

**MINORITY PRESS:
THE CASE OF GREEK-ORTHODOX MINORITY PRESS
OF ISTANBUL
AND
THE GREEK-TURKISH RELATIONS
1950-1955**

**Eleni Taschounidou
108605016**

**İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MA in INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

SUPERVISOR: Assoc. Professor Umut Özkırmı

2009

APPROVED BY:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut Özkırmı
(Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Harry-Zachary Tzimitras

Asst. Prof. Dr. İlay Örs Romain

DATE OF APPROVAL:

**MINORITY PRESS:
THE CASE OF GREEK-ORTHODOX MINORITY PRESS OF ISTANBUL
AND
THE GREEK-TURKISH RELATIONS
1950-1955**

Eleni Taschounidou, 2009
All Rights Reserved

For my dear parents and siblings

ABSTRACT

MINORITY PRESS: THE CASE OF GREEK-ORTHODOX MINORITY PRESS OF ISTANBUL AND THE GREEK-TURKISH RELATIONS 1950-1955

Eleni Taschounidou

M.A., International Relations

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut Özkırımlı

2009

This thesis is based on a personal research on minority newspapers circulating in Istanbul during the years 1950-1955, which are gathered on the archives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul. Using one of the newspapers, *Apogevmatini*, as our main source of information, we examine the Greek-Turkish Relations and the attitudes of the Greek-Orthodox minority.

Starting point of the research is year 1950 as this year can be seen as the start of the multiparty period which, in turn allowed for more freedom in expression and our finishing point is the 6/7 September 1955 events, as they signalled a tremendous change in the minority life.

First we take a closer look at the events of 1955 and also to the political environment in Turkey and Greece at the time. Then we evaluate the 6/7 September events from the point of view of ethno-national riots. In light of these, we proceed to examine the press and newspapers in Turkey and then we study the particular characteristics of *Apogevmatini*. Finally looking through articles from the period in question we make some observations about the minority, its self-determination, its congruence and its identity.

Key Words: Greek-Orthodox Minority, 6/7 September events, minority press, Greek-Turkish relations, newspaper.

**Azınlık basını:
İstanbul'daki Rum – Ortodoks azınlığın basın incelemesi
ve Türk – Yunan İlişkileri, 1950 -1955**

Eleni Taschounidou
İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Uluslararası İlişkiler Yüksek Lisans Programı
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Umut Özkırımlı
2009

Bu tez 1950-1955 tarihleri arasında İstanbul'da yayımlanan azınlık gazeteleri ile ilgili Rum Patrikhanesi'nin arşivlerinde gerçekleştirilen bir kişisel araştırmaya dayanmaktadır. Çalışmada Apogevmatini gazetesi ana kaynak olarak kullanılmış ve Türk – Yunan ilişkileri ile Rum Ortodoks azınlığın tutumları incelenmiştir.

Araştırmaya konu olan sürenin başlangıç noktası çok partili dönemin başlangıcı ve ifade özgürlüğünün gündeme geldiği yıl olan 1950 olarak alınmıştır. Bitiş noktası ise azınlıkların hayatında büyük değişime neden olan 6-7 Eylül 1955 olarak belirlenmiştir.

Türkiye ve Yunanistan'nın siyasi ortamı ile 6-7 Eylül 1955 olayları, etnik-ulusal ayaklanmalar açısından değerlendirilmiş ve Türkiye basınından Apogevmatini gazetesinin özellikleri tetkik edilmiştir. Son olarak söz konusu döneminin yazılarına bakılarak azınlığın kendi özgür irade, uyum ve kimliği hakkında bazı gözlemler yapılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Rum – Ortodoks Azınlık
- 2) 6/7 Eylül olayları
- 3) Azınlık basın
- 4) Türk – Yunan İlişkileri
- 5) Milliyetçilik

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Greek-Orthodox Minority
- 2) 6/7 September events
- 3) Minority press
- 4) Greek-Turkish relations
- 5) Nationalism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the gestation of my intense and constructive studies at Bilgi University and I am indebted to many people who helped me along the way. Firstly to Professor Harry-Zachary Tzimitras who first introduced me to the specific Graduate Program and played a decisive role in my acceptance. To my supervisor, Professor Umut Özkırmı I am also deeply indebted, firstly for the insight of his lectures which I treasured and also for the motivation he instilled into me. They both supported me in difficult times and thanks to their confidence I gathered strength to finish the challenging task of completing my studies and writing this thesis.

To my dear undergraduate Professor Pashalis Valsamidis I owe a dept of gratitude for his invaluable advice and encouragement. I would also like to express my particular thanks to Professor Ilay Ors Romain as she has been an unfailing source of inspiration for me through my studies.

And without the trust and hospitality of the library staff at the Ecumenical Patriarchate I would have never conducted my research there. I would also like to especially thank Mrs Ioulia Christou for her understanding and her kindness during the long months of the writing process of this thesis.

Last but not least I am deeply indebted to all my friends and family who supported me and were a constant source of energy for me.

Contents

Acknowledgements	vi
Chapter 1	1
Objectives of the study	1
Problem statement	3
Research methodology	11
Chapter 2	15
6 th September 1955 events and its importance for the Greek-Orthodox minority of Istanbul and the Greek-Turkish bilateral relations.	15
The political environment of Turkey in mid-1950s.	18
The 1955 events from the point of view of ethno-national riots	24
Historical background of Greek-Turkish relations and the Rum minority of Istanbul	30
Chapter 3: The Press and Newspapers in Turkey	34
The press in Turkey	34
1919-1945: the Kemalist period	34
1945-1960: transition to multi-party system	37
Greek-Orthodox Minority Press	40
History of Apogevmatini	46
Format and layout of Apogevmatini	51
Chapter 4: The articles from Apogevmatini	54
Part 1: 1950	60
Part 2: 1951	68
Part 3: 1952	74
Part 4: 1953	81
Part 5: 1954	88
Part 6: 1955	93
Chapter 5: Conclusions	102
Bibliography	108
Interviews	113
Annexes	114

Chapter 1

Objectives of the study

Our main objective is to unfold the attitudes of the minority towards its environment in the years that preceded the September 1955 events. We also aim to reveal how the minority dealt with the political issues of the time. That will help us reach some conclusions about the minority itself, its identity, its place in the Turkish society and its relation with Greece.

In doing so the newspapers of the time are a valuable source of information. Minority newspapers were flourishing in Istanbul and there are examples of newspapers that were reliable and covered daily news with responsibility. One such example of the period in question is *Apogevmatini*, which is the main source of information for this inquiry.

Other goals we wish to reach are first of all to learn more about the Greek-Turkish relations of the five years from 1950 to 1955, to learn how current affairs concerning Greece and Turkey were received and reported to the minority. We also wish to evaluate the possible impacts of the relevant current affairs on the minority. Finally we will reach some conclusions about the Greek-Orthodox minority of Istanbul, its status and identity.

This inquiry through the articles of *Apogevmatini* will cover a 5-year time span and the ending point will be the September events of 1955. What we look for while reading

through the articles of *Apogevmatini* is the political environment of the bilateral relations of Greece and Turkey and how the minority was influenced by it, how are the news reported and finally what conclusions we can reach about the minority allegiance, its identification with one or the other part of the Aegean.

In short we wish to know what preceded the incidents of 6/7 September 1955 that eventually lead to such an outbreak but from the point of view of the Rum minority.

Problem Statement

The main objective of this research is to make some evaluations about the minority and the bilateral relations of Greece and Turkey from a different point of view. Our point of view is the minority press of Istanbul and specifically of the newspaper *Apogevmatini*. However the whole issue of the newspapers has social importance as well. It is a form of expression the members of a community feel the need for, under certain social and economic/financial circumstances. Greek orthodox community newspaper publishing flourished at a time when a Greek-orthodox urban class was already shaped and crystallised. The plethora of different newspapers proves that the target readers were not only an intelligentsia or elite of their society but that a large majority of the Rum community read the press daily. To that point, there were numerous newspapers to please almost all interests and target groups. This reinforces our point that there was a prosperous and substantial urban, middle class, formed by the Greek-Orthodox minority of Istanbul. It also implies that different newspapers were the symbol of different social strata.

One should also bear in mind the importance and power of the written words at the time. Newspapers, especially of a minority, were like the linchpin between its members. Of course we do not disregard the vital role other minority institutions played in that direction, such as, first and fore most, minority schools, the Church and the Patriarchate, and all sorts of Clubs, Unions and Associations. However, a newspaper would enter a home easily, would be read over and over again, by all members of the family as a

precious means of entertainment and information. Eventually it would be used multiple times since paper was an unprocurable commodity and for various tasks (Vasileiadis 2008). A newspaper's life was long and its imprints were long-lasting as well. So, we would say that newspapers played an important role at a family and social level and at the same time they represented the social strata of the Greek Orthodox society.

Newspapers were of central importance for another reason as well, for *flagging the nation*, as put by Michael Billig (1995). National identity is continually being flagged – reproduced and pointed out - in the sense that whole series of familiar assumptions about nationhood, the world and how we are placed in the world are flagged discursively by the systematic use of banal, routine words which take nations for granted. In newspapers this flagging takes place in every single, ordinary day and no special occasion is required such as a national celebration or another significant event for the nation, e.g. victory of national team etc.

Newspapers while reporting on the up-to-date news employ a complex system of expressions in order to show the “here” and “now”. They use the nationalised syntax of hegemony, simultaneously speaking to and for the nation. So a newspaper writes in such a way that it both addresses the readership and it represents it (Billig 1995). This way, newspapers evoke a national “we” which presumes a national identity. That “we” includes the reader, the writer and the universal audience as well. It also implies a commonly shared and universally approved identity among the members of the “we”.

Thus newspapers use routine forms of referring to space and time which assist in homeland-making. The national home is the context of utterance, the centre of the world of the newspaper. However, homeland-making expressions appear more complicated in minority newspapers. Still, the feeling of a national community is reproduced by newspapers with messages, stereotypes and a certain manner of addressing to space, time and readers, all of which contribute in reproducing an imagined community, which lives in a national homeland, at that specific time (Billig 1995, Anderson 1983).

Newspapers have a simultaneous, mass consumption. Hundreds of people read the same paper on a day, and a reader is aware that he or she along with many others, of whose existence he or she is certain, they all together comprise a common community, placed in a specific point in the time-line. All use a commonly understood and accepted language in order to communicate and to receive the same messages by means of print matter, consumed simultaneously by their mass community. Every member of this community projects an imagined community of the whole readership according to the self (Anderson 1983).

Provincial newspapers of the Greek-Orthodox community inevitably adopted the techniques mentioned earlier in shaping a homeland and an imagined community. Yet, the plethora of Greek-speaking newspapers in the urban environment of Istanbul leads to additional conclusions as well. As we learn from people who have worked for such newspapers for years (Parizianos 2008), most of the minority newspapers were not economically viable. That means that most of them, if not all, were supported by grants

from prosperous minority members. That makes us wonder why somebody would get involved in publishing a newspaper. Especially, why would somebody do so under the strict political conditions imposed by the Turkish state. We could point out as a possible obstacle censorship for example, other forms of repression, such as shutting down of newspaper, legal prosecutions, deportations etc (Alexandris 1988: 502-503), (Güven 2006: 294). Apart from the previous obstacles, it is necessary for a viable newspaper to have a readership that is diligent and regular. These characteristics are instilled in a readership mainly through education.

Consequently, the difficulties publishers and editors faced on their task urge us to look elsewhere for their motivation to publish. What was the reason behind that need for minority press? We are convinced by the numerous schools, colleges and various cultural Associations that were active in Istanbul that the Greek-Orthodox minority had a satisfactory education which partly implies that there was a potential readership for newspapers (Kanner 1996, Kardaras 1992). However, it does not simply follow or suffice to conclude that a literate community had to be kept up to date, informed and entertained or that a newspaper was a popular show-off of the times, an advance imposed by the developed world. The minority took advantage of the specific circumstances and used that priceless tool, the press, in order to fight ignorance and indifference for the current affairs. At the same time the press colligated the Greek-orthodox populations, and gave them the feeling of power. That feeling emanated on the one hand from the fact that minority members felt there was a place to refer to publicly; a newspaper that would address their problems, report on their community issues, and where one could directly

write and complain for minority problems, or praise the community to the community. The other source of the feeling of power was that by having their own, minority, Greek-speaking press they manifested their existence. As the formation of the Greek state itself proves, the Greek-Orthodox millet of the Ottoman Empire had strong national consciousness. We would assume that members of Greek-Orthodox Rum minority of Istanbul, remnants of the old millet-i-Rum in the beginning of 20th century had some kind of national consciousness too. Probably not the same with that of the Greeks who lived in the Greek state, but there was certainly a strong connection.

The Greek-speaking press contributed to shaping an identity for the minority members. It would be wrong to suggest that the specific newspaper we look at, *Apogevmatini*, fully represents the whole society and that all issues touched upon by the editor and journalists represent the worldview of the minority. We are more likely to suggest that the newspaper contributed in inspiring, shaping and instilling an identity. It also contributed in directing the community to experiencing the world and the current affairs in a certain way and especially through the Greek language. The circulation of minority newspapers advocates in the development of a collective social and national consciousness.

Therefore *Apogevmatini* was a tool that manifested the unique character of a literate community, its social life, its worries, the problems encountered in the everyday life and their lifestyle as well. In the 1950s we have a Greek-Orthodox bourgeois in Istanbul, more or less aware of its place in the urban Turkish society. The articles that are chosen and pointed out are the ones that underline the relation and possible connection of the

Rum minority with Greece as well as its relation with the Turkish state and society. Our foremost goal is to point out the issues that preoccupied the minority members and how these relate to the states on the two sides of the Aegean.

In terms of contents this study is not a history of the minority through the daily papers as it does not cover all the aspects of their activities and aspects of life. On the contrary the study focuses on a specific point of view and therefore has a partial character. It is more an attempt to reform and to underline the approach of minority towards the current affairs, to situate its members within Greece and Turkey and clarify the elements of the identity of the Rum minority in the 1950s.

Another aim is to also render the Greek-Orthodox minority press and approach to the current affairs familiar to us, that is to familiarise ourselves with a form of expression of a society, its problems and agonies.

In terms of temporal restrains, the starting point is the year 1950 and finishing point the year 1955 and specifically the 6-7 September 1955 events. Both points in the time-line are important for the Turkish nation and for the Greek-Orthodox minority alike. On the one hand 1950, the starting point of this dissertation, is the beginning of the multiparty period. First step for the transition from the kemalist-one-party state, to the multiparty-democratic period was taken in May 1945 (Zurcher 1995). A strong debate broke out while the national assembly was discussing a law about land distribution. In theory multiparty period started in July, when some members of the assembly founded their own

opposition party (*Milli Kalkınma Partisi – National Development Party*). However, greater difference was achieved with another party which was founded two months later by Adnan Menderes and Fuat Köprülü (September 21 1945), the *Demokrat Parti* (Democratic Party) (Zurcher 1995: 220, 221). We could claim that, in practise, the period from 1945 to 1950 was more resembling to a transition period which paved the way for the democratic elections of 14 May 1950. In these elections the Democratic Party won 53.4% of the votes and the Republican People's Party 39.8% of the votes. Although the transition from one party regime to multiparty one took place in 1946, the actual handover of power took place after the 1950 elections. The government of the DP was a completely new experiment in Turkey, as it was the first party that had a mass following that was verified in free elections. Along with the democratisation of the political scene of Turkey, the governmental policies towards minorities became more liberal as well (Güven 2006: 227, 243). For the reasons put forward above, we believe that 1950 is a milestone in the Turkish history and was therefore chosen as the starting point of the research.

The finishing point of this dissertation is 1955 September events. Firstly because the purpose of the study is to examine how the minority perceived its environment and the current affairs and how it was influenced by it in return and to also examine any changes that might have taken place in the years before the 1955 events. The 6th September 1955 events is the ending point for an additional reason, newspapers were accused by the government of being extremely provocative and contributing to the outbreak of the events. Therefore after the events the newspapers were closely monitored and the

freedom of press was considerably suppressed (Guven 2006: 295). Consequently, after the events newspapers and especially minority newspapers do not supply us with equally valuable information about the identity of the minority, as they did before the events.

Research Methodology

The main part of this paper is composed of the analysis of the relevant articles from the newspaper *Apogevmatini*. This was a conscious choice as we believe that they contain valuable information which is accessible, now, only to a limited number of people. These articles picture the bilateral issues of the time and at the same time we form a view about the Greek Orthodox minority of Istanbul which has not been fully and systematically examined yet.

All issues of newspaper *Apogevmatini*, starting from its first issue in 1925 until the present day, can be accessed at the archive, found in the premises of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul at the area Fener of Istanbul. All copies from all newspapers of the time are kept there, bound in yearly volumes. In the same archive, one can also find newspapers and magazines that were published in Istanbul, other parts of Turkey and Greece, from the 19th century onward.

According to the same archive it is established that during the period in question a number of newspapers were published in Istanbul. Namely, apart from *Apogevmatini*, the following newspapers were also circulating:

- Embros (*Εμπρός*) was published from 1953-1974,
- Kiriakatiki Proia (*Κυριακάτικη Πρωία*) from 1954-1961,
- Hronos (*Χρόνος*), whose editor was Stavros Zervopoulos from 1942-1967,
- Eleftheri Foni (*Ελεύθερη Φωνή*) from 1954-1961,

- Efimeris (*Εφημερίς*) from 1955-1957 and
- Apostolos Andreas (*Απόστολος Ανδρέας*) from 1951-1964.

Despite the fact that for the time in question there are 6 different newspapers published, we can notice that most of them were published for a limited period. *Apogevmatini* is one of the newspapers that cover the time span in question fully and that was the main reason that the specific newspaper was chosen as the main, primary source of information for this dissertation. *Hronos* also covers the years from 1950 to 1955 but presents valuable information mostly for a social anthropologist as it is a newspaper that undertakes to update the Rum community about all social events and is not particularly politics oriented. The greatest part of the paper is devoted to reporting social events, accompanied with many pictures and only occasionally reporting on current political affairs. *Apostolos Andreas*, despite covering the time in question, is a newspaper with a religious-orthodox orientation and thus does not serve our interests. The fact of course that such a newspaper was circulating is denoting of the central role religion and the Patriarchate played for the Greek-Orthodox minority.

Although other newspapers are interesting as well, they were circulating for one or two years before the September events. *Hronos* is the only of these newspapers that was published during the whole period in question. However this newspaper, apart from being a weekly mater, essentially concentrates on reporting news from the international arena. This means that even less space of this newspaper was devoted to issues about the communal affairs of the minority and other issues that occupied people of the community such as news about Greece or politics between Greece and Turkey.

