

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

SECURITY  
COUNCIL

CONSEIL  
DE SECURITE

S/360  
27 May 1947  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

BUREAU OF DOCUMENTS UNIT

R E P O R T

by the

COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION CONCERNING

GREEK FRONTIER INCIDENTS

to the

SECURITY COUNCIL

Volume I

President of the Security Council,

The Commission of Investigation Concerning Greek Frontier Incidents, established by the Resolution of the Security Council of 18th December 1946, has the honour to submit its report, consisting of the following parts :

PART I including a narrative account of the work of the Commission was approved unanimously.

PART II including a survey of the evidence submitted to the Commission was approved unanimously with the reservations of the U.K. and USSR delegations to be found at the end of this part in Chapters 8 and 9.

PART III is divided in three Chapters :

CHAPTER 1 consists of the conclusions subscribed to by the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Columbia, Syria, U.K. and U.S.A.

The delegations of USSR and Poland did not approve these conclusions and the delegations of Belgium and Columbia made a statement to be found in Part III Chapter 3 Section A.

The French delegation abstained from approving Chapter 1 and made a statement to be found in Chapter 3 Section A.

CHAPTER 2 consists of the conclusions subscribed to by the delegation of USSR.

The delegation of Poland supported these conclusions and presented a declaration to be found in Chapter 3 section B.

The delegations of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, China, France, Syria, U.K. and U.S.A. did not approve these conclusions.

CHAPTER 3 sets out the attitude of the delegations to the conclusions contained in Chapters 1 and 2.

PART IV including proposals to be submitted to the Security Council was approved by the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Syria, U.K. and U.S.A.

The Delegations of USSR and Poland did not approve the proposals set out in PART IV Chapter I and made statements to be found in Part IV Chapter 2.

The Liaison Representatives have presented to the Commission observations and comments on Parts I, II and III both orally in a public meeting, and in writing in letters, addressed to the Commission.

The Commission has corrected some of the factual errors pointed out by the Liaison Representatives in regard to Parts I and II. All comments and oral statements made by the Liaison Representatives are attached to the Report as annexes 6 to 9 so that the Security Council may be informed of their observations on Parts I, II and III.

The Commission is at the disposal of the Security Council to supply any additional information through its Rapporteur which may be necessary in the course of consideration of the report.

#### COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION CONCERNING GREEK FRONTIER INCIDENTS

Delegate of Australia.....	<i>L. A. ...</i>
Delegate of Belgium.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of Brazil.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of China.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of Colombia.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of France.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of Poland.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of Syria.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of USSR.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of U.K.....	<i>[Signature]</i>
Delegate of U.S.A.....	<i>[Signature]</i>

# COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION CONCERNING GREEK FRONTIER INCIDENTS

## Report by the Commission of Investigation Concerning Greek Frontier Incidents to the Security Council

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>PART I: ANALYSIS OF THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION</u>	<u>1</u>
I. THE CASE BEFORE THE SECURITY COUNCIL	1
A. Summary of Discussion in the Security Council	1
B. The Resolution of 19 December 1946	3
II. ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION	4
A. Establishment of the Commission	4
1. Delegates	4
2. Liaison Representatives	5
3. The Secretariat	5
B. Methods of Procedure of the Commission	6
1. The Chairmanship of the Commission	6
2. Rules of Procedure	6
3. Publicity of Meetings	7
4. Relation of Liaison Representatives to the Commission	8
C. Subsidiary Organs of the Commission	9
1. The Committee of Experts	9
2. Investigating Teams	11
3. Drafting Committees	12
4. Establishment of Subsidiary Group of the Commission	13
III. METHODS OF OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION	
A. Itinerary of the Commission	15
B. Types of Evidence heard by the Commission	16
C. Selection of Witnesses to be heard	18
D. Communications to the Commission	21
<u>PART II: SURVEY OF EVIDENCE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION</u>	<u>22</u>
I. CHARGES BY GREECE THAT ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA SUPPORT THE GUERRILLA MOVEMENT IN GREECE AND REFUTATIONS BY ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA	22
Section A - CHARGES AGAINST ALBANIA AND ALBANIAN REFUTATIONS	22
1. Training of Refugees	22
A. Greek Charges	22
B. Albanian Refutation	25
2. Providing Guerillas with weapons and supplies	28
A. Greek Charges	28
B. Albanian Refutation	30
3. Despatching Guerilla Detachments across the frontier into Greece	31
A. Greek Charges	31
B. Albanian Refutation	33
4. Hospitalizing Wounded Guerrillas	35
A. Greek Charges	35
B. Albanian Refutation	36
5. Crossing by Guerillas from Greece into Albania	36
A. Greek Charges	36
B. Albanian Refutation	38



