the then President of Cyprus George Vassiliou - which was prepared by Andrew Manatos. Athens

wrote to Vassiliou, as “a buisnessman to another” – Vassiliou has been a leading businessman before to assuming the presidency of the Republic of Cyprus – exposing to him the economic needs of the lobby he was guiding along with Manatos, in order to bring positive effects on the Cyprus issue. “Let me lay out for you what resources are necessary to properly mobilize our network of people and bring to closure a successful result of all our efforts for Cyprus.” This letter asked for a five-year commitment of \$200,000 per annum-a mere million. The release of the letter, which the Journal acidly described as “a bottom line appeal from a US citizen to the head of a foreign state to gain influence in Congress over US foreign policy” was mysterious. Especially at a moment the Greek-Americans spoke of the «rule of law».

Having established the slippery slope that took the Greek-American lobby after 1978, Hitchens quotes - mostly anonymously - the views of American and Greek diplomats, American journalists and even senators and other officials of the Congress, who not at all believe in its effectiveness. Thus, a high official at the State Department said that the Greek lobby is “a myth in which only the Turkish lobby believes.”, while an editor from the *Washington Post* talked about a «Welfare System for a few Profiles». A hard-working press officer at a Greek embassy put down his knife and fork and laughed for almost a full minute. “What lobby?” inquired another. In Athens, officials at the Foreign Ministry spoke bitterly about the existence of a “Greek lobby” which was used by Washington to lobby Greece. Going on, Hitchens notes: “The most thoughtful off-the-record comment I (over) heard came from George Stephanopoulos”, former Clinton adviser. “The Greek cause has managed to seize the moral low ground in Washington,” he said. “Anyone taking a pro-Greek or pro-Cypriot position is assumed by the political community to be doing so from cynical motives. It is actually thought that you display more integrity and independence by being pro-Turkish.”

Of course, the Greek-American players of the lobby reacted strongly to this article, it is true with serious arguments in some times (Rossides, Manatos, Savvides from AHEPA, Sytilidis on behalf of Tsakopoulos etc.). Nevertheless there was some applause of this article, mainly in the academic community.

The article of Hitchens may in some respects be exaggerated, but dissects a reality that has not changed even today, and one can not ignore. Unless of course if all, officials or not, are satisfied with the ceremonial visits in recent years in



the White House and dispute on who would acquire better position for the photo next to President Clinton or George Bush.<sup>45</sup> One should not underestimate of course all these rituals, and even the human vanity of the photo.

However as Nicholas Gage, a journalist and author of Greek origin put it:

*When there is an issue regarding Greece at stake, for example, all the advocates of the Greek position have names that end in s –names like Athens, Rossides and Spyropoulos– and Americans who hear them discount what they have to say as being ethnically partisan and perhaps not good for America.*

*When there is an issue regarding Turkey, all the advocates of the Turkish position don't have names like Gursel or Kazanglou, but names like Brent Scowcroft and Robert Livingston, American names, so that those who hear them feel that what they have to say must be good for America because such prominent Americans are saying it.*

*I am not saying that we should not use Greek Americans in promoting Greek issues. They have an important role to play because they are well liked and highly regarded in the United States. But if we want to be effective in America we have to use American instruments of influence as well as Greek Americans.<sup>46</sup>*

So what are today the prospects of the Greek-American lobby? The experience of the past 30 years can be only negatively assessed?

Sure, it would be wrong to make only a negative evaluation. There are good things from this experience. If anything, the Greek-American lobby today knows how to act, what doors to knock at, it got known, even if its activities of all these years have not brought results. It could also make one rightly ask what would be the situation for Greek issues in Washington without its presence, even with all its weaknesses. Even the mythology that developed around its role, it should not be viewed only negatively.

The comparisons made routinely with the Jewish lobby are not always founded. The case of the Jews has a specificity for several reasons: First, the strategic importance of Israel is far more important to Americans than that of Greece. Although many do not want to admit it - as Eugene Rossides of AHI - only Turkey can be compared with Israel strategically. There is also the trauma of the Holocaust from which the Jewish lobby derives a considerable advantage over the Greek lobby or any other.



The Jewish lobby also has huge economic potential and is not funded by Tel Aviv. The opposite is the case, the Jewish-American Community is funding Tel Aviv. The Greek lobby, however, is begging to Athens and Nicosia, as shown above. Some can speak about Greek Croesus in America, and they certainly exist, but the financial support provided to Greece, compared with that given by the Jews to Israel is from non-existent to a minimum. When for example Evangelos Averoff, as defense minister, called on Greek Americans to raise money for the purchase of two naval vessels after the Turkish invasion in Cyprus in 1974, the result was disappointing.<sup>47</sup>

Of course, nobody excludes that the Greek-American lobby can take some lessons from the way the Hebrew one works. This does not mean that it can simply copy its methods to succeed. Each case presents a peculiarity and has its own dynamics.

The perspectives presented by the Greek-American lobby can be considered positive under certain conditions. What are these conditions?

The first prerequisite is the organizational structure. Any serious researcher of the Greek-American lobby finds with a naked eye weaknesses of structures that were created under conditions different from today's reality and do not meet its needs. A better organizational structure does not mean abolition of pluralism and diversity that are characteristic of a dynamic team. But it does mean structures that reflect the current realities and needs of the modern lobby and coordination between these structures.

The second condition is that a strong lobby needs efficiency at the technical level. Especially in this era of technological revolution, the possibilities offered are huge. At this stage one should not forget that professionalism is essential, an integral component of effectiveness.

The third condition for success of the Greek-American lobby is linked with coordinating the various components and the groups, as already mentioned. Coordination is also necessary with Greece and Cyprus.

The fourth condition for success is linked with clear objectives. Since the lobby is struggling to convince the various decision-makers about the justice, accuracy and the validity of its claims, the objectives should be clear and understandable. The often labyrinthine way of presenting them, is causing damage and difficulty in promoting them. Furthermore one needs to set up

priorities. One cannot defend multiple cases simultaneously, sometimes prioritizing minor and secondary matters.

Last prerequisite for the success of the Greek-American lobby - but just as important as the previous ones - is the presence of adequate leadership.

These requirements - as outlined above - are not met by the Greek-American lobby. Whether their lack may not be absolute, but still to an extent that does not allow it to be successful.

Beyond these conditions, Greece's role remains essential, its whole strategy and how the Greek-American lobby is integrated as part of it. Such a strategy is lacking both on the Greek and Cyprus side. Amateurism is the main feature of Greek foreign policy in this field. It should certainly be noted that important elements of the Greek-American community do not accept Greece as a "national center" seeking to be autonomous. Something that certainly complicates even further the role of Greece.

So long as there will not be a strategy that is acceptable to everyone - Greece, Cyprus, communities of the diaspora - and as such will have been built jointly, the Greek American community will not be able to build a strong lobby, will continue without a compass the same trip and the Greeks will experience an uncertain future without the ability to meet the challenges of the new millennium.

If you add to the above mentioned and the reverse mobilization by Washington of Greek American lobby, the fact that Greek-Americans in the future will feel and act first as Americans, rather than Greeks, it becomes obvious that the time has come for serious and balanced accounts and to see the Greek-American lobby devoid of sentimentality.

### ***Conclusion***

The Greek-American lobby is more than a matter of interests. After all, Turkey has managed, without having a large Turkish community in the U.S., to have a much more powerful lobby in Washington than Greece. The Greek-American community is for Greece an extension of the universality(oecumenism) of Hellenism. After the successive shrinkage they suffered in the 20th century in historic homelands where they lived for centuries and millennia, the Greeks are given a chance again to recompose this universality without borders, which was

always their main feature. The circumstances are certainly different today. It is a tragic mistake to believe - and many are those who believe it - that we could have communities in the “New World” - U.S., Canada, Australia basically - such as those of Alexandria, Constantinople, Trieste, Vienna, Venice or Odessa. The social structures of these technologically advanced societies in which there is now a living part of the Greek diaspora are quite different from those of the predominantly rural societies where flourished in the past the Greek communities. The Greeks in these communities were usually part of the then emerging urban bourgeois classes. The Greeks of the immigrant diaspora were farmers and laborers, and only the second and third generation are fully integrated into local communities and penetrating the bourgeois classes and their elite. These societies are also by nature strongly assimilative, which was in a much lesser extent the case of the communities in which flourished the historic Greek diaspora. But Hellenism is of protean DNA. If Hellenism didn't have this protean ability to adapt each time under different conditions it would have disappeared long ago.

The Greek-American lobby is therefore an important issue. But it is not the only issue. The important is to find a poet who will bring to the art a Greek Dream through the maze of theories and the brutal reality, a human dream without national borders, and without national distortions.

We come from the Arab land, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, the small state of Commagene which will faint 'like a small oil lamp. We come from the sands of the desert, from the seas of Proteus. The boat which travels is called Agony 2016.<sup>48</sup>

### **III. THE HELLENIC LOBBY IN CANADA<sup>49</sup>**

The Hellenic lobby in Canada emerges basically in the '60s and '70s, coinciding with the period of major Greek immigration in this country. Until then there were only small Greek Canadian communities that had always been interested in what was happening in Greece. Especially in the period of World War II they organized the shipping of substantial assistance to needy Greek people. The great wave of postwar immigration to Canada led to the creation of the current Greek communities.

The Hellenic lobby was active in three major Greek themes: anti-dictatorial struggle, the Cyprus problem and the Macedonian question. Other issues, such

as the Greek-Turkish relations, the return of the Elgin marbles, etc., also had been on its agenda at times.

### *The Anti-Dictatorship Struggle*

The dictatorship of April 21, 1967 provoked strong reactions among the Greek Canadians. Several local anti-dictatorial movements had been founded and others which were branches of broader Greek anti-dictatorship organizations which were active on a global scale. It is important to recall the presence in Toronto of Andreas Papandreou, leader of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement-PAK. What were trying all these organizations was to influence the Canadian government and to encourage it to condemn the dictatorial regime, to suspend its diplomatic relations with it, and to impose to it economic and political sanctions.

Despite the sympathy of the Canadian people to the struggle against the dictatorship and the support encountered by intellectuals, trade unions, some political parties, and political personalities from across the political spectrum, the Canadian government followed the line of other NATO countries not to openly condemn the dictatorship. However Canada kept some distance from the military regime in Athens.

### *The Cyprus Question*

The interest of Greek-Canadians for Cyprus is evident since 1964, particularly because Canada is part since that time of the United Nations' peacekeeping force in Cyprus. But their strong activation for this issue occurs after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. So they create various committees to support the struggle of Cypriots to defend the independence of their island and ask the Canadian government to oppose the occupation of northern Cyprus by Turkey. The policy, however, of the Canadian government generally coincides with that of U.S. and Britain. In 1993 Canada decided to withdraw its troops from the United Nations peacekeeping force in Cyprus after thirty years of presence on the island. They used the excuse that their presence in Cyprus didn't help in finding a solution, as it was ensuring peace, while on the other hand, Canada could not meet its responsibilities of sending troops in other parts of the world where it was most needed. Despite the reaction of the Hellenic Canadian lobby in this decision, the Canadian government moved to implement it.

Generally, the Canadian position on the Cyprus issue could be described as 'neutral', although Canada was aligned itself, with some slight variations in style than substance, with the U.S. and Britain. At the same time Canada was seeking to protect its commercial interests in Turkey. At times it had been particularly mentioned that Turkey was about to purchase a Canadian nuclear reactor, or that Canadian companies would undertake the construction of the metro in Ankara. But it should also be recognized the weakness of the Canadian Hellenic lobby to influence effectively the shaping of Canadian foreign policy. While there were occasional significant popular protests, the weakness of the organized lobby, lack of coordination of the various Greek Canadian organizations, the lack of capable leadership and organizational structure, have limited its efficiency.

### *The Macedonian Question*

As far as the Macedonian question is concerned, there was a huge mobilization of the Greek Canadians to prevent the recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia-FYROM with the name Macedonia. The political context - elections, and especially referendum on Quebec independence - helped the Hellenic Canadian lobby to prevent the Canadian government to proceed for the recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's name. Despite this relative success, there were at that time and some deplorable incidents, such as, those provoked by general Nicolaos Gryllakis, special advisor of the Greek Prime Minister Constantine Mitsotakis, who had contacts in Canada with strong actors of the powerful lobby of the slavoMacedonian minority in favor of the name Macedonia. The general appointed even its representatives in Canada, who were acting alongside and in parallel with the official diplomatic services.<sup>50</sup>

### *Conclusion*

In conclusion, it was relatively easy for the Greek Canadian lobby to mobilize thousands of people to support the Greek positions. Protests made either against the military dictatorship, or for Cyprus and Macedonian question had tremendous success. Thousands took part in demonstrations on these matters in Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere, and thousands displaced themselves in some cases from across Canada outside the Canadian parliament in Ottawa. As already

mentioned, the results of these demonstrations have been limited, precisely because the organized structure of the Canadian Hellenic lobby was not able to take advantage of this dynamic. This is because the Canadian Hellenic lobby presents organizational weaknesses, lack of coordination and lack of capable leadership. Nor Greece had helped with its policy the organization of a dynamic Canadian Hellenic lobby. Besides the lack of clear aims in promoting those issues was another major shortcoming, largely due to the lack of clear goals in Greek foreign policy itself.

#### **IV. THE GREEK LOBBY IN AUSTRALIA<sup>51</sup>**

In Australia was noted at times an intense activity of the Greek lobby. There was a strong mobilization of the Greek organizations on Cyprus and Macedonia.

The mobilization in Australia for Cyprus is also due to the fact of the existence of a strong Cypriot community. The Cypriot community of Australia is the largest of the Cypriot diaspora after that of Great Britain. But in the mobilization for Cyprus participated also all the Greek organizations.

The election of the Gough Whitlam labour government(1972-75) “saw the radical transformation of Australia’s foreign policy” and “gave parliamentarians and community groups access to foreign policy formulation”.<sup>52</sup> Whitlam received Andreas Papandreou, in exile at that time, and supported his anti-dictatorial movement. In the Cyprus issue Whitlam was more reserved but he was obliged to take in consideration the mobilization of the Greek Australian community. Even if successive Australian governments stated an interest to play an important role in the resolution of the Cyprus problem, it “should be borne in mind...that the Cyprus issue does not normally fall within the priorities of the foreign policy agenda of Australia.”<sup>53</sup> The Australian political parties “were not prepared to commit themselves to policies and practices opposed to those of the USA.”<sup>54</sup>

The main lobby organizations for the Cyprus issue in Australia are the the Pan-Australian Justice for Cyprus Coordinating Committee (PASEKA) and the Justice for Cyprus South Australia (SEKA). SEKA is active in Melbourne and Victoria. It is comprised of representatives from all the Greek-Cypriot and Greek community organisations of Melbourne and Victoria. Meanwhile SEKA is well represented on the Pan-Australian Justice for Cyprus Coordinating Committee (PASEKA). PASEKA is the main umbrella organization not only for the

Cypriote organisations of the whole Australia but also for the Hellenic-Australian associations lobbying for Cyprus. Cypriote communities and their umbrella organisation the Federation of Cyprus Communities of Australia and New Zealand are also very active in the Cyprus issue either locally, or nationally inside PASEKA.

For Macedonia, the mobilization was also important and, in a certain degree, it was in response to a corresponding mobilization of Slavo-Macedonians who sought recognition of the FYROM from Australia. In general, the Greek-Australians succeeded in adopting by the Australian Government a policy for Macedonia that was closer to the Greek positions. But even in this case the predominance of the Greek-Australian lobby is recently eroded.

The Australian government has recently decided to change its directive concerning the Australian-Skopje community being recognized under the name “Macedonian” instead of “Slav-Macedonian”, used since 1994.

The decision was formally announced by AMHRCA (Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee) on its website, which also posted a letter of the Department of Immigration and Citizenship confirming the change in policies, which resulted after a year-long campaign led by the FYROM lobby in Australia.

According to the Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee (AMHRCA), this decision resulted after a sustained lobbying campaign. In its announcement, AMHRCA called on the Australian government to proceed now with recognizing FYROM under the name Republic of Macedonia.<sup>55</sup>

Nevertheless the *Australian Department of Foreign Affairs* has reassured the Greek Australian community that the government’s position concerning the naming of FYROM remains unchanged.

The most prominent lobby organisation in the Macedonian issue is the Pan-Macedonian Federation of Australia, the peak umbrella organization. The federation serves as the voice of the Greek Macedonian communities in Australia and has taken active role in the Macedonia naming dispute. Its headquarters are located in Melbourne, where the non-profit organization of Pan-Macedonian Association of Melbourne and Victoria was established in 1961 while the Federation is also active in the entire Australia.

For Cyprus, the Hellenic Australian lobby has achieved a somewhat balanced policy of the country's government. Generally speaking, however, the policy of Australia for Cyprus was in line with that of other NATO countries. Usually the policy of the Labour government was more balanced and closer to the Greek positions.

Both on the Cyprus and on the Macedonian question the policy of Australia was affected by the strong presence of politicians of Greek (and Cypriot) origin who usually were active at the Labour Party of Australia. However despite the strong presence of the Greek-Australian lobby its effect was limited by the fact that Australia does not play an active role either in the Cyprus problem or in the Macedonian nor on other Greek issues. And this is certainly unlike the role played by countries like the U.S. and Great Britain. Even Canada is presented in, with a more active role, either because of the presence for many years of Canadian peacekeeping troops in Cyprus or because of a discreet mediator role Canada has in the international scene.

There is even the impression that “in the areas of Australian politics and foreign policy formulation, the role of the Greek lobby is dismal”,<sup>56</sup> especially in comparison with its relative success in the fields of welfare and education.

Finally the Greek-Australian lobby is fragmented, there is lack of professionalism and coordination and also presents organizational weaknesses.

## **V. THE GREEK LOBBY IN GREAT BRITAIN**

In Britain, the Greek lobby, composed essentially by the Cypriot community, is active on the Cyprus question. The World Federation of Overseas Cypriots (POMAK), has its headquarters in London and works to promote Greek positions on Cyprus. Cypriots of Britain is the largest Cypriot community of the Cypriot diaspora and counts around 200 000 people, although The National Federation of Cypriots in the United Kingdom claims the presence of 300 000 Britons of Cypriot origin.<sup>57</sup> In the British capital population of Cypriot descent is estimated to surpass the 100 000. This is a remarkable force which, for many years, is making strong its presence in this country.

Certainly London is also the home to many Greek shipowners who also have a significant power, but typically their activity is limited to the financial sector.



The practice of establishing Greek shipowners in London was already 100 years-old by the mid-twentieth century.

The National Federation of Cypriots in the United Kingdom is the representative body and the acknowledged voice of the largest and most significant community of Cypriots outside of the island itself.

It is an umbrella organisation representing the Cypriot community associations and groups across the United Kingdom and, as such, it leads and co-ordinates the activities of Britons of Cypriot origin. It claims the presence of 300 000 Britons of Cypriot origin.

The Federation's objectives are presented as follows: "As the foremost representative body of UK Cypriots, the Federation performs a two-fold role. Firstly, it spearheads the British Cypriot community's efforts to promote the cause of a reunited Cyprus, free from Turkish occupation troops and illegal colonists, for the benefit of all Cypriots. Secondly, it coordinates the work of UK Cypriots in the political, social, cultural and educational spheres and lobbies and articulates the interests and concerns of the Cypriot community in the United Kingdom.

In pursuing its objectives, the Federation co-operates closely with the democratically elected President and the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. It also fosters close links with the British Government, the leadership of British political parties, British parliamentarians, civic and community leaders, ethnic minorities, the mass media and other relevant institutions in the United Kingdom".<sup>58</sup>

The Federation was founded immediately after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. It functions under a President, an Executive and a Secretariat elected every two years and is headquartered in North London.

London was also the base of an important anti-junta movement during the era of dictatorship in Greece (1967-1974). Using London as their base a number of Greek intellectuals and the distinguished journalist Eleni Vlachou campaigned tirelessly against military rule in Greece.

## **VI. IS THERE A GREEK LOBBY IN THE REST OF THE WORLD?**

Based on the general concept of promotion and visibility of some Greek issues we can support that the Greek communities all around the world are doing this work to a greater or lesser extent. But most of the countries where the Greek communities exist have very limited role on the international scene to be able to affect the course of Greek issues. However, the sensitisation of both governments and public opinion in these countries should not be underestimated. Because it is possible to have some time to play a certain role in favour of Greek issues in the international organizations. Moreover, the presence of the Greek diaspora in these countries, even indirectly, enhances the Greek lobby in other countries which play a decisive role in the Greek issues. And certainly fosters its ecumenical dimension.

## **EPILOGUE**

There is no doubt that, from the presentation of the Greek lobby, are resulting multiple weaknesses that have to do either within itself or the role of the so-called national centre. However it could also be raised that without this lobby, with all its negatives, things concerning Greek national interests would be much worse. So we can conclude this study with an optimistic note. And of course many things could, with some effort, change in order to achieve better results on Greek issues in Washington.

The discussion on the effectiveness of the Greek lobby considers mainly the Greek-American lobby as it is in the corridors of power in Washington where important decisions are made on Greek affairs in last years. The comments have been rather critical as to the influence of the “Lobby” in the United States. But in a general way neither the leaders of the lobby neither Athens or Nicosia consider the achievements of the lobby in a negative way. Those who criticise the lobby’s effectiveness are seen as marginal by both the leaders of the lobby and the Greek and Cypriot capitals. This is not the case, however, because there are serious and documented recherches on the matter. The achievements of the Greek lobby are measured in a negative way to these of the Turkish lobby and secondary to these of the Slavomacedonians. Another usual comparison is that of the Greek lobby with its counterparts, the Jewish, the Armenian and the Cuban lobbies. To any

third observer it is clear that the Greek lobby does not have neither the power nor the effectiveness of its Jewish, Armenian and Cuban counterparts.

Another point of controversy concerning the Greek lobby is even how to name it. In a general way the Greeks of first generation, in USA, in Australia, in Canada, etc. they use the term Greek lobby. But from the point of view of the second and third generation Greeks, this term is not acceptable. As these people consider themselves Greek Americans, Greek Canadians or Greek Australians, the correct term to use is Greek-American lobby, Greek-Australian, Greek-Canadian lobby etc. Moreover these people consider that the lobby is acting on the basis of what they consider is the interest of the host country.

Eugenios Rossidis, e. g., a prominent leader of the Greek-American lobby, put it in a very clear way concerning the Greek-American lobby: «The Greek-American lobby is acting on the basis of what we consider is the interest of the United States». It's a typical American way to put the question, that is to say, for exemple concerning Cyprus, that the American interest will be better served without the presence of Turkish troops in Cyprus within an independent Republic of Cyprus. It's also the way the Greek-American lobby put in 1974 the question of the arms' embargo to Turkey. Not as a favor to the Greeks but as «the rule of law» serving American interests. It's a way to say, according to Rossides, «that we are Americans and that we act as citizens of this country defending its interests».<sup>59</sup>

In other ways, as it was put by another Greek-American leader in order to “lobby,” “effectively regarding issues affecting U.S. relations with Greece and Cyprus, we need to frame our arguments within the context of `what's in the best interests of the United States.` After all, we are not an immigrant community any longer. And as such, we don't have any major ethnic community issues that we are concerned with today-thankfully. There are no more signs in restaurant windows that proclaim ‘No Dogs or Greeks Allowed’.”

“Overwhelmingly, Greek Americans identify themselves as Americans of Greek descent. Our concerns are that of any American-employment opportunities, national security, affordable education, crime prevention, affordable and good healthcare, the welfare of our children and families, etc.

“Having said this, I also believe that as Greek Americans, we should have a vested interest in advocating and promoting a strong U.S. relationship with Greece and Cyprus. This also serves the multifaceted national interests of the U.S., first

and foremost. To this extent, we should be more vigilant as to the consequences of U.S. policy towards Greece and Cyprus, because it has the potential to affect us as Americans and the national security interests of the U.S.”<sup>60</sup>

These are the new ideas on the Greek-American lobby and this is the new direction things are going. Nevertheless not every body accepts this direction.

The discussion on the Greek lobby, on its nature and on its effectiveness, will continue for as long as it is!

## NOTES

1. [www.hellenicparliament.gr/.../To-Politevma...](http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/.../To-Politevma...)  
Under the present crisis the Greek State is unable to fulfill all these responsibilities.
2. The Greek diaspora during the Ottoman period, within which was developed the first rudimentary Greek bourgeoisie, played an essential role in the war of independence of 1821 and the building of the nation state. Within the diaspora it was also developed the movement of the Greek Enlightenment, another important pillar in the building of the nation-state. This diaspora is determined primarily in relation to the Ottoman Empire and secondary to a number of Greek communities outside its borders. For the methodological problems, concerning the periodization of the Greek diaspora and other related problems see:  
J. I.K. Hassiotis, *Review of the History of Modern Diaspora*, Thessaloniki, Vaniias publishing 1993 [In Greek], Stephanos Constantinides, “Greek Diaspora and History” in Damanakis M., Kardasis B., Michelakaki T., Hourdakias A., *History of Modern Greek Diaspora*, Rethymnon, University of Crete, EDIAMME 2004 [In Greek].
3. One of the first books to comprehensively study this issue in the 1980 is the *Modern Diasporas in International Politics* (a number of articles from different scholars) issued by Gabriel Sheffer, New York, St. Martin’s Press, 1986.  
For the Greek lobby, the first comprehensive presentation is a collective volume published by Dimitris Conostas and Athanasios Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, London, The Macmillan Press, 1993.
4. Apostolos Vakalopoulos, *Key issues in our history*, Greece, Thessaloniki, Vaniias publishing, 1988, p. 185-186 [In Greek].
5. C.P. Cavafy, *Collected Poems*. Translated by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard. Edited by George Savidis. Revised Edition, Princeton University Press, 1992.
6. Harry J. Rsoimiades, “Greece and the Diaspora: Rroblems and Prospects”, in *Greeks in English Speaking Countries*, Melbourne, Hellenic Studies Forum, 1993, p. 151.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 149.

8. The term “cultural minimum” is of Michael Damanakis. See Michael Damanakis, “Expressions of Hellenism” in the collective volume: St. Constantinides, Th. Pelagidis (eds.), *Hellenism in the 21st century*, Athens, Papazisis, 2000, p. 389 [In Greek].
9. There is also the view supported by H. Psomiades and that places the beginning of the Greek-American lobby in the period of the Second World War, when 120 Greek-American organizations have created the Foundation *Greek War Relief Association* to help Greece during those hard times. Harry Psomiades “Ethnic Politics in America: Greek Americans,” *Mediterranean Quarterly*, vol. 5, No. 1 Winter, (1994) p.56-64.
10. Alexander Kitroeff & Stephanos Constantinides, “The Greek-Americans and US Foreign Policy since 1950”, *Etudes helléniques-Hellenic Studies*, vol. 6, Spring 1998, p.8.
11. Reference to the Johnson policy and the political pressure exercised by him to the Greek side is made in Deane Philip (Philip Gigantes, Tsigantes), *I Should Have Died*, Toronto, Longman Canada, 1976, Atheneum, New York, Atheneum, 1977.
12. For this period exist dozens of articles in the Greek-American press but also in the Greek media.  
See also, George Malouhos, *I, Iakovos*, Athens, Livanis Publishing, 2002 [In Greek].
13. A. Kitroeff, Stephanos Constantinides, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
14. A. Kitroeff, Stephanos Constantinides, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
15. A. Kitroeff, St. Constantinides, *op. cit.*, p.14-15.
16. I remember that when in Paris in a radio debate Raymond Aron, the great French philosopher and sociologist, was asked one year after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus - to make an assessment of the Kissinger’s policy, he replied that his “weakness” to prevent the Turkish invasion of Cyprus was probably the weakest point of his career. Kissinger had a great appreciation for Aron - they were both Jewish - and was considering him as his teacher.
17. Basically it was an attempt by Iakovos, after the success of the embargo’s enforcement, to get back on the train of the Greek-American lobby at the moment of its “triumph”, and not to let the whole effort in the hands of more radical groups created in the roots by students, intellectuals and other non “controlled” elements.
18. See, for example, the New York Times, 21 July 1975, or the article by the famous American journalist Cyrus Sulzberger in the same newspaper on June, 4, 1975.
19. Russel Warren Howe and Sarah Hays Trott, “The inside Workings of the US Greek lobby”, *The Sunday Sun* (Baltimore), September 7, section K, 1975. See also by the same authors, *The Power Peddlers; How Lobbyists Mold America’s Foreign Policy*, New York: Doubleday, 1977. A. Kitroeff, St. Constantinides, *op. cit.* p. 17.

20. And this was said in a country where the Jewish lobby, really powerful, imposes the cruise line to the American foreign policy in the Middle East. As if the Jewish lobby is a "special" case among the ethnic lobbies. But it is true that in recent years other powerful lobbies mainly with links to major interests in the Arab world are pushing for a certain balance of the U.S. foreign policy. Thus at the end of the Cold War, the Americans tried to adjust their policy from purely pro-Israeli to a policy of mediator. It is also right to stress that the successes of the Jewish lobby in Washington, apart from its influence, is due to the fact of the alignment of its goals with the strategic choices of the U.S. As Alexander Kitroeff wrote " it was not surprising that the most effective of all the ethnic lobbies, was the pro-Israeli Jewish-American, as its objectives were aligned with the strategic choices of the USA ". He believes that " in a great extent... the U.S. policy towards Israel and Cuba had already been taken for granted without the involvement of the respective lobbies "and " the success of other pressure groups was based on cyclical circumstantial factors." For Cuba this is certainly true, but for Israel it is not so sure that the U.S. would not keep at least some distance from Israel, given the data and their interests in the Arab world, if the American-Jewish lobby was not so effective.

Alexander Kitroeff, "The role of the Greek-American lobby" in Panagiotis Tsakonas, *Contemporary Greek Foreign Policy*, Athens, I. Sideris, p. 401.

21. *The Wall Street Journal*, July 31, 1978.

22. Reported by A. Kitroeff, St. Constantinides, *op.cit.* p. 18.

23. Nicolaos Stavrou, «The Hellenic-American Community in Foreign Policy Considerations of the Motherland» in Dimitri Conostas and Athanassios Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, London, The Macmillan Press, 1993, p.81.

24. During the Karamanlis Government, Archbishop Iakovos had made a request in his letter to George Rallis, then Foreign Minister: to intervene in order to prevent PASOK and KKE in succeeding in Canada and the U.S. in what they had failed to do in Greece, that is the separation of church and the state. (In the case of America and Canada that the Communities do not become secular, but remain ecclesiastical parishes). These letters of Iakovos to Rallis have been published by the Greek Newspaper *To Pontiki* on March 23, 1984. For the role of Iakovos as Archbishop of America both in Greek-Turkish relations and in the activation of the Greek-American lobby, in addition to numerous articles published in the Greek press and in the Greek language press of the Greek diaspora, one can consult two books that have been devoted to him: Kostas Athanasiadis, *Siakovos, This Merciless Despot*, Kampana Publishing, New York 1990. The book presents a penetrating critique of Iakovos not only for his stance on national issues but also on the "despotic" - tyrannical administration that he exercised on the Greek communities in America. George P. Malouchos, I, (Me), Iakovos, Athens, Livanis Publishing, 2002. This book is more laudatory of Iakovos and fails to expose data, such as letters to George Rallis,

- then Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1978, and in which he expressed his concern about the activity of the PASOK Canada branch which was driven as he wrote, from Athens and pursued in cooperation with the Communist Party-KKE the secularization of the communities that the Archbishop wanted ecclesiastical parishes. On these issues, see also Stephanos Constantinides, *The presence of Greeks in Canada*, Rethymnon, Crete University, EDIAMME, 2004.
25. *I Proini*, A Greek-American daily (New York), 2 May 2000.
  26. It is doubtful if Andreas Papandreou himself who was heavily sick in hospital, when in 1995 was organised the first conference of SAE have been able to follow the entire path of its achievement. Costas Simitis showed very little interest in the Greek diaspora. In his book- *Memoirs for the Periode as Premier*, there is no reference whatsoever to it. Perhaps this confirms the perception presented by some political analysts that over time most Greek politicians acquire the syndrome of Attica as equivalent of Greece. There is perhaps no coincidence that Greece, unlike most European countries-and not only-refuses to adopt the voting right for the Greeks of the diaspora, although discussions on this subject are indeed permanent in Athens.
  27. Michael Ignatiou, “Hope dies last for the Diaspora”, *O Politis*, a Cypriote daily, August 13, 2000.
  28. For the chronological periodisation of the Greek American Lobby see A. Kitroeff, St. Constantinides, *op. cit*, Chris P. Ioannides, «Greek Americans and the Cyprus Issue: 1980-1992», in *Greeks in English Speaking Countries*, Melbourne 1993, Hellenic Studies Forum, Eugene T. Rossides, “U.S.Relations with Greece and Cyprus, the ‘Tilt towards Turkey’, and the Challenges Facing the Greek-American Community” in Christos P. Ioannides, *Greeks in English Speaking Countries, Culture, Identity, Politics*, New York, Aristide D. Caratzas publisher, 1997, p. 439-466.
  29. Chris P. Ioannides, «Greek Americans and the Cyprus Issue: 1980-1992», in *Greeks in English Speaking Countries*, Melbourne 1993, Hellenic Studies Forum, p. 249.
  30. *I Proini*, (New York), May 2, 2000.
  31. Michael Ignatiou, “Hope dies last for the Diaspora”, *O Politis*, August 13, 2000.
  32. Information for the Obama era was collected from different sources, like newspapers and social media.
  33. Van Coufoudakis, “The Reverse Influence Phenomenon: The impact of the Greek-American Lobby on the Foreign Policy of Greece», in Dimitri Constanas and Athanassios Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics, op. cit.*  
A. Kitroeff, St. Constantinides, *op. cit.*  
Nikolaos Stavrou, “Lobbyists: Total amateurs” special tribute of *Eleftherotypia*, the Greek daily to the Greek diaspora, p. 24, November 27, 1999.
  34. Van Coufoudakis, *op. cit.*, p. 65.
  35. Nikolaos Stavrou, *op. cit.*



36. Eugene Rossides, "The power centers in USA and our five movements," *Eleftherotypia*, a special tribute to the Greek diaspora, November 27, 1999, p. 22.
37. These concerns were expressed strongly in the conference held by AHEPA in Washington in March 2000. See the Greek-American daily *I Proini*, New York, 23 March 2000.
38. The conference was organized by the Centre of Hellenic Studies and Research Canada-KEEK, from 28 May to 1 June 1999 in Montreal, Canada. The references here are from a short text - summary of the paper of Professor Speros Vryonis presented in the conference, one of the leading Greek-American academics. Cf The archives of the Centre of Hellenic Studies and Research Canada-KEEK.
39. See the special issue of the academic journal *Etudes helléniques / Hellenic Studies*, vol. 14., No.2 (Montréal, 2006).
40. Paul Watanabe, «Ethnicity and Foreign Policy: Greek - American Activism and the Turkish Arms' Ban» in Dimitri Conostas and Athanassios Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, *op.cit.*
41. Paul Watanabe, *op. cit.* p. 39-40.
42. A. Kitroeff, "The Role of the Greek-American Lobby in U.S. Foreign Policy: 1992-2001", *op. cit.* p. 415.
43. Alexander Kitroeff, "The Greek-American cultural identity in the 1990" in *History of the Greek Diaspora*, Volume II, Rethymnon, Crete-EDIAMME University, 2004 p. 93.
44. Christopher Hitchens, 'Dead End: The Decline and Fall of the Greek Lobby in America, in *Odyssey* magazine (November-December 1995).  
I personally had the opportunity to take part in some organized events in Congress with U.S. senators and congressmen, as well as representatives of the executive. In one of these events inside the White House appeared President Clinton himself and addressed the representatives of the Greek-American lobby, and representatives of organizations from Canada, England and Australia. It was the end of his first four years mandate of his presidential office and had begun his election campaign for his second four years. Naturally he needed the support of the Greek-American element, and such an appearance was aiming to help revive the relationship with him.
45. Christopher Hitchens, an English journalist, is established since many years in Washington and has always supported the Greek position, especially in Cyprus. He is the coauthor of *Cyprus, Hostage of History*, London, Verso, 1984.
46. Nicholas Gage, *The Impact of Greek Americans on U.S. Greek Relations* [www.intellectum.org](http://www.intellectum.org)
47. It refers to the article by Christopher Hitchens, *op. cit.*, p. 31
48. George Seferis, Last Stop (*Teleftaios Stathmos*), p. 212 and *In the Manner of G. S.*



- Poems, Athens, Ikaros, 1967, p. 99 and 212. The last verse with a slight change: They call the one ship that sails AGONY 2016, instead of AGONY 937. (Wherever I travel Greece wounds me, curtains of mountains, archipelagos, naked granite. They call the one ship that sails AGONY 937).
49. Developments on the Hellenic Canadian Lobby are based on Stephanos Constantinides, “The Role of the Greek Communities in the Formulation of Canadian Foreign Policy”, in Dimitris Conostas and Athanassios Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, London, The Macmillan Press, 1993, p.107-124. and “The Impact of the Greek-Canadian Lobby on the Foreign Policy of Canada” in Christos P. Ioannides, *Greeks in English Speaking Countries, Culture, Identity, Politics*, New York, Aristide D. Caratzas publisher, 1997, p.379-400.
  50. Nicolaos Gryllakis, *I reveal* (Apokalypto), Athens, editions A. A. Livani, 2001, p.229.
  51. On the Greek lobby in Australia see Andrew C. Theofanous & Michalis S. Michael, “The Greek Community and Australian Foreign Policy: With Particular Reference to the Cyprus Issue”, in Dimitri Conostas & Athanassios Platias, *Diasporas in World Politics*, London, The Macmillan Press, 1993, Nicholas Ganzis, “The Cyprus Issue in Australian Politics: PASEKA & SEKA (SA) Perspectives”, in E. Close, M. Tsianikas and G. Frazis (Eds.) *Greek Research in Australia: Proceedings of the Fourth Biennial Conference of Greek Studies*, Adelaide, Flinders University, Department of Languages—Modern Greek, September 2001, George Karaisaridis, “The Greek Lobby in Australia: Rethinking the Fundamentals” in Christos P. Ioannides, *Greeks in English Speaking Countries, Culture, Identity, Politics*, New York, Aristide D. Caratzas publisher, 1997, p. 413-431.
  52. Andrew C. Theofanous & Michalis S. Michael, *op. cit.*, p.88.
  53. *Ibid*, p.92.
  54. Nicholas Ganzis, *op. cit.* p.95.
  55. Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee, [www.macedonianhr.org.au](http://www.macedonianhr.org.au), *Greek Australia Reporter*, February 13, 2012, [au.greekreporter.com/.../australian-governement-changes-slav](http://au.greekreporter.com/.../australian-governement-changes-slav)
  56. George Karaisaridis, *op.cit.*, p. 414.
  57. [www.cypriotfederation.org.uk](http://www.cypriotfederation.org.uk)
  58. *Ibid*
  59. Interview in APOPSI, Cypriot Political Journal (Nicosia), no 10 *magazine.apopsi.com.cy/2008/10/437*
  60. Nick Larigakis, AHI Executive Director, “What is the Greek Lobby?», Op-Ed: What is the *Greek Lobby?* - American Hellenic Institute [www.aheworld.org/.../1130-op-ed-what-is-the-greek-l](http://www.aheworld.org/.../1130-op-ed-what-is-the-greek-l).