Therefore *Apogevmatini* was chosen as it was a daily newspaper focusing on politics, reliable and with a wide circulation at the time. However, there are no official records to provide us with information about the number of papers that were circulating at the time. The current editor of *Apogevmatini*, Mr Vasileiadis, supports that thousands of papers were circulating. Oral interviews with members of the minority validate this view as we are informed that *Apogevmatini* was indeed the most popular newspaper of the time, and that the majority of minority households would buy a copy of the newspaper. Given that there is no concrete information about the number of papers of *Apogevmatini* sold per day, allow us to make a rough estimation, based on the population of the Greek-Orthodox community at the time and the interviews with members of the minority who maintain that *Apogevmatini* was the most popular Greek-speaking, minority newspaper that could be found in every house. At that time the minority counted for 103.809 people in Istanbul (Guvén 2006: 268) and approximately 34.000 households, therefore we can claim that the number of papers sold per day would be between 10 and 20 thousand papers. This popularity renders *Apogevmatini* a reliable source of information concerning the representation of the identity of the minority through its papers.

All papers (*filla*) published by *Apogevmatini*, starting from January 1st 1950 have been examined, until end of 1955. From all papers only those that refer to Greek-Turkish issues, and other issues concerning the minority were chosen. Such issues are for

example articles about the Patriarchate, minority schools and teaching of languages, Papa-Eftym¹ and many others.

¹ Papa-Eftym (Eftymios Karahissaridis) was an Anatolian priest and a *Karamanli* Greek Orthodox. He was ordained in 1915 and later, in 1918 he assumed the title of *locum tenens* for the parish of Keskin. Later he proclaimed the foundation of a Turkish Orthodox church in Anatolia on 15 September 1922 and declared his hostility towards the Patriarchate. He tried to establish links with the Karamanli communities but the *Karamanli* Greeks were included in the exchange of populations, and so the basis of the church was destroyed. Those who were left in Istanbul were integrated in the Greek community and were also attached to the Patriarchate. In short Papa-Eftym and his movement had little impact on the Greek Orthodox and finally the Holy Synod severed all links with him. The Turkish authorities on the other hand it seems that supported him and the press also sympathized and promoted him (Alexandris 1992: 151,153), (Sarioglu 2004: 69).

Chapter 2

The 6th September 1955 events and its importance for the Greek-Orthodox Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Bilateral Relations.

On 6th September 1955 the national radio of Turkey announced the news that, a bomb had exploded at the house where Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was born in Thessaloniki. The same evening, the Turkish speaking newspaper *Istanbul Ekspres* also referred to the same event (Vryonis 2005: 93-97). Later that day, university student Associations and the Association “Cyprus is Turkish” called out for action. Meeting point for the demonstration was Taksim Square at Istanbul.

The crowd started walking down Istiklal Caddesi, the central pedestrian street of the area. Various groups went astray the main crowd and started throwing stones on the windows of non-Muslim shops on Istiklal caddesi. Groups of people spread around the areas surrounding Istiklal caddesi, namely Beyoğlu, Cihangir, Şişli and Kurtuluş. These are areas traditionally nesting non-Muslims, Greek Orthodox, Armenians, Jews as well as other western Europeans. In other areas of the city, similar violent outbreaks took place simultaneously. Beşiktaş, Fatih, Eyüp, Bakırköy, Yeşilköy, Ortaköy, Arnavutköy, Bebek and even on the Asian side, Kuzguncuk, Üsküdar, Kadıköy, Moda, Çengelköy and at the Princes Islands. There were similar but more temperate events in Izmir, and only some university student demonstrations in Ankara.

During the Istanbul September 6, 1955 events, groups of 20-30 people, ready with various attack objects in hand, dashed against shops, houses, schools, churches and cemeteries of non-Muslims. These groups were organised and divided into agitators, who were leading the groups and destroyers. The leaders of the groups were indicating the places that would be attacked and the others of the group executed the orders by hitting the targets (Alexandris 1992: 264). The violent events stopped only after the army interfered and martial law was declared in Istanbul.

According to official records of the Turkish authorities, 4.348 shops were attacked, 1.004 houses, 73 churches, 1 synagogue, 2 monasteries, 26 schools and 5.317 premises of other nature (pharmacies, restaurants, hotels etc) (Alexandris 1988: 499-500). As expected there were thefts as well during the raids, accounting for various objects, jewellery, gold coins and other valuable objects. More sorrowful however, are the injuries caused during the events. Considering the extent of the assaulted real estates, the number of injured people is low. The numbers vary from 300 to 600 including injured assaulters and defendants (Güven 2006: 63-76). There were rapes as well (about 40 to 50 and mostly Greek women), although it is estimated that most of them were not reported to the authorities. Finally and most sadly, there were 16 human losses as well.

The total damage that was declared to the authorities amounted to about 150 million Turkish lira (approximately \$54 million) however not all cases were reported. It is claimed that if all cases were reported the estimated worth of the damages caused that night would be about 1 billion Turkish lira (Güven 2006: 334). Nevertheless out of the

150 million Turkish lira, the damage of people with Greek citizenship was 28 millions. Greeks with Turkish citizenship reported damages reaching 68 millions. About 20 million worth damages were induced to Armenians, Jews and foreigners (French, Italian, German etc). Finally about 35 million worth damages were inflicted on churches.

At the time it was claimed that the outbreak of these events was caused by two main factors. The first is the press. The press played a crucial role in deteriorating the situation, and intensifying the negative feelings of the people. In short it was claimed by the Turkish press that Greek Cypriots were planning to attack on the Turkish minority of Cyprus and that in such a case there would be retaliation on the non Muslims of Istanbul. The second was an article published on the newspaper *İstanbul Ekspres* on the night of September 6, 1955. The article wrote that a bomb blew up at the house where Kemal Ataturk was born, in Thessaloniki, Greece.

The Prime Minister of Turkey at the time, Adnan Menderes, claimed that these two articles had touched a tender point of the Turkish people, when he gave an account of the events afterwards. The Turkish people felt outraged by the articles and thus had impulsively and spontaneously moved against the non-Muslim minorities in general and especially against the Greek minority. However we should note that a few days later the government reconsidered its stance and claimed that Turkish communists had organised and executed the events (Alexandris 1992: 260). After these statements about 2.000 people of communistic background were imprisoned.

The Political Environment in Turkey in mid-1950s

The 6-7 events of 1955 took place at a time when a new political reality had been recently established, transition from one party political system and ruling of the RPP to the creation of opposition parties in 1945 and finally the establishment of a multiparty-political system with the 14 May 1950 elections, which the Democratic Party won with 53.4% of the votes (Zurcher 1995: 213-228). The multiparty system and the democratisation of the country had inspired expectations for a better future to the minorities. In that environment, minorities felt secure until the Cyprus issue shake their seemingly, tranquil relations with the predominant population. In any case the attacks against the Rum minority of Istanbul signalled the beginning of the end for the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul as there was a massive immigration movement after the 1955 events (immigrations mainly towards Greece, but towards the Americas and other countries as well, right after the events and for the next three to five years skyrocketed) (Güven 2006: 279, 287).

Not only that, but the 6th September events also had repercussions on the bilateral relations of Greece and Turkey. In fact the relationship between the two, the fate of Greek Orthodox minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish bilateral relations is very close. We will follow the intersecting histories of the two in the five years that will be covered in this paper.

Starting from 1950 and expanding till the 6-7 September events in 1955, we examine the Greek-Turkish Relations and the history of the Greek Orthodox minority of Istanbul with a view to approaching the 6 September 1955 events from a different angle. Our point of view is that of the Rum minority of Istanbul and more specifically we will address the issue by examining the Rum minority newspaper *Apogevmatini*.

However in order to evaluate the articles published on *Apogevmatini* we should take into account specific characteristics of the Turkish state. Turkey evolved after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, inheriting a multiethnic people within its borders (Albanians, Greeks, Armenians, various Muslim groups from the Russian Empire, Arabs from Bagdad, Syria and Palestine, Kurds and Turks) (Keyder 1997: 35).

Before the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, the Young Turks movement was supporting Ottomanism, the idea that all subjects of the Empire, regardless of their language or creed, would be citizens with equal rights of the new constitutional state (Zurcher 1995: 133) (Keyder 1997: 37). In the early 20th century that meant that the old system of dividing the population of the state into communities according to their religion (millet system) would be replaced by a secular and democratic state (Mardin 1997: 115). However Ottomanism did not serve the national interests of the different subjects of the Empire who aspired to segregate from the Ottoman Empire and create their own nation-state. The idea of Ottomanism could have flourished if there was an extended, thriving middle class to support it, but the middle class of the Ottoman Empire comprised mainly by non-Muslims, and people who were struggling for their national-causes. By the end of

the First World War, the synthesis of Ottomanism was abandoned for good (Mardin 1997: 116).

The Committee of Union and Progress, the original Young Turk organisation which took over the step of becoming a political party in 1913, had to shoulder the consequences of ideological developments, and it did this by promoting a new identity of Turkishness. Serif Mardin (1997: 118) describes Turkish nationalism as being “constitutive of society”, in the sense that it stemmed from a felt need to reach a wider Turkish audience. The tool that would help reach that audience was language. Language became the main element of the Turkish identity and the basis for shaping the other elements of the Turkish identity in the 1930s.

The Balkan Wars (1912-13) played a crucial role in the formation of Turkish nationalism and the construction of a national middle class in Turkey. The negative turnout of the war was attributed to the weak national feelings of the people (Keyder 1997: 39-41). Mustafa Kemal, having complete dominance in the political scene of Turkey established an authoritarian regime that allowed him and his government to implement an extended programme of reforms (Zurcher 1995: 134, 180).

Therefore when First World War broke out a national programme was put into effect. In that respect, capitulations were put out of practice, depriving Europeans from their privileged position. Moreover it was now compulsory to use the Turkish language in correspondence in the economy of the country. That opened the way for the replacement

of those employees whose main language was other than Turkish and who were not Muslims with others who were both Muslims and whose mother tongue was Turkish.

At that time we can also notice the attempt to create a homogenised people, a *sine qua non* for every successful nation-state. These attempts were more obvious in Central Anatolia, as this was the core of the multiethnic Ottoman Empire. Related to that is the conscious promotion and support of the vernacular. The language and a literature written in it became a “project” from early on. The aim of the project of national literature was to create a bulk of Turkish writing that would support and promote ethnic roots but most of all serve as the glue that would unite the designed nation. In the 1930s, Turkish nationalism assumed an increasing starkness with the notion of a Turkish race and theories about the Central Asian Turks as the fountainhead of civilisation.

Although the new Turkish State had committed itself in catering for all of its peoples, and in treating all of them as equals, discrimination between Muslim and non Muslim citizens of the country continued to exist. Assimilation policies were pursued by the governments of 1920s and 1930s. According to the legislations of the Turkish state all citizens were equal in front of the laws and all of them cherished the same rights and had the same obligations. However everyday life was different. State policies favoured Muslim citizens and either disregarded non-Muslims or burdened them (Çağaptay 2006). As an example one could mention the 1942 Wealth Tax (Varlık Vergisi) a special tax on ownership that was levied on non Muslims with an aim to reduce the predominance of Greeks, Armenians and Jews in the economic life of Turkey (Aktar 2000).

The beginning point of this research is 1950. The electoral victory of the Democrat Party in 1950 signalled the commencement of the multiparty-system period. It also marked the replacement of the standard ruling elite with a new one. Until that time, the ruling elite composed of bureaucrats nurtured with the Kemalist values. The Demokrat Party representatives were a different generation and from a different background and until that time had not been participating to the governance of the country. Most likely to be younger, they did not always have higher education, neither a bureaucratic or military background like the RPP representatives. Most of the representatives of the Democrat Party were locals shining in their constituencies thanks to their aptness in fields such as commerce or law (Zürcher 1995: 231-237). New political groups were now involved in the state machine. Those new groups were supported by the masses in the periphery as well as various parts of the urban population who were criticising the ruling elite more strictly. The flourishing economy of the first years of Democrat rule was impressive, an achievement of the new government that played an important role in helping it maintain control.

As far as the economy of the country is concerned, the Democrats managed to bring some changes. They used subsidies credit facilities and investments to boost the economy and followed an open economic policy. That seemed to work the first few years, but since any investment lacked planning, political inspiration and aiming at long-term results, after three years the economy was held back again. That had serious repercussions both on the

policies followed by the DP and it also caused structural reforms to create a society prone to ethno-religious riot.

In terms of other state policies, the Democrats continued the same practises towards minorities. Although it was a new party in power, state policies of earlier years were continued in the 1950s and created such a political, social and economic environment that cultivated such conditions that allowed the 6-7 September 1955 violent events to take place. These events against the Rum minority of Istanbul signalled the beginning of the end for the Greek Orthodox community of Istanbul and were also a turning point in the bilateral relations of Greece and Turkey. The Greek Orthodox minority, which counted for about 103.800 people in 1955 (Güven 2006: 268), was deeply affected, not only financially by the destructions caused during the riots, but also in the long-run. Soon after the events 5.000 members of the minority fled the country and during the following years the minority diminished gradually by an average of 10% per year (Güven 2006: 279).

Greek-Turkish relations, after a 30-year period of peaceful and fruitful relations, reached an ever lowest point after the September 1955 events (Alexandris 1992: 267) which also had implications on the Tripartite Agreement among Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia, and NATO. Greece refused to participate on allied drills on October 1955 and also withdrew the Greek military officers from Smyrna NATO headquarters, as a protest against the 6/5 September 1955 events (Tsitsopoulos 1988: 186).

The 1955 events from the point of view of ethno-national riots

The events of the night of 6 September 1955 are seen as an instance of collective violence. For others it is a spontaneous rioting of a mass that got over excited and eventually out of control. Then again, there are those who see it as a government conspiracy that progressed quickly, strayed from the initial plan and got out of control. However, none of these views completely explains the facts or convince us of the reasons why should and would so many people take part in this outbreak of violence at the specific time.

In an attempt to better understand what happened the night of 6 September 1955 it is crucial to stress the importance of ideological and structural transformations the Turkish society underwent at that period.

A very important aspect in the history of the Turkish society and Democracy is that Turkey is a state that was formed out of an empire. This implies that citizens of the newly found Republic of Turkey were not homogenous. The Ottoman Empire was a typical example of an Empire with multi-ethnic populations (Brubaker 1997). A nation state however, and even more so a newly found nation-state, has to achieve the homogenisation of its people (Gellner 1983). In this respect, states adopt series of measurements to achieve that. One of the major tools is the national educational system, imposing one language as the official language of the state, and then there are numerous

other measures such as outlawing the expression of identities and cultures that differ from the dominant-state one.

As Ali Tuna Kuyucu (2005) analyses, there are also some conditions that are common to violent outbreaks. 6-7 September riots targeted the non-Muslim minorities, that part of the population that was perceived as “others” by the dominant population. The riots are proof of the climax of the process of ethno-religious unmixing and homogenisation of Turkey. They reveal crystallised identities. On the one hand there is the dominant group and on the other we find its opposite which is perceived by the majority as a threat of its existence and a hazard to the well being of the whole community and even the state itself.

Turkish nationalism, formed in the aftermath of a multiethnic empire, acquired an exclusionary dimension (Cagaptay 2006). The nation-building elites contoured the boundaries of the Turkish nation. It follows that some were included (e.g. Kurds) some excluded. Those who were included were assimilated and formed a homogenous nation. This process lasted decades and did not fully succeed (Kadioglu 1996). Enclaves of otherness remained to exist, a phenomenon which is especially common in after-empire nations (Brass 1991). The part of the population that had successfully adsorbed the top-down reforms, had by 1950s a clear consciousness and a crystallised idea of what constitutes its collective identity and what does not. In crystallised identities one knows what makes one a Turk or a Greek, and feels strong about his characteristics and the “other” respectively.

With crystallised identities and a group of certain preconditions we compose a volatile environment that has the potential of exploding into an ethno-religious rioting. Having these preconditions in a society does not directly mean that an outbreak will take place. It only means that the environment is riot-prone.

Therefore it does not mean that whenever there are conflicting crystallised identities, there is eruption of violence. But it is one of the main preconditions. What mobilises such a response is an amalgam of the “right” social, economic, and political circumstances coupled with a well organised and efficient planning (Ozkirimli 2000: 112-115). In other words, the common characteristics of collective violence are first of all that they are planned actions and secondly that they are organised by formal or informal organisations. Moreover there must be a network of people and organisations involved in them as well as a leader (Brass 1997).

Another characteristic is that they occur in urban environments, especially when there is rapid urbanisation accompanied with poverty and unemployment. It also follows that members of a society will be discontented because of the economic difficulties they face and therefore this discontent will make them more prone to get involved in a riot. Moreover people who are under great economic pressure see a gain out of such assaults. They are usually promised some kind of reward or looting. Although there was no much theft at the 6-7 September events, shops of non-Muslims were mainly destroyed. So even if looting was not the main objective, Muslim shop-keepers benefited from the events.

So an economic crisis or an economic slowdown provide masses with an additional reason for an outbreak, especially because in riots there are usually material incentives for the actors involved in the execution of the master plan. A last point that plays an important role in violently mobilising the masses is the competitive politics of democratising regimes.

All of the above elements that constitute a “riot prone environment” were found in Turkey and the case of the September 1955 riots. To start with, ethno-national riots are not irrational and spontaneous; they serve a greater purpose, usually a larger political plan. In the case of Turkey the great political event of the agenda was the forthcoming meeting in London about Cyprus. This was a very critical point in the domestic politics and the foreign policy of Turkey.

Then again riots are organised by formal and informal organisations, and there is a leadership orchestrating the various activities. Politicians, the police, student organisations, participated in some way, all of them performing different roles. Some agitated the crowds, others spread rumours, still others distributed pamphlets and organised demonstrations.

As for the structural transformations of Turkey at the time we have to point out the factors that radicalised the population. The population of Istanbul underwent a rapid urbanisation, with rural masses that were unspecialised and of poor educational and instructional background. That led to high levels of unemployment and poverty as not

only were the new populations unspecialised in some form of occupation but there was an economic slowdown after 1953 in the country as well.

A great internal migration flow started in early 1950s. For the five years from 1950 to 1955 the population growth rate of urban regions expanded from 2.25 to 5.57 and conversely the percentage of people living in rural areas declined from 81 per cent to 77 per cent (Icduygu and Sirkeci 1999: 249-254). It is worth mentioning here that for the same five years, the population of Istanbul increased from 1 million to about 1.6 million and the percentage of the population that had not been born in the city was 44 per cent, rather than about 37 per cent that was only five years before that.

Accordingly, indicative of the dire economic conditions of the times and the harsh demographic transformations, is the dramatic increase of *gecekondu*² around Istanbul. In 1955 there were 250.000 inhabitants who lived in about 50.000 *gecekondu* and the number of their inhabitants reached 1.200.000 by 1960.