	<u>Page</u>
<u>Section B: CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA AND BULGARIAN REFUTATIONS</u>	39
6. General Greek Charges	39
7. Greek Charges of Providing Guerillas with weapons and supplies	39
8. Greek charges of despatching guerilla detachments across the frontier into Greece	39
9. Greek charges of hospitalising wounded guerillas	41
10. Greek charges that guerillas cross from Greece into Bulgaria	41
11. Bulgarian refutations of the Greek charges	44
<u>Section C: CHARGES AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA: YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS</u>	48
12. General Charges	48
A. General Charges	48
B. General Refutations by Yugoslavia	49
13. Training of Refugees	53
A. Greek charges	53
B. Yugoslav Refutations	56
14. Recruiting of Refugees into Guerilla Units	58
A. Greek Charges	58
B. Yugoslav Refutations	61
15. Providing guerillas with weapons and supplies	62
A. Greek charges	62
B. Yugoslav Refutations	65
16. Despatching guerilla detachments across the frontier into Greece.	66
A. Greek Charges	66
B. Yugoslav Refutations	68
17. Hospitalising Wounded Guerillas	69
A. Greek charges	69
B. Yugoslav Refutations	71
18. Crossing by guerillas from Greece into Yugoslavia	72
A. Greek Charges	72
B. Yugoslav Refutations	73
<u>CHAPTER II: GREEK CHARGES THAT THE NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF GREECE, AIMING AT DETACHING FROM GREECE PARTS OF HER TERRITORIES (AEGEAN MACEDONIA AND WESTERN THRACE): REFUTATIONS BY BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA</u>	75
<u>Section A: CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA</u>	75
19. Greek Charges	75
A. Charges	75
B. Evidence presented by Greece	75
20. Bulgarian refutations	77
<u>Section B: CHARGES AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA</u>	78
21. Greek Charges	78
A. Quotations from Yugoslav Statements	78
B. Testimony of witnesses	80
22. Yugoslav Refutations	82
<u>CHAPTER III: GREEK CHARGES IN RESPECT OF PROVOCATION OF BORDER INCIDENTS BY ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA</u>	85
<u>Section A : CHARGES AGAINST ALBANIA AND COUNTER ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS BY ALBANIA</u>	85
23. Charges against Albania	85
24. Albanian counter accusations and refutations	85
A. Albanian counter-accusations	85
B. Albanian refutations	85