# Sir Basil Zaharoff (1849-1936)

## Le Mystérieux Grec-Ottoman

Jean Catsiapis\*

### ABSTRACT

Basil Zaharoff, the famous arms dealer of World War lived a life full of mysteries, which Jean Catsiapis endeavoured to decipher. As a friend of political leaders of Greece and France, he was able to serve the interests of these countries while achieving personal financial gain in the armed conflicts in which he was involved. Basil Zaharoff, considered the richest man in the world in his time, has preserved all his life the secret of his origins and his personal life.

### RÉSUMÉ

Basil Zaharoff, le célèbre marchand de canons de la première guerre mondiale a vécu une vie pleine de mystères, que Jean Catsiapis s'est efforcé de décrypter. Ami des dirigeants politiques de la Grèce et de la France, il a su servir les intérêts de ces pays tout en réalisant des profits financiers personnels des conflits armés dans lesquels il s'est impliqué. Basil Zaharoff, considéré, à cette époque, comme l'homme le plus riche du monde, a su préserver toute sa vie le secret de ses origines et de sa vie personnelle.

La vie de Basile Zaharoff est pleine de mystères. Cet homme cultivait lui-même le goût du secret en se refusant à dévoiler les éléments relatifs à sa propre personne. Comme l'indique une note de la Direction de la Sûreté générale de France (Annexe 4) «Les 38 premières années de la vie de M. Zaharoff sont un mystère impénétrable». Les activités commerciales de ce Grec - Ottoman - ainsi désigné par des rapports de la police française - étaient souvent dissimulées sous couvert de sociétés qu'il contrôlait mais où il n'apparaissait pas.

\* Université de Paris X Nanterre

## La jeunesse de Zaharoff

De nombreuses rumeurs ont couru sur les origines de Zaharoff dont certaines ont été alimentées par l'intéressé lui-même. Selon la version la plus courante Zaharoff est un Grec de l'Empire ottoman dont la famille a fui Constantinople en 1821<sup>1</sup> pour échapper à un pogrom. Cette famille réfugiée à Odessa pour certains et à Kichinev (Bessarabie) pour d'autres a russifié son nom de Zacharias ou Zachariadis en Zaharoff ou Zacharoff. Zaharoff a eu trois sœurs, Sébastienne, Zoé et Chariclée. Selon un curieux certificat de baptême authentifié le 23 décembre 1892 par le Patriarche œcuménique, Zaharoff est né le 6 octobre 1849 à Moukhlios, un faubourg de Constantinople (voir Annexe 1). Une autre version émane d'un certain Haim Manelewitsch Sahar, se faisant appeler Hyman Barnett Zaharoff, petit cordonnier à Birmingham, qui a tenté toute sa vie de se faire reconnaître comme le fils de Zaharoff. Selon cet homme né en Lituanie son père Manuel Zahar aurait obtenu la nationalité russe pour éviter la confiscation de ses biens. De fait, Manuel Zahar ou Basile Zaharoff aurait fait fortune en vendant un million de fusils allemands «Mauser» à l'Empire ottoman et craignait d'être dépossédé de sa fortune par le ministre turc avec qui il avait traité cette vente d'armes. Robert Neumann, auteur d'une biographie de Zaharoff explique que Manuel Zahar était certainement juif et qu'il s'était fait baptiser comme le lui aurait dit ce «fils».<sup>2</sup>

La famille de Zaharoff de retour d'exil s'établit à Constantinople dans le quartier pauvre de Tatavla. On prête de nombreux métiers au jeune Basile: pompier ambulancier avec une pompe à incendie enroulée autour de son corps, qui pillait les lieux incendiés, ou encore guide pour étrangers, dépouillant ses clients en leur donnant de la fausse monnaie en échange des francs ou des livres sterling qu'il recevait d'eux. Selon la police française (voir Annexe 4) le jeune Basile était un «bandit», qui aurait purgé une peine de 18 mois de prison en Egypte où il travaillait comme employé de banque.

La plupart des biographes de Zaharoff affirment que celui-ci ayant vidé la caisse de son oncle, M. Sevastopoulos, un marchand d'étoffes, s'était enfui en Angleterre où poursuivi devant un tribunal londonien en 1873 et ayant été mis en prison il parvint à se disculper. On lui prête ces propos: «Frustré par mon oncle de ma part de bénéfices, je me crus en droit de prélever sur la caisse commune la somme qui me revenait».<sup>3</sup>

A sa sortie de prison Zaharoff se rend à Athènes et fait la connaissance de Stéphanos Skoulidis, qui va jouer un rôle important dans la suite de sa carrière<sup>4</sup>.

## **Zaharoff marchand de canons**

La carrière internationale de Zaharoff comme marchand de canons commence en octobre 1877 lorsqu'il est embauché grâce à S. Skoulidis en tant que représentant dans les Balkans du fabricant d'armes suédois Thorsten Nordenfelt. Zaharoff parvient au début des années 1880 à vendre plusieurs sous-marins *Nordenfeldt* à propulsion à vapeur; un à la Grèce, deux aux Turcs. Ces trois sumersibles, que Zaharoff vend en proposant à ses clients des crédits étalés sur plusieurs années couleront au bout de quelques sorties. La firme Maxim qui fabrique une mitrailleuse très performante s'avère un concurrent dangereux pour Nordenfelt. En 1888 Zaharoff se fixe à Paris, qui devient le centre de ses affaires, et orchestre le rapprochement entre Nordenfelt et Maxim puis réussit en 1897 à la reprise de ces entreprises par le groupe anglais Vickers pour donner naissance à un géant de l'armement. De la sorte le marchand de canons peut présenter un catalogue d'armes d'une grande diversité avec des facilités de crédits aux Etats désireux de s'armer.

Son champ d'action, outre la péninsule balkanique et l'Empire ottoman, va s'étendre en 1898 à l'Espagne en guerre avec les Etats-Unis à propos de Cuba et surtout à la Russie, qui après sa désastreuse défaite face au Japon en 1905 doit rebâtir sa flotte. Zaharoff crée à Tsaritsyne sur la Volga un gigantesque complexe industriel voué à la production d'armement et dont Vickers détient la majorité des parts<sup>5</sup>. A vrai dire les affaires de Zaharoff l'amènent à travailler avec de nombreux pays d'Europe, d'Asie et des Amériques: l'Italie avec la fondation en 1906 de la Vickers-Terni, la France avec Schneider et les aciéries d'Hénécourt, le Japon où Zaharoff réussit à s'entendre avec l'allemand Krupp, les Etats-Unis où est vendue la mitrailleuse Maxim, et aussi de nombreux pays en guerre d'Amérique latine, Bolivie, Paraguay, Venezuela, Panama, Colombie.

C'est la corruption qui explique principalement la réussite de Zaharoff: il couvre de son argent les hommes politiques qui dirigent les Etats avec lesquels il commerce. C'est notamment en Russie que le célèbre marchand de canons pratique sur une grande échelle son système de pots de vin en gratifiant de sa générosité les épouses ou les maîtresses des décideurs publics. C'est aussi par

une habile politique de crédit que Zaharoff arrache des marchés grâce aux banques qu'il fonde et qui prêtent à ses acheteurs les sommes nécessaires à leurs dépenses d'armement: la Banque d'Athènes, la Banque commerciale de la Méditerranée à Constantinople, l'Express Bank à Paris et la New Ionic Bank à Smyrne.

Marchand d'armes et banquier, Zaharoff a aussi été soupçonné d'espionnage et d'avoir eu la qualité d'agent secret de l'*Intelligence Service* vers 1875. Son succès auprès des femmes lui aurait permis aussi de pouvoir s'introduire dans l'administration de sociétés d'armement, comme la Vickers-Maxim (Annexe 4).

## Zaharoff et la première guerre mondiale

Au début du XX<sup>ème</sup> siècle l'Angleterre et l'Allemagne modernisent leurs armées. Zaharoff participe avec la Vickers à la politique d'armement de ces deux pays. Celui-ci décide de se ranger aux côtés de l'Angleterre et de la France lorsqu'éclate la première guerre mondiale. Conformément au décret du 27 septembre 1914, qui interdit le commerce avec l'ennemi, Zaharoff membre du conseil d'administration de la société française des torpilles Whitehead, qui comprenait d'importants capitaux allemands, dénonça lui-même ces intérêts afin de se mettre en accord avec le droit français en temps de guerre.

Comme l'écrit Jean Marie Moine<sup>6</sup> la première guerre mondiale a été l'apogée et l'apothéose, «the perfect flower» de la carrière de Zaharoff, la réalisation de son «rêve», «virtuellement le ministre des munitions de tous les alliés»; celui-ci leur aurait fourni 4 cuirassés, 3 croiseurs, 62 torpilleurs, 2328 canons, 100 000 mitrailleuses, 5500 avions pour un bénéfice de 3 milliards 400 millions de francs dont 67% à inscrire à son nom.

C'est par la propagande, notamment en France où il s'est établi le 14 mars 1888, que Zaharoff réussit à susciter la ferveur des peuples en faveur de la guerre, ce qui lui permet de réaliser les très importantes commandes d'armement pour les sociétés qu'il contrôle. Ainsi le 4 février 1916 il fonde avec Henri Turot, ancien conseiller municipal de Paris l'agence télégraphique «Radio»(Annexe 3). Déjà peu avant le début de la guerre il prend le contrôle du journal «Excelsior» et put de la sorte s'assurer de lignes éditorialistes favorables à l'industrie de l'armement.

Un de ses objectifs a été d'impliquer la Grèce aux côtés des Alliés grâce à

l'implantation dans ce pays d'une agence de presse répandant des nouvelles favorables à ceux-ci.

## **L'influence de Zaharoff sur la politique internationale**

L'influence de Zaharoff sur la politique internationale était telle durant la première guerre mondiale que les gouvernements de l'Entente étaient obligés de le consulter avant d'effectuer une grande attaque. Il voyageait durant cette période à bord d'un navire de guerre britannique qui avait été mis à sa disposition. Dimitri Kitsikis<sup>7</sup> note ainsi qu'en 1917 Zacharoff «s'était déclaré entièrement pour continuer la guerre jusqu'au bout» lorsque son avis avait été sollicité lors des tentatives de paix tentées par les princes Sixte et Xavier de Bourbon Parme<sup>8</sup> et le président Wilson.<sup>9</sup>

Au cours de la Conférence de la Paix, qui clôtura la première guerre mondiale, le gouvernement grec a utilisé des personnalités amies plus ou moins influentes comme Basile Zacharoff pour faire pression en sa faveur sur les politiques gouvernementales de l'Occident<sup>10</sup>. S'il est vrai que ce Grec Ottoman a pu agir sur Londres et Paris on peut toutefois se demander si ce n'est pas lui, qui, pour ses propres intérêts, a influencé la Grèce et ses alliés afin de prolonger le plus longtemps possible la guerre.

L'influence de Zaharoff s'est surtout manifestée dans les années, qui ont suivi la première guerre mondiale car celui-ci voulait que la Grèce reçoive une partie de l'héritage de l'Empire ottoman. Zaharoff soutient les projets d'Elefthérios Venizélos<sup>11</sup> qui visaient à la prise de possession par la Grèce de territoires d'Asie mineure où vivait une importante communauté grecque. Selon un télégramme du 16 février 1920 envoyé de Londres au ministère grec des affaires étrangères par Venizélos celui-ci souligne la décision du Conseil suprême[des Alliés] d'avoir résolu la question de Smyrne en faveur de la Grèce (Annexe 2). Selon Jean - Baptiste Duroselle c'est Georges Clémenceau<sup>12</sup>, le chef du gouvernement français, qui était intervenu quelques mois plus tôt à la demande de Venizélos et de Zaharoff pour autoriser les troupes grecques à s'emparer de Smyrne le 19 mai 1919; ce dernier s'étant vanté de façon excessive semble t-il d'avoir joué un rôle dans cette opération. A la suite de la défaite de Venizélos aux élections de novembre 1920, Zaharoff parvient à convaincre le roi Constantin de poursuivre la guerre gréco-turque, qui se termine en 1922 par un grave échec

pour Athènes<sup>13</sup>. Le marchand de canons aurait financé sur sa cassette personnelle cette guerre à hauteur d'un demi-milliard de francs, les armements livrés par lui aux Grecs ne lui ayant été jamais payés.

## **Le philhellénisme de Zaharoff**

Les origines grecques de Zaharoff expliquent son incontestable philhellénisme. D'une part, il a favorisé l'entrée en guerre de la Grèce en 1917 ce qui a permis à ce pays de figurer aux côtés des Etats vainqueurs du premier conflit mondial puis soutenu l'action des Grecs pour s'emparer de territoires de l'Empire ottoman. Il est vrai que l'échec en 1922 de ces Grecs, qui entraîna la catastrophe de l'hellénisme de l'Asie mineure a été imputé à Zaharoff même si la responsabilité de grands Etats, comme la France a été engagée dans cet évènement tragique.<sup>14</sup>

D'autre part, il a financièrement aidé des associations de Grecs et l'Etat hellénique. C'est ainsi qu'il a fourni l'argent nécessaire –tout en conservant l'anonymat– à la «Légion des Grecs Ottomans» fondée par les lieutenants Zigania, mort au champ d'honneur et Valsamachi (Annexe 3). Il a multiplié ses efforts pour que des volontaires grecs se mettent pendant la guerre au service de la France.

Il a offert à la Grèce nombre de ses ambassades. Par exemple l'Ambassade de Grèce en France qui se trouve dans un très beau bâtiment du 16<sup>ème</sup> arrondissement de Paris constitue un don de Zaharoff, comme l'indique une plaque située à l'intérieur de cet édifice au rez de chaussée.

## **Les liens de Zaharoff avec les hommes politiques**

Pour l'accomplissement de ses opérations financières et industrielles Zaharoff s'est attaché les services d'hommes politiques de premier plan dans les pays où il a accompli l'essentiel de ses activités. Les dirigeants de la France, de la Grande Bretagne et de la Grèce notamment se sont ainsi engagés aux côtés de Zaharoff dont ils ont apprécié les services rendus.

En France Clemenceau<sup>15</sup> a été un grand protecteur de Zaharoff. Mais cet homme politique dans un premier temps lui était hostile au point de faire enquêter sur les fournitures de carburant réalisées par ses agents. C'est Clemenceau, qui en juillet 1919 le propose pour recevoir le titre de Grand-Croix de la Légion d'honneur.<sup>16</sup>

Il est vrai que Michel Clemenceau, le propre fils du «Tigre» est attaché aux services directeurs de la Vickers française et a été selon une commission sénatoriale américaine le représentant de Zaharoff en Amérique latine; de son côté, Albert, un frère de Clemenceau a été administrateur de la plupart des sociétés dirigées par Sir Basil.

En Grèce, outre le politicien Stéphane Skoulidis, qui - on l'a dit - lui a mis le pied à l'étrier pour entrer dans le monde des affaires, Zaharoff a été très favorable à Vénizélos - on l'a déjà indiqué - qu' il finança pour la réussite du projet de celui-ci tendant à l'entrée de la Grèce dans la Grande guerre. En 1920, après la défaite de Vénizélos aux élections législatives, Zaharoff décide de soutenir le roi Constantin remonté sur le trône et parvient à le convaincre de poursuivre la politique vénizéliste dont le but était de récupérer les territoires grecs d'Asie mineure.

C'est le soutien de Zaharoff à la politique au Proche-Orient du Premier ministre britannique David Lloyd George<sup>17</sup>, qui lui vaut d'avoir été élevé par celui-ci au rang de baron, distinction lui permettant d'être appelé «Sir Basil Zaharoff» (Annexe 2).

Comme on va le voir ci-après avec «l'affaire de Monaco» Zaharoff a réussi à s'associer avec les princes Albert 1<sup>er</sup> et Louis II pour acheter la Société des Bains de Mer (SBM).

Au total, Zaharoff, grâce à son immense fortune, a réussi à acheter le soutien de dirigeants politiques de nombreux pays; ce qui lui a permis ensuite de récupérer par le développement de ses affaires l'argent habilement investi auprès des décideurs de haut niveau, dont il était devenu l'ami.

## **La vie privée de Zaharoff**

Grand séducteur, Zaharoff se serait marié une première fois lors d'un séjour à Londres, au début des années 1870, avec la fille d'un entrepreneur de Bristol, Emily Ann Burrows, selon Donald Mac Cormick<sup>18</sup> l'un de ses biographes. C'est sa rencontre quelques années plus tard avec une duchesse espagnole, Maria del Pilar de Marchena, épouse d'un Bourbon de sang royal, qui va bouleverser sa vie. Cette duchesse le fit bénéficier de ses relations pour l'introduire dans le monde des affaires de l'Espagne. Devenue sa maîtresse pendant plusieurs dizaines d'années, Maria, de religion catholique ne pouvait divorcer. Elle eut



trois filles, dont le père aurait été Zacharoff. Celui-ci, lorsqu'il épouse, le 22 septembre 1924, sa duchesse, devenue veuve, va adopter ses trois filles. L'une d'entre elles, Angèle, qui possédait une importante exploitation agricole, a attiré l'attention de la presse française pendant la seconde guerre mondiale pour une très légère condamnation par le tribunal correctionnel de Versailles en raison de la violation par elle et son métayer de la législation sur le ravitaillement.<sup>19</sup>

Outre son hôtel particulier de l'avenue Hoche à Paris, Zaharoff a pour demeure en France le château de Balincourt dans l'Oise, où sa sécurité est assurée nuit et jour par une garde personnelle hindoue. Certains affirment que s'intéresser de trop près au célèbre financier était dangereux: un journaliste américain trop curieux a été repêché dans un lac et un ancien policier ayant enquêté sur Zaharoff a été retrouvé mort.<sup>20</sup>

Pour satisfaire son épouse le célèbre marchand de canons décide de lui offrir la mainmise sur la Principauté de Monaco.

## **L'affaire de Monaco**

B. Zaharoff et sa duchesse espagnole fréquentent la Côte d'azur et notamment le casino de Monte-carlo alors dirigé par la famille de François Blanc. Il s'agit d'une affaire prospère, dont la principauté de Monaco, soumise à une tutelle de la France, tire un grand profit. Un traité secret entre le prince Albert de Monaco et Zaharoff avait prévu que celui-ci pourrait s'approprier ce casino et mettre à la porte les fils et les gendres de F. Blanc. Devenu actionnaire majoritaire de la SBM, Zaharoff avait pu, quelques années avant son mariage, obtenir l'aide de la France pour établir sa domination sur la Principauté.

De façon surprenante, Georges Clémenceau, devenu un obligé de Zaharoff, et qui dirige le gouvernement français conclut en pleine guerre mondiale, le 17 juillet 1918, un accord secret avec le prince de Monaco établissant que dorénavant la Principauté devra être considérée comme un Etat indépendant, bradant ainsi les droits de la France. Mais le célèbre marchand de canons, qui inspire une campagne de presse –vouée à l'échec– pour pousser le prince Louis II à l'abdication, va profiter pendant peu de temps de la montée en puissance de ses intérêts à Monaco: en février 1926 la mort de sa femme le conduit à abandonner ses projets de devenir le maître de la principauté. Il vend ses parts de la SBM mais décide de conserver les archives de celle-ci où étaient

consignées des informations confidentielles sur les joueurs du Casino, pour la plupart de riches hommes d'affaires et des princes. Ces archives furent volées à Zaharoff, qui parvient toutefois à les récupérer. Mais celui-ci, conscient du danger éventuel qu'il pouvait encourir en conservant ces documents, décide de les faire disparaître en les brûlant.

Curieusement un autre Grec, Aristote Onassis, né lui aussi dans l'Empire ottoman, a voulu devenir le véritable prince de Monaco en rachetant dès 1953 la SBM. Mais en juin 1966 le prince Rainier inquiet des projets d'Onassis, qui souhaitait que la Principauté ne soit que l'apanage d'une élite, alors que lui-même voulait un fort développement touristique fait procéder à une forte augmentation de capital de la SBM réduisant ainsi la part de l'armateur grec dans cette institution monégasque. Après avoir perdu un recours devant la Cour suprême de Monaco, Onassis se retire de la SBM.

## **Les détracteurs de Zaharoff**

Zaharoff a connu dans de nombreux pays, en France notamment, la méfiance ou l'hostilité de certains milieux politiques. Ainsi, pendant la guerre de 1914-1918, c'est le député socialiste SFIO Jean Bon qui interroge au Palais Bourbon, le 26 juillet 1918, le ministre des finances Louis-Lucien Klotz sur la présence de Zaharoff parmi les deux cents plus forts actionnaires de la Banque de France. Ce parlementaire s'appuie sur la loi de Germinal an IX, qui dispose que seuls les citoyens français peuvent être actionnaires de cette banque; ce qui, selon lui, ne pouvait être le cas du marchand de canons, né dans l'Empire ottoman et décoré de la Légion d'honneur au titre du ministère des Affaires étrangères. Il lui fut répondu que Zaharoff était bien citoyen français. De fait un décret du 18 février 1898 avait accordé à celui-ci la naturalisation française (Annexe 3).

Pendant les années suivant la première guerre mondiale Zaharoff est accusé par la presse française d'être l'agent de l'Angleterre à une époque où une rivalité oppose Paris et Londres tant à propos de la politique à l'égard des Turcs qu'en ce qui concerne la question pétrolière en Mésopotamie et en Asie mineure. De fait, la France par le traité d'Ankara du 20 octobre 1921 met fin à la guerre qu'elle menait contre les Turcs. Et Paris, de concert avec la Turquie, agit aux côtés du groupe Standard alors que l'Angleterre et la Grèce avec le concours de Zaharoff favorisent l'action de Shell pour s'emparer du pétrole de Mossoul.

C'est le journaliste et sénateur Henry de Jouvenel, qui dans le *Matin* en date du 12 octobre 1921, attaque Zaharoff dans un article intitulé «*Dans la politique internationale. L'erreur grecque de l'Angleterre ou la politique de M. Basil Zaharoff*». Ce quotidien écrit que «la politique française a reconquis son indépendance même à l'égard de M. Zaharoff». Selon de Jouvenel la France va redevenir la «protectrice de l'Islam» et celui-ci croit pouvoir avancer que lorsque «le peuple anglais aura calculé le prix que lui coûte, de l'Égypte aux Indes, une politique à la Zaharoff, sans doute voudra t-il, lui aussi, faire sa paix avec l'Islam. Il pourra compter alors sur nos bons offices».

*Le Crapouillot*, qui consacre après la première guerre mondiale de nombreux articles pour dénoncer les milieux financiers, attaque régulièrement Zaharoff: outre son numéro de novembre 1931 -cité plus haut à la note n° 3- cette revue dénonce l'influence de celui-ci dans ses numéros de mars 1932 (*Sir Basil Zacharoff, le magnat de la mort subite*), et d'octobre 1933 (*Basile Zacharoff et la Vickers*).

Jusqu'à la fin de sa vie Zaharoff fut victime d'attaques de maîtres chanteurs souhaitant lui soutirer de l'argent pour ne pas révéler des secrets le concernant. Le célèbre Levantin leur faisait distribuer une carte en superbe vélin sur laquelle il avait fait graver l'inscription «Sir Basil n'ayant plus de voix ne peut pas chanter».

## **L'homme le plus riche du monde**

Selon la revue satirique *Bec et Ongles* en date du 5 décembre 1936, publiée quelques jours après le décès de Zaharoff, celui-ci aurait laissé un héritage de 2 milliards de francs. Ce qui permet à beaucoup d'affirmer que Sir Basil, administrateur de plus de 300 sociétés, était à sa mort l'homme le plus riche du monde.

Son train de vie était fastueux. Il aurait ainsi disposé d'un service de table composé de trente six pièces en or, fabriqué par le joaillier Boucheron.

Mais Zaharoff n'était pas égoïste et a agi en généreux mécène envers de nombreuses institutions et personnes nécessiteuses: dons à la Ligue française pour la Société des Nations, aux veuves de guerre et aux pauvres de Paris, au Jardin des Plantes, à l'hôpital de guerre de Mme Barthou à Biarritz, à chaque

soldat qui arrivait en permission à la gare de l'Est(40 frs). Zaharoff a aussi contribué à la création de l'Institut Pasteur d'Athènes, du grand prix Balzac fondé en 1922 par les éditions Grasset, des chaires de littérature anglaise à la Sorbonne et de littérature française à Oxford.

## **Le décès de Zaharoff**

Souffrant à la fin de sa vie de la goutte, et ne pouvant se déplacer qu'en fauteuil à roulettes, Zaharoff meurt le matin du 27 novembre 1936 d'une attaque d'apoplexie à Monte Carlo dans sa chambre de l'Hôtel de Paris. Ne souhaitant pas que son décès puisse affoler les marchés financiers il avait exigé que sa mort ne soit rendue publique qu'après la clôture des Bourses européennes. Un fourgon mortuaire amène son corps de Monte Carlo à son château de Balincourt. Sa famille et ses proches veillent sa dépouille dans la nuit du 27 au 28 novembre. Il est enterré aux côtés de son épouse dans la crypte de la chapelle de ce château le 30 novembre. Comme l'indique le *Figaro*<sup>21</sup> un pope venu de Paris a célébré un service religieux auquel n'assistent selon le désir du défunt que les membres de sa famille et ses domestiques. Enterré selon les rites de la religion chrétienne orthodoxe Zaharoff, cet homme au destin exceptionnel, a voulu, à sa manière, dissiper la controverse sur ses origines.

## **NOTES**

1. Le 25 mars 1821, après 400 ans de domination ottomane, débute une révolution qui va conduire la Grèce à l'indépendance. Cette révolution entraîne le massacre de nombreux Grecs par les Turcs.
2. Robert Neumann, *Sir Basil Zaharoff, le Roi des armes*, traduit de l'allemand par Denise Van Moppes, Paris, B. Grasset, 1935, p. 15.
3. Xavier de Hauteclouque «*L'Intelligence service et ses mystères*», Le Crapouillot, novembre 1931.
4. Stéphane Skoulidis (1838-1928) journaliste politique est Premier ministre de Grèce du 7 novembre 1915 au 21 juin 1916.
5. Jean-Marie Moine, *Basile Zaharoff (1849-1936), le «marchand de canons»*, Ethnologie française, XXXVI, 2006, 1, p. 139-152.

6. Jean-Marie Moine, *ibid.*
7. Dimitri Kitsikis, *Propagande et pressions en politique internationale, la Grèce et ses revendications à la Conférence de la Paix (1919-1920)*, Paris, PUF, 1963.
8. Début 1917, les princes Sixte et Xavier de Bourbon Parme tentent de négocier une paix séparée entre l'Autriche et les alliés de l'Entente.
9. Le président des Etats-Unis Woodrow Wilson expose en vain sa conception d'une paix sans victoire et engage son pays en avril 1917 dans la première guerre mondiale.
10. Dimitri Kitsikis, *ibid.*
11. Elefthérios Venizélos (1864 - 1936) voulait l'entrée en guerre de la Grèce aux côtés de la France et de l'Angleterre alors que le roi Constantin, beau-frère de l'Empereur d'Allemagne, souhaitait que son pays garde une position de neutralité. Premier ministre de Grèce depuis le 27 juin 1917, il fait entrer son pays dans la première guerre mondiale puis perd les élections législatives de novembre 1920, qui sont suivies du retour sur le trône du roi Constantin, contraint d'abdiquer le 10 juin 1917.
12. Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, *Clemenceau*, Fayard, Paris, 1988 p. 778.
13. La défaite de l'armée grecque en septembre 1922 à Smyrne entraîne la fin de l'hellénisme de l'Asie mineure avec l'exil du million et demi de Grecs vivant dans l'Empire ottoman. Le traité de Lausanne du 24 juillet 1923 fonde la Turquie et remplace le traité de Sèvres du 10 août 1920, fort avantageux pour la Grèce.
14. Epuisée par la première guerre mondiale, la France décide, le 21 octobre 1921, par le traité d'Ankara conclu avec la Turquie de retirer ses troupes d'Asie mineure où aux côtés de la Grande Bretagne elle menait depuis la fin 1918 différentes opérations militaires. Ce retrait, décidé sans concertation avec Londres, a affaibli la Grèce dans sa guerre contre les Turcs, dont l'issue sera fatale pour l'hellénisme d'Asie mineure.
15. Georges Clemenceau (1841-1929) président du Conseil français de 1917 à 1919.
16. En moins de 11 ans Zaharoff obtient tous les grades de la Légion d'Honneur: Chevalier, Officier, Commandeur, Grand-Officier, et Grand-Croix (Annexe 4).
17. David Lloyd George (1863-1945) Premier ministre britannique de 1916 à 1922.
18. Donald Mac Cormick *Peddler of Death. The Life and Times of Sir Basil Zaharoff*, New York, 1965, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
19. Angèle de Borbon-Zaharoff, très appréciée pour sa générosité par beaucoup, semble t-il, a été condamnée à 200 francs d'amende, le 12 janvier 1943, par le tribunal correctionnel de Versailles pour avoir vendu quelques kilos de beurre sans ticket, en violation de la législation sur le ravitaillement. Cette condamnation est commentée par le *Matin* du 13 janvier 1943 qui souligne que cette femme est la fille du «financier juif Zaharoff».
20. Jean-Marie Moine, *ibid.*
21. *Le Figaro* du 30 novembre 1936.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Robert Neumann, *Sir Basil Zaharoff, le Roi des armes*, Ed. Bernard Grasset, 1924 (traduit de l'allemand).

Dimitri Kitsikis, *Propagande et pressions en politique internationale, la Grèce et ses revendications à la Conférence de la Paix (1919-1920)*, Paris, PUF, 1963.

Albert Pingaud, *Basil Zaharoff*, in Larousse mensuel illustré, juillet 1937, p. 753-754.

Jean-Marie Moine, *Basil Zaharoff, le «marchand de canons»(1849-1936)* in *Ethnologie Française*, 2006/I-Janvier p. 139-151.

Tristan Gaston-Breton, *Basil Zaharoff*, in Les Echos, 29 juillet 2009.

### *Annexes*

*Annexe 1 Certificat de baptême Archives nationales Paris dossier Basil Zaharoff, cote F/7/16028/1*

Nous soussignés, anciens habitants de la paroisse de Moukhlios que nous avons constamment habitée, certifions en notre conscience et foi de Chrétiens que Monsieur Zacharie Basile Zaharoff est né des légitimes époux Basile Zaharoff et Hélène le six octobre de l'an mil huit cent quarante neuf et a été baptisé suivant les rites de l'Eglise orthodoxe le huit du même mois par le Curé d'alors Papa Daniel ayant été tenu sur les fonts baptismaux par Madame Hélène Zaharoff en présence de son père.

Sur quoi nous délivrons notre présent témoignage.

Fait à Moukhlios le 21 décembre 1892

Signé: Alexandros Georgios Johannes (le reste illisible) Stéphane Gagrios

Le Curé archimandrite Makarios certifie véritable les signatures ci-dessus

En-tête: Le Patriarche œcuménique Constantinos Néophytos certifie véritable la signature sacerdotale ci-dessous (dans l'acte signature du Curé Makarios)

Fait au Palais Patriarcal le 23 décembre 1892

Je soussigné Traducteur – Juré près la Cour d'appel de Paris certifie que la

traduction qui précède est conforme à l'original, en langue grecque que j'ai signé

Ne varietur, Paris, 5 décembre 1897

Signature illisible

*Annexe 2 Document diplomatique secret, Ministère des Affaires étrangères Athènes, reproduit dans le quotidien «Le Matin» 5 décembre 1922*

Télégramme: Londres 16 février 1920

Ayant été convoqué, j'ai pris part aujourd'hui à la séance du Conseil suprême. Après la fin de la séance, j'ai déjeuné avec le Premier ministre britannique en présence de son secrétaire et de notre consul général.

Le Premier ministre anglais m'a dit qu'il était heureux d'avoir réussi à résoudre la question de Smyrne en faveur de la Grèce; il a ajouté «qu'il avait à lutter non seulement contre le président du conseil français, qui soutenait qu'on devait nous donner simplement une sphère d'influence économique, mais aussi contre le ministre des affaires étrangères anglais. Le Premier ministre m'a demandé toutes sortes de renseignements concernant la Thrace et Smyrne, afin d'être mieux à même de soutenir notre point de vue.»

[Vénizélos]

Le correspondant du *Matin* à Athènes commente ainsi ce télégramme de Vénizélos:

Le consul général dont il est question dans ce télégramme est un personnage fort curieux. Il s'agit en effet de M. John Stavridis, homme d'affaires et avocat anglo-grec, ancien associé, puis successeur de M. Lloyd George dans son cabinet d'avocat. Le Premier anglais lui a fait donner le titre de sir, comme l'a fait pour son autre homme d'affaires, celui-ci anglo-franco-grec, M. Basile Zaharoff.

Ces deux hommes d'affaires «internationaux» sont les amis communs et comparses de M. Lloyd George et Vénizélos; ils ont joué un rôle occulte de première importance dans l'histoire de la politique anglo-grecque de ces dernières années, qui fut en fait la politique de leurs affaires.

*Annexe 3 Note du 7 mai 1918 de la Direction de la Sûreté Générale (extraits)*  
*Archives nationales Paris dossier Basil Zaharoff, cote F/7/16028/1*

M. Zaharoff, Basile, Zacharie est né le 6 octobre 1849 à Moukhlios (Turquie). D'origine grecque il a été naturalisé français par décret du 18 février 1898.

Célibataire il demeure depuis 1890, avenue Hoche 53, dans un hôtel particulier qui lui appartient; en outre il possède à Echelle sur Roye (Somme) un château où lors de la déclaration de guerre il se trouvait en compagnie de Mlle de Bourbon Angèle, âgée de 21 ans, née à Paris, actuellement à Londres.

Arrivé à Paris en 1888, Zaharoff déclara à cette époque venir de Russie, où il dit avoir servi deux ans dans l'armée russe en qualité d'officier d'artillerie.

Avant de venir en France, le susnommé aurait séjourné à Londres, New York, Constantinople et Chypre sous le nom de Williamson.

Depuis 1899 Zaharoff est à la fois administrateur et agent –général pour la France de l'importante compagnie anglaise «Wickers-Sous-And-Maxim-Limited», fabrique de canons et mitrailleuses et entreprise de constructions navales, dont le siège est à Londres.