The economic crisis started at the end of 1953 during the ruling of the Democrat Party and under these conditions populist and nationalist discourses, with strong xenophobic tendencies could raise their voices at a time when Turkish politics were democratising. The general economic and social conditions combined led to a wider appeal of such discourses. We should also stress that governments, at times, create pseudo crises in order

² *Gecekondu* (built at night) could be translated as “squatter housing”. In 1950s there was a flow of mass migration from the countryside to big cities. Cities, however, were not equipped to receive such a wave of new settlers. Newcomers, having no other choice, built their own houses on unused land at the outskirts of big cities. *Gecekondu* dwellings increased rapidly in number and are still expanding to this day.

to take away the attention of discontent people from their actual problems. So such discourses are a way of disorientating the people. Last but not least, ethno-national riots take place under democratising regimes with competitive politics.

We also need to take into consideration the political relations between Greece and Turkey. The Greek-Orthodox minority has a special place in the crystallisation of the Turkish national identity. Even before the formation of the democracy of Turkey, during the Ottoman Empire the Greek-Orthodox millet had a special place and role in the society. Moreover the Rum millet was the first one to struggle for its independence which caused stronger sentiments against it in the consciousness of the Turkish people. Later the Greek-Turkish wars, the Lausanne Treaty and the exchange of populations aggravated Greek-Turkish relations even more and placed each population in the category of the “other” used for their self-determination (Millas 2000). The millet-i-Rum and the Greeks later on, played a central role in the formation of Turkish national identity.

Historical background of Greek-Turkish Relations and the Rum minority of Istanbul

The tragedy of the Greek-Turkish War of 1912-1922 was coupled with a second even worse calamity, the exchange of populations. Apart from the Christian minority of Istanbul and the Muslim minority of Western Thrace, who were excluded from the compulsory out of populations from their domiciles, all other minorities had to leave their homelands. The implementation of the Lausanne Treaty proved problematic for various reasons. The main nature of the treaty was problematic itself, as it resorted to extremes in order to solve once and for all what seemed to be an irresolvable dispute between Greece and Turkey (Clark 2006). Nevertheless the same Treaty left many things unsettled and thus caused further frustration on both sides which went on until the end of 1920s.

In short, with the signing of the Lausanne Treaty in 1923, the two sides decided for the exchange of about 1.2 million Greeks who left from Turkey and about 400.000 Muslims who came from the other side of the Aegean to Turkey. The Greeks residing in Istanbul and the two islands of Imvros and Tenedos, and the Muslims in Western Thrace were to be excluded from the exchange of populations. It proved to be very complicated to solve the problem of the non-exchangeable populations, as the Turkish side maintained that those Greeks who were not born in Istanbul, even if they had been living there for decades, would not be considered *etablis* (settled), and so they would have to be exchanged. Even if one was born in one of the provinces of the Ottoman Empire, or in

another province of the Republic of Turkey, and lived in Istanbul, was not considered by the Turkish state as *etablis*, if he had not been added to the *nufus*, the register of the citizens of a municipality of Istanbul.

This argument, if accepted, would drop considerably the number of Greek-Orthodox who would stay in Istanbul. The issue was eventually solved with the article 10 of the Ankara Agreement signed in 10 June 1930. In the meantime, however, the number of Greeks of Istanbul was already reducing. Many of those had not been decided upon as exchangeable, wished to travel to Greece but were unable to take a passport, since the issue was still pending. Those people finally decided to leave from Turkey without having the right to return there again. Eventually when the Ankara Agreement was signed only 73.000 Greek-Orthodox were still living in Istanbul whereas before 1922 the number of Greek-Orthodox of Istanbul is estimated at around 350.000 (Oikonomopoulos 1977).

The Republic of Turkey was founded on 29 October 1923 and incorporated as Turkish citizens any minority members that were still residing in its territories. However under the leadership of Ataturk, the Republican People's Party put into effect its project of homogenising the Turkish nation. Nationalism became the new political ideology that stressed a rigidly defined Turkish national identity in all spheres of life. The Kemalist ideology was targeting to create a society where there would be no ethnic, cultural, class or other differentiation among its members.

During the single-party regime, measures were taken in order to reach the goal of a unified society. Non-Muslim minorities were, naturally, targeted as a group that had to be incorporated into the Turkish nation. In 1926 the government passed a new law that made Turkish the only language to be used in business transactions and businesses. This was a step towards nationalising the economy that worked against non-Muslim minorities who were in general particularly active in commerce and business. Later, in 1932, another law prohibited non-Muslims from certain occupations – which were usually engaged by non-Muslims – and led to their dismissal. Alexandris (1983: 185) notes that after these measures about 9.000 non-Muslims left Turkey as they were unemployed. At the same time there were campaigns led by the press and the government which put pressure to non Turkish speaking communities to use the Turkish language only.

Another stroke that hit the minority was the 1942 Wealth Tax (Varlik Vergisi). The Republican People's Party voted at the Grand Assembly law No. 1842 with which a gratuity tax was imposed on the estates of individuals. Tax was estimated by committees that decided on the spot for the amount of tax for each individual in a peremptory, unrestrained, unappealable manner, without taking into consideration any criterion or records (Aktar 2000).

The government justified that the tax was going to burden those individuals that had accumulated huge sums of money from the black market during wartime. But in fact, the Wealth Tax was an anti-minority policy as tax-payers had to pay extraordinary amounts of money and those who were incapable of paying the corresponding tax were sent to

“work camps” in Anatolia where they worked on road construction works, and their possessions were confiscated. We should also note that there was huge difference in the amount of tax paid by Muslims and non-Muslims. Muslims paid only a negligible amount and at the same time non-Muslims had to sell their properties in order to find the necessary cash to pay for the tax. After this measure about 30.000 Jews and 20.000 Orthodox Christian citizens of Turkey were economically ruined and fled the country.

Chapter 3 – The Press and Newspapers in Turkey

The Press in Turkey

The history of the press of Turkey of early 20th century can be divided into two periods. The first period covers 1919-1945 and can be called the Kemalist Period and the second one covers 1945-1960, the period of transition to multiparty era.

1919-1945: The Kemalist Period

In the first period (1919-1945) the Press is in general divided into those who support the Kemalist movement and those who are against it. When the Kemalists turned to the Soviet Union for help in their fight against foreign occupation, permission was given to newspapers such as *Yeni Dunya*, whose only purpose and subject of concern was the success of the struggle against foreign powers.

In the process, the circulation of numerous newspapers came to an end. It is not known whether that happened due to some external pressure from governmental sources; it is more likely however that a general concern about the owner's future led many people to stop circulating matter. This view is enforced by the fact that about 150 people were exiled as a result of their written work (Kologlu 1994).

At the beginning of the 20th century the press used to openly support the Kemalist movement. Two such papers were published in Ankara, the *Hakimiyet-i Milliye* and *Yenigün*. Other such papers published in other parts of the country are, *Yeni Adana*, *Açıksöz* (Kastamonu), *Sebilürreşat* (Ankara), *Babalık* (Konya), *Öğüt* (Konya), *İstikbal* (Trabzon), *Işık* (Giresun) and *Albayrak* (Erzurum). In Istanbul most papers supported Ankara in its struggle except from *Peyam-ı Sabah*, *Alemdar*, *İstanbul ve Aydede*. Newspapers and magazines that were in favour of Kemalists are the newspapers *Akşam*, *İkdam*, *Vakif* and the magazine *Güleryüz*. These propagated the ousting of minorities and were in complete harmony with the ideas of the Committee of Union and Progress (Kologlu 1994).

Kemalists gradually took a firm control of the circulation of news and information. The telegraph was put under control and progressively it became very difficult for any kind of news, either through telegraph or through newspapers to enter the area that was controlled by Kemalists. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk set up the Anadolu Ajansı (Anatolia Agency) and the Matbuat Umum Mudurluğu (Public Press Directorate). This way there was uniformity in the distribution of news and current affairs information, not only within the Kemalist area but throughout the whole of Turkey as well.

With the victory of the Kemalists, any publication against them in Turkish as well as any publications circulated by the minorities were terminated (Zurcher 1995: 188). Any editors and publishers who were opposing to Kemalist were pushed away from the country.

After Ankara became the ruling centre of the country, many foreign language speaking newspapers were circulating again such as French, Greek, Armenian and Hebrew, but none of them had any political or social influence. Besides, all of them had to abide to the principles and the mindset of the Republic of Turkey in order to avoid been shut down. In short, starting from 1919 and until 1922 the Kemalists managed to impose Turkish as the single language of the press, throughout the country.

When, in 1928, the Arabic characters were replaced by the Latin alphabet it became clear that the press was attached to the Kemalists as within 4 months all newspapers had already changed the printing characters (Zurcher 1995: 196). At that time only 5% of the population were literate and even fewer than that managed to become accustomed to the new alphabet; that had of course a strong impact on the circulation of the press.

The 1930s saw a growth in the circulation, variety and quality of the press. In 1931 the first law concerning the press was put in force. Any reference to the sultanate, caliphate, communism and anarchism was penalised. Moreover the ruling elite had the right to close or ban the circulation of any material that turned against it. As a result the Public Press Directorate had so much power that even with one telephone call it could impose the closing down of a newspaper. Eventually the Ankara Radio became a more popular means of information than the newspapers.

1945-1960: Transition to multi-party system

During the second period, starting in 1945, the opposition, through the press, gained momentum. Hundreds of new newspapers and magazines, coming from all parts of the country were in circulation and many of them were opposing to the ruling elite. At the same time the Radio lost its power to form the public opinion. At that time *Ulus* was mouthpiece of RPP and *Vatan* the advocate of DP. The dispute between the two newspapers started in 1945 and was then spread to almost all papers.

As the economic crisis deteriorated, cohesion among Atatürkists diminished. This insecurity between the ruling elite made it respond with more menace to any voices raised against it. Eventually in mid 1945 İsmet İnönü decided to liberalise the political system which soon became a multi-party democratic political system.

The newspaper *Hürriyet* which started circulating on 1st May 1948 played a decisive role in the Greek-Turkish Relations. The newspaper promoted its circulation by focusing on spicy news and a dense reporting of sports-news as well as current affairs issues. England supported the newspaper and supplied it with the best printery equipment of the time (Alexandris 1988b: 495). Issues concerning Greek-Turkish relations were reported in such a manner that they would appeal to the national sentiments of the Turkish people. Apparently news about the Patriarchate, Cyprus and Greece did stir the national feelings of Turks and were used by *Hürriyet*, gradually all the more. In general at that period there are “attacks” of the press against non-Muslims, and there were only occasional references

to minority-community internal issues, their religious celebrations and other such “soft” issues. However *Hürriyet* at the beginning of its circulation in 1948 sold about 11.000 papers. At that time only a few articles could be received as an attack on the minorities (Güven 2006: 247). However later, when the Cyprus issue surfaced the circulation of the paper jumped to about 200.000 papers, and even later, when the Cyprus issue reached its climax, circulation jump-roofed to 650.000 papers (Alexandris 1988b: 496). The *Hürriyet* style of journalism and its apparent success led other newspapers in Turkey to follow its example.

Sadly, the 1955 September riots of Istanbul were used by the Turkish government as a pretext in order to impose various restrictions in an attempt to control any opposing voices raised against her. Firstly in order to resume immediate control of the situation right after the riots, the government imposed martial law in Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara; the Parliament did not function, and the press, the opposition and student organisations were suppressed (Güven 2006: 294). Especially the press was badly hurt as the government’s initial conviction was that the main culprits for the September riots, were the firing articles that were published the period before the events and caused the impulsive outbreak of the people.

Many restrictions were imposed on newspapers and there were specific issues that were not to be touched upon (Güven 2006: 296) or heavy penalties would fall heavy and the newspaper would stop from circulating. The first newspaper to stop circulating was *Ulus* and then *Medeniyet*. Three newspapers from Istanbul, *Tercüman*, *Milliyet*, *Hergün*,

stopped printing for 14 days after the events. All minority newspapers, especially Armenian and Greek were strictly censored. At the bottom line, all newspapers were more or less controlled, for an indefinite time.

Apart from censorship, the government also used other means to control the press. Printing paper was distributed by the state thriftily as well as printing ink and other necessary material for printing (Vasileiadis 2008). These measures were a strong blow to the prestige of the press at that time.

In the 50s the press had grown independent in its views, taking advantage of the liberal political situation, and had been freely criticising the government (Kologlu 1992). With the incident of the September riots the government also passed two new bills in 1956 which curtailed the freedom of press. The new bills set such preconditions that it became more complicated to own a newspaper, become an editor or a newspaper correspondent. Fines and imprisonment became an easy answer to those who would report false news or news that could harm the political and financial status of the state and cause general turbulence (Güven 2006).

In short, apart from the newspaper *Zafer*, which was a mouthpiece of the government all other opposing or independent newspapers almost completely avoided reporting internal affairs issues and focused on foreign affairs news (Güven 2006: 301).

Greek-Orthodox Minority Press

Newspapers represent the current and ephemeral. What gave birth to newspapers was the need to access information and to keep a community up to date. However newspapers served at the same time as a means of preserving and enhancing the collective consciousness of people.

Minority newspapers of Istanbul served exactly as such. The numerous newspapers published in Istanbul recorded and combined the historical background of the minority with their current affairs and so they open a window to us on their everyday life. Examining the minority newspapers we are presented with a picture that adequately depicts the struggles of a society, its aspirations, its political views and ideological confrontations as well as its evolution through time as we follow its daily pace.

Rum minority press of the 20th century is exceptionally rich both in context and language. If we were to make a first division of the minority newspapers we could divide it according to the language they were using to communicate. There are those which are written exclusively in Greek, others that are bilingual or multilingual. There were newspapers that used the Turkish language while using the Greek alphabet (Karamanlidika). There were also some bilingual newspapers, where some articles were in Greek and other in Turkish. There were also the Greek – French ones (these were published by the Catholics of Istanbul) and finally there were multilingual newspapers, published by Turkish journalists, who added articles written in other languages as well,

such as Greek, Armenian, French and Karamanli (Valsamidis 2008). The abundance of the press published in Greek proves the dynamism of the Greek speaking Rum minority of Turkey and especially that of Istanbul. It also shows that Greek speaking minority of Istanbul was prosperous and functioning in a communal spirit.

With so much printed matter, we conclude that journalism as an occupation was valued by the society. Judging from the written works in newspapers we get a picture of journalists who are in majority well educated, with an excellent knowledge of the Greek language and a fighting spirit.

Earlier we categorized the printed matter according to the language used in the articles and we called them newspapers. These are called as such because they include, among other things, current affair news, as well as everyday news regarding the local community, cultural and social events as well as ecclesiastical ones. Some of the prints of early 20th century are self-characterised as newspaper, magazine, survey or other, and the periodicity of their publication varies too. There are the daily ones and the weekly or monthly ones, although the latter is not as often³.

Despite their periodicity and whether the printed matter was a newspaper or magazine, the crucial issue is that apart from their informative role, they served as an important means of enhancing and preserving the use of Greek language among the Rum minority. Newspapers played a very important role in the self-consciousness of the minority

³ This information is based on personal research on the archives and catalogue of the relevant archive of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

members. They also helped improve the Greek-language usage and spread new ideas and life-styles coming from the west. All this helped create a society that was aware of its position in the Turkish state, who would try to provide its members with better school education and form Cultural Associations.

Although most of the time journalism was mild, there were inevitably times when it became more fighting and critical of the central state, the Ecumenical Patriarchate or Councils administrating minority institutions. These attempts of the newspapers to play an active role in the society were occasionally met with censorship (Vasileiadis 2008).

Censorship was to an extent applied in general to newspapers and journalists at the time. Minority journalists and newspaper editors and publishers were slightly more affected by it compared to Turkish newspapers (Güven 2006: 297), (Kologlu 1994: 78). Often not only would a newspaper stop its circulation but other measures were also imposed such as heavy fines, imprisoning the newspaper editor, owner or other employees, and at more troubled times even deportations of journalists and newspaper or magazine owners. Especially during the first half of 20th century, freedom of expression was occasionally restricted causing problems to journalists, especially to those who were minority members.

Very often editors who were obliged to stop publishing would come up with other ways of continuing their work. One course of action was to change the title of the newspaper, changing the editor in chief, often only in the letter, whereas in practice the editor

remained the same person-acting behind the scenes, or claiming that there is a new owner of the newspaper, usually an acquaintance, who would only act as a cover for the actual editor of the newspaper. Very often editors would rent the title and ownership of a newspaper that was inactive or even buy it (Vasileiadis 2008).

Considering the plethora of the newspapers published in Istanbul and their specific target group one can wonder about their viability. Some of them were self-supporting. Others, whose circulation and target group was more restricted, had to be funded by minority institutions or other economically strong community members. That also meant that their ideological alignment went hand in hand with their sponsor.

Disagreements and article-fighting between newspapers was not unseen. Usually the apple of contention would concern major minority institutions and their practice, the Ecumenical Archbishop of Istanbul (Athenagoras in the years 1950-1955) himself or the practice of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in general as well as political alignment (Venizelians versus Anti-Venizelians, a contention that lasted for years). Disputes over language (*Katharevousa*, elaborated, formal Greek language, closer to ancient Greek, mostly used in writing, versus *Demotiki*, vernacular Greek) generated certain political and religious orientation as well (Koliopoulos 2004: 264-66). The Ecumenical Patriarchate and the “Megali tou Genous Scholi” (Fener Rum Erkek Lisesi) stood in favour of *katharevousa*/the conservative-archaic version of Greek and the progressive more liberal ones stood for the *Demotiki*/modern-conversational Greek language. This conflict was important in the formation of the Greek national idea and self-determination

in mainland Greece, and these ideological reconsiderations influenced the peripheral Greeks who were in touch with the “homeland”.

The minority press of Istanbul raised to prominence numerous remarkable journalists and the Greek-Orthodox minority press of Istanbul was comparable to European (Alexandris 1988a: 138). It is difficult to name all active journalists and editors. Some of them should be mentioned however such as Theodoros Kasapis (Θεόδωρος Κασάπης), writing as far back as 1877 for the newspapers *Hayal* and *Momos* (Μώμος), both of them satiric papers, famous for their caricatures. Other established journalists are Evaggelinos Misailides (Ευαγγελινός Μησαιλίδης), Vlasis Gavriilides (Βλάσης Γαβρηιλίδης), Stavros Voutiras (Σταύρος Βουτυράς), Konstantinos Spanoudes (Κωνσταντίνος Σπανούδης), Pananos Kesisoglou (Παναανός Κεσίσογλου) and others, some of whom moved to Greece and worked there successfully, continuing their writing career (Tarinas 2007).

Another journalist praised for his personality, work and general contribution to the community is Theodoros Kavalieros Markouizos (Θεόδωρος Καβαλιέρος Μαρκουίζος). He was of Greek decent from the island of Syros. He started working as a journalist in 1910 at the weekly paper *Ap' ola* (Απ'όλα) which he kept publishing for 10 years. Through the years he became an important figure and was a sought after editor. In 1932 he started publishing the newspaper *Efimerida* (Εφημερίδα). However, its circulation stopped soon after that and started again years later, in 1943. The newspaper *Efimerida* would reproduce numerous articles about Greece, usually taken from Greek newspapers,

and a main article elaborately written so that current affairs were criticised in a way that would not lead to their censorship (Tarinas 2007).