	Page
25. Incidents at Trestenik	87
26. Incidents at Tsolaklis - Palamba	88
A. Greek Evidence	88
B. Albanian Evidence	89
28. Incidents at Likojan	89
A. Greek Evidence	89
B. Albanian Evidence	90
29. Incidents at Skipi (Kakavia-Radat)	91
A. Introduction	91
B. Greek Evidence	91
C. Albanian Evidence	92
 <u>Section B: CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA AND COUNTER-ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS BY BULGARIA</u>	 93
30. Greek charges against Bulgaria	93
31. Bulgarian counter accusations and refutations	95
A. Bulgarian counter accusations	95
B. Bulgarian refutations	96
31a. Incidents investigated	97
 <u>Section C: CHARGES AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA: YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS</u>	 98
32. General Charges	98
A. General Charges by Greece	98
B. General Refutations by Yugoslavia	98
34. The Surmona incidents	98
A. Greek Evidence	98
B. Yugoslav Evidence	99
34. The Skra incidents	100
A. Greek evidence	100
B. Yugoslav evidence	101
35. Idhomeni incident	101
A. Greek evidence	101
B. Yugoslav Evidence	102
 <u>CHAPTER IV: ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTIONS THAT THE PRESENT GREEK REGIME IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A STATE OF CIVIL WAR IN GREECE AND FOR THE DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICTS OF THAT COUNTRY AND GREEK REFUTATIONS</u>	 103
 <u>Section A: CHARGES THAT A STATE OF CIVIL WAR EXISTS THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE TERRITORY OF GREECE AND NOT ONLY IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICTS OF THE COUNTRY AND GREEK REFUTATIONS</u>	 103
36. Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Charges	103
37. Greek Refutations	104
 <u>Section B: CHARGES OF PERSECUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC FORCES IN GREECE BY THE GENDARMERIE, REGULAR TROOPS AND RIGHTWING BANDS: AND GREEK REFUTATIONS</u>	 105
38. Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Charges	105
39. Greek Refutations	113
 <u>Section C: CHARGES THAT PERSECUTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES (MACEDONIANS AND TCHAMS) IS ONE OF THE CAUSES OF THE TENSE SITUATION IN GREECE AND GREEK REFUTATIONS</u>	 116
40. Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Charges	117
41. Greek Refutations	120
A. Cham minority	120
B. Macedonian Minority	122

<u>CHAPTER V:</u>	ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTIONS THAT THE GREEK GOVERNMENT CONDUCTS A POLICY OF PROVOCATIONS ON THE BORDERS OF THOSE COUNTRIES	<u>Page</u> 125
42.	Charges by Albania	125
43.	Charges by Bulgaria	128
44.	Charges by Yugoslavia	130
45.	Greek Refutations	132
<u>CHAPTER VI:</u>	ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTIONS THAT THE GREEK GOVERNMENT CONDUCTS IN RESPECT OF THOSE COUNTRIES A POLICY OF PROVOCATIONS BY THE MAINTENANCE IN GREEK TERRITORY OF QUISLINGS AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF THESE QUISLINGS IN RESPECT OF ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA: AND GREEK REFUTATIONS	133
46.	Albanian Charges	133
A.	General Albanian Charges	133
B.	Albanian Charges that Greece is sheltering war criminals and quislings of the three countries	133
C.	Albanian Charges that Greece is giving the war criminals and quislings preferential treatment	134
D.	Albanian charges that Greece is encouraging the war criminals and quislings to organise a conspiracy against the regimes in Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria	135
47.	Bulgarian charges	138
48.	Yugoslav charges	140
A.	General Yugoslav charges	140
B.	Yugoslav charges that Greece is sheltering Yugoslav quislings	140
C.	Yugoslav Charges that Greece gives preferential treatment to quislings	142
D.	Yugoslav charges that Greece encourages Yugoslav quislings to undertake enemy actions and provocations directed against Yugoslavia	143