Dresseur d'affaires, renommé pour sa hardiesse, il a acquis, par des spéculations heureuses, une fortune considérable. C'est ainsi qu'il tira un gain appréciable, dit-on, de la négociation de navires de guerre entre le Gouvernement hellénique et la «Société Espagnole de Construction navale» de Madrid, dont il est devenu le conseiller technique.

Zaharoff souscrivit en 1910 500 actions de 500 francs chacune à la société en formation des «Quotidiens Illustrés», qui fonda le journal «Excelsior». Il reprit ensuite 5 744 actions de cette société, au cours de deux augmentations de capital qu'elle effectua en juin 1911 et en mai 1912. Aussi peut-on affirmer qu'il est actuellement le principal actionnaire de ce journal.

Le 4 février 1916 le susnommé fonda avec Henri Turot une société pour exploiter l'agence télégraphique Radio» mais vers la fin 1917 se retira de cette affaire.

L'objet de cette société est l'exploitation d'une agence d'informations et de publicité.

De bons renseignements sont recueillis sur les sentiments que professe Zaharoff pour notre pays. Celui-ci s'est intéressé avec une attention suivie aux diverses



sociétés de volontaires étrangers, qui se sont formées depuis la guerre, principalement à la «Légion des volontaires Grecs-Ottomans», fondée par les lieutenant Zigania et Valsamachi; ce fut lui qui, tout en conservant l'anonymat, fournit l'argent nécessaire à l'organisation de ce corps et à l'équipement des volontaires, qui s'y enrôlèrent. Il fit également des versements anonymes aux Comités russes et italiens, et lorsque la Grèce avait adopté une attitude équivoque à l'égard des alliés, on prétend qu'il multiplia ses efforts pour empêcher les volontaires grecs de rejoindre leur pays n'hésitant pas à leur consentir des dons en argent pour les engager à rester au service de la France.

*Annexe 4 Note du 25 octobre 1921 de la Direction de la Sûreté Générale (extraits).*

*Archives nationales Paris dossier Basil Zaharoff, cote F/7/16028/1*

Sir Basil Zaharoff est un financier habile. Il représente des intérêts internationaux dans l'industrie des munitions de guerre. En dehors des cercles politiques il possède dans la production des armements dans quatre ou cinq pays différents, une influence qui va jusqu'au contrôle absolu.

Pour mystérieux qu'il soit, M. Basil Zaharoff n'est pas un inconnu en France. Avant la guerre il comblait de ses dons nos instituts reconnaissants. Une fois, il acheta un journal, qui n'était politique qu'à demi; cela passa pour une fantaisie de mécène. Pendant la guerre il fonda une agence destinée à renseigner la presse française ce qui était le plus habile moyen de l'inspirer et de la diriger.

Le premier à s'en alarmer fut, je crois, M. Clemenceau. A l'arrivée au pouvoir de ce dernier, M. Zaharoff fut menacé comme d'autres. L'affaire s'arrangea à merveille, puisqu'il reçut à quelques jours de là, la Grand-Croix de la Légion d'Honneur. Depuis, une partie de la famille de M. Clémenceau est entrée dans les affaires de M. Zaharoff.

Qui est donc cet «homme mystérieux» qui guide encore la politique de M. Lloyd George, comme il a conseillé celle de M. Clémenceau tant que celui-ci est resté au pouvoir ?

M. Zaharoff ne paraît guère avoir davantage de nationalité qu'il n'a d'identité précise.

### **Son identité et sa nationalité**

Le Ministère de la Justice, qui a instruit sa demande de naturalisation, présentée le 6 décembre 1897, possède un certificat de la Légation de Grèce en France attestant que Zaharoff est sujet hellène, rentier à Paris.

Un acte délivré par une église orthodoxe d'orient et qui est au dossier de l'intéressé indique que «Zacharie-Vassiliou Zaharof ou Zacharoff Basile est né à Moukhliou, le 6 octobre 1849, fils de Vassilios ou Basile Zaharoff. Ainsi Zaharoff est né en Turquie de parents grecs; il peut déjà revendiquer deux nationalités.

Par décret du 18 février 1898, 75 jours après avoir formulé sa demande il est naturalisé français.

Depuis, il a été fait «Sir» et investi des plus hautes distinctions que peut conférer l'Empire britannique. On peut donc le croire sujet Anglais.

On se souvient que lorsqu'il est arrivé à Paris, le Ministère de la justice, qui a instruit sa demande de naturalisation, présentée le 6 décembre 1897, possède un certificat de la Légation de Grèce en France attestant que Zaharoff est sujet hellène, rentier à Paris.

### **Ses débuts**

Les 38 premières années de la vie de M. Zaharoff sont un mystère impénétrable. Il semble qu'il y ait un «trou» dans la vie de cet homme, mais un trou de «vilenie» qu'il faut oublier. Les différents services de police ont bien cherché à percer ce mystère; ils n'y sont parvenus que par des moyens de fortune n'offrant pas de certitude.

Des indications ont appris que M. Zaharoff aurait été «bandit» dans sa jeunesse probablement en Turquie. On a assuré que plus tard, étant employé de banque en Egypte, il aurait été condamné à 18 mois de prison au Caire et qu'il aurait purgé sa peine.

Ce Grec-Ottoman aurait cru devoir quitter le ciel inclément pour lui de l'Orient pour tenter la fortune en Angleterre; au cours de la traversée, sur le bateau qui l'amenait, il aurait fait la connaissance d'un riche fabricant d'armes de Londres et il serait devenu l'amant de sa femme. C'est peut être là qu'il faut chercher la cause de ses débuts dans la firme Vickers & Maxim. Il avait à cette époque 38 ans bien sonnés.

### **Son installation et sa vie à Paris**

Après un court séjour à Londres M. Zaharoff vient se fixer à Paris le 14 mars 1888. Descendu au Grand Hôtel, parlant couramment plusieurs langues dont le turc, le grec, le russe, le français, l'anglais et l'espagnol, on le croyait tout d'abord un prince étranger.

En juillet 1892 on apprit que M. Zaharoff était engagé comme agent d'informations secrètes par la compagnie Maxim Nordenfelt, société anglaise qui avait une succursale à Paris 5 rue Meyerber.

En septembre 1897 M. Zaharoff, qui passait pour jouer un rôle occulte en Europe et plus particulièrement en France, est étroitement surveillé; on suppose qu'il est à la solde de plusieurs Etats pour surveiller l'armement des puissances.

La fortune a souri à M. Zaharoff du jour où il s'est installé en France. On assure qu'il a gagné plus d'un million dans le seul agrandissement de la gare St Lazare; qu'il a encore gagné des sommes considérables dans une négociation de navires de guerre entre l'Espagne et la Turquie.

C'est surtout en armant la Russie, grâce à ses relations avec un certain grand duc qu'il aurait réalisé ses premiers millions d'avant guerre.

Il est membre du conseil d'administration de la société française des Torpilles Whitehead constituée le 1<sup>er</sup> mars 1915, ayant son siège 4 bd Malesherbes à Paris et son usine à Gassin près de St Tropez (Var). Cette société comprenait d'importants capitaux allemands; M. Zaharoff dénonça lui-même ses intérêts au cours de la guerre et demanda l'application du décret du 27 septembre 1914.

En octobre 1920, toujours avec un grand concours de réclame M. Zaharoff, s'est mis à la tête de l'Anglo Persian Oil Company, pour une fourniture importante de pétrole à faire à la France; il n'a pas hésité à fonder une société au capital de 100 millions entièrement versés.

Enfin tout dernièrement, il a mis sur pied la Banque d'Athènes, avec des capitaux anglais.

En résumé, on peut affirmer que ce métèque, qui a participé si grandement à l'armement de la France pendant la guerre et qui s'est dépensé considérablement pour la cause des Alliés, a tout de même réalisé plus d'un milliard de bénéfices quoiqu'il s'en défende sur les commandes d'armement qui lui ont été faites.

### **L'influence de M. Zaharoff**

Cette influence est considérable dans toute l'Europe. Avant la guerre il a contribué à armer toutes les nations du monde. Pendant les hostilités il est resté fidèlement attaché à la cause des alliés.

Il passe pour être le confident et le conseiller de M. Lloyd George et de M. Venizélos. On assure que pendant la guerre il avait toujours un croiseur anglais à sa disposition pour le transporter de France en Angleterre et vice versa.

On sait qu'en France il est lié par une solide amitié à MM. Barthou, Thomson, Klotz, Mandel et Tardieu; on le croit encore en intimité avec M. Briand. Il connaissait beaucoup, jadis MM. Augagneur et Gautier anciens ministres de la Marine.

### **Les libéralités de M. Zaharoff**

On a répandu que M. Zaharoff avait dépensé peut être 100 millions pour la cause des Alliés pendant la guerre. Ce chiffre paraît formidablement grossi.

En France on connaît de lui les donations suivantes:

- 700 000 frs pour la fondation de la chaire d'aviation de Paris
- 500 000 frs pour la fondation d'une chaire d'aviation en Russie
- 500 000 frs au Comité national des Sports pour la préparation des jeunes Français aux Jeux Olympiques
- 250 000 frs pour la fondation du Cercle du Marin à Toulon
- 500 000 frs au Muséum d'Histoire naturelle du Jardin des Plantes (une allée porte son nom dans ce jardin).

Il a en outre subventionné plusieurs œuvres de guerre; on dit notamment qu'il versait une mensualité de 5 000 frs à l'hôpital que dirigeait Mme Barthou.

On assure encore qu'il aurait, pendant la guerre, donné dix millions à M. Venizélos pour l'œuvre de la propagande française en Grèce.

Il est certain d'autre part que M. Zaharoff s'est directement intéressé aux combattants grecs volontaires en France et plus particulièrement à l'œuvre des Grecs-Ottomans.

### **Les distinctions honorifiques de M. Zaharoff**

C'est en juillet 1899 que M. Zaharoff fit les premières démarches pour la Légion d'Honneur.

Ce ne fut que le 15 novembre 1908 qu'il fut promu Chevalier – sur un contingent spécial du Ministère de la Marine en tant qu'Administrateur délégué de la Société Vickers & Maxim.

En 11 ans il put posséder tous les grades de notre ordre national avec les citations suivantes:

Promu Officier le 12 janvier 1913 au titre du Ministère de l'Instruction publique: «Fondateur de la chaire d'aviation de l'Université de Paris»

Promu Commandeur le 31 juillet 1914 par le Ministère de la Marine

«Fondateur de la chaire d'aviation de la Sorbonne, du Cercle du Marin et de la Maison du Soldat Titres exceptionnels»

Promu Grand-Officier le 3 juillet 1918 par le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères

«Administrateur de la Société Vickers Maxim. Services éminents rendus à la cause des Alliés»

Promu Grand-Croix, le 26 juillet 1919, avec la même citation que ci-dessus

M. Zaharoff est en outre titulaire des plus hautes distinctions étrangères, notamment d'Espagne, d'Italie, de Russie et même d'Allemagne et de Turquie, assure-t-on.

En Angleterre, il serait Grand-Croix des ordres du Bain et de l'Empire Britannique.

# The Transformation of the Greek American Press: The National Herald 1915-1939

Alexander Kitroeff \*

## RÉSUMÉ

La presse de langue grecque aux Etats-Unis dans la première moitié du XXe siècle, a été créée par plusieurs personnes ayant de fortes affiliations avec les deux grands mouvements politiques grecs, les vénizélistes libéraux et les pro-royalistes conservateurs. Bien qu'initialement créés en tant qu'organes de ces deux blocs idéologiques, les journaux ont peu à peu été adaptés aux réalités de leur environnement américain. En examinant la correspondance de Demetrios Callimaque, le légendaire rédacteur en chef du quotidien *Ethnikos Keryx*, de langue grecque, basé à New York, l'auteur de cet article examine comment ce journal a essayé de s'adapter à la situation grecque américaine tout en restant fidèle à ses racines idéologiques. Ce faisant, il révèle les façons dont un important journal américain grec a commencé la transition d'une réflexion sur la Grèce vers un miroir d'Amérique grecque.

## ABSTRACT

The Greek language press in the United States in the first half of the twentieth century was established by several individuals with strong affiliations with the two major Greek political sides, the liberal venizelists and the conservative pro-royalists. Initially formed as the organs of those two ideological blocks, the newspapers gradually had to adapt to the realities of their American environment. By examining the correspondence of Demetrios Callimachos, the legendary editor-in-chief of the New York-based Greek language daily *Ethnikos Keryx* this article examines how that newspaper tried to adapt to the situation Greek American faced and also remain loyal to its ideological roots. In doing so it reveals the ways one important Greek American newspaper began transitioning from a reflection of Greece into a mirror of Greek America.

## Introduction: The Greek American Press

When we study Greek American newspapers we have to take into account the

\* Haverford College

role of certain key individuals whose work shaped the evolution of the press. Diaspora newspapers relied to some extent on support from the homeland, but the vagaries of production and distribution, let alone ensuring reliable content always made their existence much more precarious compared to the major newspapers in Athens or Thessaloniki. The same applies more generally to the ethnic press in America, and it would be difficult to provide a detailed list of the thousands of such newspapers that appeared and in many instances quickly disappeared across the United States during the twentieth century. Even now, when we can rely on electronic databases and search engines we are not quite sure exactly how many Greek language newspapers rolled off the presses in towns across America because there were so many. Those that survived did so largely not only because they appeared in the midst of large communities and had some significant capital investment, but also because of the efforts of their founders, owners or editors-in-chief who dedicated their lives to the noble cause of Greek American journalism. The major studies of the Greek American press, emphasize the role of that dedicated group of persons who carried Greek journalism on their sturdy shoulders.<sup>1</sup>

In the pre-WWII era the individuals who played a leadership role in the Greek American press were caught up in the political rift between the Venizelists and the Royalists that divided Greek politics from 1915 to the late 1930s. The Greek press in the United States, and its leading figures, played an important role in promoting either the venizelist or the royalist cause. Indeed, the individuals who were so important for these ethnic newspapers were clearly identified with one of the two sides, with the exception of those involved in the few small workers' or left-wing newspapers. Solon Vlastos, a New York-based merchant who along with his brother Demetrios founded the *Atlantis* the first Greek language daily in the United States was an avowed and outspoken royalist. The *Atlantis* was so influential, that the venizelists established their own daily newspaper in New York, the *Ethnikos Keryx* (National Herald). Its first owner, Petros Tatanis, a businessman and Evripides "Ery" Kehaya a tobacco merchant and manufacturer who took over the paper in 1933 were both venizelists, as was the legendary Demetrios Callimachos who served as editor-in-chief under both owners. Persons committed to one of the two sides were also at the helm of the other pre-WWII Greek American newspapers. For example, Petros Lambros an ardent royalist was the owner of Chicago's *Hellenikos Astir* (Greek Star) and Alexander Pavellas, a venizelist was the co-founder of San Francisco's *Prometheus*.

Yet while most Greek newspapers in the pre-WWII United States were vehicles of either venizelist or pro-royalist ideology and politics, they were much more than that. First and foremost they were businesses, exposed to the vagaries of the price fluctuations in their industry and beholden to the economic status of their readers. They need to do what they could to survive economically. Secondly, whatever their political identification, they were links between the Greeks in America and their homeland and a mirror of their lives in their adopted country. And as I have argued elsewhere, the Greek press is more than a mirror-type record of the Greek experience in the United States, it shapes that experience by what it writes and what it says. There is a two-way interactive relationship between the ethnic press and the immigrant or diaspora community and sometimes homeland politics is deemed to be of outmost importance, but at other times the cultural ties to the homeland or the issues of assimilation and integration into American life take precedence.

This article explores the multiple functions of the Greek American press in America by examining the exchanges between the *Ethnikos Keryx*'s editor-in-chief Demetrios Callimachos with the two owners he served under, Tatanis and Kehaya. What emerges, are two main conclusions. The first is that the Greek press plays multiple roles even in periods of intense ideological divisions generated by the homeland, and secondly that "venizelism" abroad may initially appear as a reflection of venizelism in the homeland, but in fact it is mediated by the realities that shape the Greek experience in the United States. Yes, we can speak of venizelism and royalism among the Greeks of America, but it is to some extent a unique phenomenon. The Greeks in the United States, even in the pre-WWII period were not a simple extension of Greece, but an increasingly Americanized form of Greekness.

### **The Venizelist-Royalist National Schism at Home and in the Diaspora**

The so-called national schism that broke out in 1915 divided Greek politics into supporters of the liberal politician Eleftherios Venizelos who was prime minister at the time, and the supporters of King Constantine I who was head of state. The two political leaders clashed over Greece's optimal policy in World War I. Venizelos, who was Anglophile and believed that entering the war on the side of the Anglo-French Entente, which he believed would be victorious, would



support Greece's territorial claims on lands controlled by the Ottoman Empire that were historically Greek and inhabited by a majority Greek ethnic population. In contrast, the Germanophile King believed Greece should remain neutral, something that would favor the Central Powers in the war and by extension be in Greece's best interests. Venizelos also prioritized Greece's regional interests and its ties with the ethnic Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, the King and the party that supported him, the Populists, favored a more circumspect Greek-oriented foreign policy. The King dismissed Venizelos but he managed to make a comeback in 1917 with the help of the Entente. In 1920, after the pro-royalist Populist party won the Greek general election Constantine returned as head of state but he lasted only until 1922 when he was forced to abdicate in the wake of the Asia Minor Disaster, Greece's traumatic defeat at the end of the Greco-Turkish War of 1919-1922. After several turbulent years Venizelos returned to power until 1932 when the Populists won the elections and soon after that restored the monarchy allowing Constantine's son, George II to ascend the throne. All this time the Venizelist-Royalist polarization continued as deep as ever often taking the form of violence and assassination attempts, of which Venizelos survived two. In August of 1936 General Ioannis Metaxas, who had dabbled in right wing policies, seized power with a coup and established a pro-royalist authoritarian and in many ways quasi-fascist regime that persecuted Venizelists and all who were further to the left than the liberals. We can say that the national schism ended only with the outbreak of WWII, giving way to a left versus right-wing polarization.

The national schism affected the Greek diaspora communities with almost the same visceral intensity with which it had ripped apart any chance of political consensus in the homeland. The two largest Greek diaspora communities at the time of the national schism were in Egypt and the United States. These groups were different in many ways even though both were affected by the venizelist-royalist rivalry. The Greeks had originally settled in Egypt back in the nineteenth century as a merchant community, benefitting from the privileges that Britain's control over that country ensured for its foreign residents. By the 1920s, the Greeks in Egypt had grown to about 150,000 led by a wealthy group of merchants who were involved in banking and the country's main source of income, the export of cotton. Around that mercantile elite there had formed a microcosm of Greek society made up of entrepreneurs, professionals, doctors and lawyers, small

businessmen and employees. The proximity of both Greece and Cyprus, which was under Ottoman rule, meant travel and settlement in Egypt was relatively easy. While the community was divided into supporters of Venizelos and the King and the Populists, as was the Greek press in Egypt, Venizelos' vision of both an Anglophile and an outwardly oriented Greece that wished to play a role in the Eastern Mediterranean was much more attractive to the Greeks in Egypt.<sup>2</sup>

The situation among the Greeks in the United States, where almost 400,000 had settled by the 1920s was quite different: the bulk of the community was made up of immigrants from rural Greece and there was only a very small educated elite made up of merchants and white collar professionals, although the number of immigrant employees and workers who were opening businesses increased rapidly. But what mattered above all was that a very large part of those who emigrated to the United States came from Southern Greece, the Peloponnese, which politically was a pro-royalist stronghold. This could have meant a preponderance of pro-royalists in the United States but Venizelos' pro-Western policies made him attractive to many Greeks in the United States, especially after both Greece under Venizelos and the United States entered WWI on the same side in 1917 within weeks of each other. With xenophobia rising throughout America, and a premium placed on displays of loyalty by foreign immigrants, Venizelism was the obvious choice for many Greek immigrants. So roughly speaking the community was divided almost down the middle.

The most dramatic example of the depth and resonance of the venizelist-royalist divide among the Greeks in the United States was the polarization it caused in the Greek Orthodox Church in America. The cause of this was the politicization of the Church of Greece when the national schism erupted. It openly sided with the King and Theocletos I, the Archbishop of Athens and All Greece held a public meeting in which he "anathematized" Venizelos whose effigy was burned – the "anathema" is a form of excommunication and requires the person to "repent" before being admitted back in the Church. The Greek Orthodox Church in America was under the jurisdiction of the Church of Greece and Theocletos naturally favored the appointment of clerics who shared his political views. When Venizelos returned to power in 1917 he replaced Theocletos with Meletios, an outspoken Venizelist prelate. When it was Meletios' turn to be dismissed following the pro-royalist victory in the 1920 elections he did not stay idle and went to the United States where he implemented a plan that had been discussed already for several

years. Establishing a centralized Greek Orthodox authority there to coordinate Church activities that had become random and beholden to local community organizations many of which ignored the jurisdiction that Greece was supposed to hold over Church affairs in America. Metaxakis, operating as somewhat of a self-proclaimed prelate in exile, went ahead and established the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in America. But pro-royalist clergy opposed an institution that was created by a Venizelist. There followed a decade of what was essentially a Venizelist-Royalist civil war in the Church in America, with many parishes splitting in two and the venizelists or the royalists leaving and forming their own Church. All this came to an end in 1930 when the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, which had already assumed jurisdiction over Greek Orthodoxy in the Americas, appointed a new Archbishop, and restructured the Church in such a way that most, though not all parishes, declared their allegiance to the Archdiocese. The venizelist-royalist rift in the United States went well beyond religious life, arguments, sometimes heated other times calmer, over homeland politics were always part of the life of the Greek immigrants.

### **Demetrios Callimachos, an Apostle of Venizelism**

Demetrios Callimachos (1879-1963) became one of the most best known and prolific Greek American journalists. He was born in Madytos in Western Thrace the son of Panagiotis and Grammatiki Paximadas and was educated in Constantinople, Smyrna, and Athens where he obtained a degree in Theology. When he arrived in the United States at the age of 35 in 1914 he had already established a reputation as an outspoken supporter of Greece's "Great Idea", he had gained valuable journalistic experience as a contributor to the leading Athens daily newspaper *Akropolis* and as an editor of the Athens-based national journal *Hellenismos* of Neoklis Kazazis, a leading nationalist thinker in Greece in the early twentieth century. Callimachos had also lectured to several Greek communities in the Eastern Mediterranean including the large Greek communities in Egypt.

Callimachos was invited to the United States by the nationalist and pro-Venizelist organization *Panellinios Enosis* at a time when the Greek national interests were being discussed intensely among the growing numbers of Greeks in the United States. Soon after his arrival, he became editor of the Greek language daily *Ethnikos Keryx* and served in that post from 1915 to 1918 and from 1922

to 1944. In between 1918 and 1922 he served as the priest of a Greek Orthodox parish in Brooklyn, NY and he was one of the signatories of the charter that established the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in 1921. In 1925 he produced and wrote almost single-handedly a multi-paged book designed to commemorate the *Ethnikos Keryx's* first decade. He remained a strong and eloquent advocate of Venizelism through the 1930s, devoting hundreds of headlines to Venizelos, whom he interviewed several times. After 1944 he became editor in other Greek American publications but maintained a connection to the *Ethnikos Keryx* and was a principal spokesman for the cause of preserving the Greek language among the Greeks in the United States until his death in 1963.

Callimachos' personal papers were deposited at the Immigration Research Center at the University of Minnesota, which also possesses the papers of Theodore Saloutos who published the first comprehensive history of the Greeks in the United States in 1964. Saloutos had received Callimachos' help during his research. Callimachos' collection is significant, running to 20 linear feet and it includes biographical information, correspondence, writing and speeches, memorabilia and collected ephemera and photographs. A large part of the material and the correspondence refers to his work at the *Ethnikos Keryx*. The letters he exchanged with the newspaper's two owners, Petros Tatanis and Evripides Kehaya provide a unique insight into the workings of this major Greek American newspaper.

### **The *Ethnikos Kyrix's* Tatanis Era, 1915-1933**

The *Ethnikos Keryx's* history during Petros Tatanis' ownership coincides with the most intensive phase of Venizelism in the United States. Tatanis was born in Amaliada in the Peloponnese in 1884 and arrived in New York in 1905 where he worked for the Caracanda Brothers company that imported coffee and other goods. Tatanis was active in the Panhellenic Union, the major Venizelist organization in the United States, so it did not take much persuading for him to become the owner of the *Ethnikos Keryx*. The newspaper's open support of Venizelos was evident from the beginning, the headline of the first issue, that appeared on April 2, 1915 was about an interview Venizelos had granted the newspaper. The very title of the newspaper and its fonts were based on the newspaper *Keryx* that Venizelos had published in his native island of Crete. A highlight of the *Ethnikos Keryx's* early years was when Venizelos visited its offices

in New York City in October 1921 when he made a trip to the United States. Ten thousand Greek Americans had welcomed him when the ship he was traveling on arrived at the port of New York.

The *Ethnikos Keryx* supported Venizelos consistently and strongly throughout Tatanis' years as owner, and he and Callimachos were the two main spokesmen of the liberal politician's vision of Greece. Day in day out newspaper's headline referred to Venizelos' latest initiative or statement or at least on some issue of Greek domestic or foreign policy. The inside pages included, of course, American news and considerable coverage of the life of Greek American communities all over the United States. But the prioritization of political news from Greece from a venizelist perspective was made abundantly clear.

Yet beneath the surface there was much more going on with the *Ethnikos Keryx*. As a way of balancing the newspaper's budget Tatanis was apparently reluctant to acquire a big staff or pay high salaries. This was the reason why Tatanis left the newspaper in 1918. He set out the reasons in a four-page letter to Tatanis dated January, 31 1918, complaining that the workload was too much, because he had to follow both Greek politics and Greek American community affairs as a journalist as well as supervise the production of the newspaper and spend time in meetings for the purpose of promoting the venizelist cause. The lack of a business manager, he added, was harming the newspaper, as was the uncritical acceptance of advertisements and other content despite Callimachos' objections.<sup>3</sup>

The 1920s witnessed a great deal of pressure aimed at Americanizing immigrants from Southeastern Europe, including Greece. Soon, the *Ethnikos Keryx* began to display a sense of urgency about preserving Greek identity. Even though the political news from Greece dominated its headlines, the newspaper was committed to supporting initiatives designed to increase the cultural cohesion of the Greek community. When, at long last, the Church of Greece sent a representative to the United States in order to resolve the venizelist-royalist divide among the clergy and parishes, Callimachos used his connections to Venizelos and wrote to the Greek prime-minister and emphasized the value of that initiative. Overcoming those differences, Callimachos wrote in 1929, was a matter of life and death as far as the future of the Greek community was concerned. A decade of pressures on the immigrants to assimilate and acquire U.S. citizenship had begun to bring about a reassessment of the newspaper's

priorities in the mind of its editor-in-chief.<sup>4</sup> Gradually, the newspaper began promoting the idea that the Greeks in the United States should and could maintain their identity even though they had to acquire American citizenship.

In an important development that symbolized the gradual transformation of the newspaper, the *Ethnikos Keryx* endorsed Franklin Roosevelt in the U.S. presidential elections of 1932. Tatanis was chair of a Greek committee of 100 prominent individuals who were backing Roosevelt. Callimachos published an exchange of letters he had with Roosevelt, who solicited the support of European immigrants. In his own letter to Roosevelt, Callimachos described the Greeks as a people who had been reared in the values of democracy and liberalism, making the connections between venizelism and Roosevelt's policies.<sup>5</sup>

Arguably, the connection between Venizelos and Roosevelt that Callimachos skillfully constructed worked in favor of the newspaper at a time when the Great Depression was causing circulation difficulties. Both the *Ethnikos Keryx* and the *Atlantis* reached a combined circulation of 70,000 by the mid-1920s.<sup>6</sup> By the mid-1930s that number had almost halved.

While the *Ethnikos Keryx* was becoming more and more focused on the issue of preserving Greek identity – while not abandoning its strong pro-venizelist stance - its owner Petros Tatanis began to experience economic problems following the Wall Street Crash of 1929. He was able to stay on as owner only for a few more years. In 1932 Greece experienced a financial crisis and Venizelos had to step down as prime-minister. A long era of venizelist rule in Greece was coming to an end. The following year Tatanis also had to step down, and he sold the newspaper to Evripides “Ery” Kehaya.

### **The Kehaya Era of the *Ethnikos Keryx***

Evripides “Ery” Kehaya's huge contribution to the *Ethnikos Keryx* and the Greek American community has been strangely overlooked although Saloutos briefly mentions him in his history of the Greeks in the United States noting his business and significant philanthropic activities.<sup>7</sup> And yet, Kehaya an ardent venizelist and Roosevelt supporter, ushered a new era in the life of the newspaper, he professionalized its production and distribution. And most interestingly, he oversaw a turn away from the old partisan and polemical tone the newspaper had adopted, a move geared to respond to pressure from its readers.

Kehaya was born in 1885 in present day Ordu, Turkey, a town on the Black Sea coast in a tobacco-growing region with a large ethnically Greek population – the town was known as Kotyora in Greek and was part of the Ottoman Empire. Kehaya left in 1910, only a few years before the Greeks were forcibly expelled during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the emergence of Modern Turkey. The biographical information about him available on the website in association with the history of a tobacco company he would go on to establish in the United States makes interesting reading: “Although Kehaya was groomed for a role in the church, and educated by his uncle, an archbishop in a Macedonian diocese, the young man’s interests soon lead him in other directions. After traveling extensively and studying at the Sorbonne in Paris, Kehaya arrived in the United States and became a U.S. citizen. He initially found work as a waiter in a Greek-Turkish restaurant in New York City. However, the industrious young man had greater aspirations. In New York at the time, several small factories had been established at which cigarettes were rolled by hand using imported tobaccos. Several tobacco importers frequented the restaurant at which Kehaya worked, and, having become acquainted with some of them, Kehaya was prevailed upon to help sell one importer’s tobacco stock to the factories. Kehaya accepted the offer and received a commission for his sales. With the money he earned, he decided to leave the restaurant and get into the tobacco business himself. The few thousand dollars Kehaya had earned by 1912 became the start-up capital for his new enterprise: Standard Commercial Tobacco Company. Garnering a solid reputation for the good quality of its imported Oriental tobacco, the company saw steadily increasing sales and was incorporated in Delaware in 1916. That year, as a testament to Kehaya’s business acumen, Standard Commercial entered into a contract to provide Oriental leaf tobacco to R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company. When offered a commission on the purchases, Kehaya said that he would prefer to be paid with interest in Reynolds, a company he believed offered tremendous opportunity for growth. He was right; his original shares in Reynolds would over the next ten years be worth about \$5 million.”<sup>8</sup>

As an ethnic Greek from the Ottoman Empire, and a businessman, Kehaya was naturally drawn to Venizelos’ policies that emphasized modernization and a broad regional presence of Greece in the Eastern Mediterranean. He also saw the need for the Greeks to demonstrate their support for the Allies in WWI, and he served



as Chair of the Committee formed by the U.S. Treasury Department to raise money for the “Fourth Liberty Loan” through the purchase of government bonds to help the war effort. Thus it is not at all surprising to see Kehaya “bailing out” Tatanis and buying the newspaper – and keeping Tatanis on the staff.

One of the first things Kehaya did as soon as he took over the *Ethnikos Keryx* was to write to Venizelos in September 1933 and invite him to become a regular contributor to the newspaper and also to consider giving the newspaper the rights to his memoirs. Kehaya was certain that an English version could be turned into a syndicated column and that the entire memoir would definitely be of interest to an American publisher. He ended the letter by asking Venizelos for his thoughts and his terms for both those projects and assured him of the continuing loyalty of the newspaper to his person and his ideas.<sup>9</sup> The same day Callimachos wrote to Venizelos by way of introducing Kehaya and endorsing both his devotion to venizelism and his business acumen. The editor-in-chief acknowledged that both the idea of a syndicated column and the publication of memoirs came from an American business perspective but agreed with Kehaya that it would promote venizelism in the United States.<sup>10</sup> Though Venizelos’ full response is not known, he did contribute at least one article, a long review of Greek political events of 1933 that warned of a renewal of the intensity of the country’s “national schism” that appeared in December of that year.

Upon taking over, Kehaya had to confront more mundane issues, such as the internal organization of the *Ethnikos Keryx*, its distribution and of course its viability as a business. Demetrios Christophorides, one of the newspaper’s prominent journalists submitted a seven-part set of recommendations for the restructuring of the newspaper’s editorial management. Although Christophorides was a left-leaning liberal who would eventually leave in order to write for pro-communist newspapers, his recommendations were in no way colored ideologically, in fact they read as a model for the rationalization of the newspaper’s work. Division of labor, accountability including personal responsibility, editorial support, coordination, were the main points Christophorides was making “in order to prevent unfortunate errors and blunders... which would eventually undermine the moral and ultimately the financial existence of the enterprise.”<sup>11</sup> Kehaya adopted several of Christophorides’ proposals over the next few months.



A year into his ownership, and working hard to increase the numbers of subscribers, Kehaya wrote to Vasilios Chebithes, the president of a major Greek American organization, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA), to solicit his continued help. Chebithes had already found a number of new subscribers to the newspapers and now he was traveling to the West Coast, a wonderful opportunity according to Kehaya, who in encouraging him, portrayed the *Ethnikos Keryx's* many strengths by omitting its venizelist standpoint. “You are not selling hot air” he said, “you are selling good news from the old country, good news about the Greeks residing in this country, the goings on in the AHEPA, commercial and financial news, as well as good stories that relax the minds of the readers” adding “we also have comic strips in English for the children.”<sup>12</sup> This was obviously a description of a newspaper that hoped to attract the broadest possible Greek American readership.

Four years later, Kehaya was still fighting to ensure the viability of the *Ethnikos Keryx* but he was doing so without wanting to compromise the newspaper's liberal traditions. A lot had happened in the five years since he took over the newspaper in 1933. The Great Depression had deeply affected the Greek American community which had witnessed hardships, loss of businesses, unemployment and this naturally had an adverse effect on the efforts of the newspaper to increase its circulation and on its ability to gain income through advertising. In Greece there had been major political changes. Out of power, Venizelos had orchestrated a military coup against the Populist government; it failed bringing his political career to an inglorious end. He died in early 1936 in exile in Paris. In August 1936, Ioannis Metaxas established the quasi fascist “4<sup>th</sup> of August” dictatorship, persecuting venizelists, liberals, socialists and communists. The *Ethnikos Keryx* was critical of the regime in Athens though in a guarded way. A letter Christophorides sent Callimachos complaining about the newspaper's policy suggests that Callimachos believed Metaxas' anti-communist rhetoric that Greece was facing the pseudo-dilemma of dictatorship or communism. Kehaya was also concerned with Callimachos' editorial direction, and wrote to him twice, in late 1937 and 1938. He told Callimachos the newspaper was losing \$1,000 a month and needed drastic improvements in terms of appearance, format and the content, but, he added significantly, those changes should not be made at the expense of maintaining the *Ethnikos Keryx's* liberal perspective.<sup>13</sup>

A few weeks after he received the second letter Callimachos tendered his resignation, which Kehaya accepted. Callimachos' archive contains no information about the newspaper's life after he left, all we know is that Kehaya held on for another year. Then, he sold the newspaper to a Chicago lawyer Paul Demos who almost immediately then passed it on to Professor Basil Vlavianos who remained at the helm of the *Ethnikos Keryx* from 1940 through 1947. Vlavianos preserved the newspaper's liberal point of view he inherited from Kehaya. Indeed he went further adopting a sympathetic attitude towards the left-wing EAM/ELAS organizations that fought against Greece's Axis occupiers.

## Conclusions

This somewhat fragmentary evidence, mostly the letters about the *Ethnikos Keryx* that exist in the Callimachos archive, along with the contents of the newspaper itself, provide a picture of the complexities associated with leading a diaspora Greek newspaper at a time of intense ideological polarization in the homeland but also important developments affecting the Greek community in the host country, in this case the pressures of assimilation and the effects of the Great Depression. The *Ethnikos Keryx* started off in many ways as a typical diaspora newspaper, an extension of the homeland abroad. Specifically it was designed as a reflection of the venizelist movement and addressed to the Greeks in the United States. But as a New York-based publication, and one that sought readers throughout the United States the *Ethnikos Keryx* was quickly drawn into the particular dynamics of the Greek presence in that country. As the initial capital put up by Tatanis gradually diminished, the newspaper was forced to modernize in order to be able to make a profit and survive. Weakened circulation and advertising in the 1930s posed a grave danger to the existence of the *Ethnikos Keryx* but thanks to the discipline Kehaya introduced into the production process, the newspaper survived until it was able to revive thanks to the new conditions following the outbreak of World War II. By the time Kehaya handed over the reigns the *Ethnikos Keryx* showed signs of both change and continuity. It had modernized its production and had become more oriented towards American as well as Greek politics. Kehaya had even momentarily considered introducing an English-language section but did not when he saw another Greek American newspaper that did so, the *Neon Vima* was unable to survive the difficult decade of the 1930s. But there was also continuity. The

*Ethnikos Keryx* retained its liberalism, a legacy of its venizelist roots in an era when Rooseveltian liberalism enjoyed a hegemony in the United States.