History of newspaper *Apogevmatini*

June 12, 1925 was the first publishing day of the daily newspaper of Istanbul Rum minority newspaper *Apogevmatini*, one of the oldest newspapers published in Turkey along with *Cumhuriyet*.

Two brothers of the Rum minority Antonis and Konstantinos Vasileiadis (Αντώνης και Κωνσταντίνος Βασιλειάδης) were owners of a pharmacy. After the implementation of a new law, they were obliged to shut down their pharmacy. According to that law every area would only have one pharmacy so as to promote the financial viability of all pharmacies and to discourage contention among them. If in one area there were more than one pharmacy at the time of the implementation of that law, then it was chosen by lot which of the pharmacies would remain open, the ones not chosen had to shut down immediately.

The Vasileiadis brothers had the unfortunate luck to have their pharmacy in an area where there were other pharmacies so the authorities had to draw a lot. At that lot their pharmacy was not drawn and therefore they had to shut it down and find a different occupation. In 1925 they eventually got a permit to start publishing a newspaper instead. That was the beginning of *Apogevmatini*. The editor of the newspaper was Theodoros Kavalieros Markouizos who wrote most of the articles along with his subeditor, Grigorios Yiaveridis (Γρηγόριος Γιαβερίδης) who replaced him after 1929 and until 1979. The

technician and expert in the printing office was Odysseas Kristalidis (Οδυσσεάς Κρυσταλλίδης).

Theodoros Kavalieros Markouizos is praised for his journalistic competence. His articles were full of passion which caused distaste to the authorities (Vasileiadis 2008). Eventually Markouizos had to be dismissed so as to keep the newspaper being published. Yiaveridis became the new editor of *Apogevmatini*, a more moderate journalist who worked for the newspaper until his last moments. He was the editor of the newspaper from 1929 until 1979.

The ownership of the newspaper changed in 1968. Konstantinos Vasileiadis passed the ownership to his brother-in-law, Georgios Adosoglou (Γεώργιος Αδόσογλου). This new successor of the newspaper had never worked as a journalist; he was a doctor but accepted to take over *Apogevmatini* so as not to let the newspaper be shut down. He was the owner and manager of the newspaper from 1968 until 2002. Later in his life, although he was bedfast for almost 10 years, he managed to keep the newspaper alive and circulating. During this time, the quality of the articles and the variety was not as high but still the paper was circulating as a daily newspaper continually since 1925. The circulation in the end of 2002 had dropped so much that only 80 papers were printed.

It appears that the owner and manager of *Apogevmatini* after 2002 and until today is Evsevia Adosoglu. Other posterior editors are Stefanos Papadopoulos, Vasileios Kasapakis, Iordanis Bektasoglou and Odysseas Theodoridis. From November 1976 as

founder of *Apogevmatini* appears Grigorios Yiaveridis. From April 1977 there is a new numbering of the newspaper implying that the title was sold. At that time, the editor of *Apogevmatini* was Haralambos Robopoulos for one year, from 1976 to 1977. He was succeeded by Stefanos Papadopoulos who remained as editor from 1977 until 2004. Pola Taktak worked as editor and head of the material from April 2004 until today.

The current editor of *Apogevmatini*, Michalis Vasileiadis became the editor-in-chief of the paper in 2002, when Giorgos Adosoglou passed away. Vasileiadis worked as editor of newspaper *Embros* until 1975, which was again published in Istanbul. However in 1964 he had been accused of undermining the national unity of Turkey through his articles. Although his trial lasted 10 years, he was eventually vindicated. Due to the political turmoil of the 1960s and 1970s the population of the Rum minority dropped significantly which in turn had a negative effect on the circulation of the newspaper *Embros* (Εμπρός) that led to its closure. Vasileiadis who was its editor at the time had to leave Turkey as well and find shelter in Athens, where he published another newspaper, called *Eptalofos* (Επτάλοφος) until 2000. In 2000 he retired after some personal problems. And two years later, when *Apogevmatini*'s last editor, Georgios Adosoglou passed away, Vasileiadis was offered to work in charge of *Apogevmatini*. He accepted this offer and moved to Istanbul (Vasileiadis 2008).

In the first decades of its circulation, *Apogevmatini* had initially a target group of about 180.000 people. This target group included three different categories of people. Firstly members of the Rum minority of Istanbul. Secondly, Turkish citizens who became

familiar with Greek because they could not learn the Arabic alphabet. As the Arabic alphabet was used in Turkey until 1925, in printing and writing, it meant that the majority of people who did not receive special education were illiterate, that is unable to read or write in Arabic. Thirdly, at that time there were many newcomers in Turkey; people who were included in the exchange of populations and others who had travelled from the Balkans to the newly found Republic of Turkey. Some of these people already knew Greek or had found it easier to learn Greek than Ottoman Turkish language.

Like all newspapers at that time, *Apogevmatini* was essentially sold in the city of Istanbul. Other selling spots outside the city itself would be in a close distance in the suburbs of the city and as far away as the paper could be distributed on a daily basis. Inside the city itself papers were either delivered to readers or more usually sold on certain spots around the city, usually on central places, such as a patisserie or the central coffee shops.

The main source of information was the Radio. First of all the National Radio, based in Ankara had a special programme for journalists. The second source for *Apogevmatini* was the Radio of Athens, from where they received information about news concerning Greece. Then there was the domestic Press, as a secondary source. Any news from the Turkish Press concerning Greece, minority-community issues were reported by *Apogevmatini*. There were also permanent correspondents in key cities. Andromegas Konstantinidis in Athens, Dimitrios Petropouliadis in Bucharest and Dimitrios Dimitroulis in Moscow.

The newspaper set off in 1925, a year that is significant and related with the motto of the newspaper, found on the upper part of the first page; a phrase taken by Victor Hugo, “Αἱ νέαι εποχαί επιβάλλουσι και νέα καθήκοντα”. A translation of that would be “new times impose new duties too”. This gives us an idea of how the minority felt about its place and role in the Turkish state. The status of the Rum community had changed. Its role and placement used to be different when it was part of the Ottoman Empire. As a minority of the Turkish Republic, it had a different role to play and different rights than those it used to have.

In the course of time, when the newspaper had already outlived most of the other newspapers, and had not stopped circulating daily for decades, a new motto was added. “Ουδείς γεννάται, ουδείς αποθνήσκει άνευ της Απογευματινής”, that is “nobody is born, nobody passes away without *Apogevmatini*”. The long life of the newspaper had made *Apogevmatini* an inseparable part of the Rum community of Istanbul. The motto implies that the pages of the paper were considered the most updated and trustworthy way to get informed of such events, as well as other social happenings organised by members of the community, such as parties given at minority members’ home, celebrating of name days and birthdays, weddings and funerals and etcetera.

Format and Layout of Apogevmatini

The newspaper *Apogevmatini* was a four-page matter, daily with an evening circulation, as implied by its title as well. From 1925 to 1943, the newspaper was composed of two large pages, that means that it had four numbered pages, with 600 mm to 470 mm dimensions. From 1943 to 1962 again it had 4 numbered pages and 465 mm to 330 mm dimensions. Finally, from 1962 until today its shape remains the same, again with 4 numbered pages and 560 mm to 410 mm dimensions.

In the middle of the upper front page, centred we read the title of the paper, first with Latin characters, written as “*Apoyevmatini*” and underneath that, with larger characters the name of the newspaper in Greek “*Απογευματινή*”. On the left of the title there is the year of regular circulation of the newspaper, 1950 is the 25th year of continuous circulation. Every paper is numbered, so the paper circulating on the 1st January 1950 was paper No. 8801. Underneath that there is the address of the newspaper, at *Pera* (the Greek name for the area of Beyoglu) or otherwise known Beyoğlu, on Istiklal Caddesi, on the Syrian passage (Suriye Çarşısı), where the offices of the newspaper are still found to this day. The price of the paper was 5 kurus, Owner and Manager is K. E. Vasileiadis. All the above were written in Greek.

On the right side of the title there is the date, day of week, month and year, under that the name of Saint of the Orthodox Christian who is celebrated that day according to the

Orthodox calendar, if there is one. Under that the name of the Editor-in-Chief, who at the time was G. E. Yiaveridis.

Between borders separating the title and all the above mentioned information from the articles, the same information is written in Turkish. Inside these margins we find, additionally, written though in Greek, the motto «Αι νέαι εποχαί επιβάλλουσι και νέα καθήκοντα» by Victor Hugo.

The front page is always densely written. Usually, the largest percentage of the articles is dedicated to news concerning the world current affairs. Very often there are reports on the current affairs of the internal politics of Greece. On the right of the first page there is a standard column called “Lakonika” which means “in short” or “Succinct” where current affairs, usually international or community affairs are reported and criticised.

The second page and third page, the two internal pages, are dedicated to social news, advertisements and social events. One column on the second page is entitled “Social Life” where there are announcements about engagements, weddings, and various celebrations. On this column one can also find announcements about all kinds of activities organised by Minority Associations, Unions and Clubs. Next column of the second page reports accidents such as fires, thefts, fights etc. Next column is entitled “Sto ftero” namely “on the feather”; there one can read various funny stories from around the world, scientific inventions and comments on the internal-social gossips concerning the minority community. On this part of the page one can also find job ads and

advertisements for theatre plays, advertisements for various goods, night clubs and restaurants.

The third page begins with commemorating the grief for the lost ones, any funerals as well as the expression of grief by family or friends of the deceased. The largest part of this page is dedicated to advertising and news concerning the Churches of the minority where we can learn what time and which pray would be sang. There is also a column where parts from short stories were published daily as a series.

On the last page we have again news from the current affairs. This page is as important as the first one. There is usually one central article in the middle of the page and other secondary, shorter news reported. Additionally there are sport news reported and announcements on important social-minority events, etc if a minority member will celebrate his or her name-day or if he or she will host a party. There we can also find letters from the readership about current affairs of the minority and an answer to them either from the editor or from the readership.

Chapter 4

The articles from Apogevmatini.

The relevant articles are from the newspaper Apogevmatini, starting from January 1950 and covering the five-year period to 1955. The citation of articles from the newspaper stops a few days after the 6 and 7 September events in 1955.

The articles were selected according to their approach and the language they used. Very often, as some issues were reported daily, there was some repetition. The articles that will be cited in the following pages are ones which brought some new points to the discussions in question. The limited scope of this research does not allow citing all relevant articles.

The research is inductive. By examining a specific minority newspaper we reach some general conclusions about the minority and the minority press.

Before starting the archive research, we had certain expectations about the possible contents of the articles but what was finally collected, in terms of content and volume, outweighed the initial expectation. So the research could be described as “exploratory”.

By mid 1940s internal social conditions inside Turkey along with external factors pushed the country towards political change. President Inonu, comprehending the need for political change, gave room for transition to a democratic regime. Until that time, during

the single party regime, there was no opposition party but now the creation of such a body was imperative (Ahmad 1977: 102).

What eventually brought about the change in the political circumstances of Turkey was the fervent debates on the Land Reform Bill. Within the RPP, opinions around that Bill which came before the Assembly in January 1945 were quite polarised. After weeks of angry debates, party discipline prevailed and the Bill was passed in June but the cost was high. Critics of the bill did not back down and they finally founded the main opposition party, the Democrat Party (DP) which was officially announced on January 7, 1946. The founders of the party were the businessman-banker Celal Bayar, the bureaucrat Refik Koraltan, the historian Professor Fuad Koprulu and the cotton-growing landlord Adnan Menderes (Ahmad 1977: 103).

The RPP was not alarmed by the new opposition party as the leaders of the DP were in essence Kemalists as well. However general dissatisfaction against the government was widespread and when the Republicans realised that, measures were taken to liberalise the party and the society. Eventually the Republicans decided to hold a general election in 1946. Despite the electoral victory of the Republicans in the July 1946 elections (the RPP won 390 of the 465 seats, the DP only 65 and independents 7 seats), it was now clear that the general consensus was in favour of political change. It was generally admitted that the elections had been conducted in an atmosphere of fear and repression. In these elections the Inonu government started to soften its stance towards the Greek-Orthodox minority of Istanbul (Alexandris 1988a: 129). On the one hand because Inonu wished to ameliorate

the bilateral relations with Greece and on the other hand because the minority comprised a substantial part of the constituency, valuable to the first multiparty elections.

In that respect, at the beginning of 1947 the Turkish government issued an ownership title of the Theological Seminary of Chalki (Ιερά Θεολογική Σχολή Χάλκης), under the name of the Patriarchate. Additionally the tax mukataa, that was 5% of the capital of every institution was not imposed anymore. The management of the minority hospital Balukli and the church of Sotiros Hristou of Galata, which was arbitrarily managed by Papa-Eftym since 1926, were returned to the Greek minority.

Under the Cold War conditions and given the anti-Russian sentiments, the Patriarchate resumed its importance as the fortress that would contain the Russian penetration to Middle and Minor Asia (Kurat 1977). So the election of a new Archbishop was crucial in 1948. Athenagoras, the Archbishop of Americas was finally elected and arrived in Istanbul at the end of January 1949 to take over the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul. The new Archbishop Athenagoras ameliorated Greek-Turkish relations as he was a strong supporter of the rapprochement of the two countries which at the time looked promising (Alexandris 1988a: 136).

In the May 1950 elections the new party rose to prominence. The Democrats won 53.35% of the vote and a total of 408 seats. The percentage of the voters who actually cast their vote was stunning; almost 90% of the registered voters made it to the polls (Ahmad 1977: 109). The two parties however, as they themselves admitted so, had no ideological

differences and were both committed to the programme of creating a modern, prosperous Turkey. The difference between the two parties was not the goals, especially on foreign policy, but the path to achieve them (Hale 2002: 121). At the end of 1940s, the minority seems to have overcome the shock from the Wealth Tax (Varlik Vergisi) and had recovered financially as well. The social life of the minority in Istanbul was rich with dance-nights, literary soiree, various lectures and visits from artists from Greece, etc. (Alexandris 1988a: 138). It is also significant to mention that since 1946 the Greek-Orthodox minority was even represented at the National Assembly with two representatives.

At the same time in Greece political situation was dim. Parties lacked inspiration or leaders who could be capable of ruling inside their party effectively. Papagos, a former commander-in-chief, made the difference in that respect. He won the elections of 1952 with his right wing party and imposed his views. During this decade (1950-1960) differences on ideology and programme, among the parties of the right and center-right were not clear in Greece. Nor did the parties have different electoral base or were consisted by members with different background. In essence all parties were conservative, but in a different degree, parties of the right were the traditional conservatives and the center parties were liberal conservatives (Close 2005: 167).

During these years various changes on the society took place as well. When the anti-communistic paranoia relinquished, power structure of the country became more vulnerable. That is because the population movement and the economic development

made criticising and opposition easier. Moreover, to that direction assisted the better education, and the urbanisation of the country. After 1950 and until the 1970s the proportions of the urban and rural populations were reversed, from 38% and 48% respectively to 53% and 35% (Clogg 1992: 148). Economic growth indicated that the educational system had to be developed as well. Consequently there were many more students and private enterprisers who were gathered in certain, urban areas and had therefore more influence on the status quo of the time than they did before (Close 2005: 86). Any state attempts of earlier years to shift the economy away from agriculture towards industry were abandoned and instead effort was expended in restoring credibility to the currency. After the 1953 devaluation of the currency, the financial policies followed proved fruitful as they settled a long period of monetary stability and economic growth.

This improvement in the economy of the country and the political stability was supported by the financial aid Greece received from the US with a price. In return Greece had to tolerate the American intervention in its internal politics (Koliopoulos 2004: 295). The Truman doctrine and the Marshall Plan were inaugurated in 1947. Greece received a total of \$ 1.7 billion in economic aid from the Marshall Plan, in loans and grants and an additional of \$ 1.3 billion in military aid until the 1960s (Koliopoulos 2004: 295). In return, American approval of a government or a party was necessary to ensure an unobstructed term in office, and US influence on decisions on economy and general policy making was strong and manifested (Clogg 1992: 146).

The common Soviet threat had united Greece and Turkey in the early 1950s. The two countries assumed friendly relations and were also, simultaneously, admitted in NATO in 1952 which made the bilateral relations tighter.

Part 1: 1950

This year the newspaper presents us with a rich palette, touching upon various issues concerning the Greek-Turkish minority, from internal-communal issues, to bilateral ones. The general feeling is positive, stressing the cordial character of bilateral relations.

One of the issues reported in the beginning of the year was related to the Turks of Western Thrace. The Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tsaldaris, gave a speech to the Turks of Western Thrace referring to “the need to build on the Greek-Turkish relations”. Stressing the importance of the bilateral relations of the two countries, he expressed his belief that Greece and Turkey would become “a dynamic twin in that part of the world”. He repeatedly stressed the need to build on the Greek-Turkish relations, but not only on a governmental level, as it was already the case but also among common people and claimed that the new generations should be taught from a very young age how to cooperate in the direction of the common interest of the whole community and to tighten the already close bilateral relations.

Although the Muslim minority of Western Thrace did not occupy the press greatly that year, the few articles that exist are all positive. What is significant is that both sides, both the Greek-speaking press of Istanbul and the Turkish-speaking press support the cordial relations of the two countries and the people.

On January 5, 1950 (No. 8805) two of the main headings of the newspaper refer to Cyprus. When the Orthodox Church of Cyprus announced that there will be a referendum student associations organised protest marches and a few days later, on 11th January 1950 (No. 8810) representatives of the Turks of Cyprus arrived in Ankara in order to come in contact with the Turkish authorities about the forthcoming referendum and to also confirm that they are devoted to Turkey whom they consider as their mother-land and they are following its footsteps closely (e.g. adopting new alphabet, the hat law, etc.).

It is mentioned (22/01/1950, No. 8821) that the Church, who organised the referendum, threatened to excommunicate anyone who would not vote in favour of the Union of the island with Greece. It is also reported that 100.000 out of 250.000 voters cast their vote and that the Turks voted as well, although this information is debunked by the Turkish press of the island.

On January 25 1950 (No 8824), *Apogevmatini* reports an article from *Hürriyet*. At that time *Hurriyet* is the newspaper that leads the way when it comes on the more aggressive journalistic style. After student demonstrations the Turkish government asked the Turkish youth to show temperance. However *Hurriyet* counteracts, arguing that it was due to the youth's enthusiasm that the country had succeeded in the past and that Atatürk himself counted exactly on the youth when he proceeded with the national struggle and his reforms. The Greek article from *Apogevmatini* goes on and reports another article from the Turkish newspaper *Tan*, which tries to decode the demonstrations organised by the youth. It is mentioned that the youth, as true nationalists, feels deep pain whenever it

considers the possibility of the island's sovereignty being passed on from England to Greece. The article ends by approving of the youth's enthusiasm, the Minister of Foreign Affairs' for his policy and the author awaits for the day when Cyprus will be united with "our beautiful homeland".