	Page (▼)	Page
49. Greek refutations of the charges of maintenance in Greek territory of quislings and subversive activities of these quislings, in respect of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia		148
(a) Greek refutations of the charge that Greece is sheltering war criminals and quislings of the three countries.		148
(b) Greek refutations of the charge that Greece is giving these war criminals and quislings preferential treatment.		149
(c) Greek refutations of the charge that Greece is encouraging war criminals and quislings to organize a conspiracy against the regimes of these three countries.		151
<u>CHAPTER VII - ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTION THAT THE GREEK GOVERNMENT CONDUCTS AN EXPANSIONIST FOREIGN POLICY WHICH IS A PROVOCATION TO THOSE COUNTRIES : AND GREEK REFUTATIONS.</u>		155
50. Albanian Charges that Greece's foreign policy is expansionist.		155
51. Bulgarian charges that Greece's foreign policy is expansionist,		157
52. Yugoslav charges that Greece's foreign policy is expansionist.		158
53. Greek refutations of the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav charges that Greece's foreign policy is expansionist.		161
(a) In relation to Albania		161
(b) In relation to Bulgaria		161
(c) In relation to Yugoslavia		162
<u>CHAPTER VIII - UNITED KINGDOM RESERVATION</u>		164
<u>CHAPTER IX - RESERVATIONS BY THE SOVIET DELEGATION REGARDING PART TWO OF THE REPORT.</u>		165
<u>PART III. : CONCLUSIONS</u>		167
<u>CHAPTER I - CONCLUSIONS</u>		167
Section A: Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and the guerillas in Greece		167
1. Introduction		167
2. Yugoslavia		167
3. Albania		169
4. Bulgaria		170

Section B: Movement to detach Macedonia from Greece	Page 171
Section C: Frontier violations not involving aid to Greek guerillas	174
6. Introduction	174
7. The Greco-Albanian Frontier	174
8. The Greco-Bulgarian Frontier	175
9. The Greco-Yugoslav Frontier	176
Section D:	178
10. Greek domestic policy in relation to the Commission's inquiry	178
Section E:	181
11. Territorial claims	181
<u>CHAPTER II</u> - CONCLUSIONS	183
Section A: Witnesses and witnesses statements on behalf of Greece	183
12.	183
Section B: Albania	191
13.	191
Section C: Bulgaria	198
14.	198
Section D: Yugoslavia	202
15	203
Section E:	213
16	213
Section F:	219
17	219
Section G :	227
18.	
Section H :	234
19	234

<u>CHAPTER 3</u> - ATTITUDE OF DELEGATIONS TO THE CONCLUSIONS SET OUT IN CHAPTERS I AND II	Page 239
Section A: Attitude of delegations to the conclusions set out in Chapter I	239
Section B: Attitude of delegations to the conclusions set out in Chapter II	245
<u>PART IV.</u> : PROPOSALS MADE IN PURSUENCE OF THE FINAL PARAGRAPH OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION OF 19 DECEMBER 1946.	246
<u>CHAPTER I</u> - PROPOSALS	246
<u>CHAPTER II</u> - ATTITUDE OF DELEGATIONS TO THE PROPOSALS SET OUT IN CHAPTER II	252

## P A R T I

### I. The Case Before the Security Council

#### A. Summary of Discussion in the Security Council

The problem of Greece came before the Security Council for the third time during the year 1946 when on 3 December, the Delegate of Greece, under Art. 34 and 35 (1) of the Charter, requested that the Security Council give early consideration to a situation which was leading to friction between Greece and its neighbours, Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The Government of Greece charged that guerrillas in Greece were receiving support from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, that groups of men were trained for guerrilla activities, and that foreign assistance had been provided. A detailed memorandum in support of the Greek request was included. 1/

---

1/ S/203 (4 December 1946). The first Greek case came before the Security Council as a result of a letter of the Representative of the U.S.S.R. on 21 January 1946, under Art. 35 of the UN Charter, charging that the presence of British troops in Greece was a threat to international peace and security. The Security Council considered the problem at its Sixth (1 February 1946), Seventh (4 February 1946), Eighth (5 February 1946), and Tenth (6 February 1946) Sessions. See Journal of the Security Council No. 2 (24 January 1946); 14; No. 7 (2 February 1946), 87-102; No. 8 (9 February 1946); 101-37, 137-138; No. 10, (13 February 1946), 172-178.