## NOTES

1. Andrew T. Kopan “The Greek Press” in Sally M. Miller ed. *The Ethnic Press in the United States* New York: Greenwood Press, 1987 pp. 161-176; Victor S. Papacosma “The Greek Press in America” in *The Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 5/4 1979 pp. 45-61; Alexandros Kitroef “O Typos os Pigi gia tin Istoría ton Ellinon stis EPA” [The Press as a Source for the History of the Greeks in the USA] in Loukia Droulia ed. *O Ellinikos Typos 1784 eos Simera: Istorikes kai Theoretikes Prosegiseis* [The Greek Press 1784 to Today: Historical and Theoretical Approaches] INE/EIE Athens, 2005 pp. 371-379.
2. Alexander Kitroeff “O Venizelismos stin Egypto” Venizelist Republicanism among the Greeks in Egypt] in Th. Veremis & G. Goulimi eds *Eleftherios Venizelos: Koinotita, Oikonomia kai Politiki stin Epohi tou* [Eleftherios Venizelos: Community, Economy and Politics in his Era ] Athens: Gnosi, 1989 125-142.
3. Letter, Callimachos to Tatanis, Jan. 31, 1918 Callimachos Papers IHRC, Box 1 ff 5.
4. Letter, Callimachos to Venizelos Feb. 21, 1929, Callimachos Papers IHRC, Box 1 ff 6.
5. *Ethnikos Keryx* Nov. 7, 1932.
6. Andrew T. Kopan “The Greek Press” in Sally M. Miller ed. *The Ethnic Press in the United States* New York: Greenwood Press, 1987 p. 64.
7. Theodore Saloutos, *The Greeks in the United States* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964 p. 273.
8. <http://www.fundinguniverse.com/company-histories/standard-commercial-corporation-history/>
9. Letter, Kehaya to Venizelos, Sept. 8, 1933, Eleftherios Venizelos Digital Archive.
10. Letter, Callimachos to Venizelos, Sept. 8, 1933, Eleftherios Venizelos Digital Archive.
11. Letter, Christophorides to Kehaya July 16, 1933, Callimachos Papers IHRC, Box 13 ff 12.
12. Letter, Kehaya to Chebithes, July, 18, 1934 Callimachos Papers IHRC, Box 13 ff 12.
13. Letter, Kehaya to Callimachos.

# The Project “Greek Education Abroad”

**Michael Damanakis\***

**Dionysia Kontoyiannis\*\***

**Theodosia Michelakakis\*\*\***

## RESUMÉ

Cet article décrit le processus de mise en œuvre et d'évaluation du programme de recherche “Education en Diaspora” comme une tentative par le Ministère grec de l'éducation d'initier une politique de l'enseignement de la langue et de la civilisation grecques dans la diaspora, conformément à la loi n° 2413/1996. Le réseau de partenaires de cette action, la planification et la mise en œuvre de la politique, les difficultés et les problèmes qui sont apparus en route et les résultats de chaque action du programme, décrits et interprétés montrent la logique d'intervention de l'État grec dans la diaspora.

Le texte se meut dans la logique de l'évaluation d'un effort historique d'assistance de 15 ans pour l'enseignement de la langue grecque, à travers le regard des acteurs clés, en particulier du responsable scientifique, des collaborateurs issus de la diaspora et des administrateurs du programme.

## ABSTRACT

This article describes the implementation process and the evaluation of the research program “Greek Education Abroad” in an attempt by the Greek Ministry of Education to implement education policy for Greek language in the diaspora, as envisaged in the Law 2413/1996. The partner network development, planning and implementation, the difficulties and problems that emerged and the results of each action of the program, as described and interpreted indicate the outlines of the logic of intervention of the Greek State towards the diaspora. The text moves within the logic of the historical evaluation of a 15-year assistance effort in Greek language education, from the perspective of key players, particularly the scientific responsables and program managers.

\* \* University of Crete \*\* University of Crete \*\*\*University of Crete

## Introduction

The Greek Government's interest and initiatives for Greek language education in the Diaspora increased after the great migration (1952-1973) and especially after the restoration of democracy in Greece in 1974.

On the other hand, the complete integration of Greece into the European Union (EU - then EEC) in 1981 facilitated its education initiatives financially, because part of the funds given by the EU Commission to the country could be allocated to educational innovations in the Diaspora as well.

As early as the mid-1980s the first programs began to be funded with national and European Union resources.

In particular, during the period from 1986/87 to 1992/1993 a project for Greek language education in Germany, on the initiative of the Greek Ministry of Education, was funded by the EU. The aim of the program - which was implemented by the Department of Education, University of Ioannina and coordinated by M. Damanakis, A. Gotovos and C. Dimou - was the production of teaching material for the "*Teaching of Greek to Greek Children in the F.R. of Germany in the Mother Tongue Courses*" (Damanakis, 1991).

Around the same time, a corresponding program (*Learning Greek*), for Greek language education in the US was carried out by the "Pedagogical Institute" with funding from the Ministry of Education and the Archdiocese of America and coordinated by E. Vassilakis.

This followed the implementation of a program by the Athens and Ioannina Universities, headed by professors G. Markou and A. Gotovos. The purpose of this program, funded by UNESCO and the Ministry of Education, was the integration of repatriated Greek pupils into the education system (Gotovos & Markou, 1984).

These three projects were the forerunners for the four *Intercultural Education Programs* that followed in 1997, after the enactment of Law 2413 "*Greek education abroad, intercultural education and other provisions*" (Official Gazette 124, vol. I, June 17, 1996). Of the four projects three were for the interior (a) *integration of repatriate and foreign students*, b) *integration of Roma*, c) *training of Muslim children and the fourth was "Greek Education Abroad"* (in Greek, Παιδεία Ομογενών).

The immediate aim of this text is, as far as possible, to give a “critical” and “objective” review of the progress of the project and the presentation of the most important results. This is because the authors of the text had the main scientific, organizational, administrative and management responsibility for the implementation of the project: M. Damanakis as scientific facilitator and coordinator of the overall project, D. Kontogianni (1999-2005) and T. Michelakaki (2005-2014) as those responsible for its management.

Our hope and expectation, however, is the experience and knowledge that emerge, by reading between the lines and which are analytically recorded in scientific publications of the project (see. Bibliography) to serve as a basis for research and for similar intervention programs in the Diaspora. This is the indirect but most important aim of the text.

## **1. The History and the First Steps of the Project**

In March 1996 the *Special Secretariat of Diaspora and Intercultural Education* was founded and in June of that year Law 2413, “*Greek education abroad, intercultural education and other provisions*” was passed. Along with the setting up of instruction on the law, four Intercultural Education Programs were designed, under the leadership of the then Special Secretary (Dimitri Chalkiotis) and the activation of many of his colleagues, with responsibility for the Program “Greek Education Abroad” held by a fellow Greek from Australia (Chrisoula Arkoudi).

The four *Intercultural Education Programs* had already been included in the *Second Community Support Framework* (CSF, 1994-1999) in 1995. The wait however for the voting of Law 2413, which would serve as a legal framework for their implementation led to a commencement delay. This time delay resulted in the four projects not being proclaimed, but entrusted to specific research teams at Greek universities. However, the projects that followed, which were financed under the CSF III (2000-2006) and *the National Strategic Reference Framework* (NSRF 2007-2013), were proclaimed as were the other competing projects.

The implementation of interior programs began with the start of the 1996/97 school year whereas the project “Greek Education Abroad” remained “unclaimed” until the spring of 1997, when the Ministry of Education proposed that professor M. Damanakis be assigned the work on the grounds that his many years of

experience on issues of Greek-language education and his collaboration with scientists in the Diaspora could be the basis for the successful implementation of a project which claimed to be able to intervene and support Greek language education worldwide.

The specificity of the Technical Project Report, the completion-extension of the existing networks of scientists, the establishment of new networks where they did not exist, work allocation, schedules, etc. were discussed in detail in the 1st Workshop at the University of Crete in Rethymno from 27 June until 2 July 1997 (Damanakis, Michelakakis & Lidakis, 1997). In the first Workshop Meeting, the participants included, other than members of the Education and Foreign Ministries, *The Special Education Secretary of the Diaspora and Intercultural Education* (Ministry of Education) and *The Secretary General for Greeks Abroad* (Foreign Ministry). Scientists from Greek universities and universities abroad, who formed the core of networks and shouldered the implementation of the project were also involved, and, as their action has shown, survived both the duration and adversity and brought the project to completion.

## **2. Educational-Political Context, Organization and Partner Networks**

The project “Greek Education Abroad” was a program that was institutionalized and conducted in the context of a broader partnership between the Greeks in Greece and abroad. This relationship, since the foundation of the Greek state - and earlier – has taken different forms depending on the economic, social, and political conditions in various time and historical periods. For example, in 19th century and until the Asia Minor disaster, the Greek educational system was supported economically by the Greek Diaspora (Tsoukalas, 1979). After the regime change in 1974, in Article 108 of the 1975 Constitution, it was foreseen that “*the state concern itself with the life of emigrant Greeks*” (see Kriari - Katrani, 2008). Under this welfare policy a series of welfare measures were institutionalized, while on a practical level the responsibility of the Centre for the Diaspora was expressed through the posting of Greek educators and the sending of educational material. Quickly though, it was realized that the Greek-centric care by Greece of the Diaspora did not meet the needs of Greek-language education and so in the mid-1990s the search for a new relationship between the Centre and the Diaspora began.

In this context, Law 2413 “*Greek education abroad, intercultural education and other provisions*” was established in 1996 and to the revision of the 2001 Constitution, Article 108, a second paragraph was added which was the philosophy of the new relationship between the Centre and the Diaspora. In particular, the World Council of Hellenes Abroad (SAE) which, according to the second paragraph, was “*dedicated to the expression of all forces of Hellenism worldwide*” was founded. This new relationship promised to be “*two-way*” without, however, nullifying the “*preferential arrangement*” of the first paragraph.

In the meantime, on a political level, a relationship between the Centre and the Diaspora developed, in which Greeks everywhere, both inside and outside the Greek territory would have the opportunity to interact on an equal and reciprocal basis. As far as the project “Greek Education Abroad” is concerned the development of a dynamic encounter and mutual enrichment between the Centre and the various Diaspora populations was the main target on a theoretical, pedagogical and implementational level.

The organization of the program was based on two pillars, one of which was in Greece and the other abroad. As shown in the project organizational chart (see. Figure 1 in the annex), the overall monitoring of the performance of the work on an educational policy and economic management level was conducted by the Greek Ministry of Education and its services (Special Secretariat of Diaspora and Intercultural Education, The Institute of Diaspora and Intercultural Education), as the program was the official, authorized intervention of the Greek state in Greek language education in the Diaspora (Kontogianni, 2005). The project was implemented by the University of Crete which collaborated with the Education Offices in the local Greek Consulates or Embassies and several scientists serving Greek language education either on an academic level (Greek studies in foreign universities) or on the Greek language instruction level in primary and secondary education in several countries.

In particular, the University of Crete had direct responsibility for the financial management of the project through the *Foundation’s Research Committee*, the scientific responsibility and the overall coordination and implementation of the program through the *Centre of Intercultural and Migration Studies* (EDIAMME), its Director and members of the board. Meanwhile, faculty members of the University of Crete and other universities of Greece made up the *Central Scientific Program Committee* and in cooperation with the *Regional*



*Scientific Committees* in each country took decisions on the course of the project, scientifically observed the project and coordinated joint Working Groups (with teachers and other specialists) from Greece and abroad for studies, the production of teaching materials and teacher training.

The overall organization of the project “Greek Education Abroad” was based on the equitable cooperation between the Centre and the Diaspora, creating, for each program action and sub-action, cooperation networks, i.e. individual *Working Groups* with specialist members who came from both Greece and countries where there was Greek Diaspora and sharing their knowledge and experience of the three main socio-cultural program activity areas: country of origin, country of residence and the community. The establishment of joint *Working Groups* from Greece and abroad, is one dimension envisaged in the law for Greek language education in the Diaspora (Law 2413 Article 4, paragraph. 1), evidence that shows that in an institutional framework the relationship between the Centre and Diaspora had entered new equal ground.

What, however, was crucial to the effective cooperation between the Centre and the Diaspora as well as the smooth and efficient operation of the project were the *Annual Scientific Workshops* which took place at the University of Crete and were attended by all the members of the *Scientific Committees* from Greece and abroad as well as members of the *Working Groups*. At these meetings there was an annual report on the progress made in implementing the project actions and sub-actions and new individual areas of work were defined for the following year, on an equitable reciprocal basis between all partners of the Centre and the Diaspora.

### **3. Theoretical Starting Point, Structure and Goals of the Project**

In the 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop Meeting in the summer of 1997 the main theoretical axes were determined and the pedagogical principles for the construction of the subject and its targeting were already identified. This data is summarized in the following points:

**As for the students who were enrolled in the various forms of Greek language education:**

- The bicultural and bilingual socialization conditions of Greek children of the Diaspora were recognized. “*The respect, acceptance, utilization and promotion of the bicultural - bilingual capital*” of students were the starting point and goal of the program actions (Damanakis, Michelakakis & Lidakis, 1997: 17).
- The consequence of this principle was that the concepts of *identity* and *diversity* had to be equal tools for analysis since the ethno-cultural identity of Greeks everywhere is composed of common elements that result from the common Greek origin and of different elements derived from their different socialization processes in various communities of residence (Damanakis, 2007: 186).
- It was recognized that students attending various forms of Greek language education are divided into two broad categories: those who are bearers of Greek sociocultural characteristics and whose acquisition or cultivation of the Greek language is a component of their identity, and those who are neither bearers of Greek characteristics nor emotionally connected to the Greek language. This marks the different method of the acquisition of Greek by the students themselves. On the basis, then, of ethnic and linguistic criteria, namely the possession or non-possession of the Greek language, the students in the various forms of Greek-speaking education in the Diaspora were classified (for the needs of the program) into three main target groups, which have different educational needs and therefore require different educational materials. These target-groups are:
  - a) *Greek-speaking pupils of Greek origin*
  - b) *Pupils of Greek origin with no knowledge of Greek*
  - c) *Foreigners with another mother tongue.*
- The different learning conditions of students involve the need for differentiated curricula for the teaching of Greek as a second and foreign language both on a methodological and target and content level (OEDB, 2006: 60-65).
- Finally, the need for the cultivation of cultural knowledge and experiences through the active participation of students in educational programs that bring them into direct, vivid contact with modern Hellenic reality, i.e. the vernacular language and everyday culture, was recognized.

**As for teachers who served in various forms of Greek language education:**

- A difference in the degree of knowledge of the Greek language, the degree of pedagogical and didactic training, but also the degree of information on the socialization conditions in the Diaspora were recorded.
- Based on these findings the training needs of teachers were determined and respective training programs were organized.

**As for the communication and interaction between all the collaborators in Greek Education:**

- The need for the recording, evaluation and communication of educational material used in the various forms of education and different countries by the beginning of the project was recognized.
- The realization of the need for the dissemination of good practices and successful educational models in the Greek Diaspora.
- The need for the systematic charting of the forms of education, teachers and students of Greek language education in the Diaspora was recognized.
- Emphasis on the need to create communication networks and the use of new technologies and e-learning services in both the teaching of the Greek language and its culture to the students and in teacher training.

All these observations and findings were the theoretical principles of the project “Greek Education Abroad” which is aimed at *maintaining, cultivating and promoting the Greek language and culture abroad and especially in the Greek Diaspora, through the improvement of primary and secondary Greek-language education, while contributing to the smooth integration of children into the educational and socio-cultural system of the country of residence and their community.*

With this objective in mind we sought: *a) the development of educational materials in print and electronic form, b) training of seconded and immigrant teachers, c) the organization of educational and artistic programs for pupils living abroad and d) the creation of databases, networks and e-learning services.*

In particular, the subject of the project was constructed in three actions or parts, each of which was given, for communication purposes, a name. Specifically, the

first action was given the name ATHENE, the second PROMETHEUS and the third HERMES. Finally, there were three Horizontal Sub-actions supporting the overall project (see. Table 3.1.).

**Table 3.1.:** Summary Table of Actions (Parts) of the Project

<i>a/a</i>	<b>Action Title</b>
<i>I</i>	ATHENE (A): Curricula and Teaching Material
<i>II</i>	PROMETHEUS (P): In-service training of teachers and student exchange programs
<i>III</i>	HERMES (H): Databases and Communication Networks
<i>IV</i>	HORIZONTAL SUB-ACTIONS (HS)

Specifically, the *first action (ATHENE)* had as its objectives, the preparation and establishment of curricula and their subsequent monitoring and the production of teaching materials -in print and electronic form- for teaching:

- a) Greek as a second language in primary and secondary education (GSL)*
- b) Greek as a Second Language (GSL) in Accelerated Courses in secondary education*
- c) Greek as a Foreign Language(GFL) in primary and secondary education*
- c) History and Culture in primary and secondary education.*

The *second action (PROMETHEUS)* referred to the continuous and systematic in-service training of seconded and immigrant teachers and the organization and implementation of educational and artistic programs for students of Greek origin, in order for them to have contact with modern Greek culture in Greece.

The third action (HERMES) had, as its objective, the establishment of databases, communications networks and e-learning services.

Finally, the Horizontal Sub-actions such as meetings, seminars, symposia, conferences, exhibitions and project promotion/publicity, penetrated the three actions and supported the smooth development and implementation of the overall project.

#### 4. Funding Flow and Implementation of the Subject

Since the inception of the program in June 1997 until the end of the implementation of the subject there was a lack of continuity, because it was dependent on funding by the Ministry of Education. However, the implementation seemed to be continuous for the recipients (students and teachers) of the program materials because EDIAMME continuously supported Greek language education in the Diaspora.

Table 4.1. reflects the period of implementation and the final budget of each individual project.

**Table 4.1.:** Funding Flow of the Project “Greek Education Abroad”

<b>Project title</b>	<b>Duration of Implementation</b>	<b>Final Budget in Euro</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad I</i>	3/7/1997 - 31/12/1999	4.784.150,15
<i>Transition bridge to project Greek Education Abroad II</i>	1/1/2000 - 31/10/2001	914.671,49
		<b>5.698.821,64</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad II</i>	15/3/2002 - 31/12/2004	<b>3.599.912,31</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad III</i>	12/1/2006 - 31/8/2008	<b>4.318.128,36</b>
<b>TOTAL BUDGET “Greek Education Abroad”</b>		<b>13.616.862,31</b>
<i>Intercultural Greek Language Education in the Diaspora*</i>	4/2/2011-31/12/2014	<b>3.037.4223,84</b>

\* Although the project “Intercultural Greek Language Education in the Diaspora” is the continuation of the project “Greek Education Abroad” (See. Ch. 5) we will not refer to it further because we consider an evaluation to be premature.

As has already been mentioned, the implementation of the subject of the program was carried out by joint working groups from Greece and abroad. At the start of the program an essential prerequisite was the charting of the student and teacher numbers involved in Greek-language schools abroad and the documentation of the forms and operating conditions of Greek language

education. In the first year of the implementation of the program specific studies for each country were prepared which reflected the reality of Greek language education in the Diaspora (see. [www.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.uoc.gr/diaspora), Meletes).

Then the writing of the teaching materials (action ATHENE) began. Teachers of the *Working Groups* in Greece and abroad undertook the obligation of collecting original material and contributing to the writing and testing of modules of such teaching materials. At the same time, teachers from different countries and forms of Greek Education undertook the implementation of pilot textbooks in their classrooms and sent comments on the experiment in order for any changes to be incorporated in the final version of the books. A limited number of copies of the teaching materials were printed, sent to schools abroad for piloting, and simultaneously submitted to the Pedagogical Institute of Greece and then the Ministry of Education for approval, in order to print thousands of copies to meet the needs of students abroad.

At this point it should be emphasized that while the other three *Intercultural Education Programs* (Roma, Muslim and Immigrant Students) were developing supplementary teaching materials based on the existing curricula, “Greek Education Abroad” was obliged to draw up Curricula and develop appropriate basic educational material from the beginning (In relation to the approval and printing of Curricula see Gazette 807/04 July 2006).

For the realization of in-service teacher training (PROMETHEUS action) the contribution of Education Coordinators and scientists who have contributed both to the selection of teachers who would be involved in training sessions and the organization of training seminars was crucial.

In addition, the project partners and teachers who participated in the program informed other Greek-language education collaborators about student exchange programs in Greece. The same happened with the theater groups that participated in the annual Student Theatre Festival.

Furthermore, for the realization of Databases, Networks and e-Learning services (HERMES action) skilled scientists and teachers worked to gather empirical data, to record the number of teachers and students and create the databases. The HERMES actions were the precursor to the development of the e-Learning Environment.

## 5. From Conventional to E-Learning

The issue of the transition from conventional to electronic learning was discussed in June 2007. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the launch of the project *Greek Education Abroad* an international conference entitled “*Globalization and the Greek Diaspora*” was organized from 29 June to 01 July at the University of Crete in Rethymno. (See, [www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora,Studies](http://www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora,Studies)).

The evaluation report for the decade 1997-2007 concluded:

*“As an educator I have always supported, that digital technology is the medium and the vehicle but not the content. For the vehicle to be meaningful it requires content that makes sense and can be digitized and placed in the vehicle.*

*Today we have the content and the vehicle. Let us then place the content in the digital vehicle and let the vehicle travel through the Internet and satellite television to every part of the world where there are people of Greek and non-Greek origin who wish to learn Greek and become partakers of the Greek civilization.*

*And let us not forget that the Internet, and in general digital technology, cannot substitute, in the same place and time, interpersonal communication.*

*The lively meeting of students in the various forms of Greek language education (day/evening schools, Saturday classes etc.) operates as a form of socialization and is not confined to the acquisition of some language skills. This means that the use of digital technology in the context of Greek-language education should be complementary and enriching” (Damanakis 2007a).*

The transition to electronic learning as a complementary and enriching tool was discussed at the conference. The then Special Secretary, Professor I. Kriari, who actively participated in the conference, accepted this concept and included it in the future plans of *the Special Secretariat of Diaspora and Intercultural Education*. Of course, the proposal was to be translated into education policy in the 2009/10 school year by another Special Secretary, Professor T. Dragona.

For the record, it should be noted that between the tenure of Professor I. Kriari and Professor T. Dragona, two Special Secretaries intervened and that, during the second’s tenure for the first time, the program was seriously threatened

because there was an attempt to abolish it, as an autonomous project, and include it, as one action, in the *Repatriate and Foreign Students Integration Program*.

The mobilization of Diaspora institutions, starting with the World Council of Hellenes Abroad USA, in conjunction with the change of government, led to the inclusion of the program in the NSRF, as an autonomous project and its relaunching, the main innovation of which was *e-learning* and namely the development of an *e-learning Environment* for teaching/learning the objects: “*Greek Language*” and “*Elements of Greek History and Culture*”. Indeed, to mark the “new era” for Greek language education in the Diaspora, the program was renamed from the project “*Greek Education Abroad*” to “*Greek Language Intercultural Education in the Diaspora*.”

Based on the proclamation text and the specifications of the NSRF the Project Specification Document was drafted, the (competitive) University of Crete proposal was submitted to the Managing Authority of the Ministry of Education, approved, and implementation began, informally from December 2010 and officially from 04 February 2011, with Professor M. Damanakis as Coordinator.

Based on the targeting and specification in the proclamation of the project «*Greek Language Intercultural Education in the Diaspora*”, but also the scientific knowledge of the members of the Project Team, objectives were formulated and targeting was specialized towards the development of an *e-Learning Environment* as follows:

*“The purpose of an e-Learning Environment is the improvement of the existing, conventional Hellenic Education in the Diaspora through its enrichment, using forms of Distance Education.*

*This general objective can be broken down into three-part targeting:*

- 1. Additional use of an e-Learning Environment in conventional face to face teaching-learning in organized forms of Hellenic Education (Schools, Mother Tongue Courses).*
- 2. Use, by the teacher, of contemporary and non-contemporary Distance Education for students in remote areas.*
- 3. Use by the students within the Learning Communities framework.”*  
(Damanakis, 2014: 278).



Following an extension, the project was completed in December 2014, with Coordinator associate professor Aspasia Hatzidakis, who took over the management of EDIAMME in September 2011 and the overall coordination of the new program in July 2012 after the retirement of M. Damanakis.

The results and the general course of “*Greek Language Intercultural Education in the Diaspora*” is not covered in this text. Two characteristics however, should be noted.

The first is that the debate on e-Learning in the Diaspora has just begun, with the said program. The road on both the technological and pedagogical-didactic side seems long.

The second, and perhaps more important, is that particularly in Greece conditions have changed. The Centre cannot (and probably will not be able to for the foreseeable future) afford to continue its previous policy for Greek language education in the Diaspora. The temptation, therefore, to focus on and limit its interventions in Distance Education is great. Such a development would weaken the socialization role of Greek language education, and only benefit distance language skills.

## **6. Results of the Project**

Based on the layout lines of the program, the overall results may be summarized as follows:

### **Teaching Material in Printed and Digital Form:**

- **75** generally, two-volume textbooks for the teaching of Greek as a second and foreign language as well as the corresponding instructions for the teacher.
- **25** CD roms and listening CDs and
- **4** DVDs.

### **Studies, Conference Proceedings**

- **27** specialized studies and conference proceedings, symposiums, colloquium.

The **teachers**, trainees attending various seminars in Greece and abroad, or remotely via videoconferencing totaled **7,894**.

Table 6.1 presents the number of teachers by program and type of course.

**Table 6.1.:** Trainee Teachers by Program and Type of Seminar

<b>Project title</b>	<b>Seminars in Greece</b>	<b>Seminars abroad</b>	<b>Seminars for seconded teachers seminars</b>	<b>Video conferencing/ distance</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad I</i>	<b>222</b>	<b>2917</b>	<b>696</b>	
<i>Greek Education Abroad II</i>	<b>235</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>474</b>	
<i>Greek Education Abroad III</i>	<b>387</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>1709</b>	<b>203</b>

The **students** who participated in exchange programs in Greece and the Student Theatre Festival totaled **1,578**. The tens of thousands of students who use the program teaching material should be added to these.

**Table 6.2:** Number of students participating in the Exchange and Student Theatre Festival programs

<b>Project title Festival</b>	<b>Exchange Programs</b>	<b>Student Theatre</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad I</i>	<b>266</b>	<b>341</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad II</i>	<b>288</b>	<b>172</b>
<i>Greek Education Abroad III</i>	<b>228</b>	<b>283</b>

In the context of the implementation of the above programs 15 conferences, seminars, colloquiums, symposia and 14 Workshops were held, at which scientific issues and issues related to the organization and implementation of the program were discussed. All of the above data, studies and educational materials in print and electronic form, are freely accessible on the Project website: [www.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.uoc.gr/diaspora) or [www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.ediamme.edc.uoc.gr/diaspora)

## 7. Endogenous and Exogenous Difficulties in Implementation

The project “*Teaching of Greek to Greek Children in the F.R. of Germany in the Mother Tongue Courses*” (1986-1992) is the first teaching material production project outside the *Pedagogical Institute* (P.I.) of Greece. The resulting material had, of course, to be approved by the P.I but the production was implemented by an independent research-writing team. This was an unfamiliar process in the institutional framework and mentality of the P.I, which had a direct negative impact on the communication between the research-writing team and those responsible in the P.I. (president, division chairmen, assessors, researchers).

A source of additional difficulties was an intense “Greek-centrism” in the majority of P.I. members. In keeping with this view, it was thought that what was proven and acclaimed in Greece was also good for Greek children abroad. On the other hand, the “ethnocentrism” of several members of the P.I. did not leave much room for the development of bicultural and bilingual oriented teaching material (in relation to the internal and external difficulties of this program, see Damanakis,1997).

Fifteen years later, the above-mentioned difficulties and attitudes no longer existed, or at least not to a great extent. The experiences and above all the transformation of Greece from a country of emigration to a country of immigration as well as the massive presence of children with a migrant background in Greek schools contributed as a catalyst to a change in attitude. Interculturality was no longer an “exotic” approach, but was becoming “an interior need”.

But what remained unchanged was the bureaucracy and particularly the relegation of the publication of material by the authorized services of the Ministry of Education to the P.I. and to the School Book Publishing Organization (OEDB) and vice versa - and then the abolition of the P.I. and the OEDB and the production of the material was relegated to the “*Institute of Educational Policy*” and to “*Diophantus*”.

The external difficulties of the new project “*Greek Education Abroad*” include, apart from the bureaucracy, the staffing of the *Education Offices* in consulates and embassies and the attitude of the Hellenic Education Institutions in the various countries of residence. In the first case, the attitude of each

Educational Coordinator and the degree of responsiveness to the needs of the program played an important role in the implementation of the educational material in the different forms of Greek Education. On the other hand, the non-staffing of the Office of Educational Coordinators in the first eighteen months of implementation hampered its beginning, especially since, in the same period, some reactions by certain organizations and education institutions manifested themselves. In particular, some institutions, particularly in the US and Germany, maintained and demanded that the leadership of the Ministry of Education allocate the project funds per country and provide teaching materials according to the needs of each country. But the response by the political leadership of the Ministry of Education was against the fragmentation of the program. The objections these institutions expressed were retracted, when the implementation of training programs for teachers of Greek started and especially with the implementation of the initial educational material. Thus teachers and parents began to be convinced of its appropriateness. Meanwhile, the project networks per country had also been established, which contributed to the acceptance and the consolidation of the project.

Other external factors that affected the smooth continuation of the project were the funding gaps (see. Chap. 4), changes to the rules for the allocation of funds and the overall management of the program. Under the second CSF, for example, the organization of training seminars abroad was allowed, while in the following funding periods this was no longer the case. This change particularly affected the experimental application of educational material in the different forms of Greek Education.

The internal program difficulties can be categorized as follows: a) the formation of teams, especially abroad, b) the development of a common code of communication between scientists of different disciplines from different countries, c) the pre-existing experience and knowledge of the teaching of Greek as a second and foreign language abroad and d) the dynamics of each group.

In the first case, the difficulties mainly consist of the selection of suitable partners among many stakeholders. The de facto exclusion of some led, in some cases, to discontent, protests and tension. The second category of internal difficulties constituted an epistemological and academic challenge for the team members and was creatively overcome through scientific conferences / workshops / colloquium, annual Workshop Meetings and through endless

discussions in smaller groups. The third category is related to the second, but is broader and directly linked to the preparation of curricula and the production methodology of the teaching material. The above-mentioned program for Greek language education in Germany and similar programs which were implemented in the Greeks' countries of residence (see. Damanakis, 1994) were to some extent based on, but did not respond to the teaching and methodological questions of the new program, which came with the claim that it would create material that would meet the needs of students not only in one country, but in all. So, Curricula had to be developed from the beginning as well as a new teaching-methodological approach. In contrast to the usual chronological order - first the development of Curricula and based on this, the development of the material-, in the project "*Greek Education Abroad*" these processes were conducted in parallel, so that, in combination with the experimental application of the material they fed one another (OEDB, 2006).

Tensions, mainly in the material writing groups occasionally led to malfunctions, but were never a threat to the project. What was unpleasant, but not ultimately detrimental to the program, was the behavior of a few collaborators (usually professors) who used or exploited rather than served the project and through it the Greek language education in the Diaspora.

Despite internal and external difficulties, the implementation of the project was achieved, based on the relevant planning and programming. And this is due both to endogenous and exogenous factors. The most important endogenous stabilizing factor was the consistent Project Team, whose members (in Greece and in the Diaspora) were inspired by the same vision and passion for the Diaspora, by related scientific approaches and by the same fighting spirit.

Of the external factors, what distinguishes itself is the political support for the project, which is outlined in the next section.

## **8. Political Aspects and Partnerships**

As outlined in Damanakis' article in this volume (Chap.4), the project "*Greek Education Abroad*" was implemented during the "*period of visions and great expectations from 1996 to 2009*".

The interest in the Greek Diaspora permeated all the parties in the Greek parliament and was mainly expressed through the *Special Permanent Committee*

*on Greeks Abroad*. The long-standing president of the Committee, and later Deputy Foreign Minister, Gregory Niotis, decisively contributed to creating consensus and unity among the members of the Committee, which his successors continued. Also, among the members of the Committee and members of the Project Team there was ongoing communication, which was expressed mainly through the participation of the Committee representatives and also the political parties, in conferences or other Project events and through the regular, official Committee briefing on the progress of the program by the Coordinator. This created a tradition that ensured the continuation of the program independently of changes in education ministers and governments.

The support by the Ministry of Education, through the respective *Special Education Secretary for the Diaspora and Intercultural Education* was immediate and effective. Tension existed only with those Secretaries who had neither knowledge of the issues of Greek-language education in the Diaspora, nor general education.

In addition, the support for the Program (project) by major institutions in the Diaspora, by the SAE and the educational services of the countries of residence was important. From the beginning, the Program Policy was to keep both the major Hellenic Education Institutions and the appropriate educational services in the country of residence informed. The first was guaranteed through the systematic involvement of the Institutions' schools in the Program. The second was accomplished mainly through the involvement of persons of Greek origin who held important posts in Education Ministries (e.g. Ms Vicki Marineli of The Victorian Ministry of Education in Australia) or other important educational services (e.g. Ms Maria Xenikaki of The Board of Education, Toronto) or through university-teachers of Greek origin who were collaborators in the Program.

The direct or indirect involvement of politicians and institutions, educational services, teachers and scientists in the Program contributed greatly to the creation of positive conditions for its implementation and the maintenance of a climate of optimism for over a decade. This climate, of course, depended on and was fueled directly by the general positive political climate of the period of "*visions and great expectations*", which ended on an institutional note with the enactment of Law 4027/2011. This law marked the end of an era and the beginning of a new one, whose main features are: "*cost reduction*" and "*suppression of areas of action by the Greek State*" in the Diaspora.

## 9. Overall Assessment and Prospects

The project “*Greek Education Abroad*” came into being in 1997 (along with the other three intercultural education programs) to transform the education policy of Law 2413/1996 into educational practice. The law itself was adopted at a time when the Greek Diaspora was in the spotlight in the Greek state, as shown by the following enactments:

- 1995 (13/06) *Presidential Decree 196/95, Establishment and operation of Council of Hellenes Abroad (SAE),*
- 1996 (18/03) *Special Secretariat for Diaspora and Intercultural Education.*
- 1996 (17/06), *Law 2413, Greek education abroad, intercultural education and other provisions,*
- 1996 (17/06) *Institute for the Diaspora and Intercultural Education (IPODE),*
- 1996 (08/07) *Special Permanent Committee on Greeks Abroad in the Hellenic Parliament.*

The members of the *Project Team* and the broader networks of collaborators around the world were aware of the historical situation and of the responsibility that they had to bear, and made every effort to make the project bear fruit. And indeed - apart from the educational programs for students of Greek origin, through which informal “transnational youth networks” were created, and in addition to in-service training programs for immigrant and seconded teachers, which also led to the creation of educational networks within countries and between countries - the project has left behind rich educational material in printed and electronic form (CD Rom, DVD), which covers the educational needs of different target groups in primary and secondary schools and is freely accessible to all interested parties (see. [www.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.uoc.gr/diaspora), Teaching Materials).

The value of this “*educational material bank*” emerged, in particular, during the period 2010-2014 in which the Greek Ministry of Education, mainly for economic reasons, no longer neither printed nor provided such material in the Diaspora. During this period the Hellenic Education Institutions abroad and individual teachers resorted to the “*educational material bank*”, took the educational materials needed, made copies and gave them to their students.

The existence of such educational material appears to have had a positive impact on the educational policies of the countries of residence. In the new (national) *Curriculum of Australia*, for example, one of the conditions to be fulfilled by a language that is part of the Curriculum is the existence of teaching materials (learning resources) (ACARA, 2011: 5). Greek is one of the few languages that meet this requirement thanks to the project “*Greek Education Abroad*”.

The positive effects of the project so far do not however allow for complacency, for two main reasons. The first relates to the very nature of the educational material. It is common educational knowledge (place) that any educational material has a lifespan of ten to fifteen years at the most. Much of the program material is already fifteen years old and therefore should be renewed. Here lies the second reason; has the Greek State the resources and therefore the willingness - after the enactment of Law 4027 / 2011- to incorporate Greek language education in the Diaspora into its education policy priorities and continue to fund projects for the renewal and enrichment of the *bank of educational material*?

The conditions of the 1996-2008 period, but also the momentum of the program itself, are difficult to repeat. So, unilateral initiatives by the Centre can no longer be expected but solutions through systematic and pragmatic cooperation between the Centre and the Diaspora must be sought. The Program Networks could play a very important role in such an effort.



## SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

### **SOURCES**

The main source of information on the project “*Geek Education Abroad*” is its site [www.uoc.gr/diaspora](http://www.uoc.gr/diaspora), and in particular the links: *Teaching Material* (Εκπαιδευτικό υλικό) and *Studies* (Μελέτες). All of the printed and digital educational material is posted on the first link and the curricula and scientific studies (conference proceedings / colloquium, studies per country, special / thematic studies, etc.) on the second.

A second source is the EDIAMME Archive. Recourse to Law 2413/1996 and the Constitution of Greece (1975 and 2001) are also important.

### **See also: Reports of our Diaspora Research Associates (2014)**

**États-Unis:** A. Michopoulos et B. Selountou

**Canada:** Stephanos Constantinides

**Argentine:** S. Rousallis,

**Australie:** A. Tamis et M. Tsianikas,

**Afrique du Sud:** A. Krystallidou,

**Royaume-Uni:** E. Filippaki, M. Luca

**Allemagne:** M. Damanakis,

**Albanie:** G. Kapsalis,

**Russie:** E. Alepova,

**Ukraine:** A. Chatzipanagiotidou et E. Prodi

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) (2011). *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages*

Damanakis M., Michelakakis T. & Lidakis M. (1997). *A' Workshop Proceedings: Rethymnon June 27 - July 2 1997*. Rethymnon: EDIAMME.

Damanakis, M. (1991). *Introduction to the Theoretical Framework of the Production of Linguistic Teaching Material Program for Greek Children in Germany*. Ioannina.

Damanakis, M. (1994). Greek Teaching Materials Abroad. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 5 (2), 35-46.

Damanakis, M. (1997). Endogenous and Exogenous Difficulties in the Production of Intercultural Oriented Teaching Materials. *Ta Ekpaidevtika*, Spring, 66-73.

Damanakis, M. (2007). *Identities and Education in the Diaspora*. Athens: Gutenberg.

Damanakis, M. (2007a). Greek Education Abroad: Assessing the Decade 1997-2007 and Proposals for the Next Decade. In the Proceedings of the Conference-Globalization and the Greek Diaspora (Volumes I - II) (29 June to 1 July 2007). Rethymno: EDIAMME.

Damanakis, M. (Ed.) (2014). *Greek Language Education and E-Learning in the Diaspora: Results of empirical research as prerequisites for the development of an e-learning environment*. Rethymnon: EDIAMME.

Damanakis, M. (Ed.), (1999). *Greek Education Abroad. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches*. Rethymnon: EDIAMME.

Gotovos, A., Markou C. (1984). *School Reintegration of Repatriated Pupils: Problems and Prospects*. Athens: Ministry of Education-UNESCO.

Kontogianni, D. (2005). A Presentation of the Paideia Omogenon Program. *Études Helléniques / Hellenic Studies*, 13 (2), 63-78.

Kriari-Katrani, I. (2008). The Constitutional Protection of Education of Greeks in the Diaspora- Contribution to the Interpretation of Article 108, para. 1 of the Constitution. Athens: Sakkoulas.

Law 2413/1996. Greek Education Abroad, Intercultural Education and other Provisions (Government Gazette 124, issue A. 17.6.1996).

OEDB, (2006). *Theoretical Background and Curricula for Greek language education in the Diaspora*. Athena.

Tsoukalas, K. (1979). *Dependency and Reproduction*. Athens: Themelio.

## ANNEX

### ***GREECE***

- Ministry of Education: Special Secretariat of Diaspora and Intercultural Education / Institute for the Diaspora and Intercultural Education /Department of Diaspora and Intercultural Education / Special Management Service for Operational Program for Education and Initial Vocational Training (O.P. “Education”)/ Community Support Framework / ESPA
- University of Crete: Central Scientific Committee / Coordination - Project management \*/ Working Groups \*
- Political Institutions: Special Permanent Committee on Greeks Abroad (Hellenic Parliament)

**Diagram 1:** Organization Chart for the project “Greek Education Abroad”

### ***DIASPORA***

- Education Offices - Education Coordinators \*
- Regional Scientific Committees \* - Diaspora Scientific Associates \*
- Working Groups \*

\* Let us emphasize that the number of persons who cooperated in the implementation of the Greek Education Abroad program runs into hundreds. If the Education Coordinators and teachers who implemented pilot training materials or helped to collect data and conduct research are included, the number runs into the thousands. Therefore, it is not possible to mention all the names in this text. These appear in the particular studies or specific teaching materials.

# Grecs et Philhellènes de France

Jean Catsiapis\*

## ABSTRACT

The article of Jean Catsiapis emphasizes the weakness, politicization and division of the Greeks of France which form a community of only 35 000 members. However, amongst them, many have acquired notoriety in the political or cultural spheres. These are the Philhellenes of France, who act most effectively to defend a weakened Greece in recent years by an unprecedented economic crisis and to ensure the safeguarding of Hellenism which is especially threatened in Cyprus.

## RÉSUMÉ

L'article de Jean Catsiapis insiste sur la faiblesse, la politisation et la division des Grecs de France qui forment une communauté forte de seulement 35 000 membres. Toutefois, on compte parmi ceux-ci beaucoup de personnes ayant acquis dans le domaine politique ou culturel une notoriété certaine. Ce sont les Philhellènes de France, qui agissent le plus efficacement pour la défense de la Grèce affaiblie depuis plusieurs années par une crise économique sans précédent et afin d'assurer la sauvegarde de l'hellénisme, menacé notamment à Chypre.

La communauté hellénique de France constitue une des minorités les moins importantes de ce pays. Dans une précédente étude de 1983 nous avons estimé qu'il y avait en France environ 35 000 Grecs et Français d'origine grecque<sup>1</sup>. En 2016 le site de l'Ambassade de Grèce en France évalue au même nombre les membres de la communauté hellénique de ce pays.

Si on met à part la communauté grecque de Cargèse en Corse<sup>2</sup> la très grande majorité des Grecs de France sont les descendants des réfugiés d'Asie mineure de 1922, qui exerçaient les métiers de tailleurs, coiffeurs ou commerçants. Durant certaines périodes troubles de la Grèce la France a aussi accueilli des

\* Université Paris Ouest Nanterre

centaines de ressortissants de ce pays: pendant la guerre civile (1946-1949) et la dictature des colonels (1967-1974) des intellectuels grecs se sont réfugiés en France, en particulier l'historien Nicolas Svoronos durant la première période ainsi que le journaliste Michel Stylianou et les professeurs d'université Aristovoulos Manassis et Phédon Végleris au cours de la seconde période.

## **Les Communautés Grecques**

Les Grecs de France sont répartis sur l'ensemble du territoire de ce pays, mais c'est surtout dans trois villes qu'ils se sont établis (Paris, Lyon et Marseille, ville fondée vers 600 avant Jésus-Christ par des Grecs venus de Phocée). Les communautés grecques ont toutes des liens étroits avec les Eglises orthodoxes de la ville où elles sont implantées. Ainsi chaque 25 mars, jour de la fête nationale de la Grèce, ou encore le dimanche le plus proche de cette date, le président de la Communauté hellénique de Paris et des environs prend la parole à l'Eglise St Stéphane, siège de la Métropole grecque orthodoxe de France pour souligner devant les Grecs, qui assistent à l'office religieux célébré à cette occasion, l'importance de la commémoration du début de la guerre d'indépendance de leur pays. Puis à l'issue de cet office ce président, avec l'Ambassadeur de Grèce et le Métropolitain se rendent avec les fidèles de l'Eglise St Stéphane à l'Arc de Triomphe tout proche pour déposer des gerbes de fleurs sur la tombe du Soldat Inconnu et y chanter l'hymne national hellénique joué par une fanfare de l'armée française.

La faiblesse, la politisation et la division sont les principales caractéristiques des communautés grecques de France.

De fait, les Grecs, qui sont très individualistes, participent peu aux organisations qui les représentent<sup>3</sup>. Ceux d'entre eux qui sont diplômés et relèvent de professions libérales comme les architectes ou les avocats ne fréquentent pas les différentes formations communautaires

Les partis politiques de Grèce à la fin du vingtième siècle se sont efforcés d'avoir une mainmise sur les communautés grecques de France. C'est surtout la communauté de Paris qui a été très politisée, les différentes listes des candidats aux élections à sa direction étant patronnées plus ou moins ouvertement ces dernières années par la *Nouvelle Démocratie* et le *Pasok*. Cette politisation explique sans doute la faible fréquentation des communautés helléniques par les Grecs de France.

C'est surtout la division qui domine certaines communautés, comme c'est le cas à Marseille avec l'Union hellénique et la Communauté grecque, la première étant une association très traditionnelle dont les manifestations s'articulent surtout autour de la fête nationale de la Grèce et des célébrations religieuses alors que la seconde met l'accent sur l'enseignement du grec pour les jeunes ainsi que sur les problèmes - comme l'occupation du nord de Chypre par l'armée turque- auxquels est confronté l'hellénisme

Thomas Efthymiou, président de la Communauté hellénique de Paris et des environs en 2009 expose ce que devrait être le rôle idéal de son organisation<sup>4</sup>:

*Tout d'abord qu'elle ne soit pas exclusivement gréco-grecque, qu'elle s'ouvre aux Grecs-Français ou Français-Grecs pour maintenir en France, l'héritage de leur famille et de leur lieu d'origine. Œuvrer à la création d'un établissement gréco-français de la maternelle aux portes de l'université, créer à Paris un cimetière orthodoxe à l'instar de celui des Russes, des Chinois ou des Portugais, donner une nouvelle impulsion à la Fédération des communautés grecques de France, boudée par nombre d'entre elles, en raison de leur orientation politique ou des querelles de clochers. Notre avenir passe par le regroupement de toutes les associations: grecques, chypriotes et philhellènes.*

Le fait est que les associations de Philhellènes auxquelles participent certains Grecs ou Français d'origine grecque jouent un rôle majeur pour la promotion de l'hellénisme en France.

## **Les Associations de Philhellènes**

La véritable force de l'hellénisme de France tient aux nombreuses associations de Philhellènes qui regroupent des Français amoureux de la Grèce dont ils font la promotion. On peut ainsi citer l'importance des comités de jumelage de villes françaises avec des villes grecques, le rôle significatif des associations des amis de Chypre,,qui éclairent l'opinion publique française sur la tragédie subie par le peuple chypriote depuis 1974, ainsi que le rayonnement de nombreuses associations culturelles.

## **Les Comités de Jumelages**

Dans la tradition française, née peu après la seconde guerre mondiale, se sont développés des jumelages de villes françaises avec des villes allemandes afin de sceller la réconciliation franco-allemande. Mais rapidement nombre de villes françaises ont développé des jumelages avec des villes de pays amis. C'est ainsi qu'en 2016 on compte 39 communes de France, qui ont des liens de jumelage avec des villes de Grèce. Ces jumelages, qui impliquent des voyages de jeunes et de seniors des villes concernées, des expositions, des manifestations pour faire connaître en France les villes grecques liées aux communes françaises sont animés par des comités formés de personnes proches des mairies des villes françaises engagées dans une coopération avec la Grèce.

Le processus de formation de la plupart des jumelages franco-grecs est toujours le même: un touriste français en Grèce épouse une femme grecque et ce couple établi en France pousse à la création d'un jumelage dont il assume la direction en devenant les animateurs du comité, qui va diriger l'association de la ville française avec la ville grecque. On peut ainsi citer les jumelages de la ville bretonne de St Brieuc avec Agia Paraskevi, de la ville du Mans avec Volos, ou encore de Royan avec Nauplie. D'autres jumelages concernent des villes françaises où il y a une communauté grecque assez importante: Sartrouville avec Kallithéa, Cargèse avec Oitylos, Marseille avec le Pirée.

Il y a aussi plusieurs jumelages de villes françaises avec des villes chypriotes réalisés après 1974 afin de prouver au niveau local la solidarité des Français avec les Chypriotes éprouvés par l'occupation militaire turque: le plus notable est celui de Combs la ville, située dans le département de Seine Marne, qui sous l'égide d'Alain Vivien, son député-maire, grand ami de Chypre, décide de s'associer en 1978 avec Dali (Idalion). Un autre jumelage très actif est celui de Saint Cyr sur Loire avec Morphou réalisé en 2002 à l'initiative de Paul Olivier, par Philippe Briand, député-maire de cette ville du département de l'Indre et Loire. Il faut aussi noter le récent jumelage de Truyes avec la ville chypriote de Katokopia.

## **Les Associations des Amis de Chypre**

Après 1974 se sont créées des Associations des Amis de Chypre composées pour l'essentiel de Français sympathisants de la Grèce et de Chypre. Au niveau national il y a l'Association des Amis de la République de Chypre basée à Paris

créée en 1975, qui informe régulièrement les parlementaires et l'opinion publique française de l'évolution de la question chypriote. A l'occasion des élections présidentielles françaises cette organisation interroge les candidats sur leurs positions concernant l'occupation par l'armée turque du nord de Chypre et demandait aussi à ceux-ci jusqu'aux élections de 2002 de s'exprimer sur la candidature d'adhésion de ce pays à l'Union européenne.

De nombreuses Associations des Amis de Chypre se sont constituées au niveau local. La plus active est certainement l'Association des Amis de Chypre en Touraine dirigée par Paul Olivier, un infatigable défenseur des droits de l'homme. A son actif on doit noter outre l'organisation de nombreuses réunions et expositions sur Chypre et une information précise et constante sur la question chypriote adressée aux députés et sénateurs élus en Touraine, la réalisation de plusieurs jumelages: ceux de St Cyr sur Loire avec Morphou, de Truyes avec Katokopia, déjà cités et de l'Université François Rabelais de Tours avec l'Université de Chypre. De nombreux Chypriotes vivant en Touraine et qui étaient isolés sont devenus des membres actifs de l'organisation créée il y a 30 ans par Paul Olivier.

## **Les Associations Culturelles**

Le rayonnement de la culture grecque en France est assurée par des personnalités très célèbres à côté de nombreuses organisations nationales et locales.

Parmi les personnalités françaises qui ont consacré toute leur vie à défendre le grec ancien, l'antiquité grecque et la Grèce contemporaine il faut citer Jacqueline de Romilly (1913-2010) membre de l'Académie française. Cette femme admirable, auteur de nombreux ouvrages,<sup>5</sup> a reçu la nationalité grecque, le gouvernement d'Athènes ayant voulu honorer son action en faveur de la sauvegarde de l'hellénisme en France. On doit aussi mentionner le nom de Jacques Lacarrière (1925-2005), qui avec le grand succès de son livre *L'été grec*,<sup>6</sup> a fait connaître la Grèce à un très large public et a contribué ainsi à l'expansion du tourisme français dans ce pays.

Au niveau national le *Centre culturel hellénique*, dirigé aujourd'hui par Alexandra Mitsotakis est un organisme privé oeuvrant pour la promotion de la culture grecque en France. Son action est soutenue par les fondations des



armateurs Leventis et Niarchos. Ce centre organise des manifestations culturelles multiples et accorde son parrainage à des expositions, des concerts, organisés par des artistes grecs ou français d'origine grecque. *La Maison de la Grèce* de son côté, située à Paris et qui dépend du Consulat général, organise de nombreuses manifestations culturelles et prête ses locaux pour les activités des différentes associations professionnelles de Grecs. *Le Pavillon hellénique* de la Cité universitaire de Paris ne se contente pas d'offrir des chambres aux étudiants grecs mais organise aussi régulièrement des expositions de peinture et des concerts dans ses salons. Un hommage au célèbre cinéaste Théo Angelopoulos (1935-2012), lui-même ancien résident de ce Pavillon, y a été rendu après son décès.

L'Association *Athèna* fondée en 1966 a pour objectif la défense des civilisations grecque et latine. Cette organisation –sans but lucratif– organise chaque année des croisières culturelles en Méditerranée avec des escales dans les ports de Grèce ainsi que des concours pour des élèves de grec dont les prix sont constitués par un voyage d'une semaine dans ce pays.

Au niveau local il faut mentionner *Defkalion* créée en 1997 et basée à Lyon, dont l'objet est d'approfondir les liens de la France avec la Grèce d'aujourd'hui «en faisant connaître, vivre et partager sa culture». Cette Association franco-hellénique fort active organise ses activités de conférences en liaison avec la Maison de l'Europe de Lyon et son vidéo club avec le service culturel de l'Institut national des sciences appliquées de cette ville. Le rayonnement de *Defkalion* s'étend à toute la région lyonnaise.

A Paris deux institutions jouent un rôle notable pour faire connaître non seulement la culture grecque mais aussi les difficultés auxquelles est confrontée la Grèce: *la Librairie Desmos* et l'Association *Phonie Graphie Desmos*, considéré comme «un ilot grec à Paris» n'est pas seulement un lieu de vente de livres, disques et DVD sur la Grèce. C'est un lieu de culture, fondé par Yannis Mavroeidakos, arrivé en France en 1967 qui organise des conférences et des expositions et dirige la revue trimestrielle «Le Lien». Celui-ci, habité par la passion de la Grèce, a pour rêve de «constituer une mnémothèque, qui rassemblerait les archives littéraires, les enregistrements audio et vidéo accumulés depuis trois décennies. Elle illustrerait aussi ces échanges si fructueux entre culture grecque et française».

*Phonie Graphie* est avant tout un centre d'enseignement de la langue grecque mais Nikos Graikos son dynamique Coordinateur pédagogique et culturel, qui

s'est établi en France il y a une trentaine d'années, organise à Paris et en province des ateliers de théâtre et de nombreuses activités de conférences et de concerts.

## **Les Grecs de France et la Politique**

Les Grecs de France et les Français d'origine grecque ne s'impliquent pas beaucoup dans le pays où ils vivent. Toutefois deux présidents de la République française sont d'origine grecque: Adolphe Thiers et Nicolas Sarkozy.

Adolphe Thiers, dont la mère Marie Lomaca, née à Constantinople, était d'origine grecque, a été le premier président de la III<sup>ème</sup> République (1871-1873). A. Thiers durant son mandat de Chef de l'Etat a nommé ambassadeur de France en Grèce Jules Ferry.<sup>7</sup> Celui-ci a été chargé au cours de sa mission à Athènes (1872 -1873) de régler le différend du gouvernement français avec les autorités grecques le conflit concernant les mines du Laurion. Dans ses instructions à J. Ferry, le président A. Thiers lui recommande de ne pas être trop dur avec les Grecs, prouvant ainsi qu'il souhaitait ménager sa patrie d'origine.

Nicolas Sarkozy président de la République (2007-2012) dont le grand-père Bénédict Malah était né à Thessalonique a manifesté au cours de son mandat un grand intérêt pour la Grèce. En visite à Athènes, le 6 juin 2008 il s'exprime devant le Parlement hellénique. Dans son discours devant les députés grecs il fait référence à son grand-père.<sup>8</sup> Au cours de sa visite il signe avec le Premier ministre Kostas Karamanlis «une déclaration conjointe sur la défense et la sécurité» dont l'objet était de renforcer la coopération militaire franco-grecque et de développer les exportations d'armement françaises en Grèce. En 2011 il réussit à convaincre la chancelière allemande Angela Merkel de sauver la Grèce en la maintenant dans la zone euro. Toutefois ce sauvetage de la Grèce par Paris et Berlin a plongé ce pays dans une terrible austérité économique et financière et contribué à la démission du Premier ministre Georges Papandréou.<sup>9</sup>

Au niveau parlementaire les députés et sénateurs d'origine grecque sont peu nombreux et agissent pour la plupart d'entre eux sans prendre en compte les intérêts de la Grèce.

A gauche il faut citer les députés Jean-Christophe Cambadélis, et Marietta Karamanli ainsi que le sénateur Luc Carvounas, tous trois membres du parti socialiste; Michel Vaxès est ancien député communiste.

Jean-Christophe Cambadélis, député de Paris, où il est né, est l'actuel premier secrétaire du parti socialiste depuis 2014. Ancien trotskyste, il dirige avec difficulté le parti socialiste dont le véritable chef est le président François Hollande. Si le père et le grand père de J-C Cambadélis se sont impliqués dans les activités de la Communauté hellénique de Paris, celui-ci en revanche ne se sent pas concerné par les problèmes de la Grèce. En revanche Marietta Karamanli, née à Volos et députée de la Sarthe, et actuelle vice-présidente de la commission européenne de l'Assemblée nationale, s'active pour faire connaître en France les difficultés de la Grèce. Présidente du Groupe d'Amitié France-Grèce de cette Assemblée, elle a publié en 2013 un livre<sup>10</sup> pour livrer sa conception de la crise économique et financière du pays où elle est née. Sénateur du Val de Marne depuis 2011, Luc Carvounas dont les parents sont originaires de Smyrne (Izmir) rappelle parfois que sa famille possède des racines grecques et préside le Groupe d'Amitié France-Grèce du Sénat. Toutefois il intervient rarement pour mettre en lumière les souffrances du peuple grec endurées depuis 2008. Michel Vaxès,<sup>11</sup> député communiste des Bouches du Rhône de 2007 à 2012, dont le père était originaire d'Asie mineure, a été élu en raison du poids de la forte communauté grecque vivant à Port de Bouc, située dans sa circonscription mais il s'est toujours abstenu de toute action ou intervention en faveur des intérêts de la Grèce, se bornant à participer aux activités folkloriques de cette communauté.

A droite et au centre il y a peu de personnalités d'origine grecque. Le Docteur Jean Coumaros, né à Corinthe, député gaulliste de Moselle de 1958-1973, n'a pas œuvré au cours de sa vie parlementaire en faveur de son pays de naissance. De même Chantal Brunel, née Zorbas, fille de médecins d'origine grecque et députée de Seine et Marne de 2012 à 2012, a été porte parole de 2008 à 2009 de l'UMP, le parti de N.Sarkozy mais n'a pas manifesté un intérêt particulier pour la Grèce durant son mandat parlementaire. En revanche, Jean Yannicopoulos (1939-2011) maire de Garons (département du Gard) de 1976 à 2008, né en Grèce, et figure notable du centre droit a entretenu des liens particuliers avec sa patrie d'origine et a jumelé en 1995 la municipalité qu'il a dirigée avec la ville grecque de Kalyvia, située à 30 kms d'Athènes.

On doit noter que les épouses de Bernard Tapie et de Jean-Marie Le Pen, deux personnages sulfureux de la vie politique française, sont d'origine grecque. Celles-ci semblent jouer un rôle notable auprès de leurs conjoints: Dominique Damianos-Tapie dirige la Société civile Immobilière «Calypso»-dont le nom

rappelle ses racines grecques-qui regroupe les actifs immobiliers de son mari et Jany Paschos, née de père grec, préside de nombreuses associations au sein du Front national, dont le président d'honneur est son époux.

### ***Grecs de France Célèbres***

Il y a de nombreux Grecs et de Français d'origine grecque qui se sont distingués dans le domaine de la philosophie, de la littérature, de la poésie, de l'histoire, du droit, de la musique, de l'architecture, de la peinture, du cinéma et des affaires.

Dans le domaine de la **philosophie** trois anciens élèves d'Octave Merlier, qui a dirigé l'Institut français d'Athènes, sont venus s'établir en France et ont joué un rôle majeur dans la vie intellectuelle française: Cornélius Castoriadis, Kostas Axelos, et Kostas Papaïoannou.

Cornélius Castoriadis (1922-1997) a été non seulement un philosophe, mais aussi un économiste et un psychanaliste. Il a été un des fondateurs du mouvement *Socialisme et Barbarie*.

Kostas Axelos (1924-2010) a été professeur de philosophie à la Sorbonne et spécialiste d'Héraclite mais aussi de Marx. Il a fait découvrir de grands penseurs comme Herbert Marcuse. Auteur de nombreux ouvrages il a publié notamment «Le destin de la Grèce moderne», édité pour la première fois en 1954, un texte prémonitoire à la lumière de la crise que ce pays traverse actuellement.<sup>12</sup>

Kostas Papaïoannou (1925-1981), qui s'installe en France en 1950 est un philosophe proche de Raymond Aron. Très critique envers le totalitarisme, il a publié plusieurs ouvrages sur Marx et les marxistes. K. Papaïoannou conduit jusqu'à sa mort une carrière d'écrivain, d'enseignant et de chercheur au CNRS. A ce trio il convient d'ajouter le nom de Nicos Poulantzas (1936-1979), venu en France en 1960. Philosophe et sociologue dont les travaux ont une orientation générale marxiste avec une influence de Gramsci et d'Althusser, N. Poulantzas membre du parti communiste grec de l'intérieur esquisse à la fin des années 1970 une voie vers l'eurocommunisme. Christine Buci-Glucksmann après le suicide de ce philosophe lui consacre un livre.<sup>13</sup>

S'agissant de la littérature le nom de Vassilis Alexakis s'impose. Né en 1943, cet écrivain franco-grec se partage entre la France –où il s'installe à l'âge de 17 ans– et la Grèce. Son œuvre romanesque est importante: ses trois premiers romans

ont été écrits en français, ses autres livres ont été rédigés en grec ou en français. Il convient de rappeler que dans le passé deux autres écrivains franco-grecs se sont distingués, Jean Moréas (Ioannis Papadiamantopoulos) et Jean Psichari. Jean Moréas (1856-1910) né à Athènes vint s'établir à Paris assez jeune et fut un des membres éminents du mouvement symboliste. Jean Psichari (1854-1929) a joué un rôle important pour le développement de la langue grecque. Ce linguiste et écrivain, qui a occupé la chaire de grec moderne à l'Ecole des Langues Orientales, est devenu le gendre d'Ernest Renan et s'est fait connaître pour son roman, *Mon voyage*, publié en 1888, première œuvre en prose rédigée en langue démotique. Constantin Dimaras (1904 -1992), professeur associé de l'Institut néo-hellénique de l'université de Paris IV Sorbonne de 1970 à 1978 a formé de nombreux chercheurs et enseignants en grec moderne. Sa famille, en octobre 2014, a offert au Département d'études helléniques de l'Université de Strasbourg plusieurs milliers de livres de sa bibliothèque personnelle. Clément Lépidis (1920-1997) né de parents originaires d'Anatolie, passe son adolescence dans le quartier de Belleville à Paris. Il publie une vingtaine de livres dont un roman *l'Arménien* publié en 1973 aux Editions du Seuil, qui obtient le prix de l'Académie française.

Il y a de très nombreux Grecs de France à avoir publié de la poésie: parmi ceux-ci les noms de Constantin Kaïteris, Alexandre Mitzalis, Stephanos Constantinides et Cléopâtre Macridou se détachent.

Constantin Kaïteris né à Paris en 1948 d'un père grec a mené une carrière d'écrivain de traducteur et de poète. Il est notamment le coauteur d'un dictionnaire grec-français de 150 000 mots (Athènes, Ed. Kauffmann 2002), qui fait autorité. Parmi ses nombreuses traductions d'auteurs grecs il faut noter celle du «Luth d'ébène» de Panagiotis Agapitos, publié en 2013 à Paris aux Editions Anacharsis. C'est surtout son importante œuvre poétique qu'il faut souligner. Il appartient à la longue lignée des poètes qui attirent l'attention sur les éléments du quotidien. C. Kaïteris est notamment l'auteur des poèmes intitulés «Pommes politiques» (Amiens, Ed. Corps Puce 2011).

Alexandre Mitzalis né à Athènes en 1935, s'installe à Paris en 1968. Documentaliste aux Sciences Po il publie un essai philosophique et trois recueils de poèmes en grec et un bilingue (français-grec). En 2009 est publiée à Paris aux Editions de la Nouvelle Pléiade la traduction de son livre de poèmes «Ceux qui croyaient au ciel et ceux qui croyaient à la terre».

Stephanos Constantinides est un universitaire canadien, né à Chypre, qui a

fait ses études à Paris, à la Sorbonne, et qui a vécu en France pendant les années '70. Il a publié un recueil de nouvelles et cinq recueils de poésie en grec. Un de ses recueils de poésie, 'Anthumes', a été traduit par Jacques Bouchard, néo-helléniste et professeur à l'Université de Montréal. Ce recueil comprend aussi une introduction de Jacques Bouchard à l'ensemble de son œuvre poétique.

Cléopâtre Macridou née à Chypre vient dans les années 1970 en France, qui deviendra sa seconde patrie. L'occupation de son pays d'origine par l'armée turque est pour elle une blessure qui apparaît dans ses recueils de poèmes. En 2015 elle publie à Lille aux Editions Variations «Requiem», traduction française d'un poème édité en grec à Nicosie, une ode au Sous Officier Kypros Ioannou mort héroïquement durant l'invasion turque de 1974.

Dans le domaine de l'histoire deux noms se détachent: Nicolas Svoronos et Hélène Ahrweiler. N. Svoronos (1911-1989), qui s'était engagé dans la résistance communiste à l'occupant nazi vient en France grâce à une bourse que lui a fait obtenir Octave Merlier. Privé de la nationalité hellénique il obtient la nationalité française en 1962. Spécialiste de l'histoire de la Grèce byzantine, il intègre l'Ecole pratique des hautes études. Auteur de nombreux livres<sup>14</sup>, N. Svoronos fait connaître en France l'histoire de la Grèce. Après la chute de la dictature il retourne en Grèce et enseigne dans les universités de Thessalonique et Crète.

Hélène Glykatzi-Arhweiler, née en 1926, vient en France après ses études à Athènes et obtient en 1966 son doctorat d'histoire<sup>15</sup>. Professeur d'histoire, à la Sorbonne, puis présidente de l'université de Paris I (1976-1981) elle est nommée par François Mitterrand recteur de l'Académie de Paris en 1982. Elle sera aussi présidente du Centre Pompidou de 1989 à 1991. En 1998 un volume de *Mélanges* en deux tomes lui a été offert par ses collègues, disciples et amis sous le titre *Eupsychia*.

A toute époque de nombreux Grecs sont venus en France pour étudier le droit et y passer leur doctorat C'est ainsi que de nombreux professeurs de droit public en Grèce ont été étudiants dans leur jeunesse à l'université de Paris comme Evangelos Vénizélos et Nicos Alivizatos. Pendant la dictature des colonels (1967-1974) des juristes grecs sont venus enseigner dans des universités françaises: Phedon Vegleris et Aristovoulos Manessis. Parmi les juristes grecs qui ont vécu toute leur vie en France deux noms se détachent: Nicolas Politis et Antoine Frangulis.

Nicolas Politis (1872 -1942) reçu premier en 1901 au concours d'agrégation des facultés de droit de France a été professeur à l'université de Paris (1910-1914) et ambassadeur de Grèce en France (1924-1927). Cet homme, qui a aussi été ministre des affaires étrangères de Vénizélos (1917-1920), consacra toute sa vie à l'amitié franco-grecque. Antoine Frangulis (1888-1975), délégué de la Grèce à la S.D.N et auteur de nombreux ouvrages de droit international est devenu secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie diplomatique internationale à Paris jusqu'à sa mort.

C'est sans doute dans le domaine de la musique que se sont distinguées le plus grand nombre de personnalités grecques de France. Trois compositeurs Iannis Xénakis, Georges Aperghis, et Cyprien Katsaris se sont faits connaître par leurs créations musicales. I. Xénakis (1922-2001) est le premier compositeur européen à avoir utilisé l'ordinateur pour l'élaboration de sa musique. Il invente la musique stochastique, qui consiste à adopter des processus compositionnels liés au calcul des probabilités. Son épouse Françoise est une femme de lettres et sa fille Mâkhi poursuit une carrière d'artiste peintre. Georges Aperghis (né en 1945), arrive à Paris en 1963. D'abord proche de I. Xénakis, il s'est lancé ensuite dans la composition de musique de chambre et a dirigé le Conservatoire de musique de Strasbourg. Cyprien Katsaris né à Marseille en 1951 de parents chypriotes est un célèbre pianiste et un compositeur remarqué notamment par sa «Rapsodie chypriote» qu'il crée à Paris à la salle Pleyel en 1978.

Il convient aussi de rappeler que le compositeur Mikis Théodorakis, né en 1925, a fait deux séjours prolongés en France: dans sa jeunesse il a suivi des études musicales à Paris où il se réfugie de 1970 à 1974 pour fuir la dictature des colonels.

S'agissant des chanteurs et chanteuses grecs, la plus célèbre est certainement Nana Mouscouri, née en 1934, dont les apparitions ont été fréquentes jusqu'à ces dernières années sur les chaînes de télévisions de la France. Georges Moustaki (1934 -2013) chanteur-compositeur d'origine grecque a été proche de M. Théodorakis et n'a jamais oublié l'hellénisme de sa famille Théo Sarapo (1936-1970) a été lancé par son épouse Edith Piaf. Sa carrière prometteuse a été très courte puisque ce jeune chanteur a trouvé la mort dans un accident de voiture, quelques années après le décès en 1963 de sa femme. Il faut décerner une mention spéciale à Angélique Ionatos. Cette chanteuse-compositrice, née à Athènes en 1954 s'établit en Belgique puis en France où elle vit aujourd'hui.



Elle a mis en musique de nombreux poètes grecs, en particulier Odysseas Elytis avec sa cantate intitulée «Marie des Brumes». De 1989 à 2000 A. Ionatos a été associée au Théâtre de Sartrouville. Par sa voix grave chargée d'émotions elle fait découvrir à un large public français la musicalité de la langue grecque.

Il convient de souligner l'originalité de la rappeuse Diam's (Mélanie Georgiadès), née en 1980, qui a souvent revendiqué ses origines chypriotes. Cette chanteuse très populaire soutient en 2007 Ségolène Royal, alors candidate socialiste aux élections présidentielles. Diam's met fin à sa carrière en 2012 après sa surprenante conversion à l'Islam.

L'architecture est un domaine que choisissent de nombreux jeunes Grecs venus en France pour faire leurs études. I. Xénakis, outre ses talents de compositeur de musique, a été aussi un grand architecte. Georges Candilis (1913-1995) s'installe en France en 1945 et devient l'un des principaux collaborateurs de Le Corbusier pour la «Cité radieuse de Marseille». Il a participé à l'aménagement de plusieurs sites touristiques –comme celui de Port Bacarès– et de projets de logements et d'écoles au Moyen-Orient.

Mario Prassinis (1916-1985) né à Constantinople est la figure de proue des Grecs de France ayant choisi la peinture par passion. Peintre non figuratif, il réalise sa première exposition en 1938, préfacée par René Char. Ses tableaux, par la suite, seront exposés à Paris au Grand Palais et il décore la Chapelle Notre Dame de la Pitié à St Rémy de Provence, siège de la donation de 108 œuvres qu'il a faite à la France. Sa sœur Gisèle Prassinis (1920-2015) a consacré sa vie à la peinture et à la poésie. Les incendies de forêt qui ont ravagé la Grèce en 2007 ont incité de nombreux peintres grecs de France ou ayant fait leurs études dans ce pays, comme Dimitri Alithinos, Démosthène Agraphiotis et Louisa Kakissi, à faire don de certaines de leurs œuvres pour une vente aux enchères à Paris, dont les bénéfices ont été versés à deux villages sinistrés du Péloponnèse.

Costa Gavras (né en 1933), président administrateur de la Cinémathèque française, et dont la carrière se déroule en France est dans le domaine du cinéma le membre de la communauté grecque de ce pays le plus connu. Adonis Kyrou (1923-1985), s'installe à Paris en 1946 et participe au groupe surréaliste d'André Breton. Réalisateur de films et écrivain de cinéma, il met en scène de nombreux courts métrages et deux longs métrages: *Bloko* (1965) et *Le Moine* (1972). Nikos Papatakis (1918-2010) cinéaste d'origine grecque et éthiopienne, mort à Paris



où il a vécu presque toute sa vie a réalisé peu de films. Cependant son film *Les Pères du désordre*, interdit en Grèce par la dictature des colonels, est un chef d'œuvre, qui a contribué à faire de lui un réalisateur très original et engagé politiquement. Robert Manthoulis, né en 1929 est un réalisateur de films et de documentaires pour le cinéma et la télévision. Il s'établit en France en 1967 pour fuir la dictature des colonels. Il s'est impliqué par ses films dans la résistance à cette dictature. Durant plusieurs années, il a présidé la Communauté hellénique de Paris et des environs. S'agissant des artistes de cinéma, Adèle Exarchopoulos née en France en 1993 d'un père d'origine grecque, et dont le film *La Vie d'Adèle* obtient la Palme d'Or au Festival de Cannes en 2013 n'appartient pas vraiment à la communauté grecque de ce pays. Toutefois cette actrice a découvert avec bonheur la Grèce où elle se rend pour la promotion de ce film. Anne Mougialis est une actrice de cinéma et une comédienne de théâtre née en 1978. Un de ses arrière-grands pères, originaire de Kastelorizo, est venu s'établir en France durant la Première Guerre mondiale. Elle a notamment joué en 2009 le rôle de Coco Chanel dans le film de Jan Kounen *Coco Chanel et Igor Stravinsky*. Roger Diamantis (1934-2010) né à Paris d'un père commerçant originaire du Péloponnèse a ouvert le *Cinéma St André des Arts*, un établissement parisien classé «d'art et d'essai», qui a fait découvrir aux Français le cinéaste Alain Tanner et les films de Theo Angelopoulos, de Nagisa Oshima et de Ken Loach. Un film documentaire a été réalisé sur la vie de R. Diamantis.<sup>16</sup>

De nombreux Grecs de France se trouvent dans le monde des affaires et sont des commerçants, ou des chefs d'entreprise; ceux, qui sont venus d'Asie mineure après la catastrophe de 1922, ont pour la plupart exercé le métier de coiffeur ou de tailleur. Aujourd'hui Jean-Marc Maniatis, né en 1942, et fils d'un grand bottier parisien venu de Grèce en 1920, s'est fait un nom dans le domaine de la coiffure. Il est à la tête de nombreux salons de coiffure de haute gamme et occupe une place de choix au sein de la vie parisienne. Dans le passé deux Grecs de France ont été de grands chefs d'entreprise: Basile Zaharoff et André Mentzelopoulos. B. Zaharoff (1849-1936) le célèbre marchand de canons de la Première Guerre mondiale a été l'homme le plus riche du monde. Ce Grec-Ottoman, ami de la France où il a passé la plus grande partie de sa vie, a été décoré de la Grand Croix de la Légion d'Honneur sur proposition de Georges Clemenceau pour les services exceptionnels rendus à la France.<sup>17</sup> A. Mentzelopoulos (1915-1980) né à Patras a été un prestigieux homme d'affaires. Il rachète en 1958 la chaîne des magasins

Félix Potin et en 1977 le célèbre grand cru de Bordeaux, Château Margaux. A. Mentzelopoulos a été très proche de Constantin Caramanlis durant l'exil parisien (1963-1974) de cet homme politique. Sa fille Corinne, née en 1953, a pris la direction de la société Château Margaux et poursuit un programme d'investissement pour conforter l'exploitation de ce grand vin bordelais.