The author of the Turkish article in newspaper *Tan* seems to be very proud about the nationalistic sentiments of the youth; he also uses the "we" of the homeland-making (Billig 1995) and praises the Turkish youth to the Turks. All possible devices a speaker can use to create the feeling of a homeland and its people, united by common national feelings, are used in this piece. Yet these are reported in a minority newspaper. Do the Orthodox-Greeks feel part of that homeland and of the "we" the speakers call upon? Undeniably, minority members do feel proximity to the Turkish state. When bilateral political situation was not tense and internal politics of Turkey were unruffled, the minority felt more welcome and thus more likely to feel Turkey as its homeland and itself as part of the Turkish "we". However, when times were turbulent, the minority was seen by the Turkish society as an enclave of "otherness" that constituted a threat to the well being of their state. Consequently, minority feelings towards Turkey fluctuated according to how the minority was received by the Turkish society, whereas feelings towards Greece were a constant; Greece always appears as homeland for the Greek-Orthodox minority.

1950 saw numerous new measures in favour of the Rum minority, especially with regard to minority institutions and schools. First of all, it was reported that "Teachers of Turkish

Language will be paid from the State” (January 15, No. 8814), which was a great relief for minority schools (some subjects of the curriculum were compulsively taught by Turkish teachers, paid by the minority schools). We are informed that (February 1, No. 8831) another law specified that minority communities could opt for the administration committee of their pious institutions. Moreover (February 19, No. 8849) the yearly budget for minority schools would be increased considerably (from 61.000 Turkish lira to 403.000).

On Monday 27 February, 1950 (No. 8857), based on an article of *Yeni Istanbul*, we read at *Apogevmatini* that the “relevant observers see that East Europe is getting involved in Orthodox Church” and that “the Church of Moscow is trying to get under its influence the Orthodox Churches”.

On February 28 1950 there is a second article, again based on the reports from the Turkish-speaking *Yeni Istanbul*, entitled the “struggle between the Patriarchate and the Church of Moscow”. *Yeni Istanbul* article reports that the struggle between these two institutions is of great importance, not only from a religious but also from a political point of view as well. A year passed after Athenagoras, from New York, was elected as Patriarchate and he is known to be siding with the West and there were questions on how he would treat those Orthodox Christians who happen to belong to the spiritual sphere of Moscow. Athenagoras is described as very mild and reserved in his stance both towards the West and towards Moscow too. Moscow on the other hand also avoids creating any friction in the relations with Athenagoras. The article goes on to argue that it is in the

interest of the Phanar/Ecumenical Patriarchate that there is a good cooperation with the “Red” Patriarchate of Moscow, so that the prestige on the countries under the influence of Moscow is regained.

On March 21, 1950 (No. 8879) the article entitled “Minorities at Turkey” and subtitled, “the writer of the article holds that minority schools are unnecessary”, informs us about an article that was published at *Yeni Istanbul*. According to the article during the last meeting of the City Council, while discussing the allocation from the city budget, someone commented on the word “minority” and stressed that this word has no relation with the spirit and letter of the laws of Turkey...a stable (state) policy can help create an ideology that will move away from the community ideology. Minority schools are institutions that support the “minority mentality”. The Turks who have attached their lives with this land will not accept this segregation which emanates from the word *minority*.

At the end of April (29 April 1950, No. 8917) Papa Eftym comes up on the current affairs. The article on the bottom of the front page is entitled “Papa Eftym on stage: with new statements, he disrespects the Patriarchate and the Rums”. The article continues as follows: with unfounded arguments he tries to hold the ground that falls apart under his feet. *Yeni Sabah* newspaper writes that Eftym, who is called “başpapa” (the chief pope) of the Turkish-orthodox applied to the relevant authorities and asked that profitable estates (of Rum community) should be appointed to his administration (mutevelli) to look after them. He also said the following: “I believe that there cannot be Rum Orthodox

within the borders of the Turkish state. As we are Turkish citizens it is impossible that we are also called Rum Orthodox. We should be called Turkish-Orthodox community. This causes the long disagreement between us and the Patriarchate. I continue to support this belief as I support that this is a national issue. As Ataturk stressed in his speech, Rum Orthodox, that is the Patriarchate, never stopped being disposed in disfavour towards the Turkish state”.

The Turkish government shows its support to Archbishop Athenagoras and the Patriarchate on the issue of Papa-Eftym. He was a former priest and administrator of some Rum minority institutions for almost two decades without the support of the Rum community. Eventually, with the interference of the Turkish government the issue was solved (April 29, No. 8917) in favour of the minority (May 5, No. 8923).

Later that month, (May 23 1950, No. 8941) the Demokrat Parti (Democrat Party) won the general elections and formed the new government. Adnan Menderes became the new Prime Minister and Celal Bayar was elected as the new President. The new Minister of Foreign Affairs was Fuat Koprulu, who stated openly (27 May, No. 8944) that he “will do whatever possible in order to strengthen the intellectual relations of the two countries. Our policy is familiar to you, the one inaugurated by Ataturk and Venizelos. We are happy about this (Turkish-Greek) friendship, and we will be even happier if we can strengthen it. I believe that Greek politicians feel the same way and that our friendship will not be hindered. The friendship between Turkey and Greece is a solid base for the happiness of our people and global peace.”

On June 2, 1950 (No. 8950), on the bottom of the last page we read an article based on an article from newspaper *Ulus* with the subtitle “the current status quo must be kept”. The article states that “If the attempt of the Union is realised, then there will be attempts to subordinate the Turks of the island to the interests of the Rums here” and continues that “there is no reason why we should accept that the island should be seized by Greece...The Great Idea “*Megali Idea*” of the Greeks is still developing to such an extent that today it claims Cyprus, tomorrow Eastern Thrace and the day after maybe another island. For the time we wish to stress that the Turkish public opinion, after the Dodecanese, will not show any tolerance (towards such claims of the Greeks)”.

On June 7, 1950 (No. 8955) the article on the top of the last page informs that a “Cordial Discussion between Mr Plastiras and Mr Fuat Koprulu took place in Paris” and that a “New impetus on the Turkish-Greek friendship” could be foreseen as there was a “Turkish-Greek common communiqué”. Rum minority seems very supportive of the idea of cordial relations between the two countries.

On the whole, during 1950, we see a minority that is comfortable with itself. The political environment seems to promote a confidence to the minority as minority schools and the Patriarchate receive state support. Any opposing voices heard, calling on the national sentiments of the Turkish people, or wishing for assimilation of minorities, are not alarming for the Rums. Politicians of the two countries often refer to Turkish-Greek friendship and encourage people to leave behind old hatred and devote in a cordial

relation with their neighbouring country. The reporting style of *Apogevmatini* is relaxed, and with the new government in command they have revitalised their hopes for a bright future in Turkey.

Part 2: 1951

Throughout 1951 we see that there are various issues that occupy the press with regard to Turkish-Greek issues as well as Rum minority affairs. The only topic that causes some puzzlement is the Cyprus issue. However there are many bilateral meetings and the press, in general, supports friendly relations between the two countries.

A central article at the beginning of the new year declares that “Turkish-Greek friendship is the cornerstone of Greek foreign policy”. The Greek Minister of Press among others expresses good wishes for the New Year and praises the Greek army as one of the most capable in Europe, always willing to fight for freedom and democracy. At the same paper we are informed of articles from the Turkish press, *Son Telegraf* and *Vatan*, about the wishes Archbishop expressed towards the Greek football military team that visited him. The Archbishop Athenagoras praised the military armies of Greece and Turkey who fight side by side in Korea and who are willing to face the common enemy of both countries, namely communism, if they have to do so in the future.

A few days later, on 11 January 1951, we are informed that there will be a “Turkish-Greek Meeting in Our City (Istanbul)”. The Meeting was attended by the Turkish, the Greek and the American-Marshall delegations. The discussions evolved around the works at Evros region. Our attention is drawn to the use of “our” when referring to Istanbul. It seems that homeland for the Rum minority is the city rather than the country. Of course the author does not feel the need to mention which city he is referring to, since the

newspaper is circulated mainly in Istanbul, but still we are convinced that even if *Apogevmatini* circulated elsewhere, it would be clear what *the city* is, especially for the Rum minority of Istanbul.

On the 13th of January 1951, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs talks about “Turkish-Greek Friendship and Cooperation”. “This friendship is a factor of peace and safety in the Balkan and Mediterranean region. The Minister Fuat Koprulu, when asked to comment on Turkish-Greek relations, gave the following answer: “as I stress with pleasure whenever I have the chance, our relations with Greece are very friendly and cordial, and I do not see any reason why they would be different. This friendship apart from the amicable feelings is also based on the convergence of the interests of the two countries to safeguard peace in the Balkan region and Asia Minor. We agree on the ideals of justice and culture, and the consolidation of world-wide peace”. And he went on saying that there are already positive results at the intellectual level of common understanding between the people of the two countries, as this is the basis of cooperation.

Later, on 16 February 1951, another headline causes some worries. The big headline on the last page of the newspaper informs us that “Venizelos made some statements about Cyprus at the Parliament: The yearning of the Greeks to be united with Cyprus”. After the statements of an English Minister that Greece has not expressed its wish to be united with Cyprus, apparently the issue was brought up at the Greek Parliament and Venizelos was asked to comment on that. Venizelos confirmed that he was surprised by the news as all Greek governments since 1915 have supported the wish of the Greek people to be

united with Cyprus. The fact that this government has not asked the settlement of the issue does not mean that the case has been abandoned. Venizelos also assured that Union with Cyprus is a fervent wish of both the Greek and the Cypriot people.

The following headline made its appearance at the bottom of the first page of *Apogevmatini* on 26 March 1951 (No. 9242): “*Vatan* writes about the Cyprus issue”. And at the subheading we read that “according to Sinan Korle, although the Greek people are indifferent, the government instigates the issue so that people are fooled into forgetting about their hardships”. Sinan Korle wrote the article after a visit to Greece and he is convinced that common people are oblivious to the issue and occupied with the everyday hardships.

Despite some negative articles, bilateral relations were improving and the frequent meetings of the heads of the two states in the context of international organisations paved the way for an amelioration of their relations. At the state level, bilateral relations had recuperated a feeling of mutual trust and cooperation. That benefited the minorities on both countries. Bilateral talks led to an Educational Agreement signed on April 20 by Mr Kontoumas and Mr Aktur. This agreement foresaw the exchange of teachers and schoolbooks. The previous year minority schools in Turkey had been exempted from certain taxes and had been allowed to teach on the Greek language. These measures led to a gradual improvement in the minority education and to a respective increase on the

number of Rum children attending them. Namely the number of school children attending minority schools almost doubled in 10 years⁴ (Alexandris 1988a: 137).

Next month (26 April 1951) another article, this time from *Hürriyet* is reported, at the centre of the front page. The article is entitled as “Fake Friendship” and the subtitle reads: “According to *Hürriyet* there are many vexed issues between Turkey and Greece. The word “Cyprus” should be deleted from Greek dictionaries”. This was the main article of *Hürriyet* that day, full of patriotic messages calling Turks to take action and save their brothers who live in the “Holy” Dodecanese Islands. The language of the article becomes all the more poetic as the writer calls his co-patriots to take back what “nature gave them as a gift” and was deprived of them, and causes a feeling of shamefulness at the reader if they fail to fulfil their duty and loose these “holy” lands, “where the Turkish Flag will definitely flaunt”.

Meanwhile there are various articles (throughout the year 1951, there were 20 articles about Cyprus, including articles from the Turkish press) concerning Cyprus, and presenting the Turkish, official stance on the issue. At the time Ankara was declaring that the geographical proximity of the island to mainland Turkey as well as the fellow countrymen and the historical bond make Cyprus of interest to Turkey, but Turkey supports the status quo. If the status quo is questioned then Turkey will pursue the application of her “lawful right with every possible means”. These are part of the speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs Fuat Koprulu. *Hürriyet* comments on every occasion

⁴ In school year 1945-1946 3.762 Rum students were attending Rum minority schools, all grades- elementary school, junior high school and high school. In 1956-1957 there were 6.912 students.

on similar speeches of the Menderes government concerning Cyprus as “passive”, shameful, cautious, not worthy of the glorious Turkish people who have a fighting spirit, and not representing the view of the people on the issue.

Another issue that came up that year was about the book of Faik Okte and the atrocities he revealed about the Wealth Tax. *Apogevmatini* dedicates its banner headlines to that article as well as half of the front page and one third of the last page. The report is a reproduction of an article published by *Yeni Istanbul* and in short it criticises the Wealth Tax and the opportunistic approach of past governments in the political and economic life of the country. The coverage of the article makes it clear that *Apogevmatini* supports the views expressed, taking this chance to refer to a sensitive issue. The discussion about the Wealth Tax continues in the following days (No. 9302, 9304, 9305) as well especially after the statements of Saraçoğlu, former Prime Minister from July 1942 until August 1946, who, with the occasion of the publishing of the book, made some statements and called the Wealth Tax a tax of “Social justice” and avowed that if given the opportunity, he would impose the same tax again. Despite the statements of former Prime Minister Saraçoğlu, *Apogevmatini* seems content to see that there are opposing voices and that modern people disapprove of such attitudes.

The head of 13 July 1951 (No. 9348) front page declares: “The Turkish Language and the Minorities”, and the subtitle reads: “an answer to the Minister of Education”. The writer, A. Benaroya, is a Jewish Turk and the article was published at the newspaper *Levan*. The writer criticises Minister’s Tevfik İleri’s statement that “whoever takes the advantage of

being one of our compatriots, must also use *the* language as well” and expresses his feeling of being suppressed when he is obliged to speak in Turkish even in personal-family occasions and not allowed to use his mother tongue. The article is a stream of complaints about the freedom of speech, the freedom of language, religion and political views. Apart from the general discountenance of the restrictions of freedoms in Turkey, this article is also interesting as it implies a detachment of the writer from what is considered to be his homeland. Whenever the writer wants to refer to what is supposed to be his homeland, he writes “Turkey” or when referring to the people or language he writes “Turkish”. This, according to Billig (1995), reflects that the writer does not feel as part of the Turkish “we”, nor does he feel that Turkey is his homeland. If we feel that a place is our homeland, then we use abstract words to refer to that place, we do not have to name it; especially when we talk to people who also share the same homeland it is pleonasm to name the homeland with its actual name.

The previous articles draw a picture of 1951 that depicts a gradually growing concern. The Greek-Orthodox minority, as bad omens about Cyprus and minorities in Turkey are becoming all the more often, seems to waver between Greece and Turkey. This uncertainty *vis-a-vis* the two main “candidate” homelands seems to force the minority to feel more attached to Istanbul. Love for their city is demonstrated boldly. Moreover, the minority seems to draw strength to keep its faith on Greek-Turkish cooperation, by the bilateral meetings and articles such as the ones regarding the Wealth Tax book and improvements in minority education.

Part 3: 1952

This year saw a great increase in the articles concerning bilateral issues as there are many official visits, and developments in international as well as bilateral political arenas.

Talks between Turkey and Greece in Washington became all the more frequent as both countries were getting prepared to join NATO. Both sides were officially declaring on every occasion that bilateral relations are becoming more cordial and that the two governments are cooperating closely. In January (No. 9519) it was announced that both Turkey and Greece will become members of NATO, which was eventually realised on February 18, 1952. The two countries had strategic importance for NATO as members (Tsitsopoulos 1988: 180). They were both at an important crossroad, have extended coastlines and share borders with countries allied with Moscow.

Minority and communal issues are reported regularly as well. *Apogevmatini* devotes most of the front page to cover the ceremony for the Epiphany on January 7 (No. 9523). Two pictures are published, which is very uncommon for the newspaper, from the ceremony at Galata. The article starts with a strong nostalgia for the past: “The celebration of the Epiphany in our city with the submersion of the cross in the sea, was very glamorous; it reminded us the past....thousands of people gathered in the churches where the Epiphany is celebrated according to our ways...”.

Later on January 20 (No. 9536) *Apogevmatini* declares that: “Turkey invited Mr. Venizelos to Ankara”. The Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs accepted the invitation. It is characteristic that the *topos* or homeland of the minority is neither of the two countries. It would be normal for any other newspaper in Turkey to write that Mr. Venizelos is invited to Ankara, as it would be taken for granted by all readers that “*our*” government, the Turkish government, is inviting somebody to “*our*” homeland. General references will be evident and self-explanatory. On the contrary, when somebody specifically states “*who*” and “*where*” it is implied that the meaning is not clear for the audience. We may thus conclude that the readers of *Apogevmatini* are detached from the rest of the community and the place as well.

At the end of January (No. 9545) the banner headlines of the front page shout the arrival of Sofoklis Venizelos to “*our city*”. The subtitle states that the official welcome will take place at the waterfront of Galata. The Turkish press sends its regards to the Greek Minister. The Greek Minister arrived at Ankara where the meetings were conducted as planned with all the predictable statements about the unobstructed future of the bilateral relations etc. This environment seems to please the minority. At the column “*Succinct*”, where the editor expresses his views, he appears very positive and confident about a cordial future of the two neighbouring countries.

In a feeling of festivity, *Apogevmatini* (26 April, No. 9633) covers the visit of Adnan Menderes, Prime Minister, and Fuat Koprulu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, to Athens, daily and with extended articles. Many details and pictures that practically cover

a large part of the paper, reveal the support for the visit and the excitement for the positive outlook regarding bilateral relations which would consequently promote the minority's position.

On May 6 (No. 9642), a small yet very interesting article made its appearance on the upper part of the front page: "Will the 500th anniversary of the fall not be celebrated?" The Association of Celebration of the 500th year since the Fall (of Constantinople) had an assembly where one of the members, talking on behalf of the board underlined that people are suggesting not to celebrate this anniversary. Those in favour of this view support that the world will characterise them as "invaders" and moreover this celebration does not go hand in hand with the policy of friendly relations with the Greeks. The article finishes with the following lines: "most of the members attending the assembly however talked in favour of celebrating the Fall with all the necessary festivities".

On the other hand, it seems as if the minority retains its culture and language and especially its toponyms. The main headline declares that: "Prime Minister's speech will be summarised at the Democrat Party Congress in *Μαγνησία/Magnesia* (Manisa). Similarly we read at another article (No. 9697) that "The Turkish Navy celebrated its anniversary at *Μόδι/Modi* (Moda)".

On June 8 (No. 9675) huge banner headings vaunt "Welcome". At the subheading we learn that: "The Greek royal couple will be arriving this afternoon". An extended article

on their arrival and a portrait of the Greek King and Queen in the centre of the page, reflects a mood full of enthusiasm.