The second Greek case was brought to the attention of the Security Council by a cable from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR on 24 August 1946, under Art. 34 of the UN Charter, charging that the policy of the Greek Government had produced a situation in the Balkans endangering international peace and security. The Security Council discussed this problem during the Fifty-Fourth, Fifty-Seventh, Fifty-Eighth to Sixty-Second, and Sixty-Fourth to Seventieth Sessions (28 August - 20 Sept. 1946). See United Nations, Security Council, Official Records, First Year, Second Series, as follows: No. 4, p.33-39; No. 5, 145-149; No.5 Supplement, Annex 8 S/137), p.150-151; No. 6, p.153-56, 157-171; No. 7 P. 173-197; No. 8, p.200-212; No. 9, p.214-256; No.10, p.260-281; No. 11, p.234-297; No. 12, p.300-321; No. 13, p.324-341; No.14, p.344-364; No.15, p.365-392; No.16, p. 393-422.

The Security Council placed the problem on its agenda at its Eighty-Second Session and the complaint was discussed during the Eighty-Second to Eighty-Seventh sessions (10-19 Dec. 1946). 2/ Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were invited to participate, without vote, in the discussions. Because Albania and Bulgaria are not members of the United Nations, their participation was agreed to on the condition that they accept in advance, for the purposes of the case, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the Charter. These obligations were accepted by the representatives of Albania and Bulgaria on 17 Dec. 1946. 3/

Additional statements of charges and counter-charges were made during the Eighty-Fifth session of the Security Council by the Greek and Yugoslav representatives, 4/ and the representative of the United States proposed that the Security Council, without passing any judgment, establish a commission to ascertain the facts relating to alleged border violations with authority to conduct on-the-spot investigations in such areas of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia as the Commission might consider necessary, and to report the results to the Security Council. 5/ This draft resolution, modified and expanded by amendments proposed by the Representatives of Mexico, Poland and the

---

2/ For the record of the Security Council discussion see S/PV/82 (10 Dec. 1946), p.27-152; S/PV/83 (12 Dec. 1946), 27-100; S/PV/84 (16 Dec. 1946), 16-100; S/PV/85 (17 Dec. 1946); S/PV/86 (19 Dec. 1946), 1-81; S/PV/87 (19 Dec. 1946).

3/ S/160 and S/161 (18 Dec. 1946).

4/ A considerable documentation was presented as well. See especially: S/133 and S/133/Add.1 (26 Aug. 1946); S/203/Add.1 (16 Dec. 1946); S/215 (16 Dec. 1946); S/216 (16 Dec. 1946); S/218 (16 Dec. 1946); S/219 (18 Dec. 1946); S/221 (18 Dec. 1946); S/222 (19 Dec. 1946) S/AC/4/2. See also Official Records, 1st Year, Sec. Ser., Sup. No. 10 p. 169-191.

5/ S/PV/85, pp.69-70.



United Kingdom, was adopted unanimously at the Eighty-Seventh session of the Security Council, on 19 Dec. 1946.

B. The Resolution of 19 December 1946

The text of the resolution of 19 December 1946 is as follows (S/AC.4/5):

WHEREAS, there have been presented to the Security Council oral and written statements by the Greek, Yugoslav, Albanian and Bulgarian Governments relating to disturbed conditions in northern Greece along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the other, which conditions, in the opinion of the Council, should be investigated before the Council attempts to reach any conclusions regarding the issues involved.

RESOLVES, that the Security Council under Art. 34 of the Charter establish a Commission of Investigation to ascertain the facts relating to the alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the other.

That the Commission be composed of a representative of each of the members of the Security Council as it will be constituted in 1947.

That the Commission shall proceed to the area not later than 15 Jan. 1947 and shall submit to the Security Council at the earliest possible date a report of the facts disclosed by its investigation. The Commission shall, if it deems it advisable or if requested by the Security Council, make preliminary reports to the Security Council.