## **Médias et Organes Franco-Grecs de Presse**

Les journaux de la communauté grecque de France ont presque, tous disparu. Le seul à avoir subsisté est «*Acropolis*», revue bimensuelle, basée à Marseille et dirigée par le journaliste chypriote Yannis Stavrinou. Ce sont des sites sur Internet, qui aujourd'hui, constituent le moyen d'information sur la Grèce et un organe de liaison des Grecs de France. C'est *Info-Grece.com*, qui est le site le plus consulté. Son information quotidienne sur la Grèce et les communautés grecques de France est de grande qualité. Le site *diaspora-grecque.com* est un autre site très utile pour s'informer sur la Grèce et les Grecs de ce pays et d'ailleurs. Un autre site *okeanews.fr*, qui fonctionne difficilement par manque de moyens financiers, fournit une information souvent militante sur les difficultés actuelles traversées par la Grèce. Nikos Aliagas, né en France en 1969 est un journaliste de grande notoriété, animateur de télévision et de radio, qui travaille dans différents médias français tout en participant aussi à des organes d'information athéniens. Stéphane Nicolopoulos journaliste et réalisateur de films documentaires a deux passions: le Canada où il est né et la Grèce, patrie de son père. Venu à Paris au début des années 2000, âgé d'une vingtaine d'années, il publie un numéro hors série de *Paris Match* consacré à la Grèce et aux Jeux Olympiques d'Athènes de 2004. Collaborateur de plusieurs chaînes de la télévision française, S. Nicolopoulos a reçu plusieurs prix pour ses films «les défis de l'expatriation en Chine» et «Objectif Pôle Nord». Il convient de rappeler le rôle important joué dans le passé par Michel Stylianou et Richard Soméritis. M. Stylianou, né en 1928, s'établit en France pendant la dictature des colonels, période durant laquelle il dirige les émissions grecques de l'ORTF (radio d'Etat) qui fournissent une information objective sur la Grèce. De 1974 à 1981 il est le Conseiller de presse de l'Ambassade de Grèce en France. En 1989 il retourne en Grèce où il poursuit ses activités de journaliste. Richard Soméritis, né en 1931 vient en France pour faire ses études au début des années 1950. Il devient à Paris correspondant de presse, puis fonde l'agence *Athènes*

*Presse Libre*, qui de 1967 à 1974, informe l'opinion publique française sur la réalité de la dictature des colonels. Il est le correspondant du quotidien *Kathimerini* à Paris après le retour de la démocratie à Athènes. Revenu en Grèce il collabore au journal *To Vima*.

## **Les Grecs de France et la Crise Économique de la Grèce**

La crise économique, que connaît la Grèce depuis plusieurs années, a profondément marqué les Grecs de France. Les différentes chaînes de la télévision française rendent compte régulièrement de l'évolution de la situation de la Grèce. Le film documentaire *Khaos, les visages humains de la crise grecque* réalisé par la Franco-roumaine Ana Dumitrescu est sorti en France en 2012. Ce film auquel a contribué Panagiotis Grigoriou, historien et ethnologue, rend compte de la tragédie qui a frappé depuis 2008 le peuple grec. De nombreux livres sur la crise économique grecque<sup>18</sup> ainsi que les traductions françaises de différents ouvrages de Yanis Varoufakis<sup>19</sup> ont été publiés en France au cours de ces dernières années.

Les partis politiques français ont pris position sur la crise économique de la Grèce. Les formations de gauche se sont prononcées en faveur de Syriza. Yanis Varoufakis est très connu en France. En août 2015, l'ancien ministre des finances grec a été l'invité vedette d'une fête organisée par l'ancien ministre français de l'économie, Arnaud Montebourg. Y. Varoufakis est revenu en France le mois suivant pour assister à la Fête de l'*Humanité*, quotidien du parti communiste français et rencontrer Jean-Luc Mélenchon, fondateur du Front de gauche, une formation d'extrême gauche. Nombre de Grecs de France ont participé aux meetings de soutien au gouvernement grec organisés par les forces de la gauche française.

Force est de constater que les communautés grecques vivant sur le territoire français sont parfaitement intégrées dans leur pays d'accueil. Les mariages mixtes franco-grecs sont aujourd'hui très nombreux. L'obligation imposée autrefois par l'Eglise catholique française à un Grec ou une Grecque de religion orthodoxe d'abjurer sa religion afin d'épouser dans une église catholique une personne de cette religion n'existe plus.<sup>20</sup>

Le manque d'unité des Grecs de France explique la faible réaction de leur part à la décision récente du gouvernement français de réduire la possibilité déjà très limitée pour les élèves des collèges d'apprendre les langues mortes dont le

grec ancien. Jack Lang, l'ancien ministre français de la Culture, un grand ami de la Grèce n'a pas réussi, malgré ses protestations à l'endroit de la ministre de l'Education nationale, Najat Valaud-Belkacem, auteur de cette décision, à faire fléchir les positions de celle-ci. Sans une cohésion des communautés grecques de France les intérêts de la Grèce en Europe et en France sont en danger. Le philhellénisme naturel des Français est en train de s'effiloche, notamment en raison du poids croissant de la communauté turque chez eux.<sup>21</sup> La propagande d'une certaine presse de France qui pousse à exclure la Grèce de la zone euro mais aussi de la Convention de Schengen sur l'ouverture des frontières entre pays européens prouve le désarroi des Français face aux problèmes qui assaillent l'Europe.

L'ignorance par les Français des valeurs auxquelles les Grecs sont attachés depuis l'Antiquité risque d'entraîner le repli de la France sur soi et l'abandon de la poursuite de tout idéal par la nation française.\*\*

## NOTES

\*\* Note de l'Éditeur

Jean Catsiapis est né à Paris en 1945 d'un père grec et d'une mère française. Enseignant en droit et science politique à l'université de Paris X Nanterre a écrit deux livres sur la Grèce (La Grèce dixième membre des communautés européennes Paris 1980, La documentation française, et *Grec express* Paris éditions du Dauphin 2006) et de nombreux articles notamment sur l'hellénisme chypriote. Il a aussi publié un *Guide de la Ve République* (Ellipses, 2004) et le *Guide du Droit Administratif* (Ellipses, 2009). Collaborateur de première heure à la revue académique *Études helléniques/Hellenic Studies* pour laquelle a écrit de nombreux articles sur la Grèce et Chypre. En 1975 il a créé l'Association des Amis de la République de Chypre. Jean Catsiapis reste très attaché à la Grèce et à Chypre, pays dont il est un fin connaisseur.

1. Jean Catsiapis, "Les Grecs de France" in *Études helléniques/Hellenic Studies*, Printemps 1983 p.33-40.
2. En 1676 des Grecs dont les ancêtres s'étaient réfugiés après 1453 dans la région de Maïna en Laconie ont décidé d'émigrer en Corse alors sous la domination de la République de Gênes. Etablis à Paomia les Grecs de Corse se sont déplacés à

- Cargèse, territoire que leur a assigné la France à la fin du 18<sup>ème</sup> siècle, lorsque cet Etat a pris possession de cette île. Parmi la communauté grecque de Corse il y a eu des membres de la grande famille byzantine des Commène dont une jeune fille qui devint la duchesse d'Abrantès, épouse du général Junot et s'est fait connaître en littérature pour ses *Mémoires* dont les deux premiers tomes sont consacrés aux Maînotes et à leur histoire à Cargèse.
3. Aux élections de décembre 2006 à la communauté grecque de Paris il y a eu un fort taux d'abstention avec seulement 660 participants pour cette première communauté en France, qui compte 4 000 familles et 6 400 personnes de plus de 16 ans. En décembre 2014 le taux d'abstention a encore été très élevé puisqu'il n'y a eu que 580 votants, qui ont eu à choisir parmi cinq listes de candidats.
  4. Info-Grèce, *Thomas Efthymiou, Une mémoire grecque de Paris*, 17/11/2009.
  5. Outre ses nombreux livres, dont son fameux *Pourquoi la Grèce ?* (Paris, Ed de Fallois, 1992) Jacqueline de Romilly a accordé de nombreux entretiens, notamment celui intitulé *Thucydide hier et aujourd'hui* publié dans notre Revue (*Etudes helléniques/ Hellenic studies*, automne 1998, p.15 à 19).
  6. *L'Eté grec*, Paris, Plon, 1976. Jacques Lacarrière a aussi publié le *Dictionnaire amoureux de la Grèce*, Paris, Plon, 2001.
  7. Jules Ferry est surtout connu pour ses lois sur la gratuité de l'enseignement primaire (16 juin 1881) et l'obligation et la laïcité de l'enseignement secondaire (28 mars 1882), qu'il a fait adopter par le Parlement français en sa qualité de chef de gouvernement et de ministre de l'Instruction Publique.
  8. Le discours de Nicolas Sarkozy du 6 juin 2008 devant le Parlement hellénique est reproduit dans le dossier spécial «Grèce» de la Revue *Politique Internationale* (n°121, automne 2008).
  9. Selon l'AFP du 9 novembre 2011 N. Sarkozy aurait traité Georges Papandréou de «fou» et de «dépressif» au cours d'une conversation-censée être privée- avec son homologue américain lors du sommet du G-20 à Cannes. Ce Premier ministre grec avait proposé, le 31 octobre 2011, l'organisation d'un referendum sur le plan de sortie de crise établi par l'Eurogroupe. Face à l'hostilité franco-allemande envers ce referendum G. Papandréou est acculé à la démission le 9 novembre suivant.
  10. Marietta Karamanli, *La Grèce victime ou responsable ?* La Tour d' Aigues, Ed. de l'Aube 2013.
  11. Pierre Dharréville, *Michel Vaxès: portrait d'un citoyen en député du peuple*, Paris, Arcane, 2011.
  12. C'est dans le numéro 7 de la revue *Esprit* (juillet 1954) qu'a été publié pour la première fois «Le destin de la Grèce moderne». En 2013 cet ouvrage a été réédité aux Editions Encre Marine.

13. Christine Buci-Glucksmann *La Gauche, le pouvoir, le socialisme: hommage à Nicos Poulantzas*, Paris, PUF, 1983.
14. L'ouvrage fondamental de N. Svoronos est son «Que sais je», *Histoire de la Grèce moderne*, Paris, PUF, 1980, 4<sup>ème</sup> éd.
15. H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer, la marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe- XVe siècles*, Paris, PUF, 1966.
16. Elise Gérard a réalisé en 2005 le film documentaire «Roger Diamantis ou la vraie vie».
17. Voir notre étude sur Sir Basil Zaharoff publiée dans le présent numéro de cette Revue.
18. Parmi les nombreux livres publiés en France sur la crise économique on peut citer: Panagiotis Grigoriou, *La Grèce fantôme: voyage au bout de la crise, 2010-2013*, Paris, Fayard, 2013, sous la direction de Marie-Laure Coulmin Koutsaftis, *Les Grecs contre l'austérité: il était une fois la crise de la dette*, Montreuil, Editions Le Temps des Cerises, 2015.
19. Yanis Varoufakis, *Le minotaure planétaire: l'ogre américain, la désunion européenne et le chaos mondial*, Puteaux, Editions du Cercle 2015.  
*Un autre monde est possible: pour que ma fille croie encore à l'économie*, Paris, Flammarion, 2015.
20. Un exemplaire d'un certificat d'abjuration de la religion orthodoxe est publié dans le livre de Photini Mitrou, *La Roumanie refleurira, Requiem pour un empire volé*, Paris, Copyright Photini Mitrou, 1995.
21. Dans notre article de 1983 sur « Les Grecs de France» (voir supra note n°1) nous avions alors estimé à 150 000 le nombre des Turcs de France. Le 4 octobre 2015 Recep Tayyip Erdogan est venu à Strasbourg pour s'exprimer devant 12 000 Turcs à l'occasion de la campagne pour les élections législatives turques. Différents commentateurs à cette occasion ont évalué à 700 000 le nombre des ressortissants turcs en France.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Constantin Alevras, *Les Volontaires Hellènes en France pendant la guerre franco-allemande en 1870*, Paris, R. Debresse, 1947.

Vassilis Alexakis, *Les Grecs d'aujourd'hui*, Paris, Balland, 1979.

Michel Calopodis, *La Communauté grecque à Marseille-Genèse d'un paradigme identitaire (1793-1914)*, Paris, L' Harmattan, 2010.

Michel Calopodis, *Les Grecs à Marseille: minorité ethnique ou nation en diaspora de France?* Paris, L' Harmattan, 2012.

Marie-Anne Comnène, *Cargèse, une colonie grecque en Corse*, Paris, Belles lettres, 1959.

Pierre Echinard, *Grecs et Philhellènes à Marseille: de la Révolution française à l'indépendance de la Grèce*, Marseille, Institut historique de Provence, 1973.

Annie Maïllis, *Des Grecs en Camargue: un exil entre sel et mer*, Arles, Ed. Odyssees, 2014.

Jean Mathorez, *Les Grecs en France du XVème au XIXème siècle*, in *Revue des Etudes Grecques*, janvier-mars 1916, n°131.

Alexandre Mavridis, *Les Grecs à Grenoble, des pionniers à nos jours: deux siècles de liens historiques avec la France*, Paris, L' Harmattan, 2009.

Konstantinos Pandazoglu dit Constant Pandazopoulos, *Sartroupolis, la Communauté grecque de Sartrouville originaire majoritairement d'Asie mineure*, Istanbul, Ed. Isis, Les Cahiers du Bosphore 2009.

# The Influence Of Greek On Other Languages

George Kanarakis\*

*“The urge to discover secrets is deeply ingrained in human nature”*

John Chadwick

## RÉSUMÉ

L'auteur de cet article se penche sur l'influence de la langue grecque sur les autres langues et note que les linguistes acceptent qu'il n'y a pas de langues en contact qui soient complètement pures et libres des formes et des structures linguistiques transférées. L'influence de la langue grecque et sa contribution à d'autres langues est un phénomène historique et culturel d'intérêt international. Cet article met l'accent sur l'influence linguistique et socioculturelle diachronique de la langue grecque sur 28 autres langues dans le monde, comme l'illustre un travail collectif publié récemment. Les chercheurs ont éclairé nos connaissances sur ce sujet important et contribuent pratiquement à la planification et l'organisation de l'enseignement / apprentissage d'une langue seconde ou étrangère, fournissant un stimulus pour une exploration plus poussée et productive du sujet vital des contacts mondiaux interlangues et interculturels.

## ABSTRACT

Linguists accept that no languages in contact are completely pure and free of transferred language forms and structures. The Greek language's influence and contribution to other languages is a historical-cultural phenomenon of international interest. This paper focuses on the diachronic linguistic and sociocultural influence of the Greek language on 28 other languages of the world as illustrated in the collective work *H διαχρονική συμβολή της Ελληνικής σε άλλες γλώσσες* [The diachronic contribution of Greek to other languages, ed. George Kanarakis, Athens, 1st ed. 2014, 2nd ed. 2015, in Greek]. The 34 studies by 32 noted scholars enlighten our knowledge on this important subject, contribute practically to the planning and organisation of second or foreign language teaching/learning, and provide a stimulus for further productive exploration of the vital subject of global interlanguage-intercultural contact.

\* Charles Sturt University, Australia



Within the multinational, multilingual and multicultural history of Europe, the Greek language, which has been since 1981 one of the official languages of the European Community, equal in rank with the languages of its member countries, constitutes a special case of interest.

According to the general acknowledgement of linguists, Greek is the historically unifying language of the European peoples, distinguished by the oldest written texts (the Knossos tablets in the syllabic writing system known as Linear B, dated to at least approximately 1450 BC) covering a time of about 3,450 years,<sup>1</sup> while according to the celebrated hellenist James Thomas Hooker, “We can hypothesize validly that [Linear B] appeared in a somewhat quite older chronology”.<sup>2</sup>

Apart from the tremendous historical interest which the Greek language presents with its oldest and rich written tradition among the languages of Europe, it also constitutes a case of particular significance because of its steady cohesion and uninterrupted diachronic continuity, due to the high percentage of words used since antiquity until the present day,<sup>3</sup> without ever losing its original Greek character. Regarding the uninterrupted historical continuity and the unbroken cohesion of the Greek language, which has been used since antiquity in the same geographical area by the same people (the Greeks), the linguist Brian D. Joseph states characteristically “[...] Greek is essentially a single language throughout its long history, yet constitutes a separate and distinct branch of Indo-European, though it too has considerable dialect diversity at all points in its history”.<sup>4</sup>

For these reasons, but also for its early and in depth cultivation by celebrated Greek intellectuals of an international and diachronic range for the expression of high modes of thought (philosophy, rhetoric, science, poetry, logic, etc.), the Greek language succeeded in rising to a level of diachronic value, and did not merely develop to a structurally flexible communication medium. Consequently, it became a base of semantic expression (*semantic language*),<sup>5</sup> a steady point of reference and, therefore, a source of continuous direct and indirect contribution to other languages, especially the European ones and through them to other languages even in remote parts of the world. In addition, Greek never lost its vitality nor its plasticity and it never even reached the point of breaking down into daughter languages, as happened, for example with Demotic Latin to the so-called neolatin languages. In fact, the cultural and purely linguistic

prestige which the Greek language acquired even beyond its geographical area, wherever it was spoken as mother tongue (*national language*), is acknowledged indicatively by the linguist Kenneth Katzner in his work *The Languages of the World*: “Greek, the first great language of Western civilization, is considered by many to be the most effective and admirable means of communication ever devised. Its lucidity of structure and concept, together with its seemingly infinite variety and modes of expression, render it equally suitable to the needs of the rigorous thinker and the inspired poet. We can only surmise how classical Greek must have sounded to the ear, but the spoken word was probably no less beautiful than the written”.<sup>6</sup>

So, while the influx of the richness of Greek into Latin, for example, was impressively extensive and diverse, its influence even on other more recent languages, especially to most European ones, has not been insignificant. Compared with some languages it has been diachronic and at the same time deep and multifaceted. In the past Greek words and word stems entered mainly indirectly through Latin, French or other European languages, while in modern times through newly structured words. In the latter case, these newly made words have as a base mainly Greek word stems adopted into every day communication as well as into scholarly and scientific expression, although frequently this escapes our attention or proves difficult to pinpoint in all its extent. This is a process which has been going on for centuries now, especially since the Renaissance (14th-17th centuries) until our times. This is the unceasing capability of Greek as a special case of a language of civilisation to give expression of new knowledge, something which makes it appear always expressive and timely. This is why we are not surprised that various languages, particularly the European ones, as well as European education and science in general, continue to utilize to full advantage both the linguistic and cultural qualities of the Greek language to the extent that specialist scientists and intellectuals in general acknowledge the inventive dynamism of Greek for a deeper understanding of their own language.

A relevant example, among many others, is the opinion of the American lexicographer John C. Smock, who observed “the mastery of a relatively small number of Greek words infuses with significance tens of thousands of English words and [...] these circumstances justify continued emphasis of the importance of the study of Greek in institutions of general culture”.<sup>7</sup>

In more recent years, among other scholars, worth noting are the opinions of the French linguists Jean Bouffartigue and Anne-Marie Delrieu who in the prologue of their book *Trésors de racines grecques* point out characteristically: “In reality what we were interested in more was to reveal how suitable the Greek language is to describe other worlds as well, apart from the one in which it developed” and then, referring to their native language, state that “the understanding of our language, the rediscovery of its essence – this is the usefulness of knowing the Greek word stems. The Greek stems give the French language its deepest support and, at the same time, they provide it with the highest ability for abstraction. Greece is a distant source of our civilisation, and is alive in the words we say. It shapes our language every day”.<sup>8</sup>

This is why, for the above reasons, according to the renowned linguist David Crystal, “Some writers have even begun to talk of ... Eurogreek”.<sup>9</sup>

However, as we very rarely come across absolutely pure civilisations, in the same way rarely do we come across pure languages. According to Ronald W. Langacker, “Living languages never hold still. Every language is the product of change and continues to change as long as it is spoken. (...) In all probability, no language whose speakers have ever had contact with any other language is completely free of borrowed forms”.<sup>10</sup>

The Greek language’s influence and contribution to other languages, especially to those of the peoples of Europe during antiquity and mainly during the Renaissance period (14th to 17th centuries) and through them to other languages of the world, is a historical-cultural phenomenon of particular interest. After all, the Greek language, being a profoundly cultivated and developed language of civilisation has proven a rich source for the linguistic and cultural creative utilization of the human intellect in Europe, a fact reflected in the old adage, “The Greeks have a word for it”.

Of course, until now the Greek language has been studied extensively regarding not only the language elements it has received from other languages but also the elements of the various language levels (phonetic-phonological, graphemic, morpho-syntactic, lexical and semantic) it has lent to other languages. What had been missing, however, was the examination of the diachronic contribution of Greek to the enrichment of the language levels, not of one language or even of a few but of a large number of languages, not only genetically related like most

languages of Europe (belonging to the Indo-European family), but also of those belonging to different language families geographically located on other continents, as well as isolates. A work of this nature and range had not been attempted in the past, although a number of scholars had noted the need, particularly in the present context of globalization. The collective volume entitled *Η διαχρονική συμβολή της Ελληνικής σε άλλες γλώσσες* (The Diachronic Contribution of Greek to Other Languages), published in Athens by Ekdoseis Papazissis in 2014 (2nd edition, rev. and enl., 2015), is a contribution towards helping to fill this gap in Greek language studies in the field of contrastive linguistics and to inform those who are interested in interlanguage contact and influences, and particularly in the Greek language as linguistic and cultural lender, and why today we can speak of it as “Globogreek”.<sup>11</sup>

This extensive volume presents the collaboration of thirty-two scholars from different countries, including Greece. It highlights through thirty-four specialised studies in a scholarly yet quite easily understandable manner the diachronic dimensions of the international phenomenon of interlanguage contact and the influences arising from it, as well as the multi-level impact (direct and/or indirect) of Greek on other languages throughout its history. The impact of Greek on other languages is not only a linguistic phenomenon but also a sociocultural one. Additionally, this work intends to reflect the various ways (similar or different) that these influences have been embodied by other languages and through them into the civilisations of their peoples. It is noteworthy that this volume is based on primary research and investigates the interlanguage and intercultural influences of Greek, relying on relevant documentation, avoiding thoughtless exaggerations which frequently lead to linguistic chauvinisms.

The articles included in this volume go beyond the “expected”, sometimes temporary, influences, and therefore frequently provide important information even for the most established influences of the Greek language.

The languages included are Latin, Italian, French Spanish, Portuguese, Rumanian, English, German, Dutch, Afrikaans, Swedish, Danish, Russian, Polish, Bulgarian, Croatian, Albanian, Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish, Georgian, Hebrew, Arabic, Maltese, Thai, Korean, Japanese and Chinese. Of course, this does not mean that Greek influences are absent from other languages. The range of studies included in this volume provides a quite comprehensive understanding

of the extent of the influences of Greek on other languages ranging across a broad spectrum of the world.

Notably, the advantage of this collective work lies in the following points:

- First, this broad collective work of thirty-four studies, including two introductory articles, contributed by linguists, philologists and other scholars from a variety of countries, contained in one volume presents research into twenty-eight languages from five continents. From this viewpoint, I believe that it fills a relevant gap in the Greek bibliography.
- Second, the knowledge and methodology of the contributors, who share both their expertise and experience, insure an objective, informed approach to the subject matter.
- Third, this volume substantiatively expands the bibliography, available up to this point of the 21st century, related to the diachronic influence of Greek on other languages of the world (although indirectly in some respects) even on languages geographically and culturally beyond Europe.
- Fourth, the twenty-eight languages presented are not limited to the *Indo-European* family but also belong to other language families not genetically related, such as the *Uralic* (Hungarian, Finnish), *Altaic* (Turkish), *Kartvelian* or *South Caucasian* (Georgian), *Afro-Asiatic* (Hebrew, Arabic, Maltese), *Tai-Kadai* (Thai or Siamese), *Sino-Tibetan* (Chinese), also including *isolates* of East Asia, such as Korean and Japanese (according to some linguists Altaic or, according to others, members of a united Japanese-Korean family).
- Fifth, the total number of languages examined are typologically (structurally) extensive and diverse, that is, some belong to the so-called *inflectional* or *synthetic languages*, like most European ones, and those of idiosyncratic structure, such as Hebrew, Arabic and Maltese. Others are *agglutinative* or *agglutinating*, such as Hungarian, Finnish, Turkish, Georgian, Korean and Japanese, while others are *isolating* or *analytic* or *root* languages, such as Thai and Chinese. The diversity of the languages under examination adds to the originality and pioneering nature of this collective volume.
- Sixth, the totality of the studies reveals different approaches to the common subject of the volume, also reflecting each scholar's particular interest and point of view. This characteristic contributes to a more complete understanding of

the multidimensional variety of ways in which Greek has enriched other languages. Some studies with a historical approach reveal the contacts and influences of Greek which spread to languages of ancient times (Latin, and others), while others relate to comparatively more recent ones (French, Italian, Spanish, and others) and some to even more recent (Finnish, Korean, Afrikaans, and others). Correspondingly, some studies are theoretically more linguistic in the manner of examining the subject and explore the influences of Greek on the various previously mentioned language levels where they appear.

It must also be mentioned that some contributions surprise with the types or even the extent of the influences of the Greek language which were unforeseen and which until the publication of this volume had remained unnoticed. This is due to the fact that quite a few of these studies – as several of their writers have confirmed – had not been undertaken until now, such as with Korean, Chinese, Japanese, Afrikaans, and others.

For the above-mentioned reasons, I believe that this publication which presents the conclusions of expert researchers from Greece and other countries, together with the relevant international bibliography accompanying each study, constitutes a significant collective examination of the impact of Greek on other languages. It not only enlightens this important, often problematic subject by broadening our knowledge, but it also contributes practically to the planning and organisation of Greek language teaching and learning as a second or foreign language. Furthermore, to make their studies more comprehensive, many writers have provided introductory information on the identity and even the history of the language under examination.

In conclusion, I believe that this collective work will attract the interest not only of experts in the theoretical and applied linguistic sciences and of educators in second or foreign language teaching and learning, but also of the general readers. Moreover, it authoritatively expands our knowledge in these scholarly fields providing a broader understanding of the extent of the impact that Greek – one of the oldest and most significant languages of civilisation – to the linguistic and cultural enrichment, initially of the languages of Europe and through them of many other languages of the rest of the world.

It is hoped that this publication will become a stimulus for further productive exploration of the vital subject of global interlanguage-intercultural contacts

and interinfluences within the multinational and multicultural reality of our times.

## NOTES

1. Among other sources, see John Chadwick, *The Decipherment of Linear B*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1990, p. 13, 15; John Chadwick, *Linear B and Related Scripts*, London: British Museum Publications, 1987, p. 8; Brian D. Joseph, “The Indo-European Language Family: The Linguistic Evidence”, in *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, ed. A.-F. Christidis, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, p.163.
2. J.T. Hooker, *Εισαγωγή στη Γραμμική Β (Linear B: An Introduction*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1980, transl. Haralambos E. Maravelias), Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis, 1994, p. 53.
3. According to the linguist George Hadzidakis, of the 6,840 words of the Homeric epics 3,385 were used by the Attic writers and 1,165 have survived until today. As well, of the approximately 4,900 words of the New Testament, 2,280 are still used in today’s Standard Modern Greek, while another 2,200 are comprehensible to all Greeks, and only 400 are unintelligible because they are either foreign or they are archaized written words, not of the spoken form of their time (Nicholas G. Contossopoulos, *Γλώσσες και διάλεκτοι της Ευρώπης*, Vol. Α’, Athens: Ekdoseis Grigoris, 1998, p. 59).
4. Joseph, 2001, p. 163.
5. The term “semantic” language indicates that there is primary, that is, causal relation between the word (*signifier*) and its meaning (*signified*), in contrast to the so-called “semiological” languages in which the words (*signifiers*) are conventional and their meanings (*signified*) arbitrary.
6. Kenneth Katzner, *The Languages of the World*, London: Routledge, 2003, p. 98.
7. John C. Smock, *The Greek Element in English Words* (ed. Percy W. Long), New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931, p. xi.
8. Jean Bouffartigue and Anne-Marie Delrieu, *Οι ελληνικές ρίζες στη γαλλική γλώσσα (Trésors des racines grecques*, Paris: Belin, 1981, transl. Amalia Mozer), Athens: Ekdoseis Eleftherotypia, 1993, p. 9.
9. David Crystal, “English as a Classical Language” [<http://www.davidcrystal.com/?fileid=-4042>, accessed: 14/12/13].
10. Ronald W. Langacker, *Language and Its Structure: Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968, p. 176.



11. Indicatively see Usa Korntaptim, “The Influence of Greek on Thai”, in *Η διαχρονική συμβολή της Ελληνικής σε άλλες γλώσσες*, ed. George Kanarakis, Athens: Ekdoseis Papazissis, 2014 (2nd edition, rev. and enl., 2015), p. 629.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bouffartigue, Jean and Anne-Marie Delrieu, *Οι ελληνικές ρίζες στη γαλλική γλώσσα (Trésors des racines grecques*, Paris: Belin, 1981, transl. Amalia Mozer), Athens: Ekdoseis Eleftherotypia, 1993.

Chadwick, John, *The Decipherment of Linear B*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1967<sup>2</sup>.

Chadwick, John, *Linear B and Related Scripts*, London: British Museum Publications, 1987.

Contossopoulos, Nicholas, G., *Γλώσσες και διάλεκτοι της Ευρώπης*, 2 vols, Athens: Ekdoseis Grigoris, 1998.

Crystal, David, “English as a Classical Language” [<http://www.davidcrystal.com/?fileid=-4042>, accessed: 14/12/13].

Hooker, J. T., *Εισαγωγή στη Γραμμική Β (Linear B: An Introduction*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1980, transl. Haralambos E. Maravelias), Athens: Morfotiko Idryma Ethnikis Trapezis, 1994.

Joseph, Brian D., “The Indo-European Language Family: The Linguistic Evidence”, in *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, ed. A.-F. Christidis, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, p. 161-169.

Kanarakis, George, ed., *Η διαχρονική συμβολή της Ελληνικής σε άλλες γλώσσες*, Athens: Ekdoseis Papazissis, 2014 (2nd edition, rev. and enl., 2015).

Katzner, Kenneth, *The Languages of the World*, London: Routledge, 2003.

Korntaptim, Usa, “The Influence of Greek on Thai”, in *Η διαχρονική συμβολή της Ελληνικής σε άλλες γλώσσες*, ed. George Kanarakis, Athens: Ekdoseis Papazissis, 2014 (2nd edition, rev. and enl., 2015), p. 621-630.



Langacker, Ronald W., *Language and Its Structure: Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.

Smock, John C., *The Greek Element in English Words* (ed. Percy W. Long), New York: The MacMillan Company, 1931.

# **Greek-Canadians Write to Prime Minister Venizelos: Two Letters from the Interwar Era**

**Dimitrios Filippou\***

## **RÉSUMÉ**

Deux lettres envoyées par des Grecs de Montréal au Premier Ministre Grec de l'époque Eleftherios Venizelos au début du vingtième siècle expriment leurs inquiétudes sur le maintien de leur identité, leur culture et leur religion et la crainte de l'assimilation.

## **ABSTRACT**

Two letters from Montreal to the then Greek Prime Minister Eleftherios Venizelos in the beginning of the twentieth century express the worries of the early Greek immigrants in Montreal on issues of identity, culture, religion and assimilation.

The years 1900–1939 were a period when the Greek immigrant community started laying foundations in Canada. It was also a period of great upheaval in the history of Greece, with national and political sentiments running very high.

As Greek immigrants were trying to establish themselves in organised communities in North America, the issues of identity, culture, religion, assimilation, etc. were central to their everyday discussions. Two letters which we found in the recently released on-line archives<sup>1</sup> of the then Prime Minister of Greece Eleftherios Venizelos (1864–1936), clearly express such worries.

## **A church Scandal to be Dealt with**

In the first letter written in Montreal on Jan. 29, 1929, George Kalfas,<sup>2</sup> a prominent Greek-Canadian businessman, writes to Venizelos so as to complain about a deposed Greek Orthodox bishop named Vasileios Komvopoulos.<sup>3</sup> Kalfas

\* Radio Centre-Ville, Montréal

accuses Komvopoulos of pretending to have been reinstated and, in this way, to have ordained another 40 priests choosing from “men illiterate, gamblers and committers of unspeakable acts.” Kalfas also dares to accuse the official representatives of Greece in Canada and the USA for being too close to some Greek Orthodox clergy, and for that reason they were not giving to the Government of Greece a clear picture of the situation.

Apparently this was not the first scandal in the Greek community of Montreal involving a priest. Hercules Papamanolis, in his *Greek-Canadian Guide* published in Montreal in 1922,<sup>4</sup> mentions that another priest divided by his actions the Greek community in 1906–1907, embezzled money from several Greek-Canadians, and then ran away taking with him all precious church objects, including the Gospel and the chalice. The priest was eventually captured in Liverpool, UK. He was sent to Canada, and from there he was extradited to Greece.

The answer to Kalfas from the private secretary of Venizelos dated February 28, 1929, says that the Greek Prime Minister read Kalfas’ letter “with interest” and that “he took notes.” We do not know if there were any follow-up actions from the Greek Government, but Komvopoulos was reinstated as Bishop of Drama in 1930, while Venizelos was still Prime Minister of Greece.<sup>5</sup> Another thing is also certain: Such problems inside the Greek-Canadian communities and the Greek Orthodox clergy did not end in 1929. They rather continue to our days.<sup>6</sup>

## **A Self-Appointed Organiser of Greek-Canadian Communities**

The second letter is from Hercules N. Papamanolis,<sup>7</sup> an intellectual, teacher of Greek and journalist, who writes to Venizelos as the “Grand Governor of Canada” (sic) of the Delphic Order of GAPA.<sup>8</sup>

Papamanolis’ lengthy letter is dated April 11, 1931 and it is handwritten in the simple purist Greek (ἀπλή καθαρεύουσα) of that time. Papamanolis first introduces himself by stating that he had already met “His Excellency” (Venizelos) in Paris and he had spoken to him about matters of concern to the Greek-Canadians. He then goes on to say that he is the owner of the only Greek newspaper in Canada, *Hestia*.

After that introduction, Papamanolis explains that the major issue of that time is that a significant number of Greek immigrants across the vast Canadian

territory remained unorganised in communities, i.e., they were without any Greek school or Greek Orthodox parish, with a serious risk of assimilation. To correct the situation, Papamanolis proposes himself to go on a 45-day mission across Canada to set up Greek schools in communities with unorganised Greek immigrants. His only request is that the Greek Government pays him \$700 for his trip expenses. This proposal, he says, was welcome by the Acting Consul of Greece in Montreal,<sup>10</sup> who passed it to the Embassy of Greece in London (which was overseeing the Greek-Canadian diplomatic relations). However, Papamanolis states that, several months after his meeting Consul General of Greece in Montreal, there was no answer from the Embassy of Greece in London. For that reason, he concludes in his letter, he decided to write directly to the Prime Minister of Greece.