The visit is of course a major political event, especially as it is the first official visit of the royal couple to another country, even more so as this visit was to Ankara. However journalists have their own way of marking which side they stand on, which side represents “their” point of view. Journalists do not write for themselves, they write for their readership and they are expected to comply with the expectations of the audience. Journalists write *for* the readers and *to* the readers at the same time (Billig 1995). In other words, covering official visits extensively is expected and anticipated, however the extent of the articles concerning Greece is, compared to other relevant articles, more extended, more detailed and also include extensive speeches delivered by Greek politicians and Greek newspapers, almost as if *Apogevmatini* was reporting domestic news, about Greece. We are presented with such an example on June 8, where we read an article on the internal affairs of Greece and the meeting of Mr Venizelos with the King, and other news about the political life of Greece, taken from the Radio of Athens.

About a month later, on July 5, we read about the attempt to inspire Greek-Turkish friendship from the top down, to the youth of the two countries. On an elite level the project of “Friendship” with official visits, bilateral agreements and numerous interviews given by important politicians to journalists of the neighbouring country was progressing with stunning success and was supported by the press. Apparently, as we learn from the articles, the people were also supporting the amelioration of bilateral relations. This time

we are informed about changes in schoolbooks and a general change in the approach of referring and teaching things about Turkey, as specified in one of the “Turkish-Greek agreements signed in Ankara”.

Only some days later, on July 10 (No. 9705 and later as well), the headline warns: “The impact from the article of *Acropolis* about Hagia Sophia (church turned into mosque turned into museum in Istanbul) on the Turkish press. The Turkish press in general disapproves of it and criticises the authorities for sacrificing a lot of things in order to enforce this friendship. At the same time deplorable incidents in the neighbouring country prove that such a friendship cannot last for long or even exist. The article in the Greek newspaper *Acropolis* claims that the “Great Idea” is not dead and asks that Hagia Sophia is turned into a church again, and honoured as the Acropolis of Orthodoxy. Some papers (*Vatan*) are more cool-headed than others (*Hürriyet*). For the Turkish journalists, this is another chance to “praise the Turks to the Turks”, by underlining that the Turks are not the kind of people who succumb to the will of the others; they are noble people who appreciate honest friendship and as Turks have the right to ask for the Dodecanese but they will not do so, as that could jeopardise the national interests of their country. On the other hand the Greeks personify all the evil and contemptible characteristics of the “other” (Millas 2001).

Apogevmatini on the other hand, does report these articles from the Turkish press but does not take sides. At the beginning paragraph, it always states the source of information (another newspaper, a radio or a correspondent) and presents the views of both sides,

Turkish and Greek, as balanced as possible (with articles of almost equal length and a dry and careful language). The newspaper *Cumhuriyet* asked the Rum intellectuals to express their views on the issue. The view of the latter (Rum intellectuals (*sic*) can be summarised like this: “*Acropolis* is opposing the Greek government. Such a publication is improper at a time when the Turkish-Greek friendship is so warm and the politicians from both countries try so hard to reinforce it. We should not give such coverage to this publication. For us there is no such issue as turning Hagia Sophia into a church”. And the *intellectuals* continue: “Besides, other Greek newspapers have not adopted the view of *Acropolis* about Hagia Sophia and the specific article did not stir up the Greek people”.

We should draw our attention to two things about this article; first of all the fact that the “Rum intellectuals” answer to *Cumhuriyet*; related to that is the second point, the fact that the minority was asked to express a collective stance, as a community, to the Turkish press. From the minority point of view, expressing a collective stance shows its insecurity as if the minority was crouching against a common confrontation. A collective answer is a way to calm the Turkish public opinion that this mild view represents the whole community. Moreover, the answer is not given by any random person but the *intellectuals*, who are entitled to represent the whole community and express a sober opinion; at the same time, granted that they are *intellectuals*, they can guide and influence the rest of the community as well. The Turkish press on the other hand, asks for a collective answer in order to make sure that the answer will be representative of the whole community, and, in a way, to also remind the minority that they should all abide by this collective stance and hold back any opposing voices.

In general, this year the articles referring to Greek Turkish issues, were much more than the previous years. That was due to the official visits exchanged and the issues touched upon after the visits. On the other hand there were also attempts to agitate the readership, which in effect caused a string of articles on the national press of both countries. However, although not mentioned here, there are constantly and systematically articles about the internal affairs of Greece. This year also saw the inauguration of the Celal Bayar school in Komotini and later the visit of Celal Bayar (November 26) to Athens. It seems that the official meetings did not inspire enough confidence to the people in order to truly change their attitude towards the other.

Part 4: 1953

Gradually, articles about Greek-Turkish issues are increasing in number. This year there are at least 150 articles reporting relevant topics with various subjects; the most common issue is the Cyprus issue, followed by Turkish-Greek relations. That year there are numerous (almost on daily basis) articles referring either to domestic Greek affairs or Greek foreign relations and the coverage is tight and with extended articles.

1953 does not start in a very promising way. The article of January 1 (No. 9874) in the centre of the front page announces that: “The Patriarchate is always a nest of intrigue” says *Yeni Sabah* editor. After a long historical overview, starting from 1821, the journalist, Kadircan Kafli, finishes the historical part and gets to the point: “the hatred should be forgotten, and that gate, which remains closed as a protest for the hanging of an Archbishop who betrayed the Turks, has not opened yet”. The writer goes on to personally address Archbishop Athenagoras with the following: “whenever Archbishop Athenagoras is given the chance, he declares that he is a Turk, a compatriot, however he acts as a Greek citizen. As long as the famous central Gate (*sic*) does not open how can one believe that if a chance is given the Patriarchate will not undermine Turkey?”. There are no comments in the same column. The editor prefers to report other, harmless issues, which however report on Greece: for example at the down corner we learn from a small article that “Miss Hellas will visit our city” and on the back an article entitled “Message from King Pavlos to the Greek People. He verifies that the condition of Greece is

improving”. *Apogevmatini* tries to avoid any face to face confrontation with other Turkish-speaking newspapers.

On a political level, however, relations proceed unobstructed. We learn that the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Fuat Koprulu, will invite Mr Stefanopoulos to Ankara. The Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs first paid a visit to Belgrade and from there he visits Athens in order to inform the Greek government about his previous visit and the prospects of the tripartite friendship among Turkey, Greece and (former) Yugoslavia. The same page includes numerous small articles about Greece. Some of them read: “The banking policy”, and another one “The public increased its incomes”. In both cases, the context was clear, yet not specifically stated. The reader would not wonder which public “that” was, the place was clearly defined in this elusive way which is very reassuring for the reader, who feels comfortable in reading about Greek internal issues and at the same time is at home in Turkey.

Later in January (No. 9893), an article at the column “Succinct” is especially interesting as this time the editor expresses his personal views on the “Character of Turkish-Greek Friendship”. Minister Koprulu, on his way to Athens, crossed North Greece where he was warmly welcomed by the people there. For the writer, that proves that the Turkish-Greek Friendship is gradually accepted by the people and is not just a governmental-elite policy which does not touch the public. The article also comments that: “When a Foreign Minister visits a country, he is normally welcomed according to the protocol but in Greece there was a widespread enthusiasm to welcome the train carrying the Minister of

Foreign Affairs of Turkey...” This article again reveals the joy of the Greek-Orthodox minority to see that the bilateral relations are improving. Proud of the warm welcome of the Greek people, *Apogevmatini* again shows the special place of the minority in the middle of the Aegean.

Hürriyet (No. 9899) at the end of January publishes a bombing article about minority books and the Greek language. *Apogevmatini* rushes to report on that and then add its comments. The bombing title of *Apogevmatini* is “*Hürriyet* about the language of our schoolbooks”, and the subtitle “Claims that communist campaign is conducted in our Schools”. The article says that at Rum schools, the books are written in vernacular Greek, a language that is closely related to left-wing ideologies and that school headmasters work subtly to spread this language among the Rums of our city”.

The editor of *Apogevmatini* claims that those who gave such false information to *Hürriyet* serve in the worst manner their interests and their convictions. The information about our schools is false and unfounded, and the editor continues: “were a search to be conducted, all the accusations would prove to be unsubstantial. Our educators, our schools and the fellow minority members (co-nationals or omogenes stoiheio) fall in the eyes of the Turkish public opinion which, on top, create the false idea that we are leftists as well”.

Again with the occasion of the 500th celebration of the Fall of Constantinople the editor of *Apogevmatini* writes in an irritated manner: “It is unacceptable to force a person to

celebrate the subjugation of its people. The people who thought up the moral harassment of the Greek students of Constantinople should keep that in mind. Ismet Inonu himself said that friendship can never mean the annulment of history”.

There are the usual articles against the minority, one from *Zaman*, accusing Archbishop Athenagoras for been involved in the internal affairs of Turkey and acting contrary to the interests of the country. Another article by *Hürriyet* foresees a secret political agenda behind the visit of Archbishop to Jerusalem. Then again *Cumhuriyet* questions Turkish-Greek friendship. We notice that despite the amelioration of bilateral relations on an official level, the press does not follow the same line. Sometimes negative articles about Greece are a way for a newspaper to show its opposition to government policy, other times a mere trick to attract a larger audience and other times an expression of the feelings of the Turkish people. In any case, such articles appear all the more often in 1953 compared to the previous two years.

In the meantime bombing headlines and an article that covers the whole of the last page announce that there was a tragedy in the Ionian Islands (Eptanisa, islands in the Ionian Sea in Greece) caused by an Earthquake. “There are 1000 deaths, 2000 wounded and 120.000 homeless and the earthquakes continue and cause even more catastrophe. The damage seems to be much extended; in the island of Zakinthos only three houses survived the earthquake, all other collapsed. In Greece we learn that people from all regions of the country help the fund raiser.

“Turkey sends her sympathies” reads one of the subtitles; another says “The decisions taken by the Government”. The two homelands, the distant one Turkey and the homely homeland, are addressed in a comfortable manner. It seems that tragedy unites the people and that “earthquake diplomacy” became part of the agenda in the 1950s as well. The Turkish newspaper *Her Gun* publishes a central article which says that “they were very sad to hear about the catastrophic earthquake of the Ionian Islands. The Turks themselves have suffered similar disasters and sympathise with their friends, the Greeks”. The newspaper even urges the government to help the Greeks as much as possible in this suffering, the Greeks “who are our closest friends”. “In such tragedies, political rivalry and disputes are naturally forgotten” the journalist claims.

An issue that came up (September 26 No. 10134) and caused some puzzlement was the emigration of 28 Turks from Western Thrace to Turkey. “They claim support that they were suppressed by the Greek Authorities and they describe life in Greece with the darkest colours”.

Later that year (October 24) the Spiritual Leader of the Turks of Western Thrace rejects that there is suppression from the Greek Authorities. What follows is a series of articles (e.g. No. 10192, 10196) from most of the newspapers of Istanbul who defend that “the minority of Turks of Western Thrace are being oppressed”.

The situation got out of control when “*Hürriyet* suggested retaliation against the Rums there” as an answer to the sufferings of the Muslims in Western Thrace. A long article

makes an overview of the relevant articles from the whole Turkish press. *Milliyet*, a newspaper from the Muslim minority of Xanthi in Greece⁵, comments that the publications of the Turkish press are a mere exaggeration. *Hürriyet* and Hikmet Bill (a journalist who worked for this newspaper and systematically wrote explosive and aggressive articles against Greece and the Rum minority of Istanbul) however do not seem to be convinced and therefore suggest to Mr Koprulu to confiscate the properties of the Rums of Istanbul (in an act of retaliation as it was claimed that the Greek government had confiscated lands belonging to Turks of Western Thrace). The issue occupied the press for many days, with articles from all sides. Most of the Turkish press praised the comfortable life the Rums of Istanbul, the Greek newspapers trying to defend their country, the Minority press of Xanthi suggesting temperance to the Turkish press and refuting their claims and *Apogevmatini* keeping her readers up-to-date but avoiding to write anything pro or against. We assume that the most important reason for that was the fear that whatever article *Apogevmatini* would publish, it could be used to accuse all newspapers of Istanbul and the whole minority that they “support the enemy”. Especially after this suggestion for retaliation, *Apogevmatini* became extremely conscious of any comments on issues that could be used against it and accuse it of treachery.

The articles show a systematic attempt to get the two minorities involved in the bilateral relations and the Cyprus dispute. The involvement of the Muslim minority of Western Thrace by the Turkish press seems deliberate; neither the Turkish government, nor other

⁵ This *Milliyet*, is a Turkish-language minority newspaper published in Xanthi, Greece, not the same with the *Milliyet* published in Turkey. *Milliyet* was first published in 1931 and its circulation stopped in 1968 when it was accused harshly by the Muslim minority that it does not support its interests (Iordanoglou 1989: 223).

diplomatic authorities in Greece, report some kind of maltreatment of the Muslim minority by the Greek authorities (Hatzivassileiou 1991: 151). However the Turkish press embarks on a war of nerves against the Rum minority who is also seen as a remnant of the Greek *Megali Idea*, the old Greek aspirations of establishing a large Greek state in the Eastern Mediterranean. Political Agreements, meetings and the earthquake, although a bit reassuring, do not comfort the Greek-Orthodox minority who gradually becomes more indignant.

Part 5: 1954

1954 proved to be an ever richer year in terms of issues related to the Rum minority. At least 200 articles were published, not including articles about Greek internal affairs, which were again very common. Almost every second day there was another article bringing Greece closer to the minority.

The abundance of articles unfortunately translates into more explicit manifestations of the national identity of Turks and Greeks alike. All the more, Turkish newspapers published articles evoking the Rum minority to respond and prove that they are not just Turkish citizens but fellow-patriots as well, who wish the best for their country, Turkey.

On the journalistic domain the dispute continues. *Hürriyet* publishes an article with the title “Us and them...” juxtaposing the Muslim minority of Western Thrace with the Rum minority of Istanbul. The starting point for this article was some misleading information which mentioned that some confiscated property would be returned to the Patriarchate. The editor of *Apogevmatini* (January 28 No. 10256) accuses his colleagues and especially Hikmet Bil, the writer of the article for *Hürriyet*, of “disregarding the truth for the sake of a catchy story, ignoring the fact that this is poisoning the public opinion”.

Apogevmatini reports the statements of President of Turkish Republic Celal Bayar (February 2 No. 10261) who defends his policy of friendship with the following words: “Those weak-minded (journalists) who believe that they can hinder the course of history

should listen to what I have to say. The friendship of the two people is not a political manoeuvre or a temporary catchword. It is the best course of action for the good of both people and a natural consequence of our cultural and spiritual affinity...no power is strong enough to part us, since the common good and the historical relation unite us". Referring to those who write provocative articles he stresses that: "these are people who support petty-politics; they cannot appreciate long-term plans and are naïve enough to believe that their articles can change the reality".

The banner heading "Mr Fuat Koprulu talked about the Foreign Policy of the Country" crowns an article that covers the whole of front page (25 February, No. 10284). At the meeting of the Grand National Assembly, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr Koprulu said that the foreign policy of Turkey is based on the principle of peace and safety. As for the issues with Greece the Minister stressed that these are exaggerated and can easily be solved in the spirit of cooperation.

On the same days, there is a "Meeting of Journalists from the three Balkan Countries" (Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia) taking place in Ankara. With the occasion of celebrating the first anniversary of the Tripartite Balkan Agreement, journalists from the three countries met in Ankara to discuss their cooperation, enforce their bonds and plan the inauguration of a union of journalists among the three countries.

Athens made an official statement that since Great Britain refuses to have bilateral talks about the Cyprus issue then the Greek government will apply to the United Nations for

the settlement of the issue. At the same time, the Greek Minister of Education gave a circular to all schools, to avoid, during the celebration of the Greek National day of 25th March, any speeches that could insult the national feelings of Turks. The (Greek) press however protested with articles referring to “Turkish atrocities”.

Apogevmatini returns to the Cyprus issue again (22 April, No. 10340) to report on the “Cyprus’ Day” and the Academic Meetings of the Turkish Student Youth which took place the previous day. Similar events took place in Ankara as well in order to celebrate the Cyprus day. The Confederation of Turkish Students announced the 21st of April as the “Cyprus Day” and organised meetings of academic character in major cities. At these meetings, the main idea was that “Cyprus is Turkish”, “Turkish blood will be shed if this is necessary to keep the island” and other similar expressions of national enthusiasm.

An article on 23 May (No. 10370) updates the Greek readership of the Turkish press about the “attacks of the Turkish press *vis-à-vis* our Greek-speaking press”. A leaflet, written in Greek, unsigned, without giving any hint who might be its composer, was handed out (not sold) and reported on the disagreement between the Archbishop and a large part of the prelates. This leaflet inspired the Turkish press to accuse Greek minority newspapers in general and the Patriarchate as well. Almost all Turkish-speaking newspapers of Istanbul held the same belligerent stance towards the Patriarchate. The editor of *Apogevmatini* is convinced that the leaflet was written by some members of the minority, and criticises them harshly because they act audaciously and harm the whole community and the Patriarchate.

The issue continued (No. 10371) with more articles from both sides. *Dünya* reports that the minority press has been divided into two camps, one side holding that everybody should keep their temper and supports the 7 priests (Metropolitans) opposing to Archbishop Athenagoras, and the other side calling the same priests “rebels”. The Rums are themselves abhorred and believe that some Rum newspapers try to create enmity between the Turks and the Rums. Moreover the Rums are said to support the “opening of the central Gate of the Patriarchate which remains closed as a symbol of the hatred of the two people. The Patriarchate should take the wish of the minority members into consideration and act accordingly and if it is still not convinced about the will of the Rum community then he should conduct a plebiscite”. The editor finishes off the article by defending himself and supporting that unsigned leaflets do not represent the minority as a whole.

Such and other similar articles did not prove enough to affect the policy making of the two countries. So, on a political level the meetings continued unimpeded. “Prime Minister Adnan Menderes arrived in Athens” announces *Apogevmatini* (June 8) according to the Radio of Athens. Menderes was previously in Washington and flew to Athens with Admiral Fletcher. There the Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs confirmed that the military alliance of the 3 Balkan Countries is a fact, although not signed yet. Later in August (5 August No. 10469) the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs Koprulu visited Thessaloniki where he was welcomed with enthusiasm. The final destination was Belgrade where the three parties would sign the military alliance. This was considered to

be a great accomplishment for the time and a serious blow against the Russian policy in the region. The long-term plan was to include this alliance to NATO.

The Cyprus issue was not forgotten all this time: protest marches and gatherings were frequent and the Turkish press was following them and supporting them. Through *Apogevmatini* we learn about “the Turkish point of view” (No. 10480): “there is no new political development which could justify a change in the status quo of Cyprus”. Moreover, Russia is said to be behind the coalition of communists and the Cypriot Church in promoting the *Enosis* (Union) of Cyprus with Greece. The goal is to spread discord among the members of the Balkan Coalition and break it. *Cumhuriyet* (August 21, No. 10481) also compares the Rum minority with the Greeks of Cyprus, saying that “there is a numerous community of Rums in various areas and suburbs around Istanbul but that would not give them the right to ask for a change in the status quo of the city”.