That the Commission shall have authority to conduct its investigation in northern Greece and in such places in other parts of Greece, in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia as the Commission considers should be included in its investigation in order to elucidate the causes and nature of the above-mentioned border violations and disturbances.

That the Commission shall have authority to call upon the Governments, officials and nationals of those countries, as well as such other sources as the Commission deems necessary, for

- 
- 6/ For discussion and amendments see S/FV/87 as follows: 1) Polish amendment on description of area covered by complaint, pp.61-88; 2) Mexican and French amendments on composition of commission, pp. 91-106; 3) Polish and Soviet amendments on area subject to investigation, pp.111-127; 4) Soviet amendment on limitation of staffs of delegations, pp.128-130, 131-132; 5) Polish amendment on participation of representatives of Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria in Commission's work, pp.137-151; 6) United Kingdom amendment inviting commission to make proposals for preventing repetition of disturbances, pp.152-165.

information relevant to its investigation.

That the Security Council request the Secretary-General to communicate with the appropriate authorities of the countries named above in order to facilitate the Commission's investigation in those countries.

That each representative on the Commission be entitled to select the personnel necessary to assist him and that, in addition, the Security Council request the Secretary-General to provide such staff and assistance to the Commission as it deems necessary for the prompt and effective fulfillment of its task.

That a representative of each of the Governments of Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia be invited to assist in the work of the Commission in a liaison capacity.

That the Commission be invited to make any proposals that it may deem wise for averting a repetition of border violations and disturbances in these areas.

## II. Organization of the Commission

### A. Establishment of the Commission

Soon after the adoption of the resolution by the Security Council, the Secretariat of the United Nations began making preparations for operations and transport of the Commission, and the eleven members of the Security Council appointed their representatives.

#### 1. Delegates

The delegates of the Commission of Investigation were as follows:

<u>Australia</u>	Mr. John D.L. Hood, External Affairs Officer, London.
<u>Belgium</u>	Lt. Gen. Maurice Delvoie, former Military Attache, Paris.
<u>Brazil</u>	Mr. Antonio Mendes Vianna, 7/ First Secretary, Brazilian Embassy, Madrid.
<u>China</u>	H.E. Dr. Wunsz King, Ambassador to Belgium.
<u>Colombia</u>	Mr. Francisco Urrutia, Minister to Belgium

---

7/ Because of illness, General Santos was unable to serve.

<u>France</u>	Mr. Georges Daux, Professor of History, University of Paris.
<u>Poland</u>	Mr. Jerzy Putrament, Minister to Switzerland
<u>Syria</u>	H.E. Ihsan el-Sherif, Minister to Turkey
<u>U. K.</u>	Mr. R.T. Windle, Chief National Agent of the British Labour Party
<u>U.S.S.R.</u>	Mr. A.A. Lavrishchev, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Moscow
<u>U. S.</u>	Mr. Mark Foster Ethridge, Publisher, <u>Courier-Journal</u> and <u>Louisville Times</u> . 8/

2. Liaison Representatives

The following Liaison Representatives were appointed by their respective Governments to serve with the Commission pursuant to the resolution of the Security Council:

<u>Albania</u>	Col. Nesti Kerenxhi
<u>Bulgaria</u>	Mr. George Kulishev, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs.
<u>Greece</u>	Mr. Alexander Kyrou, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
<u>Yugoslavia</u>	Mr. Josip Djerdja, Minister to Albania.

3. The Secretariat

The Secretariat of the Commission, totalling 27 persons, was headed by Col. A. Roscher Lund in the capacity of Principal Secretary, together with a Deputy Principal Secretary, Mr. G. Gottesman, and three Assistant Secretaries. Press relations were handled through the Press Officer of the Secretariat, Mr. Stanley Ryan. There were one official photographer and one cinematographer,

---

8/ A complete list of the membership of the Commission may be found in the Appendix I.

as well as administrative officers, interpreters, secretaries, verbatim reporters and stenographers. Additional interpreters for the Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Macedonian and Serbian languages were employed by the Secretariat, as required in Greece. <sup>9/</sup> In Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia interpreters in these languages were supplied by the respective governments.