The answer to Papamanolis' proposal comes indirectly in another letter from Dimitrios Kaklamanos,<sup>11</sup> the Greek Ambassador in London, dated June 1st, 1931. In his letter, the Ambassador states he never received any request from Papamanolis. And Ambassador Kaklamanos goes on saying that Papamanolis did not have the necessary clout for such a mission, because he had already gone on a similar mission across the United States with almost zero results. In place of Papamanolis, the Ambassador proposes Apostolos Machairas, who had already served as General Consul of Greece in Montreal between 1919 and 1923.<sup>12</sup>

Looking at these letters almost a century later, one may understand that Greek-Canadians were really worried about losing their ethnic and cultural identity, a worry that remains always alive even today. This concern had made some members of the Greek-Canadian community to look at themselves as potential national organisers, leaders and saviors. One such self-appointed national savior was apparently Hercules N. Papamanolis. Judging from his deep involvement in the Greek-Canadian community affairs, probably his intentions were genuine. This does not exclude a possibility that he was also trying to make a meagre living out of patriotic undertakings.

## NOTES

1. For more details about the Venizelos Foundation, see: [www.venizelos-foundation.gr](http://www.venizelos-foundation.gr) (last accessed on Jan. 30, 2016).
2. The “adventurous and daring” George Kalfas (Γεώργιος Α. Κάλφας or Καλφάκης: born in Creta, died in Montreal in 1960) was also involved in the internal politics of the Greeks in Canada. Leading a group of supporters of Venizelos, he founded the “Greek Orthodox Community of Holy Trinity” in Montreal in 1925, because of political differences with the royalist-controlled “Greek Orthodox Community of Montreal.” The two Greek communities of Montreal (the one run by Venizelos’ partisans and the one run by Royalists) reunited in Dec. 1931. For a few more details about him and the two Greek pre-WWII communities in Montreal, see: S. Florakas-Petsalis, *To Build a Dream: The Story of the Early Greek Immigrants in Montreal*, 2nd ed., Montreal 2010, pp. 170–172; T. Ioannou, *La Communauté grecque du Québec*, Institut québécois de la recherche sur la culture, Québec 1983, pp. 24–25; and G.D. Vlassis, *The Greeks of Canada*, 2nd ed., Ottawa 1953, p. 140.
3. Bishop Vasileios Komnopoulos (Βασίλειος Κομβόπουλος: born in Sinope, Ottoman Empire, 1877; died in Drama, Greece, 1941) was a controversial Greek Orthodox cleric. Being a royalist, he clashed with the pro-Venizelos Patriarch of Constantinople Meletios Metaxakis, and in 1922, he left for the United States where a year later he created the splinter “Autocephalous Greek Orthodox Church of America and Canada” («Αὐτοκέφαλος Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐκκλησία Ἦνωμένων Πολιτειῶν καὶ Καναδά»). He was officially deposed in 1924, but he was reinstated by Bishop Damaskinos (later Archbishop and Regent of Greece) in 1930, in a gesture of reconciliation within the Greek Orthodox Church. After his reinstatement, he returned to Greece to become Bishop of Drama. For more details about Bishop Komnopoulos, see: <http://www.imdramas.gr/news/?c=26> (last accessed on Feb. 21, 2016).
4. Η. Ν. Παπαμανώλης, *Περὶληπτικὴ Ἱστορία τοῦ Καναδά καὶ Ἑλληνο-Καναδικὸς Ὅδηγός*, Canadian Greek Publishing Co., Μοντρεάλη 1921–1922, σσ. 140–142.
5. See Note 2.
6. The dispute between the Hellenic Community of Greater Montreal and the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Toronto (Canada), which has a history of more than 30 years now, is probably the most protracted discord in the Greek minority of Canada.
7. Hercules Papamanolis (Ἡρακλῆς Ν. Παπαμανώλης: born in Piraeus, Greece, circa 1875; died in Montreal in 1946). He apparently held a degree in Law from the University of Athens. In 1902–1903, he edited and published in Piraeus two literary collections (φιλολογικὰ λευκώματα) of short stories, essays and poems written by various Greek authors of that time. By 1910, he had immigrated in Montreal, where he briefly held the position of teacher and director of the newly-established Greek School. In 1921–1922, he published a Greek-Canadian *Guide* (see Note 2) and in

1923, he launched the Greek weekly newspaper *Hestia* (*Ἑστία*), which was published until 1958. He probably travelled a few times across the Atlantic. Beyond his trip to Paris to meet Venizelos sometime before 1931, which is mentioned in his letter, his name is found twice in the Ellis Island (NY, USA) registry of immigrants: once in 1933 with “age 54”, and a second time in 1939 with “age 60.” A grave in the Mount Royal Cemetery of Montreal bears the name “Hercules Papamanolis” with a date of death November 15, 1946.

8. GAPA stands for Greek American Progressive Association. It was established in 1923 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as a more nationalist counterpart of AHEPA (American Hellenic Progressive Association). Contrary to the assimilation-oriented AHEPA, GAPA was placing more emphasis on the preservation of the Greek language, and only Orthodox applicants were accepted as members. Several GAPA chapters are still active today in the US, but the organisation is virtually non-existent in Canada.
9. The amount of \$700 was substantial in 1931. To put things into perspective, in 1930, the average annual wage for men was \$931 and for women \$564 (see: A. Rashid, “Seven decades of wage changes.” *StatCan Perspectives*, summer 1993, vol. 5, no. 2, article 1; URL: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/1993002/57-eng.pdf>, last accessed on Feb. 17, 2016).
10. A.V. Seferovitch was the Consul General of Yugoslavia and the Acting Consul of Greece in Montreal in the late 1920s and early 1930s (see: G.D. Vlassis, *The Greeks of Canada*, Ottawa 1942, p. 26).
11. Dimitrios Kaklamanos (Δημήτριος Γ. Κακλαμᾶνος; born in Nafplion, Greece, 1867; died in London, UK, 1949) was a Greek intellectual journalist and career diplomat (see: Π.Γ. Καλλίνικος, *Δημήτριος Κακλαμᾶνος: Ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὸ συγγραφικὸ του ἔργο*, Δόμος, Αθήνα 1994).
12. Apostolos Machairas (Ἀπόστολος Μαχαιρᾶς; born in Lefkada, Greece in 1883; unknown where and when he died) was a Greek career diplomat, and the first salaried General Consul of Greece in Montreal. His presence in Canada was cut short due to budget cuts (see: Γιάννης Κόκκωνας, «Ἡ ἐλληνικὴ διπλωματία στὸν Καναδά», 31 Αυγούστου 2013; URL: <https://coconasblog.wordpress.com/2013/08/31/>, last accessed on Feb. 21, 2016).

## The Transcribed Letters

### *Letter 1*

*From George Kalfas to Eleftherios Venizelos, Prime Minister of Greece*

Mr George Kalfas

Montreal, 28 Ιαν. 1929

Πρὸς τὴν Αὐτοῦ Ἐξοχώτητα  
κ. Ἐλευθέριον Βενιζέλον  
Πρωθυπουργὸν  
Εἰς Ἀθήνας

Κύριε Πρόεδρε,

Ἔχω τὴν τιμὴν νὰ ἀποστείλω Ὑμῖν συνημμένως ᾧδε ἀντίγραφον ἐκθέσεως γεγονότων τῶν ὁποίων ἦρωσ τυγχάνει ὁ καθηρημένος Βασίλειος Κομβόπουλος.<sup>1</sup>

Αἰτία τῆς ἀποστολῆς πρὸς Ὑμᾶς τοῦ ἐν λόγῳ ἐγγράφου εἶναι ἡ διάδοσις ὅτι ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀπεφάσισε νὰ ἄρῃ τὴν καθαίρεσιν καὶ νὰ ἐπαναφέρῃ τὸν Κομβόπουλον εἰς τὸ ἀξίωμα τὸ ὁποῖον κατεῖχεν ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ πρὶν καθαιρεθῆ. Τοῦτου γενομένου, θὰ δημιουργηθῆ μία κατάστασις πραγμάτων μεταξὺ τῆς ἐν Ἀμερικῆς ὁμογενείας καθ' ὅλοκληρίαν ἀθεράπευτος. Καὶ ἐξηγοῦμαι:

Ὁ Βασίλειος Κομβόπουλος μετὰ τὴν καθαίρεσίν του ἐχειροτόνησε 40 ἱερεῖς, ἀνθρώπους ἀγράμματους, χαρτοπαίκτης καὶ ἦρωας ἀκατανομάστων πράξεων, οἱ ὅποιοι ἐπανερχομένου τοῦ Βασιλείου εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῶν κληρικῶν θὰ παραμείνωσι πέτρα σκανδάλων καὶ διαιρέσεων τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τῆς Ἀμερικῆς καὶ τοῦ Καναδά. Διότι, γνωστοῦ ὄντος τοῦ χαρακτηῖρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων, οὐδεὶς φρόνιμος καὶ σεβόμενος ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὴν ἁμωμον θρησκείαν μας θὰ ἀναγνωρίσῃ ὡς ἀντιπροσώπους αὐτῆς. Οἱ λεγόμενοι ἱερεῖς τοῦ Κομβόπουλου ἔχουν τελέσῃ διάφορα μυστήρια ἀνερχόμενα εἰς χιλιάδας ἅτινα βεβαίως εἶναι ἄκυρα, καθότι (2)<sup>2</sup> ἐτελέσθησαν παρὰ λαϊκῶν.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αἱ πράξεις καὶ αἱ ἐνέργειαι τοῦ Κομβόπουλου καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντων προκαλοῦσι τὴν φρίκην καὶ τὸν ἀποτροπιασμόν. Ἐξηγυτέλισαν τὸ ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα εἰς τὰ ὄμματα τῶν ἰθαγενῶν καὶ κατερρείψωσαν τὴν Ὁρθοδοξίαν.

Ἴσως δὲν ἔπρεπε ἐγὼ νὰ προβῶ εἰς τὴν ἀποστολὴν τῆς παρούσης διότι ἀρμόδιοι εἶναι οἱ ἐπίσημοι ἀντιπρόσωποι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Κυβερνήσεως, ἀλλὰ γνωρίζω ὅτι, οὗτοι ὄχι μόνον δὲν ἐξέθεσαν τὴν ἀληθῆ κατάστασιν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν μας πραγμάτων ἐν Ἀμερικῇ καὶ Καναδᾷ, ἀλλὰ, θέσαντες τὰς προσωπικὰς τῶν συμπαθείας ὑπεράνω τῶν κοινῶν συμφερόντων, παρέστησαν εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν Κυβέρνησιν ὅλως διαφορετικὴν τὴν κατάστασιν.

Βεβαίως γεννῶνται τὰ ἐρωτήματα:

- Πρέπει νὰ διαιωνισθῇ ἡ κατάστασις καὶ ποῖα μέτρα πρέπει νὰ ληφθῶσι διὰ τὴν θεραπείαν της;<sup>3</sup>

Ο Κομβόπουλος καταρρέει, οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐλάχιστοι, καὶ ἐὰν διὰ μιᾶς ἐνεργείας τῶν ἐπισήμων ἀντιπροσώπων τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ ἰδίως τοῦ ἐν Οὐασιγκτῶν Πρεσβευτοῦ, διὰ τῆς ὁποίας νὰ ὑπεδεικνύετο ἐντόνως καὶ αὐστηρῶς εἰς τοὺς ἀκολουθούοντας τὸν Κομβόπουλον ὅτι τὰ μυστήρια τὰ τελούμενα παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντων εἶναι ἄκυρα, καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶς καὶ πολιτικῶς, τὸ εὐχάριστον ἀποτέλεσμα θὰ ἐπήρχετο ταχύτερον παρ' ὅσον ἐλπίζεται. Διότι οὐδεμία παρομοία ἐνέργεια ἐγένετο παρὰ τῶν ἀντιπροσώπων τῆς Πατρίδος μας μέχρι σήμερον.<sup>4</sup>

(3) Ἐπίσης θὰ ἦτο συντελεστικὸν εἰς τὴν παγίωσιν τῆς εἰρήνης ἐὰν ἀπεστέλετο διακεκριμένος κληρικὸς καὶ εἰ δυνατόν ἐκ τῶν νέων χωρῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὁ ὁποῖος νὰ περιέλθῃ ὅλας τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς Κοινότητες Ἀμερικῆς καὶ Καναδᾶ καὶ μὲ δύναμιν καὶ σθένος ὑποδείξῃ εἰς τοὺς ὁμογενεῖς τὰς συνεπειὰς καὶ εἰς ποῖον κρημνὸν ὀδηγοῦνται. Εἶμαι βέβαιος ὅτι θὰ ἐπειθε τοὺς καλῆ τῇ πίστει ἀκολουθούοντας τὸν Κομβόπουλον.

Καὶ τέλος ἐὰν δοθῇ –συγχωροχάρτι –<sup>5</sup> εἰς τὸν Κομβόπουλον θὰ προκαλέσῃ κάκιστον προηγούμενον καὶ δὲν θὰ εἶναι δύσκολον, λαμβανομένης ὑπ' ὄψιν τῆς ἐλαστικότητος τῶν νόμων Ἀμερικῆς καὶ Καναδᾶ, νὰ ἀναφανῶσι καὶ ἄλλοι Κομβόπουλοι, εἰς τὸ λίαν προσεχῆς μέλλον.

Πάντως οἰαδήποτε ἐνέργεια ἣτις ἤθελε τεθῆ εἰς ἐφαρμογὴν οἱ χειροτονηθέντες παρὰ τοῦ Κομβόπουλου πρέπει νὰ παύσωσιν ἐπαγγελόμενοι τὸν ἱερέα.

Πεποιθὸς ὅτι ἡ Ὑμετέρα Ἐξοχώτης θὰ κατανοήσῃ ὅτι τὰ ἀνωτέρω εἶναι ἐξωτερίκευσις τοῦ πόνου διὰ τὴν ἐν λόγῳ κατάστασιν, Ἑλληνοῦ οἰκογενειάρχου καὶ Χριστιανοῦ Ὁρθοδόξου.

Διατελῶ μετ' ἀπείρου σεβασμοῦ,

Γ. Α. Κάλφας



**Letter 2**

*From the Private Secretary of Eleftherios Venizelos, Prime Minister of Greece, to George Kalfas*

Ἀθῆναι τῆ 20/2/1929.–

Κύριε Κάλφα,

Ὁ κ. Πρόεδρος τῆς Κυβερνήσεως μοῦ ἀνέθεσε νὰ σᾶς γνωρίσω ὅτι ἀνέγνωσε μετ' ἐνδιαφέροντος τὴν ἀπὸ 28 λήξαντος ἐπιστολὴν σας κρατήσας σημείωσιν τοῦ περιεχομένου της.–

Μετὰ τιμῆς

Ὁ Ἰδιαιτέρος Γραμματεὺς<sup>6</sup>

Κον Γ. Κάλφαν

Montreal, Kanada<sup>7</sup>

**Letter 3**

*From Hercules Papamanolis to Eleftherios Venizelos, Prime Minister of Greece*

Hercules N. Papamanolis

Grand Governor of Canada

Delphic Order of G.A.P.A.

Grand Governor's Office

4395 St. Denis Street

Montreal, Canada 11 Ἀπριλίου 1931

Κύριε Πρόεδρε!

Ἐν γνώσει τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐπιθυμίας ὅπως ἐλευθέρως ἀπευθύνεται πᾶς Ἑλλην πρὸς Ὑμᾶς εἴτε διὰ τὴν ἀπονομὴν δικαίου εἰς αὐτόν, εἴτε ὅπως ἀναπτύξῃ τι

συντελεστικὸν διὰ τὴν γενικὴν πρόοδον, λαμβάνω τὴν τιμὴν νὰ σᾶς ἀπευθύνω τὴν παροῦσαν, ἐν πεποιθήσει ὅτι θέλει τύχη τῆς δεούσης προσοχῆς.

Πρὸ τῆς εἰσόδου μου εἰς τὸ θέμα, ἐπιτραπήτω μοι νὰ ὑπομνήσω τῇ Ὑμετέρα Ἐξοχότητι ὅτι ἔσχον τὴν τιμὴν νὰ σᾶς γνωρίσω ἐν Παρισίοις καὶ νὰ σᾶς ὑποβάλλω – καθ' ἣν ἐντολὴν εἶχον παρὰ τῶ Κοινοτήτων τοῦ Καναδᾶ – τὴν εὐγνωμοσύνην τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τοῦ Καναδᾶ διὰ τὰς ὑπερόχους πρὸς τὸ Ἔθνος ὑπηρεσίας σας, (2) ἔτι δὲ νὰ προσθέσω ὅτι εἶμαι ἰδιοκτῆτης καὶ διακινήτης τῆς μόνης ἐν Καναδᾶ Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐφημερίδος «Ἐστίας», περὶ τῆς δράσεως τῆς ὁποίας θὰ ἠδύνατο νὰ ζητηθοῦν πληροφορίαι παρὰ τῆς Α.Ε. τοῦ ἐν Οὐασινγκτῶνι Ἀντιπροσώπου τῆς Ἑλλάδος, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Σεβ. Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κορινθίας.

Εἰσάγω τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ μου τὸ πράττειν ἀπλῶς καὶ μόνον ἵνα ἡ Ὑμετέρα Ἐξοχότης ἔχει ὑπ' ὄψει τῆς ὅτι λόγῳ τῆς ιδιότητός μου ὡς δημοσιογράφου ἔχω μελετήσῃ τὸ θέμα τὸ ὁποῖο λαμβάνω τὴν τιμὴν ν' ἀναπτύξω.

Ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ τῇ Ἐπικρατεῖα τοῦ Καναδᾶ, εἶνε ἐγκατεστημένοι περὶ τοὺς 8.000 Ἕλληνες. Τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτῶν ἔχουσιν ἐγκατασταθῆ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τοῦ Καναδᾶ, Μοντρεάλῃ,<sup>8</sup> καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν Ontario. Τὸ δ' ἕτερον ἥμισυ (3) εἰς τὰς λοιπὰς Ἐπαρχίας. Κοινότητες λειτουργοῦν τρεῖς: δύο ἐν Μοντρεάλῃ μετὰ δύο ἰδιόκτητων σχολείων, καὶ μία ἐν Τορόντῳ Ont. μετὰ σχολείου.<sup>9</sup> Τὸ Δελφικὸν Τάγμα τῆς Gara διατηρεῖ ἐν τῇ πόλει Quebec σχολεῖον Ἑλληνικόν.<sup>10</sup>

Ἡ Μοντρεάλῃ εἶνε ἔδρα τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Προξενείου, ὑπάρχει δὲ καὶ Ὑποπροξενεῖον ἐν Τορόντῳ. Τὸ ἐν Βανκοῦβερ κατεργήθη.

Ἡ ἀπόστασις ἀπὸ Μοντρεάλῃς μέχρι Βανκοῦβερ εἶνε σιδηροδρομικῶς περὶ τὰ πέντε ἡμερονύχτια, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐπαρχίας Ontario ὁμογενεῖς μέχρι Βανκοῦβερ οὐδέποτε εἶδον Ἕλληνα Πρόξενον, οὐδέποτε ἤκουσαν μίαν πατριωτικὴν ὁμιλίαν, καὶ ὅπου συνέβη νὰ μὴν εὐρίσκονται πλησίον τῶν πόλεων εἰς τὰς ὁποίας διαμένουσι Ἑλληνικαὶ παροικίαι τῆς Ἀμερικῆς ἠναγκάσθησαν οἱ ὁμογενεῖς (4) νὰ τελοῦν τὰ μυστήριά των εἰς τὰς Ἀγγλικανικὰς Ἐκκλησίας. Τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα εἶνε τὰ Ἑλληνόπουλα τὰ πέραν τοῦ κύκλου τῶν Ἐπαρχιῶν Quebec καὶ Ontario ἀγνωοῦσι τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν, καὶ εἶνε ἐλάχισται οἱ οἰκογένειαι ἐκεῖναι αἱ ὁποῖαι ἐμερίμνησαν νὰ δώσουν Ἑλληνικὴν τινα μόρφωσιν εἰς τὰ τέκνα των.

Ὅπως καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀμερικῇ Ἑλληνισμός, οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἐν Καναδᾷ τοιοῦτος διακρίνεται διὰ τὴν φιλοπατρίαν του, πλὴν οἱ εἰς τὸ ἐσωτερικὸν τοῦ Καναδᾶ ὁμογενεῖς παραμεληθέντες παρημέλησαν νὰ ὀργανωθοῦν εἰς Κοινότητας.

Τελευταίως καὶ αἱ δύο ὀργανώσεις Gara καὶ Ahera ἴδρυσαν τμήματα εἰς τὸ ἐσωτερικὸν τοῦ Καναδά, ὅπου ἀπεδείχθη ὅτι χρειάζεται κάποια ἐπίσημος ἐνέργεια πρὸς διοργάνωσιν τῶν ἄνευ Κοινοτήτων Ἑλληνικῶν παροικιῶν τοῦ (5) ἄχανοῦς Καναδά.

Κατανοῶν τελείως ὅτι μόνον μία ἐπίσκεψις ἀνθρώπου περιβεβλημένου κάποιαν ιδιότητα εἰς ἐιδικὴν ἀποστολὴν θὰ ἐδύνατο νὰ ρυθμίση τὴν κατάστασιν, νὰ ἐμψυχώση, νὰ ἐνθαρρύνῃ καὶ νὰ ὀργανώσῃ τὸν Ἑλληνισμὸν ἐπισκέφθη πρὸ μηνὸς τὸν ἐν Μοντρεάλῃ ἀναπληρωτὴν Γενικοῦ Προξένου κ. Ζεφέροβιτς καὶ τοῦ εἶπα ὅτι θὰ ἦτο καλὸν νὰ ταξιδεύσῃ, ὑπὸ τὴν ιδιότητά του ὡς Προξένου, ἀπὸ μιᾶς Ἑλληνικῆς παροικίας εἰς ἄλλην καὶ νὰ προβῇ τουλάχιστον εἰς τὴν δημιουργίαν σχολείων, δεδομένου ὅτι ὑπάρχουν πέντε κέντρα ὅπου κάλλιστα δύνανται νὰ διαβρεθῶσι τοιαῦτα. Ὁ κ. Πρόξενος εὗρεν ὀρθὴν τὴν ιδέαν μου, δηλώσας μοι δ' ὅτι δὲν ἔχη τὸν καιρὸν διὰ νὰ ἐπιχειρήσῃ τὸ ταξείδιον αὐτό, με ἐρώτησεν ἐὰν ἐδυνάμην ἐγὼ (6) νὰ τ' ἀναλάβω ὑπὸ τίτλου ἐιδικῆς Προξενικῆς ἀποστολῆς, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐρωτήσει του δὲ τίνας ἀξιώσεις εἶχα διὰ ταξείδιον τὸ ὅποιον θ' ἀπῆτει ἐν ὄλῳ 45 ἡμερῶν ἀπουσίαν ἐκ Μοντρεάλῃς, τῷ εἶπον ὅτι προκειμένου διὰ τοιοῦτον ἔργον δὲν θέλω ἢ μόνον τὰ ἐξοδά μου, ἦτοι ὑπολογίσαμεν ὅτι τὰ σιδηροδρομικὰ καὶ λοιπὰ ἐξοδα θ' ἀνέρχοντο εἰς \$700. Ὁ κ. Πρόξενος με εὐχαρίστησεν καὶ μοι ἐδήλωσεν ὅτι θὰ γράψῃ περὶ τούτου ἔκτενῶς εἰς τὴν Πρεσβείαν Λονδίνου. Παρῆλθον ἄρκετοὶ μῆνες, καὶ ὡς μοι ἀνακοίνωσε δὲν ἔτυχε ἀπαντήσεως ἐπὶ τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου.

Αἰσθανόμενος ὅτι δύναμαι νὰ φανῶ χρήσιμος τῇ Πατρίδι ἐπὶ τοῦ ζητήματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ πιστεύων ὅτι ἀποτελεῖ ἀδίκημα νὰ μείνῃ ἀναδιοργάνωτον μέγα τμῆμα τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τοῦ Καναδά, ἀπεφάσισα (7) ν' ἀποτανθῶ πρὸς Ὑμᾶς, καὶ νὰ θέσω ὑπὸ τὴν κρίσιν σας τὴν ιδέαν μου. Δὲν ὠθοῦμαι ἀπὸ φιλοδοξίαν, ἀλλὰ νοιώθω μέσα μου ὅτι δύναμαι νὰ φέρω εἰς πέρας μίαν τοιαύτην ἐντολήν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτον ἔλαβον τὸ θάρρος νὰ γράψω πρὸς τὴν Ὑμετέραν Ἐξοχότητα.

Διατελῶ μετὰ βαθυτάτου σεβασμοῦ

Ἦρ. Παπαμανώλης

**Letter 4**

*From Dimitrios Kaklamanos, Ambassador of Greece in London, UK, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece*

No. 1531/Π/31

ΛΟΝΔΙΝΟΝ ΤΗ 1ην<sup>11</sup> Ιουνίου 1931

Πρὸς τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἐξωτερικῶν Ὑπουργεῖον  
Τμῆμα Β'. Πολιτικόν.

Ἀπαντῶν εἰς τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑπ' ἀριθμ. 6514 ἔγγραφον τῆς 13ης Μαΐου, λαμβάνω τὴν τιμὴν νὰ ἀνακοινώσω ὑμῖν, ὅτι, κατὰ τὴν γνώμην μου, ἡ πρότασις τοῦ δημοσιογράφου κ. Παπαμανώλη, ὅπως περιηγηθῆ τὸν Καναδᾶν, πρὸς ὀργάνωσιν Ἑλληνικῶν Κοινοτήτων κτλ. δὲν μοῦ φαίνεται πρακτικὴ, οὔτε δύναται νὰ καταλήξῃ εἰς οἰονδήποτε ἀποτέλεσμα, διότι οὗτος δὲν ἔχει τὸ διὰ τοιαύτην ἐργασίαν ἀπαιτούμενον κῦρος. Ὁ κ. Παπαμανώλης, ἄλλως τε, καὶ πρὸ τριετίας ἐπεχείρησε τοιαύτην περιοδείαν, κατ' ἐντολὴν καὶ διὰ δαπάνης τῆς ἐν Οὐσιγκτῶν Ἑλληνικῆς Πρεσβείας, χωρὶς ἡ περιοδεία του ἐκείνη νὰ καταλήξῃ εἰς τίποτε τὸ χρήσιμον ἢ πρακτικόν.

Τὸ ἔργο διοργανώσεως τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Κοινοτήτων εἰς τὸν Καναδᾶν ἐφ' ὅσον ἐννοεῖται θὰ ὑπῆρχον καὶ τὰ πρὸς ὀργάνωσιν τοιοῦτων κοινοτήτων στοιχεῖα, θὰ ἠδύνατο ν' ἀναληφθῆ ὑπὸ ἐμμίσθου ὑπαλλήλου τῆς Προξενικῆς ἡμῶν ὑπηρεσίας, ὡς τοιοῦτον δὲ συνίστων τὸν Γενικὸν Πρόξενον κ. Μαχαιρᾶν, ὅστις καὶ ἄλλοτε ἐπεσκέφθη, με εἰδικὴν ἀποστολὴν, τὸν Καναδᾶν, καὶ ἐὰν ἡ Κυβέρνησις ἐνόμιζεν ὅτι ἐνδε[ι]κνύεται ὀργανωτικ[ή] τις ἐνέργεια ἐκεῖ, εἶμαι βέβαιος ὅτι ὁ κ. Μαχαιρᾶς θὰ ἐξεπλήρου τὴν ἀποστολὴν του ἐπιτυχῶς.

Ἐ[ξ] ἄλλου, ὁ κ. Σεφέροβιτς<sup>12</sup> οὐδέποτε μοῦ διαβίβασε τὴν ἀναφερομένην ὑπὸ τοῦ κ. Παπαμανώλη αἴτησιν περὶ τοιαύτης περιοδείας· αὐτὸς δὲ εἶνε ὁ λόγος δι' ὃν καὶ δὲν ἔλαβεν ἀπάντησιν ἐπὶ τῆς προτάσεώς του ὁ κ. Παπαμανώλης.

Ὁ Πρεσβευτῆς  
Δ. Κακλαμᾶνος

### NOTES ON THE TRANSCRIBED LETTERS

1. A handwritten note on the letter states: “<Also newspaper clips>.”
2. Numbers in bold parentheses indicate the page number of the original manuscript.
3. The author says that there are several questions, but he puts forth only one.
4. This is a direct accusation that the Greek diplomats in Canada and the USA were too close to some clergy circles.
5. The long dashes are present in the typewritten letter. It is likely that the author wanted to use quotes for the word *συγχωροχάρτι*, which sounds as not part of the Greek purist (*καθαρεύουσα*) vocabulary. (Yet, this word is perfectly Greek.)
6. There is no signature in this note by the Private Secretary of Venizelos.
7. In the original, the word Canada is misspelled with a K instead of C.
8. According to the 1915 Census data included in Papamanolis’ Greek-Canadian *Guide* of 1921–1922, Montreal was then the biggest Canadian city with a population of 617,000 (not including the suburbs). Toronto was second with a population of 534,000. By 1931, the two cities were almost equal in population, and later Toronto overpassed Montreal.
9. Montreal and Toronto are today the only two Canadian cities where daily Greek schools are operating. Particularly in Montreal, there is a network of six kindergarten and elementary Greek schools with over 1,200 pupils.
10. The Greek school in Quebec City was opened in 1930, but closed in 1938, because it did not have enough students (see: S. Constantinides, *Les Grecs du Québec*, Éditions O Metoikos – Le Métèque, Montréal 1983, pp. 74–76).
11. Mistakenly written in the original letter. It should have been written as 1η.
12. Mistakenly written in the original letter. It should have been written as Ζεφερόβιτς (Zeferovitch).

# Les notions de la continuité et de rupture dans le post-modernisme chypriote: Aspects de l'antiquité dans l'œuvre poétique de Kyriakos Haralambidis

Louiza Christodoulidou\*

## ABSTRACT

While touching upon some examples of the postmodernist use of myth and ancient history, we study the presence and use of ancient art and archeology, as part of the quest for preservation of the roots, especially in the poems of Haralambidis that are written after the 1974 Turkish invasion.

We observe that the museum objects, archaeological sites and ruins of ancient Greece function very much as catalysts to enable the poet to suggest boldly, through the permanence but also of renewal, the following profession of faith: "I'm not Greek, I am Hellenic (ελληνικός), according to the liberator formula of Cavafy.

## RÉSUMÉ

Tout en nous attardant à quelques exemples de l'utilisation post-moderniste du mythe et de l'histoire ancienne, nous étudions la présence et l'usage de l'art antique et de l'archéologie, comme éléments de la quête/préservation des racines, plus particulièrement dans les poèmes de Haralambidis qui sont écrits après l'invasion turque de 1974.

On constate que les objets muséaux, les sites archéologiques et les ruines de l'antiquité grecque fonctionnent comme autant de catalyseurs pour permettre au poète de suggérer de façon audacieuse, au travers de la permanence mais aussi du renouveau, la profession de foi suivante: «Je ne suis pas grec, je suis helléni(sti)que» (ελληνικός) selon la formule «libératrice» de Cavafy.

\* Université d'Égée

Les pérégrinations poétiques de Kyriakos Haralambidis, que ce soit sur des sites archéologiques (de la préhistoire jusqu'à l'époque byzantine) où se révèlent l'identité et la permanence du paysage, ou dans des musées où surgissent les objets muséaux, de «facture» grecque, sont nées de la connaissance de l'Antiquité que détient le poète et qui fait partie de son patrimoine personnel (il a étudié l'Histoire et l'Archéologie à l'Université d'Athènes). À travers son long et passionnant périple, se dessine peu à peu la complexité de la relation entre le moi lyrique ou narratif du poète, son pays natal et l'Antiquité grecque qui ont été assimilés et retranscrits dans sa poésie comme un «pécule de matière poétique».

Les univers classique, homérique, hellénistique, gréco-romain, byzantin traversent sa poésie et cheminent ensemble dans une osmose culturelle, puisque Haralambidis n'hésite pas, au gré d'anachronismes, à intégrer des rituels antiques dans des mondes byzantins, comme, par exemple, dans le poème: «Séridos et Lysimaque» (*Épreuve*, 2000, 69-71). De ce fait, l'élargissement que marque Chypre, en tant que lieu grec, englobe aussi Byzance, la culture byzantine prenant le relais de l'Antiquité. Animé d'un zèle d'historien, le poète reconstitue donc, «par l'imagination et le verbe» les diverses strates historiques, dans une minutieuse exploration des racines grecques. Ainsi, dans le poème intitulé «Relais», le poète chypriote clôt hermétiquement la bouche:

«De ceux qui ne possèdent pas d'histoire  
Et ne doivent rien à la géographie.»  
(«Relais», *Famagouste régnante*)

«Αυτών που δεν κατέχουνε ιστορία  
και δεν εξαργυρώνουν γεωγραφία.»  
(«Σκυτάλη», *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*)

Toutefois, Chypre byzantine ne nous occupera pas dans la présente étude.

En nous attachant à quelques exemples de l'utilisation post-moderniste du mythe et de l'histoire ancienne, nous tenterons tout d'abord de montrer que le poète voit dans la notion de la grécité, puis dans la présence de l'art antique et de l'archéologie (deux thèmes qui apparaissent dès ses premiers poème) et dans

l'usage qui en est fait, les éléments d'une continuité et d'une revendication des racines grecques, et cela vaut aussi bien pour les pièces écrites avant qu'après la «funeste» année 1974.

Vu l'importance du corpus des poèmes en rapport avec le thème que j'ai choisi de traiter, je serai contrainte de me limiter à un petit nombre d'échantillons. Quelques titres en tant que tels sont révélateurs, qu'il s'agisse aussi bien de ceux des recueils, *Le vase aux figures* [*To αγγείο με τα σχήματα*], *Rivage des Achéens* [*Αχαιών Ακτή*], que de certains poèmes: «Statue d'Antinoos» [«Άγαλμ' Αντινόου»], «Vase de style libre» [«Αγγείο ελεύθερου ρυθμού»], «Statue acéphale» [«Ακέφαλο άγαλμα»], «Acropole» [«Ακρόπολη»], «Chevaux d'une tombe à vouïte» [«Άλογα θολωτού τάφου»], «Inscription votive dans le rempart oriental» [«Αναθηματικό στο νότιο τείχος»], «Archaïque» [«Αρχαϊκό»], «Jour de naissance d'un cheval» [«Γενέθλιο ίππου»], «Exploration de Salamine» [«Εξερεύνηση Σαλαμίνας»], «Leçon d'archéologie» [«Μάθημα αρχαιολογίας»], «Devant le temple» [«Μπροστά στο ναό»], «Visage d'idole» [«Ειδώλου πρόσωπο»], «Le Kouros de Milos» [«Ο Κούρος της Μήλου»], «Aphrodite au trône multicolore» [«Ποικιλόθρονη Αφροδίτη»], «Sarcophage» [«Σαρκοφάγος»], «Les idoles» [«Τα ειδώλια»], «Le char» [«Το άρμα»], «Phiale d'une statue d'airain» [«Φιάλη αγάλματος χαλκού»], qui, avec «N'oublie pas qu'ils sont grecs» [«Μην το ξεχνάς πως Έλληνες είναι αυτοί»] et «Nationalité» [«Ιθαγένεια»]; on constate que les titres et le contenu des poèmes ont un effet catalyseur, permettant au poète de suggérer avec audace, au travers de la permanence mais aussi du renouveau, du fait de sa facture postmoderniste, l'aphorisme cavafien: «J'appartiens à la race grecque», encore que dans un essai inspiré, sur le poème «Visite à Aigialoussa» [«Αιγιαλούσης επίσκεψις»], il souligne: «Je ne suis pas hellène, je suis hellénique» [«Δεν είμαι Έλλην, είμαι ελληνικός»], reprenant la formule «libératrice» du même Cavafy.