All year long, there were many articles and speeches delivered by Turkish and Greek politicians stressing the importance of the Greek-Turkish friendship and cooperation. However, when Greece placed the Cyprus issue on the United Nations Assembly agenda, it became apparent that the future of the Rum minority would be endangered. Cyprus had become a very sensitive issue, intertwined with the Greek-Orthodox minority of Istanbul. All the more, the Turkish public opinion put pressure on the Rum minority to support the Turkish views. Even Prime Minister Menderes stated that: “The Patriarchate, the Communities and the Rum Associations will be asked to support the Turkish view on the issue” on August 29, thus deteriorating the already tense environment.

Part 6: 1955

Only in the first 8 months of 1955, until the events of the 6-7 September, there are at least 200 different articles referring to Cyprus, on a daily basis, as well as articles from the Turkish press in provocative style *vis-à-vis* the minority and Greece. There were also many articles about the Patriarchate, even about its “Vaticanisation”, the canonicals of the clergy, the silence of the Patriarchate concerning the Cyprus dispute and many other issues which reveal the intolerance of the Turkish press towards anything related to the Greek Orthodox minority and Greece.

However Cyprus overshadowed most of the other issues. The intensity of the articles and the rising hostility is apparent in the reporting style. The year had started with official visits that would promote cooperation on common problems. In mid-February the Greek Minister of Transportation, Mr Karamanlis visited Istanbul. On the agenda was the cooperation for flood-preventing works at Evros River. An Agreement was also signed and followed by statements that crowned the event: “the works will be conducted in such a way that both sides will benefit. The honest understanding of the two friendly and ally countries started with the bridge of Ipsala and it will be continued this time as well with this new project”.

Later that year (May 31, No. 10760), another friendly meeting took place, this time concerning educational issues of the two minorities in their respective host countries. Talks were conducted in Athens, and Turkey was represented by the Istanbul representative Mr. Alexandros Hatzopoulos and a head of department from the Ministry

of Education Mr. Kiamil Su. The main objective of the talks was to safeguard a general cooperation between Greece and Turkey on minority education. The first measure to be taken was to arrange the use of the official state schoolbooks in the education of each minority which will be written in the mother tongue of the minority, i.e. Greek schoolbooks for the Greek minority schools in Istanbul and Turkish schoolbooks at the Muslim minority schools in Western Thrace. Another measure concerned the educational personnel which would preferably be trained in Greece or Turkey respectively. Two main issues vexed the meeting; on the one hand, Greek schoolbooks had a considerably big amount of negative references about Turkey and the Turks in general; so naturally the Turkish delegation disapproved of their use in minority schools. The second issue concerned the education of Pomaks in Western Thrace. The Turkish delegation claimed that they should be taught at Turkish minority schools not at *medrese* (as was the case at that time); but the Pomaks themselves rejected such a prospect on the grounds that they are Muslims but not Turks and therefore did not wish to follow Turkish education. The Turkish press, when reporting the meeting, accused the Greek state for suppressing and mistreating the Muslim minority of Western Thrace. Comparing the Muslim minority with the Greek minority of Istanbul the journalist from *Cumhuriyet* underlines that: “the Rum minority cherishes freedom and absolute equality which explains why nobody from the Rum minority has fled Istanbul”.

In the meantime the conditions in Cyprus were deteriorating. With the occasion of the celebration of the birthday of Queen Elisabeth of the United Kingdom, on June 10, the Greeks of the island organised a demonstration in favour of the Union of Cyprus with

Greece and later that night a bomb exploded near the police station in Lefkosia. A few days later (June 14, No. 10774), five Greeks who were hailing in favour of Union with Greece were accused of creating an explosive atmosphere in the island and were found guilty by the court of Cyprus and sentenced to pay a fine. Revealing of *Apogevmatini*'s support of the struggle for the Union of Cyprus with Greece when reporting on the news is the following expression: "all of the Greeks who were accused (by the court of supporting the Union with Greece) pleaded guilty bravely for their acts".

The following days we are informed that there were police investigations in various houses of local Greeks, followed by some arrests (June 15, No. 10775). The day after, weapon possession was forbidden to all Cypriots. The official British order read that all kinds of weapons should be handed in to the authorities (June 17, No. 10777). At the end of June (June 29, No. 10789) *Apogevmatini* reports that the condition in Cyprus is deteriorating dramatically. Both sides go to extremes after the recent announcement, which caused panic to the Turks of Cyprus, that Great Britain plans to cede semi-independence to Cyprus.

On July 1st, Great Britain invites both sides, Turkey and Greece to London in order to discuss about defence issues in the east Mediterranean including the Cyprus issue. Both sides accepted the invitation.

However the article (July 3, No. 10793) informing us that Turkey accepted the invitation is very interesting as it shows a drift in the stance of *Apogevmatini* on the issue of

Cyprus. The article is entitled: “The announcement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After previous articles of *Apogevmatini*, one (the author included) would suppose that the article will refer to the announcement of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is not the case however (*Apogevmatini* usually states for example “the Turkish Ministry” when referring to Turkey and “the Ministry” when referring to Greece. In this case it was the other way around). The source of information is the National radio of Ankara, the Anadolu Ajansi, and the article read: “...our government accepted this invitation. This will be a chance (for our government) to clearly express our views on the issues that concern us greatly”. This inconsistency with regard to previous norms can be explained in various ways.

One explanation would be that the minority does not feel confident anymore to freely express its views on current affairs in fear of provoking the Turkish public opinion. Besides, the Turkish press had displayed, in the last months, great intolerance towards anything that deviated from their ideas.

Another explanation has to do with the source of information. The above article was written based on information from the National Radio in Ankara and the Anadolu Ajansi. Mr Vasileiadis, the current editor of *Apogevmatini*, underlined that the National Radio in Ankara used to broadcast a special news-programme for journalists. By listening to that programme journalists got the latest news. However, when an issue was critical for the government, domestic or international, the news were broadcasted in an authoritative style as if prescribing how the news should be presented to the public, not leaving much

space for a different presentation of the news. If that is true then it is very likely that *Apogevmatini* abided by the state instructions, and did not change its views concerning the homeland.

The same article continues: "...in the following days, our embassy in Athens will give a note to the Greek government asking her to stop initiating terrorist activities of the Rums of Cyprus". The article also reports relevant articles from the Turkish press, where we learn that "people are concerned about what the Patriarchate thinks about the involvement of the Greek and Cypriot clergy to the Cyprus issue". As we learn from other sources (Alexandris 1988b: 498), other newspapers put pressure on Archbishop Athenagoras to express his views on the Cyprus issue. However, he systematically refused to do so as according to the Lausanne Treaty the Ecumenical Patriarchate had only a spiritual role, not a political one. So the Archbishop avoided any interference on the political life of Turkey and the Cyprus issue, in fear of jeopardising his or the Patriarchate's fate in general.

The articles reporting on the tense Turkish-Greek relations abounded and most of them were written in the same style, namely comparing the current political situation (bilateral political life in 1955) with that of the early 20th century, when the two countries were engaged in an armed conflict. We could summarise the main idea of such articles, written by Turkish journalists, with the following sentence: "whatever happened to you in the Turkish-Greek war, the same will happen in Cyprus too".

We learn from *Apogevmatini* that the Greeks, similarly, started comparing the politics of 1955 with past times. For example on a radio programme transmitted in Athens a journalist gave a speech with the title: “If Mustafa Kemal was alive”, claiming that “Turkey does not have the right to get involved with Cyprus but that Turkish governments are manipulated by the English (politicians)”. The Greek journalist goes on to support that “Ataturk took some measures that eliminated the likelihood of tension between Turkey and Greece” (and was wise to do so, whereas the current Turkish government, under the British encouragement, act in a desultory manner).

In these last months before the 6 of September, both sides plunge into hostile articles, showing suspicion towards the other side. Especially the Patriarchate was systematically accused of undermining the Republic of Turkey even though “it is an institution in the Turkish lands, within Turkish borders” as the Turkish journalists often underline, sometimes imply, other times again, openly state that “the Patriarchate is obliged to take sides and support the Turkish cause and the Turkish national aspirations” (July 18, No. 10808).

Moreover Turkish newspapers attack *Apogevmatini* and the Rum press in general for not openly supporting the Turkish side and the Turkish national view on the Cyprus issue. The Turkish press also accuses the Rum newspapers for indirectly supporting the Greeks by publishing articles that are based on the radio of Athens, the Greek press as well as articles about the Greek views in general.

As 6-7 September approached and the delegations were preparing to fly to London for the Tripartite Conference, old ghosts were revived. References to previous confrontations with Greece became very frequent and common both in the Turkish press and by politicians and the Prime Minister Adnan Menderes (August 25, No. 10842) himself.

Despite the entire negative attitude, the hostile discourses and the verbal attacks, *Apogevmatini* continues to dedicate long articles to Greek politics, the Greek diplomacy and views on Cyprus, and the Greek aims at the London Conference. Eventually the Conference started on the 29th of August. Things were quiet on the first day, then with the statements of Zorlu, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs and head of the Turkish delegation that “only Turkey and Britain can decide for the fate of Cyprus” made the climate very explosive. *Apogevmatini* reports articles from Turkey and Greece alike. These articles are gradually becoming harsher towards the other side and expose an intolerance of the people for their neighbour on the other side of the Aegean Sea. Indicative of the polarisation of the society is an article on September 4, reporting on an incident with a Greek woman in Eskisehir. According to the article, the Rum woman got agitated by the breakdown in Turkish-Greek relations and a possible failure on the Cypriot aspiration for union with Greece and started protesting in favour of Cyprus publicly. Passers by attacked her and she was almost killed by the incensed crowd.

Last day before the 6th September events, on the 5th of September (No. 10853), we read again about attacks of the Turkish press against the Patriarchate and criticisms about the Archbishop’s decision not to get involved in the politics of Turkey. We also see in a short

article on the upper corner of the last page which reports that some young Turks attempted to burn, in the middle of Taksim square, some Greek newspapers because they were infuriated by their articles.

Next day, on September 6 (No. 10854) *Apogevmatini* expresses her strong concern about the general atmosphere in the country. Many “minor” incidents are reported, along extended articles about the meetings in London, which show the fanaticism of the Turkish people towards anything Greek-related. And then circulation stops. The premises of the newspaper, like many other workplaces, were severely damaged that night.

Apogevmatini returns to circulation on the 21st September 1955. “Restoration”, declares an article of editor Yiaveridis. In an article that attempts to give courage and inspire trust towards the authorities, he calls the 6/7 September riots as a “national disaster which hurt the morale and the economy of the country”. The reassurance of the government that such incidents will not be allowed to occur again and that compensation will be given in order to solace those stricken” was reported. Another article reports that “Ministerial investigations on the 6 September events have started” in order to clarify whether the Ministry of Interior was in some way involved in the events. At the same time the newspaper informs that people who suffered damages at the events will have to apply to their relevant tax office to receive compensation. At the column “Succinct”, the editor notes that the newspaper “did not escape from the damages of 6 September, just like other Greek-speaking (the actual Greek word used in the article is *omoglosses* which could be translated in English as: of the same language) newspapers. At this time, the

newspaper repaired the mechanical damages and is now ready to resume communication with its readership”.

On the last page of the newspaper, we read the message the American Minister of Foreign Affairs, Foster Dulles, sent to Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes. The message read that Turkish-Greek friendship and cooperation should not be interrupted especially since both countries are members of NATO and of the tripartite Balkan Alliance. Prime Minister Menderes stated that they (the government and people of Turkey) consider Turkish-Greek friendship of outmost importance and a guarantee for the national interest of both countries.

Next days, *Apogevmatini* reports on the re-opening of minority schools and the procedure for taking compensation for the 6-7 September events. These are the only issues relevant to the minorities. The press is numb, focusing on foreign affairs and avoiding any reference to domestic issues. The martial law froze all other minority activities, although the editor of *Apogevmatini* wrote that “now, under the martial law, people feel safer and more confident to start rebuilding what was destroyed”.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

On the previous pages we attempted to outline what preceded the 6-7 September 1955 events from the perspective of the minority press and the Greek-Orthodox community of Istanbul. This study did not aspire to cover every expression of the life of the community or all the events in the political arena. Our initial aim was to examine the minority press and to reach some conclusions about the role of *Apogevmatini* and the character of the Greek-Orthodox community in that period.

On the whole the articles we have cited promote our aim which was to point out the issues that preoccupied the minority. Through these issues, and the relative articles, we wished to relate the minority with the two sides of the Aegean. These articles are valuable in revealing the identity of the minority.

Even if the news we have presented from *Apogevmatini* do not, inevitably, cover all aspects and issues, we believe that they are indicative of the general attitude of the newspaper and adequate to let us reach some conclusions about the minority in general.

Apogevmatini was one of the many newspapers of Istanbul at that period. Although there is no concrete information about the circulation and the specific number of the papers printed and sold daily, we know, through oral sources, that it was the first in circulation among the other Greek-speaking newspapers. This is confirmed by a motto that was attributed to that newspaper shortly after that period. The motto reads: “nobody’s born,

nobody departs without *Apogevmatini*”. This motto also underlines the social importance of this printed matter which would be unthinkable if it was not a popular newspaper.

Apogevmatini, as a daily minority newspaper, was of immense value in reminding the members of the minority of their community and nation. *Apogevmatini* and the other Greek-speaking newspapers of Istanbul made their ‘imagined community’ even more real. It was not only the newspaper *per se* that helped in doing so but the news that were reported daily too and the language used to report these as well.

With regard to the national identification of the minority, we notice the double “confusion” of the minority. On the one hand, they had been Turkish citizens and on the other, Greek nationals. The perplexity of their identity becomes even greater if one considers their school education. A study on schoolbooks (Dimasi, 1996: 221) has shown that certain national ideals were promoted in the schoolbooks used at that time, such as love and sacrifice for the country, sacrifice for democracy, honour to the flag, work for the progress of the country and so on. These national ideals were naturally promoting Turkey as the beloved homeland and not Greece.

However *Apogevmatini* promoted a different homeland. Through its news coverage, it created another worldview. There, Turkey was not of course disregarded, nor was it attacked. But at the same time, equal space was given to news regarding Greece as was devoted for news about Turkey. This duality did not cause serious problems when bilateral relations were cordial. Nevertheless, when the Cyprus issue came up, then things

became more complicated. Attitude towards Greece and Turkey was not as stable as was the attitude towards Istanbul. Especially in such hard times, when pressure was put on the minority to choose either Greece or Turkey, then the minority newspaper *Apogevmatini* would avoid expressing its affiliation for something other than Istanbul. This was the birthplace of the minority and naturally its members were attached to it.

Affection for Greece, although not direct, was evident and promulgated in two ways. One was the close coverage of the news about internal-domestic issues of Greece; the other was the reporting of the Greek point of view when relations with Turkey were far from friendly. The latter is more indirect and was achieved by the language used when reporting on Greece in contrast with Turkey. This has to do with the creation of the homeland as described by Billig (1995). Turkey was the home of the minority anyway. But nothing felt as close and intertwined with its past, present and future as Istanbul did. Greece on the other hand felt like home as well. A country that had the same language and religion and where thousands of the minority had settled inevitably felt as a second home.

We have underlined for example that *Apogevmatini* constantly reported news from the Turkish press. That was not done only out of necessity, because Turkish newspapers were a source of information; nor was it a necessity imposed by a linguistic inadequacy of the Greek-Orthodox minority, because the large majority had, at least, a working knowledge of Turkish since in the early 1920s the Turkish Ministry of Public Instruction issued a *Circular* that made teaching of Turkish language, history and other subjects, obligatory

for Allied and minority schools (Sarioglou 2004: 61). In the academic year 1923-1924 there were 15.760 students attending lessons at 73 different Greek-education schools around the district of Istanbul and the Prince's Islands. Although the number of students attending these schools fluctuated from year to year, nevertheless we can deduce that young generations receiving school education were obliged to learn at least some Turkish or otherwise they would be unable to progress (Sarioglou 2004: 64). So, we tend to believe that the reason behind that practice was an interest to learn the Turkish public opinion about the current affairs and secondly to hold minority members from buying Turkish newspapers. Therefore, those from the Greek-Orthodox minority who wished to be kept up-to-date, could find Greek quality newspapers, that could make up for not reading the Turkish press. With this practise, the minority preserved its unique character by having its own newspapers, and spreading the use of Greek language; it also promoted minority press and at the same time did not estrange the minority from the Turkish society.

So the circulation of newspapers acquired even greater importance not only because it promoted the formation of collective identity but it also made easier other activities of the community as well (control of communal affairs, participation in community activities, religious and cultural gatherings etc). In this sense the newspaper acted as a unifying agent that shaped uniform perceptions and a unified stance for the Greek-Orthodox population of Istanbul.

As a whole we can argue that despite the love for Greece, the Greek-Orthodox community of Istanbul wished to remain in the city it perceived as home. The Turkish state on the other hand and the Turkish people, as seen in articles from the Turkish press, accepted the presence of a minority in their territories as long as minorities eradicated their distinct character. In the years before the 6/7 September events Turkish society, through the press, asked from the Greek-orthodox minority to place itself on the side it supported. Especially during the first months of 1955 and until the September events the minority is repeatedly asked to prove that its members are true “Turkish” patriots. During these periods of tension in the bilateral relations of the two countries, Turks became more suspicious towards the Greek-Orthodox minority and demanded that the minority expressed its loyalty to the Turkish state and Turkish national aspirations. In the articles from *Apogevmatini* we have not found any articles that could fulfil that wish of the Turkish society.

That leads us to the conclusion that the fate of the Greek minority is tightly identified with Greece and closely influenced by the bilateral relations. When relations were friendly, the minority benefited greatly and enjoyed an atmosphere that gave room for freedom, allowing for their cultural development and a prosperous and cosmopolitan life, where the minority felt safe and confident. On the contrary, at times when bilateral relations were strained, like the last years of the period under question, the minority felt the pressure of a society that considered them as alien. Both the Turkish government and public opinion personified the evils of the “other” in the face of the Greek-Orthodox

minority who became the scapegoat and suffered because of its resistance to be integrated into the Turkish society and because it preserved its affiliations with Greece.

To sum up, what we can deduct from the *Apogevmatini* newspaper articles is that the Greek-Orthodox minority trusted the ruling Democrat Party that was in power. The minority seems to be confident during the rule of DP mostly because the bilateral relations became more cordial and subsequently expected that the minority would be able to evolve in the Turkish society freely. During the first years, 1950, 1951 and 1952 articles reveal that the minority is still confident and trusts that measures such as the 1942 Wealth Tax (Varlik Vergisi) will not be repeated. However, in the following years the minority gradually became more cautious. Under no circumstances could someone from the minority have predicted what was to happen in September 1955. We do notice however through the articles that Greek-Orthodox minority was more anxious and more careful about anything that was to circulate, probably in fear that a careless article could be misunderstood and that could have repercussions on the whole minority.

As a last comment we wish to underline that although the Greek-Orthodox minority had a distinct character and a strong identity, very different from that of the dominant population, it chose not to keep a low profile as a means of preserving its place in the Turkish society.