B. Methods of Procedure of the Commission

1. The Chairmanship of the Commission

The Principal Secretary of the Commission presided over the first meeting of the Commission in Athens on 30 January, <sup>10/</sup> since the question of the Chairmanship was not decided until the second meeting on 31 January. The Commission decided to adopt the principle of rotation of the chairmanship, in alphabetical order in the English language, with each chairman to hold office for one week. In travelling, the chairman did not hand over his office until the first meeting at its new base. It was further agreed that the chairman could, if he chose, designate another member of his delegation to serve as representative of his country during his term as chairman of the Commission.

2. Rules of Procedure

It was agreed at the first meeting of the Commission that the working languages should be French and English, although any delegate was at liberty to speak in any of the official languages

---

<sup>9/</sup> See S/AC.4/SR/9, p.5. It was agreed at the ninth meeting of the Commission on Feb. 5 that an oath of loyalty to the United Nations should be administered to interpreters in the Balkan languages, although this practice was not always followed.

<sup>10/</sup> S/AC.4/SR/1, p. 1 FF. and S/AC4/SR/2, p. 1-8.

of the UN. In the interest of saving time during the presentation of declarations by the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Liaison Representatives, and by various individuals and non-governmental bodies who spoke in French, translations into English were waived in view of the fact that written statements in English had been prepared and were circulated to the delegations.

The Commission decided that there was no necessity for written rules of procedure, that none should be used as long as it was possible for the Commission to function efficiently without them, and none were, in fact, used during the work of the Commission. Nevertheless, the Chairman of the Commission in summing up the views on controversial points, found it useful at times to ask the opinions of all delegates in order to ascertain the position of the Commission as a whole. 11/

Other procedures of the Commission were established by usage based upon the practices of the Security Council. For example, the first item on the provisional agenda of any meeting was the adoption of the agenda which was prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chairman. It was established that each member of the Commission had the right to put any item within the competence of the Commission on the provisional agenda of any meeting.

### 3. Publicity of Meetings

There was general agreement among all members of the Commission concerning the desirability of holding open meetings unless

---

11/ S/AC.4/SR/3, p.5. See also the discussion in S/AC.4/SR/80, p.5.

otherwise decided by the Commission. 12/ The Commission also held private meetings to discuss procedure, at the close of which, statements were issued by the Press Officer of the Secretariat. In addition, the Press Officer, on behalf of the Secretariat, communicated to the Secretariat at Lake Success a press summary of the work of the Commission. Subsequently as a result of a decision taken at a meeting in Geneva, press communiques were only issued after being approved by the Chairmen of the Commission or of the Drafting Committees. 13/

#### 4. Relation of Liaison Representatives to the Commission

The relationship of the Liaison Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia to the Commission was discussed at the second meeting on 31 January. 14/ The Commission decided, in accordance with the resolution of the Security Council of 19 December 1946, that the Liaison Representatives should attend all public meetings of the Commission, and should be invited by the Commission to participate in its work. At the Ninth Meeting of the Commission on Feb. 5, it was decided that the Liaison Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia could participate in the discussions on the same conditions as the representatives of these countries participated in the discussions in the Security Council during the consideration of the Greek complaint. In practice the Commission allowed full participation of the Liaison representatives at its open meetings and they interrogated witnesses, made statements, and offered arguments on questions before the Commission for decision. In the interrogation of witnesses, members of the Commission took precedence over Liaison Representatives. A similar practice was adopted in the investigating teams of the Commission. Liaison Representatives

---

12/ S/AC.4/SR/2, p.3-4. For other references to the Press see S/AC.4/SR/9, p.5; S/AC.4/SR/17, p. 1-2; S/AC.4/SR/19, p.1; S/AC.4/SR/49, p.2. For Press Releases see S/AC.4/Press/1 ff.