Haralambidis est, bien entendu, à la fois hellène et hellénique, de la race grecque, puisqu'il appartient à l'Hellénisme périphérique. Du reste, son œuvre elle-même en témoigne avec des éléments irréfutables. Ce qu'il suggère, c'est qu'il appartient dans le même temps à l'Hellénisme œcuménique. Il appréhende la grécité, exactement au sens où l'entendaient Engonopoulos, Cavafy, Séféris ou Sikélianos, partageant leur vision de son élargissement, de son extension et de sa diachronie, se ralliant à leur philosophie et à leur vision du monde. Son sentiment d'appartenance à la race grecque est historique et il l'exprime, en



voyageur extrêmement cultivé qu'il est, dans ses pérégrinations poétiques cycliques, mentales ou réelles, dans ses expéditions historiques et archéologiques, qui balisent la patrie comme un palimpseste archétypal. Il est ainsi conduit de la notion d'appartenance à un hellénisme périphérique à celle d'une appartenance à la diachronie de l'Hellénisme universel. Il parvient, à la faveur d'une promenade culturelle, cartographiée avec une réelle érudition historique, à fixer sur le papier, parallèlement à sa brillante œuvre d'essayiste, la conception qu'il a de sa patrie propre, l'autre Grèce, située en dehors du territoire grec. Il est convaincu que Chypre, autre pays grec, élargit à l'infini la notion de la Grèce et de la grecité; en fait, elle constitue un «élargissement» de la Grèce car elle réunit à jamais ces matériaux qui déterminent l'essence de la nation. À Chypre, survivent les éléments vivifiants de l'Hellénisme puisqu'il s'y trouve un noyau de culture grecque, d'une texture différente, dont émanent, dans sa simplicité, grâce et sentiment; ce que Seféris, lui aussi, avait bien compris:

«cette île m'a donné ce qu'elle avait à me donner dans un cadre suffisamment limité pour que tout sentiment ne parte pas en fumée, comme dans les capitales du vaste monde.»<sup>1</sup>

La critique a déjà commenté le fait que «la quête d'une 'autre Grèce' l'avait occupé dès l'époque d'Ulysse et la première présentation de *Terre éolienne* (*Jours*, III, 33). De ce point de vue, Chypre se transmue en modèle d'une patrie idéale, qui peut être considérée comme une autre terre éolienne.»<sup>2</sup>

Haralambidis n'est pas en quête de son identité hellène; celle-ci est donnée d'avance. Son origine grecque est énoncée quatre fois par les termes: «phytra/genos» [germe/race] («N'oublie pas que ceux-ci sont des Grecs»), «phylī» [race] («Nationalité»), «gennitika» [le caractère génétique] («Par alliance»). Des mots, formés sur la racine –hellin [de la même famille ou dérivés, comme Hellinas/es [Hellène(s)], («hellinikos/a/o») [hellénique et «hellinoprepis» [propre aux Grecs] présentent, dans un écrit resté à l'état de brouillon, d'une à huit significations différentes.

À travers les échanges intertextuels que le poète chypriote entretient avec ses congénères, Takis Papatsonis et Georges Seféris, dans le poème: «N'oublie que ce sont des Grecs», et avec pour guides des vers de Dante<sup>3</sup> et de Papatsonis,<sup>4</sup> un peu avant 1974, il écrit:

«Fiers et arrogants, conscients de leur valeur,  
Ulysse et les quelques compagnons restés se mirent en route  
pour franchir “l’étroit chenal, qu’Héraclès avait posé  
comme frontière à l’homme”. Ils voulurent ainsi  
aller au-delà de la traduction du soupçon  
et voir de leurs yeux le mouvement inconnu,  
n’oubliant pas leur race, ni que leur destinée était  
la bravoure et la connaissance – l’audace de percer le détroit.  
Ainsi furent-ils engloutis un peu avant d’apprendre.

Mais moi je viendrai avec de fidèles compagnons  
devant l’Atlantique où ces hommes ont disparu,  
Grecs de race, car moi aussi je suis grec  
et ne souffre plus qu’ils soient plus longtemps engloutis.»

«Περήφανοι και αλαζόνες, με συνείδηση της αξίας τους,  
ξεκίνησαν οι Οδυσσέας και λίγοι απομένοντες σύντροφοι  
για να διαβούνε “το στενό κανάλι, που ο Ηρακλής  
έθεσε σύνορο στον άνθρωπο”. Θέλησαν έτσι  
ν’ αντιπεράσουν τη μετάφραση της υπόνοιας  
και να δουν με τα μάτια τους την άγνωστη κίνηση,  
μη λησμονώντας τη φύτρα τους, ότι μοίρα τους ήταν  
η ανδρεία και η γνώση – η τόλμη για τη διάνοιξη του στενού.  
Έτσι καταποντίστηκαν λίγο πριν μάθουν.

Μα εγώ θα έρθω μαζί με πιστούς συντρόφους  
προς τον Ατλαντικό που χαθήκανε οι άντρες εκείνοι,  
Έλληνες το γένος, γιατί κι εγώ Έλληνας είμαι  
και δεν αντέχω να είναι βουλιαγμένοι άλλο πια»,

ayant bien sûr à l’esprit les notes du Journal de Séfëris:

Samedi, 22 août 1936: À mesure que le temps et les événements avancent, je vis avec le sentiment de plus en plus intense que nous ne sommes pas en Grèce, que cette construction que tant de gens importants et divers représentent chaque jour n'est pas notre pays mais un cauchemar, aux rares trouées lumineuses, pleines d'une très lourde nostalgie. Rien n'est plus amer que d'avoir la nostalgie de son pays, quand on vit dans son pays. [...] Les grands nageurs, qui ont lutté, aussi longtemps que leurs bras l'enduraient, pour atteindre et voir de plus près cette cruelle île d'Éole, l'autre Grèce. [Tous ont sombré...].<sup>5</sup>

Dans le poème: «Nationalité» (*Le vase aux figures*), écrit «en mémoire du premier Grec» qui a doté Chypre de sa caractéristique fondamentale de terre grecque, Haralambidis confesse que, même

«Si notre race est un “mélange de peuples”,  
aux goûts hideux, aux manières terribles,  
comme le tranchant de l'épée, une chaise près de s'écrouler  
malgré les mots que nous assènent des peuples blonds,  
nous survivons comme Grecs, tels des imposteurs».

«Κι αν η φυλή μας είναι “μείγμα λαών”,  
μ' άσκημα γούστα, τρόπους τρομερούς,  
σαν κόψη του σπαθιού, καρέκλα ετοιμόρροπη,  
μ' όσα κι αν καταπάνω μας λένε ξανθοί λαοί,  
επιζούμε ως Έλληνες, ως θαυματοποιοί».

Rappelons, entre parenthèses, qu'«avec la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. arrivent à Chypre les premiers commerçants mycéniens. La colonisation se poursuit et fut achevée au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle avec la descente mythique des héros de la guerre de Troie qui fondèrent les dix royaumes chypriotes». <sup>6</sup> L'institution du royaume chypriote a une origine mycénienne.

Dans sa poésie, le poète chypriote brandit la notion de la race dans ce qu'elle a de plus profond. Aussi la notion de nationalité a-t-elle un caractère spirituel profond et intense. Il soulignera:

«Voilà pourquoi je n'ai pas peur de dire "je suis Grec»,  
Si tout soudain le cyprès a de belles branches  
Et si là-bas la colonne mûrit au soleil».  
(«Nationalité», *Le vase aux figures*)

«Για τούτο δε φοβάμαι να ειπώ "είμαι Έλληνας»,  
εάν αίφνης η κυπάρισσος έχη κλαδία καλά  
κι ωριμάζει παρέκει στον ήλιο η κολώνα».  
(«Ιθαγένεια», *Το αγγείο με τα σχήματα*)

L'écho de vers<sup>7</sup> de l'ode de Calvos: «Au bataillon sacré» est ici manifeste.

Mais après 1974 également, s'adressant directement à Famagouste occupée, qu'il a métamorphosée en femme-amante, il lui assurera:

«Ma belle, prends patience et je te réunirai.  
Tu ne vois pas que je lutte de toute la force de ma foi  
dans cette source génétique que je ne modifierai  
pour rien dans ce monde ni dans aucun autre?»  
(«Jeu magique», *Famagouste régnante*)

«Κορίτσι κάνε υπομονή και θα σε συναθροίσω.  
Δε βλέπεις που αγωνίζομαι με ομόλογο την πίστη  
σε κείνα τα γεννητικά που δεν τα μεταλλάζω  
με τίποτα στον κόσμο αυτό και σ' όποιον άλλο κόσμο;»  
(«Μαγικό παιχνίδι», *Αιμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*)

car

«Cette semence, dit-on, derrière la montagne  
dans le tunnel où nous voyons les courbes de sa voix  
tombera ici et là parce qu'elle est grecque.  
Et elle lèvera pareillement comme je l'ai dit déjà.

Et se disséminera dans la rivière  
qui emporte le fruit, un corps, vers le réceptacle marin.»  
(«Par alliance», *Famagouste régnante*)

«Αυτός ο σπόρος, λέει πίσω από το βουνό  
μες απ' τη σήραγγα που βλέπουμε τα νότα της  
φωνής του,  
θα πέσει εδώ κι εκεί γιατί 'ναι ελληνικός.  
Και θα φυτρώσει ανάλογα καθώς προείπα.  
Και θα διασπαρεί μες στο ποτάμι  
που φέρνει τον καρπό ένα σώμα προς τον αποδέκτη.  
(«Εξ αγχιστείας», *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*)

L'allusion à la «race élue» est claire. Souvent, il tire fierté des «exploits des ancêtres» («Soumission», *Famagouste régnante*). Nulle trace ici pourtant de chauvinisme fanatique. Aucun symptôme pathologique. Lui-même admoneste:

«Pas d'ordres ni de cris.»  
(*Leçon d'archéologie, Famagouste régnante*).

«Όχι καπετανάτα και κραυγές»  
(*Μάθημα Αρχαιολογίας, Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*).

Parallèlement, il précise que d'une part certes,

«la poésie dans les eaux de Chypre s'écrit avec le sang du cœur,  
la source des inspirations exprime le combat de l'Hellénisme et  
c'est capital; nous foulions la plaie. Cela donne, au-delà de  
l'esthétique, une autre dimension à l'œuvre qui voit le jour. Mais  
il faudra aussi la préserver des contrefaçons occasionnelles.»<sup>8</sup>

Le but qu'il poursuit, en tant que Grec de la périphérie, c'est de montrer Chypre comme une partie authentique de l'Hellénisme qui a reçu et fait fructifier au centuple les bienfaits civilisateurs de sa génitrice. Son attitude procède de la

conscience de l'homme dont la patrie, à moitié occupée, risque de perdre son identité. Chacun peut constater que l'Hellénisme à Chypre, telle une peau de chagrin, se rétrécit dangereusement et que le rapport démographique entre habitants légitimes et colons turcs sera bientôt totalement déséquilibré, au détriment de l'élément grec.

Ses poèmes, très proches de la conception antique des choses (du fait de son commerce avec Homère, les lyriques anciens et Eschyle), pourraient être signés de la main d'un poète lyrique antique qui aurait survécu de nos jours. Lui-même avoue fonctionner comme un Bacchylide ou une Sapho emmurés dans l'aujourd'hui. Autrement dit, à la façon du poète lyrique de l'Antiquité qui parle sur un mode lyrique de problèmes grecs. Si Sapho vivait aujourd'hui, son puissant souffle lyrique se muerait en un mode d'expression moderne identique à celui de Haralambidis, par exemple.

Dans l'ensemble de l'œuvre que nous a livrée à ce jour le poète chypriote, on peut déceler des cycles successifs qui font apparaître le poète-lecteur. Il se veut en toute clarté simplement un authentique épigone – nous y avons déjà fait allusion – de la «poésie déjà consacrée», tant de Cavafy que de Seféris, deux poètes qui eux aussi ont noué un dialogue inventif et créatif avec le monde grec antique.

Souvent, le poète chypriote nous suggère des jalons, tantôt ouvertement, tantôt de façon cryptée, en nous offrant avec prodigalité des clés pour mieux comprendre sa poésie car «s'il est des parties visibles, d'autres sont cachées» (Solomos). Nombre de poèmes comportent en exergue une inscription, une maxime, un vers homérique, un passage/une citation, un alinéa – réminiscence des tragiques anciens, une information – un document, une coupure de journal, qui indiquent quel a été le point de départ du poème; ailleurs, à l'instar de Seféris, le poète insère des notes explicatives dans les dernières pages de ses recueils.

La nationalité du pays et du paysage se révèle dans des vestiges épars de la civilisation grecque antique de Chypre, qui s'avèrent de précieux outils poétiques: statues, vases de style libre, groupes de statues d'albâtre, de marbre ou de bronze, chevaux d'une tombe à voûte, amphores, chars, boucliers, idoles, vases inscrits, stèles funéraires, théâtres antiques, offrandes funéraires, tombes maçonnées, Kouroi, monolithes cyclopéens, cruches, lécythes, lampes à huile,

nécropoles, monnaies, sanctuaires païens d'époque mycénienne, palestres, cornes en *poros*, sarcophages, autels funéraires, chaudrons en bronze, mosaïques, hydries. Autant de trésors qui, réunis, constituent le matériel poétique de Haralambidis, et qui sont érigés en symboles et en mythes car le poids de la «patrie perdue» est impossible à soulever.

Des trouvailles archéologiques se trouvent, éparses, à travers tout l'hinterland chypriote:

«La solution se trouve sur la plage en bas  
dans les bustes des statues protégés par les dieux.»  
(«Leçon d'archéologie», *Famagouste régnante*),

«Η λύση βρίσκεται στην αμμουδιά από κάτω  
σε θεοσκέπαστους κορμούς των αγαλμάτων.»  
(«Μάθημα αρχαιολογίας», *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*),

dans le musée chypriote:

«et j'ai passé un anneau à leur bec farouche»  
(«Au Très Haut», *Famagouste régnante*)

«και πέρασα δακτύλιο στ' αγέρωχό τους ράμφος»  
(«Υψίστω Θεώ», *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*)

où il fait allusion aux idoles féminines à tête d'oiseau de la fin de l'Âge du Bronze, mais aussi à des trésors marins sur la plage de Salamine:

«Des monnaies d'or dans les tresses des vagues  
que Poséidon traîne sur la grève.»  
(«Le tronc tremble», *Famagouste régnante*).

«Νομίσματα χρυσά μες στις πλεξούδες των κυμάτων  
τα παρασέρνει ο Ποσειδώνας έξω»  
(«Τρέμει ο κορμός», *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*).

Tous ces vestiges préservent l'argument historique et archéologique et affirment l'unité sans faille et la permanence de l'hellénisme à Chypre.

Le poème «Jour de naissance d'un cheval», issu du recueil *Famagouste régnante*, doit sa genèse à la découverte fortuite par un touriste italien qui nageait au large de Salamine d'une statue d'un mètre de haut, échantillon d'une facture et d'une technique remarquables. En l'occurrence, la source directe du poème est un article de journal «notable / mémorable»,<sup>9</sup> une information glanée par le journal chypriote turc *Halkin Sessi* et répercutée dans la presse chypriote grecque<sup>10</sup> concernant la trouvaille en question. La sculpture, qui représentait la déesse polymaste de la fécondité, fut remise à la police chypriote turque.

Le poème «Leçon d'archéologie», qui a pour décor le même site archéologique, est né d'une visite que Haralambidis avait faite à Salamine du temps où il était élève avec son éminent professeur de lettres, Kyriakos Hadziioannou,<sup>11</sup> visite qui fut pour lui une expérience incomparable. Ce n'est pas un hasard si le poète a choisi Salamine qui, de son propre aveu, a une présence privilégiée dans son œuvre, pour y ciseler six poèmes: («Jour de naissance d'un cheval», «Exploration de Salamine», «Le tronc tremble», «Leçon d'archéologie», «Début de l'*Indiktos*»). Les vers:

«L'Achéen la vit, la désira.

[...]

D'un bond il a juché sur son cheval

se penche et l'embrasse. Jaillissent de terre des cités,

des palais et des palestres, des théâtres, des marchés.»

(«Le tronc qui tremble», *Famagouste régnante*)

«Ο Αχαιός την είδε τη λαχτάρησε.

[...]

Μ' ένα πήδο τη ζέχνει στ' άλογό του

γέρνει και τη φιλεί. Φυτρώνουν πόλεις,

παλάτια και παλαιίστρες, θέατρα, αγορές.»

(«Τρέμει ο κορμός», *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*)



rappellent sa fondation par le héros homérique qui, on le sait, s'étant fait à l'idée d'avoir perdu sa propre patrie et ayant fini par accepter que pour lui il n'y aurait pas de retour, accepta, posément et réalistement, l'ordre d'Apollon, de fonder une nouvelle Salamine, en souvenir de la sienne. En outre, l'antique Salamine constitue le décor classique de ruines, lié au monde grec antique et, bien sûr, les poèmes en question présupposent tacitement ceux de Séféris: «Salamine de Chypre» et «Egkomè», écrits à l'occasion des visites du poète sur les sites en question, du temps où les fouilles étaient en cours.<sup>12</sup>

«Il est resté peu de chose d'Egkomé de Salamine  
et une statue agitée dans la mer.»

(«Jour de naissance d'un cheval», *Famagouste régnante*)

«Ξέμεινε λίγη Ἐγκωμη και Σαλαμίνα  
κι ἀγαλμα παραγμένο μες στη θάλασσα.»

(«Γενέθλιο ἵππου, *Αμμόχωστος Βασιλεύουσα*)

Parallèlement, le poète accomplit sa périégèse, tel un nouveau Pausanias, et contemple les chefs-d'œuvre qui ornent ou ornaient l'Acropole<sup>13</sup>:

«Des rochers qui marchent et titubent  
pendant que Poséidon vainc d'un bras léger  
Athéna à la lutte. Colonnes  
qui se succèdent l'une à l'autre  
sur le terrible soubassement.

Le Verbe

sans une plainte tourne vers la Lune  
les branches de l'olivier et de Pandrosos  
la goutte sacrée de laquelle  
le Monde est né.

La main de Phidias

brille. D'Ictinos, de Callicrate  
et de Polygnotos les solives symétriques  
esquissent les élans de la pensée.

Marie vêtue d'un réplum brodé à l'or  
modèle de Promachos et d'Athéna Erganè,  
tressaille dans les cieux du Parthénon.

La nuit tremble, les cloches ou les étoiles  
dans leur palais mycénien  
poussent la fusion du sang à dire  
d'étranges soubresauts de poros.»

(«Acropole», *Épreuve*).

«Βράχια που περπατούν και που τρεκλίζουν  
καθώς αλαφροπιάνει ο Ποσειδών  
την Αθηνά στο πάλεμα. Κολόνες  
που διαδέχονται η μια την άλλη  
στο φοβερό κρηπίδωμα.

Ο Λόγος

αγόγγυστα γυρνά προς τη Σελήνη  
τα κλαδιά της ελιάς και της Πανδρόσου  
την ιερή σταγόνα που εξ' αυτής  
ο Κόσμος εγεννήθη.

Του Φειδία

το χέρι λάμπει. Των Ικτίνου, Καλλικράτη  
και Πολυγνώτου οι σύμμετρες δοκοί  
της σκέψης σχηματίζουν υποδόχες.

Η πεπλοφόρος χρυσοκέντητος Μαρία,  
δείγμα Προμάχου και Αθηνάς Εργάνης,  
πάλλει στους ουρανούς του Παρθενώνος.

Η νύχτα τρέμει, τα κουδούνια ή άστρα  
στο μυκηναϊκό ανάκτορό τους  
ωθούν την τήξη του αίματος να κρένει  
αλλόκοτους παρόλιθους σπασμούς.»

(«Ακρόπολη», *Δοκίμν*).

Lui-même écrit, à propos de la poétique du lieu:

«L'être du lieu détermine la nature des hommes qui y poussent. De la même façon que la déesse de l'Acropole a conduit inéluctablement, dirait-on, Freud à l'évanouissement. [...] Il faut vraiment une oreille exercée pour entendre "l'inaudible"».<sup>14</sup>

Il se tiendra, empli d'une terreur sacrée et plein de respect, devant des monuments et des œuvres d'art d'une beauté éblouissante qu'il divinise. Il les admire et il en tire fierté.

La statue est une des composantes récurrentes de la poésie de Haralambidis et, qu'elle soit intacte ou décapitée, qu'elle soit mutilée de ses membres ou brisée, le poète affirme qu'elle a une «tête artistiquement ciselée» («Statue acéphale») et que l'art peut, malgré cela, perdurer éternellement:

«L'art demeure et il est à nous, rien qu'à nous !  
Et nous restons totalement athéniens  
d'esprit et de cœur !»  
(«Le char», *Épreuve*)

«Η τέχνη μένει κι είναι ολόδική μας!  
Και παραμένουμε παντάπασι αθηναϊκοί  
στο νου και την καρδιά.»  
(«Το άρμα», *Δοκίμιν*)

Une visite au musée de Delphes, qui abrite une statue d'albâtre d'Antinoos, d'une beauté imposante, sera, de l'aveu même du poète prétexte à ciseler un poème magnifique, «Statue d'Antinoos» (*Épreuve*):

«Son tendre corps nonchalant  
s'incline avec une douceur de jeune fille  
pour écouter les paroles des guides  
[...]

Unique consolation, pour cette statue,  
c'est de compter, entend-il dire, parmi les plus belles.»

«Το νωχελές και τρυφερό του σώματος  
γέρνει με κοριτσίστικη γλυκάδα  
των ξεναγών ν' ακούσει τα λεγόμενα»  
[...]

Μόνη παρηγοριά του ετούτο τ' άγαλμα.  
είναι, καθώς ακούει, απ' τα εμορφότερα.»

On décèle ici un narcissisme, du reste justifié, qui exprime le regard esthétique du poète face au raffinement de la facture classique, à l'élégance et à la supériorité des statues grecques sur les statues romaines pléthoriques, volumineuses qui se trouvent, par exemple, dans le portique oriental de la Palestre du Gymnase, autour du bassin de natation nord, à Salamine, et qui «sont énormes, comme si elles renfermaient en elles leur propre désert»: «statues des Romains grosses mais encloses sur leur solitude». («Leçon d'archéologie», *Famagouste régnante*).

L'imagination de Haralambidis nous fait voyager à travers des musées, des sites archéologiques et des champs de fouilles, qui renvoient à la poétique des ruines, thème littéraire si cher au romantisme, mais sans tomber pour autant dans le piège d'un fastidieux culte des ancêtres. On ne voit pas revenir dans sa poésie les motifs stéréotypés d'une passion idolâtre de l'archéologie et, du reste, l'opposition du poète à cette forme stérile de culte de la patrie s'exprime de multiples manières comme nous l'avons déjà signalé.

Haralambidis vit son pays sur le mode du fantasme et du mythe, cherchant sa réalité plus profonde dans son histoire qu'il remonte à contre-courant, son art et sa civilisation grecque antique. Il confirme et cautionne ainsi l'unité sans faille et la permanence grecque qu'il renforce encore en glosant sur de «patients noms grecs»<sup>15</sup> car lui-même écrit:

«L'invocation de noms à la racine purement grecque – et même ancienne – donnait la mesure de la résistance du lieu lui-même, ou plutôt donnait, par la substance même de son être, la réponse à l'envahisseur étranger».<sup>16</sup>

Pour peu que les toponymes soient dénaturés, le pays s'affaiblit car leur maintien est une forme de résistance du lieu même.

Le poète est habité, à juste titre, par le souci angoissé de «l'existence biologique» de la terre de l'âge du Bronze, qu'il réussit toutefois à contrôler. Combatif comme il est, il met en avant l'évidence, à travers l'art grec qui survit au mépris du temps et ne saurait être exproprié.

Les symboles auxquels il a recours sont les fragments d'images culturelles et constituent une métonymie de la mesure et de l'éthique, tout en étant parallèlement érigés en signes de connaissance et de mémoire. Valorisé et élaboré de main de maître, son matériel multiforme occupe la place» de bas-reliefs d'un art humble». <sup>17</sup>

## NOTES

1. Note explicative placée en tête de la première édition du recueil: *Chypre où je fus envoyé*, Athènes, Ikaros, 1955.
2. Nicolaou A. Nikos, «Teucer, la réfutation du nostos ulysséen», *G. Séféris, Mythologie III*, Athènes, Daidalos, 1992, p. 118 (note 31).
3. «Fiers et arrogants, conscients de leur valeur» (Dante).
4. «Laisse-moi parler, je sais ce que tu veux, et quand bien même ils résistent à ton discours, n'oublie pas/que dans leur vie, ceux-ci étaient des Grecs...», *Jours*, 26, 1965, p. 19.
5. Séféris Georges, *Jours, III*, Athènes, Ikaros, 1984, p. 33.
6. Commentaires du poète cités à la fin du recueil: *Famagouste régnante*, Athènes, Ermis, 1982, p. 164.
7. «Le sort vous a arraché le laurier du vainqueur/et de myrte, vous a tressé une autre couronne funèbre de cyprès [...] Mais si quelqu'un est mort/ pour la patrie, le myrte /est un feuillage sans prix /et bonnes sont les branches /du cyprès.» [«σας άρπαξεν η τύχη /την νικητήριον δάφνην, /και από μυρτιά σας έπλεξε /και πένθιμον κυπάρισσον /στέφανον άλλον. [...] Αλλ' άν τις απεθάνη /δια την πατρίδα, η μύρτος /είναι φύλλον ατίμητον /και καλά τα κλαδιά /της κυπαρίσσου.»]
8. Haralambidis Kyriakos, «En épelant Chypre», *Anti* 236 (8 juillet 1983) 55.
9. J'emprunte les termes à Yorgos Kehayoglou, *Sur la route des philhellènes* (en grec), Athènes, Polytypo, 1984, p. 32.

10. *Le Libéral* [*O Philelefthéros*], Nicosie, 9.8.1980.
11. Il est intéressant de noter qu'il est l'auteur de la monumentale œuvre en huit volumes: *Chypre antique dans les sources grecques*, Nicosie, Saint archevêché de Chypre, 1985.
12. Egkomé: le 13 novembre 1953, *Jours VI'*, 103 et 16 octobre 1954. Le poème «Egkomé», si l'on en croit Évangélos Louizos, a été achevé en 1955.
13. Georgiadou Agathi, «Les poèmes attiques de Kyr. Haralambidis», *Porphyras* 124 (juillet-septembre 2007) 322.
14. Haralambidis Kyr., *Visite à Aigialoussa [Αιγιαλούσης επίσκεψις]*, Athènes, Agra, 2003, p. 15.
15. *Ibidem*.
16. *Ibidem*.
17. «τ' ανάγλυφα μιας τέχνης ταπεινής», Séféris Georges, «I», *Roman*, Athènes, Ikaros, 1989, p. 43.



# Χρηστικό Λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας

Academy of Athens (ed. **Christoforos G. Charalambakis**),  
Athens: National Printery, 2014.

**George Kanarakis\***

The task of the lexicographer, to present the ever-evolving “living organism” which a language is and how that language is spoken, written and conceptualised by its users, is a laborious and never-ending task. A work which exemplifies such labour is the recently published (2014) Χρηστικό Λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας of the Academy of Athens. Dr Christoforos Charalambakis, Professor of Linguistics, Department of Philology of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, is the dictionary’s editor and compiler. Under his expert direction this imposing dictionary was completed within an eleven-year period (2003-2014).

The Χρηστικό Λεξικό is an impressive achievement in that it presents the lexical treasury of the Greek language in its most dynamic and representative form, as it appears and is used today at the beginning of the 21st century. Based on more than a decade of original and painstaking research, the corpus of this dictionary records 75,000 entries of the 120,000 in the electronic base, as well as about 5000 neologisms that are not found in any of the other Modern Greek language dictionaries. Examples of the latter include *αναγνωρισιμότητα*, *αντιμνημονιακός*, *γενόσημα*, *έμπολα* (Eng. Ebola virus, 1976), *μπότοξ*, *νευρωτικά δίκτυα*, *σκάιπ* (Eng. skype, 2003), etc., while many have already become internationalisms in the form of loan translations (calques). Also, it features 103 branches of knowledge including some recorded for the first time, such as *βαριατρική*, *ιχθυοπαθολογία*, *μουσειογραφία*, *φυτοτεχνολογία* κ.ά. In addition, abbreviations, symbols, as well as Latin phrases and non-Greek acronyms complete the entire scholarly work.

\* Charles Sturt University, Australia



The volume (21 x 29.50 and weighing 3 kilos and 650 grams), printed by the National Printery of Greece, consists of 1,819 pages formatted into three columns and in two colours.

This dictionary is neither historical in approach nor intended only for experts, but being contemporary and practical, it presents the living Greek language as it functions today and appeals to a wide readership. On this aspect, the Secretary General and Member of the Academy of Athens, Mr. Vasilios Ch. Petrakos states in the prologue to the Dictionary: “The Academy, with the Χρηστικό Λεξικό does not aim at the regulation of the language, ... It presents in a systematic and scientifically verified way the real face of Modern Greek, its language richness and its wondrous capabilities.... The great multitude of neologisms and of new meanings included in the Χρηστικό Λεξικό constitutes the true evidence of this fact which demonstrates the Greeks’ creative power in language and proves false those who lament its corruption”.

The dictionary, based on the frequency of the use of the words, but also on the extent of their usage that is reinforced by modern technology and the advancement of sciences (like those mentioned above), is a powerful tool to access the international vocabulary which has entered the Greek language. So, Professor Charalambakis in producing this dictionary, which apart from presenting the wealth and fullness of expression of contemporary Greek language and through this the Greek socio-cultural reality, increases the ability of the users of Greek, whether the native Greek speaker, the second/foreign language learner, the translator, the teacher as well as the literary writer and the media professionals to communicate effectively in a globalised context. The Χρηστικό Λεξικό also reflects how the Greek language has kept pace with the acceleration of the contemporary global reality and responds dynamically to the growing influence of constantly changing technologies, mass media and sciences, rather than to the influence of literature as used to happen in the past. In parallel, the dictionary incorporates and projects a scientific, impartial point of view. The research data, in this case the words and expressions of the Greek language itself at the beginning of the 21st century, are presented as they exist and function in the everyday life of its users.

In the introduction to the dictionary and in the directions for its use (pp. 13-14), the innovations of this work are outlined and in many cases with examples. A close examination of the dictionary confirms, furthermore, that these

innovations provide a range of significant advantages for its users in both oral communication and writing. Among other innovations, are the following:

- The organisation of the headwords, derived from extensive databases including the National Thesaurus of the Greek Language, InterActive Terminology for Europe, the Google search engine, electronic data bases and electronic dictionaries of English, French, German, Italian and Spanish, as well as particular databases of the Academy of Athens.
- The establishment of double spelling for 500 words, such as *αβγό* – *αυγό*, *εταιρεία* – *εταιρία*, *συγγνώμη* – *συγνώμη* κ.ά.
- The concise and essential definitions of the headwords.
- The inclusion of the scientific nomenclature of animals and plants.
- The unification of the meanings of the entries, differentiating them from their usage, as illustrated by the verb *κόβω*, which according to some dictionaries has 53 meanings, whereas according to this dictionary the meanings number only ten and the rest are treated as uses.
- The provision of modern meanings of words, illustrated by authentic examples and phrases used by people in contemporary everyday life, including the year in which an English or French loan word first appeared.
- The analytic presentation of the combinative abilities of the Greek words, such as *ομορφιά* – *αγγελική*, *ασύγκριτη*, *ανδρική*, *γυναικεία*, etc.
- The accurate stylistic identification of words and phrases based on 30 categories, for example, slang, archaic, humorous, etc.
- The treatment of the stereotypical or idiomatic expressions and lexical combinations, given from a new viewpoint at the end of each entry.
- The presentation of the headwords not only in the monotonic, but also in the polytonic system.
- The syllabication of all headwords of the entries.

These innovations and others, in addition to the high standard of research, compilation, writing and presentation of the work in organising and producing this outstanding work make it an essential, worthy and valuable resource.

Not unexpectedly, this dictionary does not make any judgements about what

is “proper” or standard. Rather it describes the Greek language in the natural and unpretentious way that it is expressed by its Greek speakers. Moreover, in the 21st century the rate of change precludes the language being limited by fixed “standards” imposed in previous centuries. In an interview published in the Athenian newspaper *To Vima* (9/11/2014), Professor Charalambakis stated characteristically: “Shall we ostracize the “ugly” words and keep only the “beautiful ones. If we hide them, it doesn’t mean that they don’t exist”.

Finally, it is admirable and encouraging that, as the Member of the Academy Mr. Petrakos states in his prologue to the dictionary, the electronic form of this work will continue being enriched. As with other quality international dictionaries, such as the Oxford Language Dictionaries, Merriam-Webster, etc., this will be a significant accomplishment as it will insure that the dictionary will continue to keep pace with the ongoing linguistic and socio-cultural developments of the Greek language. After all, as Professor Charalambakis asserted in his lecture on the launch of the *Χρηστικό Λεξικό της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας* at the Academy of Athens, “No dictionary can cover completely the aims which its compilers set from the beginning.... The composition of a dictionary in essence is never brought to completion since language evolves and is enriched with new elements constantly”.

# Poésie grecque

**Stephanos Constantinides**

## **Pérégrinations d'Alexandre**

Alors qu'à Pentalia  
les amandiers sont en fleurs  
Alexandre  
toi quelque part  
entre le Granique  
et l'Hydaspe  
tu parcours dit-on  
le monde  
entre la Macédoine  
et le Granique  
des milliers de milles  
et la silhouette de Nausica  
aux socques de velours  
s'estompe  
du champ visuel  
des sens  
aux heures de la curieuse émergence  
de l'inconnu  
l'insondable destin  
de l'homme  
Et Roxanne  
qui sans le savoir  
attend  
de rencontrer son destin  
ces jours-ci  
ont une curieuse sensation  
peut-être qu'il se trouve

au Québec  
à Montréal  
- Alexandre  
fit dit-on le tour du monde  
Granique  
Hydaspe  
Babylone  
le pays des Parthes  
l'Amérique du nord  
et l'Amérique du sud  
le Bélouchistan  
le Québec  
la Bactriane  
la Commagène  
Montréal  
sa bosse aux quatre coins du monde –  
alors qu'à Pentalia  
les amandiers sont en fleurs  
Alexandre  
toi  
entre le Granique  
et le Québec  
tu parcours le monde  
à ce qu'on dit  
j'ai contemplé  
le sévère paysage  
la lune était pleine  
il ne restait que  
quelques décombres  
preuve qu'autrefois  
il y avait des maisons  
puis il est disparu  
dans la nuit

personne ne sait  
s'il est mort  
à Montréal  
à Pentalia  
ou à Babylone

Note: Au dire d'un vieux synaxaire, Alexandre naquit à Pentalia de Paphos, un peu au nord de l'endroit où Aphrodite naquit de l'écume de la mer. Il est étrange que les historiens ne l'aient pas appelé le Paphien.

**DIRECTEURS / EDITORS**

(1983-1985)

Stephanos CONSTANTINIDES

Leonidas BOMBAS

**DIRECTEUR / EDITOR**

(1985-2005)

Stephanos CONSTANTINIDES

**COMITÉ DE RÉDACTION / EDITORIAL BOARD**

(1983-1985)

Michel LAFERRIERE (†), McGill University (Canada)

**Remerciements / Thanks to**

Panayiotis Constantinides

Jean Catsiapis

Thalia Tassou

CONCEPTION GRAPHIQUE / GRAPHIC DESIGN: Iraklis Théodorakopoulos

COMPOSITION / MISE EN PAGE: Constantina Metaxa

### ADVICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

*Études helléniques / Hellenic Studies* welcomes manuscript submissions presenting original research on, and critical analysis of, issues prevailing among Greeks in both Greece proper and the numerous Greek communities abroad.

Manuscripts should be original and should not be under consideration elsewhere. Recommended length is approximately 7000 words. Authors should submit (either by postal mail or by email) three typed and double-spaced copies of manuscripts. Submissions must be either in English or in French, but quotations, terms, and references in other languages (especially Greek) are encouraged, especially if they are considered as supportive to the argument of the manuscript. In such instances, English translations should follow. Manuscripts should also include a 150-word abstract and endnotes. Manuscripts, published or unpublished, are not returned.

For more submission guidelines, please find the style sheet at:  
<http://www.mediterraneanstudies.gr/hellenicstudies>

The Editors and Editorial Board of *Études helléniques / Hellenic Studies* take no responsibility for the opinions or data presented by contributors to the journal.

### AVIS AUX COLLABORATEURS

*Études helléniques / Hellenic Studies* accueille des manuscrits présentant des recherches originales et des analyses critiques sur des questions qui prévalent parmi les Grecs de la Grèce métropolitaine ainsi que de ceux se trouvant dans les nombreuses communautés helléniques de la diaspora.

Les manuscrits doivent être originaux et ne pas avoir été proposés à d'autres revues. La longueur recommandée est d'environ 7000 mots. Les auteurs doivent envoyer (par courrier postal ou électronique) trois copies dactylographiées en double interligne de leurs articles. La présentation doit être en anglais ou en français, mais les citations ainsi que les références dans d'autres langues (en particulier le grec) sont encouragées, en particulier si celles-ci favorisent l'argumentation de l'auteur. Dans de tels cas, leur traduction anglaise ou française doit les accompagner. Les manuscrits doivent également inclure un résumé de 150 mots et de notes; publiés ou non ceux-ci ne sont pas restitués.

Vous pouvez trouver des indications plus détaillées, à l'adresse:  
<http://www.mediterraneanstudies.gr/hellenicstudies>

Les éditeurs et le Comité de rédaction de la revue *Études helléniques/ Hellenic Studies* déclinent toute responsabilité pour les opinions ou les données présentées par leurs collaborateurs.