Bibliography

Ahmad, Feroz, *Turkish Experiment in Democracy, 1950-1975*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1977.

Aktar, Ayhan, *Varlik Vergisi ve "Turklestirme" Politikalari*, Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinlari, 2000.

Alexandris, Alexis, *The Greek Minority of Istanbul and Greek-Turkish Relations, 1918-1974*, Athens, Center for Asia Minor Studies, 1992.

Το ιστορικό πλαίσιο των ελληνοτουρκικών σχέσεων (α), 1923-1955, στο «Οι Ελληνοτουρκικές Σχέσεις, 1923-1987», Εκδόσεις Γνώση, Αθήνα, 1988, σελ. 31-172.

Το μειονοτικό ζήτημα, 1954-1987 (β), στο «Οι Ελληνοτουρκικές Σχέσεις, 1923-1987», Εκδόσεις Γνώση, Αθήνα, 1988, σελ. 493-552.

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso, 1991.

Brass, Paul R., *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison*, Sage Publications, London, 1991.

Brass, Paul R., *Theft of an Idol: Text and Context in the Representation of Collective violence*, Princeton University Press, 1997.

Brubaker, Roger, Aftermaths of Empire and the Unmixing of Peoples in *After Empire: Multithnic Societies and Nation-Building: The Soviet Union and Russian, Ottoman and Habsburg Empires*, Karen Barkey and Mark Hagen (eds.) Westview Press, 1997, pp. 155-180.

Cağaptay, Soner, *Islam, Secularism and Nationalism in Modern Turkey Who is a Turk?*, Routledge Studies in Middle Eastern History, 2006.

Clark, Bruce, *Twice a Stranger: How Mass Expulsion Forged Modern Greece and Turkey*, Granta Books, London, 2006.

Clogg, Richard, *A concise History of Greece*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Close, David, *Ελλάδα 1945-2004, Πολιτική, Κοινωνία, Οικονομία*, Θύραθεν, Thessaloniki, 2005.

Dimasi, Maria, Θρησκευτικές και εθνικές αρετές των Ελλήνων στα αναγνωστικά βιβλία της Κωνσταντινούπολης (1880-1955), *Η καθ'ημάς Ανατολή*, 3, Athens, 1996.

Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Güven, Dilek, *Εθνικισμός, κοινωνικές μεταβολές και μειονότητες, Τα επεισόδια εναντίων των μη μουσουλμάνων της Τουρκίας (6/7 Σεπτεμβρίου 1955)* Athens, 2006.

Hale, William, *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*, Cass Publications, 2002.

Hatzivassiliou, Evanthis, The Lausanne Treaty Minorities in Greece and Turkey and the Cyprus Question, 1954-9, *Balkan Studies* 32 (1), 1991, pp. 145-161.

Icyudu, Ahmet and Ibrahim Sirkeci, Cumhuriyet Donemi Turkiyesi'nde Goc Hareketleri in *75 Yilda Koylerden Sehirlere*, Oya Baydar (ed.), Istanbul Tarih Vakfi Yayinlari, 1999.

Iordanoglou, Anastasios, Ο τύπος της μουσουλμανικής μειονότητας της Δυτικής Θράκης από τη συνθήκη της Λωζάνης ως σήμερα, *Βαλκανικά Σύμμεικτα* 3, Θεσσαλονίκη, 1989, pp.217-238.

Kadioglu, Ayse, The Paradox of Turkish Nationalism and the Construction of Official Identity, in *Turkey: Identity, Democracy, Politics*, S. Keroude (ed.) Routledge, 1996, pp. 177-193.

Kanner, Efi, Φιλανθρωπικοί Σύλλογοι και αποκρυστάλλωση κοινωνικών ταυτοτήτων στην Ελληνική κοινότητα της Κωνσταντινούπολης (1861-1922), *Η καθ'ημάς Ανατολή*, 3, Athens, 1996.

Kardaras, Hristos, Η εκπαιδευτική και κοινωνική κατάσταση του Ελληνισμού της Κωνσταντινούπολης κατά τη δεκαετία του 1920, *Δωδώνη*, 1 (21), Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα του Τμήματος Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Ιωαννίνων, Ιωάννινα, 1992.

Keyder, Caglar, Collapse of Empires: Causes: The Ottoman Empire, in *After Empire: Multithnic Societies and Nation-Building: The Soviet Union and Russian, Ottoman and Habsburg Empires*, Karen Barkey and Mark Hagen (eds.) Westview Press, 1997, pp. 30-44.

Koliopoulos, John and Thanos Veremis (eds.), *Greece: The Modern Sequel, from 1821 to the Present*, Hurst & Company, London, 2004.

Koloğlu, Orhan, *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Türkiye'de Basın*, Cep Üniversitesi, İletişim Yatınları, 1994.

Kurat, Yuluğ Tekin, Elli yıllık Cumhuriyetin dış politikası, 1923-1973, *Balkan Bibliography*, 4 Supplement, Thessaloniki, 1977.

Kuyucu, Ali Tuna, Ethno-Religious “unmixing” of “Turkey”: 6-7 September Riots as a case in Turkish nationalism, *Nations and Nationalism* 11 (3), 2005, pp. 361-380.

Mardin, Serif, Collapse of Empires: Consequences: The Ottoman Empire, in *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building: The Soviet Union and Russian, Ottoman and Habsburg Empires*, Karen Barkey and Mark Hagen (eds.) Westview Press, 1997, pp. 115-128.

Millas, Hercul, *Εικόνες Ελλήνων και Τούρκων: Σχολικά βιβλία, ιστοριογραφία, λογοτεχνία και εθνικά στερεότυπα*, Αλεξάνδρεια, 2001.

Oikonomopoulos, Kl. Panagiotis, Greek-Turkish Relations from 1923 up-to-date, *Βαλκανική Βιβλιογραφία*, 6, Παράρτημα, ΙΜΧΑ, 1977 pp.191-127.

Ozkirimli, Umut, *Theories of Nationalism: a critical introduction*, St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Sarioglou, Irini, *The Turkish Policy towards the Greek Education in Istanbul: 1923-1972*, Chronos, 2003.

Tarinas, Stratis, *Ο Ελληνικός Τύπος της Πόλης*, Ηχώ, 2007.

Tsitsopoulos, Giorgos and Thanos Veremis, Οι ελληνοτουρκικές αμυντικές σχέσεις, 1945-1987, στο «Οι Ελληνοτουρκικές Σχέσεις, 1923-1987», Εκδόσεις Γνώση, Αθήνα, 1988, σελ. 173-214.

Vryonis, Spyros, *The mechanism of Catastrophe: The Turkish Pogrom of September 1955 and the Destruction of the Greek community of Istanbul*, 2005.

Zurcher, Erik J., *Turkey: A Modern History*, Tauris & Co Ltd, 1995.

Interviews

Michael Vasileiadis, journalist in various newspapers and current editor of minority newspaper *Apogevmatini*, 19.03.08

Antonis Parizianos, former distributor of newspaper *Apogevmatini*, 20.03.08

Paschalis Valsamidis, Professor of Turkish Language at the Democritus University of Thrace and researcher at the Institute of Macedonian Studies (Ινστιτούτο Μακεδονικών Σπουδών), 14.03.08

ΕΤΟΣ 26ος ΑΡΙΘΜΟΣ 9339
Γραμμή Διάδοχ Σελίδες 18-19
Τεύχος Κιβότις 2187 Πλάτος
ΤΥΠΗ ΦΥΛΑΔΥ 5 ΓΡΟΖΙΑ
ΤΗΛΕΦΩΝΟΝ 41403

Ίδρυτής: Βασίλειος
Κ. ΒΑΣΙΛΙΑΔΗΣ

Επιμέλεια: Μιχαήλ Κ. ΒΑΣΙΛΙΑΔΗΣ. Διεύθυνση: Βουλή Συρίας Κορυφή, 10 - 12, «Απογευματινή» Ματθαίου
Υπο-επιμέλεια: Νίκος Νίκος: Λ. ΥΑΒΕΡΙΔΗΣ

ΑΠΟΓΕΥΜΑΤΙΝΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΜΑΤΙΝΗ

ΤΕΤΑΡΤΗ
4
ΙΟΥΛΙΟΥ 1951

Αστική μέση
Αστυνομική Συντάξις
Γ. Ε. ΓΙΑΒΕΡΙΑΝΗΣ

Carpatha 4. Temmisi 1551

«ΑΙ ΝΕΑΙ ΕΠΙΧΑΙ ΕΠΙΒΑΛΛΟΥΣΙ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΑ ΚΑΘΗΚΟΝΤΑ» Β. ΟΥΓΚΟ

ΝΕΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΩΣΕΙΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΤΟΥΡΚΙΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΑ

Εξ της Τουρκίας δίδονται 12 1/2 εκατομμύρια δολάρια εις την Ελλάδα ή 45 εκατομμύρια. Εξ της Τουρκίας δίδονται 12 1/2 εκατομμύρια δολάρια εις την Ελλάδα ή 45 εκατομμύρια.

Ποσίου, 3 (Π. Α.) 'Ο άρθεύς εθνομιστής Οικονομικός αναπροσανατολισμός άποκαλύπτει ότι θα δώσουν ειδικά πιστώσεις 72,500 000 δολάρια εις την Τουρκίαν, την Ελλάδα και την Αυστραλίαν και τόποι μέχρις άτου άρχισθή από του Καναδάου νέαι σπείραι δεικνύουσιν ότι άρα εις την Τουρκίαν θα δώσουν 12,500 000 δολάρια, εις την Ελλάδα 15,000 000 και την Ελλάδα 45,000 000 δολάρια. Εξ της 'Ελλάδος έσπεύσθη μεγαλυτέραι πιστώσεις εις άποπεράσει πηγή άσας τις μέχρι τούδε χορηγηθείσας εις αήθη πινύσεις.

Η ΕΠΙΣΧΥΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΡΚΙΚΟΥ ΣΤΟΛΟΥ
Νικηφόρος, 3. Παρεφορμίστρια, 3. Μοίρα του τουρκικού στόλου άπελευθερώθη από τους Κ. Κιπρούλους θα συνεχίσουν επί μερικάς ώρας ήμερας. Ούτω, μετά της χθις ήρας, οι συναρμολογηθέντες και σήμερον μεταξύ του πρεσβυτείου και του υπουργίου των 'Εσπερικών κ. Κιοπρούλου, και άναμνηστικώς μέλλεται έπί της πλειοψηφίας των περιστασίων τα όποια έσπεύσθησαν κατά της διεξαχθείσας προηγουμένης συναρμολογίας 'Αγίου μετά της κ. Κιοπρούλου και των αντιπροσώπων της 'Ιταλίας, της Γαλλίας και της Ελλείδος.

Τα έσπερικά και τα άντιπροσώπων και οι Σουλταν Κιοφ, Δαμρ Κιοφ και Μουαβεντ θα καταπολέμη διά φιλικών έπιστολών εις όχημας άμύνης. 'Η έπίσκεψις θα άρχισθή την 20 'Ιουλίου και θα διαρκέσει επί 20 ήμερας. 'Η τουρκική μοίρα θα έπισκεφθή και λιμένας της Μεσογείου.

Τός έσπερικός και τός άντιπροσώπων της Βουλών των Κουενταίων έπί η 'Αγγλία έστι έπιση έντονη ης έπίσκεψις της Τουρκίας, συνάμα και η της 'Ελλείδος, εις τήν Ατλαντικήν έσπερικήν ή εις Μεσογειακήν πλεύσιν. Έχει άσας άναμνηστικώς τήν Τουρκίαν εις τήν έπίσκεψιν της Τουρκίας, συνάμα και η της 'Ελλείδος, εις τήν Ατλαντικήν έσπερικήν ή εις Μεσογειακήν πλεύσιν. Έχει άσας άναμνηστικώς τήν Τουρκίαν εις τήν έπίσκεψιν της Τουρκίας, συνάμα και η της 'Ελλείδος, εις τήν Ατλαντικήν έσπερικήν ή εις Μεσογειακήν πλεύσιν.

ΑΙ ΣΥΝΟΜΙΛΙΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΓΛΟΥ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΜΕ ΤΟΝ Κ. Φ. ΚΙΟΠΡΟΥΛΟΥ

Ήναμνηστικώς ή ίδια του συναμνηστικώς άναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

προσέβηται ότι οι συναρμολογηθέντες και σήμερον μεταξύ του πρεσβυτείου και του υπουργίου των 'Εσπερικών κ. Κιοπρούλου, και άναμνηστικώς μέλλεται έπί της πλειοψηφίας των περιστασίων τα όποια έσπεύσθησαν κατά της διεξαχθείσας προηγουμένης συναρμολογίας 'Αγίου μετά της κ. Κιοπρούλου και των αντιπροσώπων της 'Ιταλίας, της Γαλλίας και της Ελλείδος.

Παρεκτός της άνταλλαγής για

μαί επί της συντήσεως του συναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου, ο πρεσβυτής της Αγγλίας διεβείβασεν ρητίες τόν κ. Κιοπρούλου ότι οι συναμνηστικώς μέλλεται έπί της πλειοψηφίας των περιστασίων τα όποια έσπεύσθησαν κατά της διεξαχθείσας προηγουμένης συναρμολογίας 'Αγίου μετά της κ. Κιοπρούλου και των αντιπροσώπων της 'Ιταλίας, της Γαλλίας και της Ελλείδος.

ΙΤΑΛΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΑΝΑΛΑΒΑΝΕΙ ΤΗΝ ΕΞΥΠΡΕΤΗΣΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΠΕΡΣΙΑΣ

Ήταλι είδική κτηρήσιν εις τήν Αραβίαν.—Εξ ειδική Γενικήν άπό έπισησίν ή άναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

Σειδων καταπληθέντων έγγράφων. Συνείτια της ταχίας έξελείας της καταπολέμης και της πειθούς έπιστολής της λατινικής των διατάξεων τών 'Αραβίων, ή προηγουμένης Μοσουλίου έπιστολής εις συναρμολογίας τήν έσπερικήν των περιστασίων. ΚΑΙ Η ΠΕΡΣΙΑ ΒΑ ΠΡΟΣΟΨΗ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛΙΟΝ ΑΣΙΑΤΙΚΩΝ

Τεχνικός, 3 (Π. Α.) 'Αδελφότητα ημερήσιον μεταβούθη εις ή ημερήσιον άναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

άναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

ΑΠΟΚΡΙΝΥΝΤΑΙ ΟΤΙ Η ΠΡΑΞΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΤΙΤΣΑΝΗ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΩΝ ΦΑΝΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ ΥΠΟΚΙΝΕΙΤΑΙ ΕΞ ΟΣΩΝ

ΤΑ ΚΟΜΜΑΤΑ ΣΥΖΗΤΟΥΝ ΤΗΝ ΣΥΜΠΗΝΙΣ ΕΝΙΛΙΟΥ ΕΘΝΙΚΟΥ ΜΕΤΩΠΟΥ

Και άλλ άπόσπασμα κατά προσηρσίαν άναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

ΑΙ ΔΙΚΗ
'Αναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

ΑΙ ΔΙΚΗ
'Αναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

Ο ΝΟΜΑΡΧΗΣ ΠΡΟΕΙΔΕΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΣ ΛΑΧΛΑΧ ΚΑΙ ΟΠΟΡΙΚΟΙΣ

Ήναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

ΑΙ ΔΙΚΗ
'Αναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

ΑΙ ΔΙΚΗ
'Αναμνηστικώς της Μεσογείου. 'Η 'Αγγλία πιστή εις την συμπαρίστασιν της ά έκτελεση πλέθους

Πρωτεύουσα Πολις - Ένωρξιαί

ΠΟΛΙΣ
«Απόθρονον» Πρωτεύουσα
Ζυγί είς πρλίαν του Νέου
πρλί

Νέος διαβητήρ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΚΗ ΖΟΗ
ΟΜΗΡΟΣ Σ. ΣΙΑΚΑΚΙΔΗΣ
ΤΑΣΟΥΛΑ Β. ΣΑΜΟΥΗΛΙΔΟΥ

ΙΔΑΝΝΗΣ ΔΕΡΜΟΙΟΛΟΓΟΥ
ΕΛΕΝΗ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΪΔΟΥ

Νοσηρία Βαλκάνικη
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Αθλητισμός
Ν Ανταλίσ είς τήν πρλίαν

Εκκαμεία
Βαλκάνικη Εκκαμεία

Κ. ΤΣΟΧΑΤΖΗΣ
Βιθίλ Σπαρλίλ

ΠΩΛΕΙΤΑΙ
Μαγαζήτορ

ΠΩΛΕΙΤΑΙ ΟΙΚΟΦΕΑΝ
Πωλείται οίκος

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ CANLI BALIK
ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΕΚΠΑΝΣΙΣ

ΘΕΑΤΡΟΝ ΜΑΞΙΜ
ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΣ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΣ ΘΙΑΣΟΣ

ΛΟΝΤΡΑ - ΠΑΡΙΣΙ - ΑΘΗΝΑ
Έργα ή πρλίλ

ΔΥΣΤΕΧΝΗΜΑΤΑ ΕΓΚΛΗΜΑΤΑ

Μεγαλοπρλίλ
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Ξόβιερο

Μαγική πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Ο ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΠΑΛΜΟΣ

Πρλί πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

Συνοχίλ του πρλί
Συνοχίλ του πρλί

ME ΠΙΛΠΟΥΣ ΜΗΝΙΑΙΟΣ ΔΟΣΕΙΣ
Κατοχίλ είς παρλίλ
ΜΕΡΙΝΟΣ
πρλί 150 λίρα

PUKAY
Κατοχίλ είς παρλίλ
ΜΕΡΙΝΟΣ
πρλί 150 λίρα

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΣΟΥΚ ΣΟΥ
ΟΙΚΟΦΕΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΟΦΕΑΝ ΜΕ ΔΟΣΕΙΣ
150 πρλί 375 λίρα

ΕΚΘΕΣΙΣ ΣΤΑΜΠΟΥΛ 1951
Είς τήν έκθεσιν
ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΥΠΑΙΘΡΙΟΝ ΘΕΑΤΡΟΝ
Η ΕΠΙΘΕΡΗΣΙΣ ΠΑΤΙΝΑΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΓΟΥ

ΚΑΤΑΣΤΗΜΑ ΤΑΠΗΤΩΝ
"ΟΥΣΑΚ"
ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΦΟΓΛΟΥ

ΕΚΘΕΣΙΣ ΣΤΑΜΠΟΥΛ 1951
Είς τήν έκθεσιν
ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΥΠΑΙΘΡΙΟΝ ΘΕΑΤΡΟΝ
Η ΕΠΙΘΕΡΗΣΙΣ ΠΑΤΙΝΑΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΓΟΥ

Typical example of 2nd page of Apogevmatini