13/ S/AC.4/SR/76A, p.3 (April 18, 1947).

14/ S/AC.4/SR/2, p.5-6. See also the discussion in the Ninth meeting, 5 Feb. 1947, S/AC.4/SR/9, p.7-8; Tenth Meeting, 6 Feb. 1947, S/AC.4/SR/10; and Eleventh Meeting, 6 Feb. 1947, S/AC.4/SR/11, p. 1-3. For the discussion in the Security Council see S/PV/87, p. 137-61.

also attended private meetings of the Commission and of the Committee of Experts when their presence was considered necessary. Liaison Representatives not only submitted a substantial documentation to the Commission, but, at the invitation of the Commission, made suggestions as to methods of investigation, places to visit and witnesses to be heard by the Commission. Attendance of Liaison Representatives, by invitation of the Commission, at private meetings, although agreed in principle, rarely took place.

#### Subsidiary Organs of the Commission

In the interest of efficient dispatch of its work, the Commission established a number of subsidiary organs, namely:

- 1) The Committee of Experts;
- 2) Investigating Teams;
- 3) Drafting Committees;
- 4) The Subsidiary Group of the Commission.

##### 1. The Committee of Experts.

The Committee of Experts was established as a result of discussions in the Commission during the Fourth and Fifth Meetings on 1 and 3 February. 15/ Members of the Commission felt, even at this early stage of their work, that it was necessary to have a small body which could make recommendations to the Commission on such matters as the planning of its work, the examination of communications submitted to the Commission, and the selection and scheduling of witnesses to be heard. It was agreed that this Committee should not be a "steering committee", but that it would deal only with matters specifically referred to it by the Commission.

15/ S/AC.4/SR/4. p.1-7; S/AC.4/SR/5, p.1-2.

In its first phase the Committee was composed not of principal delegates, but of members of the delegations of Colombia, Poland, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. During this phase the Principal Secretary generally served as Chairman of the Committee and as its rapporteur to the Commission. Occasionally the Chairman of the Commission attended these meetings and presided over the Committee.

This Committee held six meetings, on 3, 5, 10, 13 and 15 February. Meetings were entirely informal and its recommendations were reported to the Commission for decision. 16/

On arrival in Salonika, and in order to expedite further the work of the Commission, the Committee of Experts was re-organised at the thirty-third meeting of the Commission on 23 February. It was agreed that the Committee of Experts henceforth be composed of the Chiefs of the Delegations then sitting on the Committee of Experts, together with the current Chairman of the Commission who would also serve as Chairman of the Committee. Under this arrangement the Committee of Experts could work out all detailed arrangements and schedules of work and submit recommendations to the Commission. 17/ On 1 March, it was agreed that the delegate of France should serve as a member of the Committee of Experts. 18/

The reconstituted Committee of Experts was able to function

---

16/ For a record of these recommendations and decisions with respect thereto by the Commission see: S/AC.4/SR/8, p.1-6 (4th February 1947); S/AC.4/CR/14, p.2-5; (4th February 1947) S/AC.4/SR/19, p. 1-6 (11th February 1947); S/AC.4/SR/25, p. 7-8 (10th February 1947); S/AC.4/SR/26, p.1-6 (16th February 1947).

17/ S/AC.4/SR/25A. p.2.

18/ See discussion in S/AC.4/SR/43, p.1-3.



effectively, and held numerous meetings which planned the work of the Commission. The details were worked out by the Sub-committee of this Committee, which was composed of deputies of the Chief Delegates of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, and France, with a deputy of the current chairman of the Commission serving as chairman of the Sub-committee. The Sub-committee not only planned the hearing of witnesses, but laid out programmes and itineraries for field investigations. In the selection of witnesses and planning of field trips, the Sub-committee worked in close co-operation with the four Liaison Representatives, and made its recommendations after examining their suggestions. Upon approval by the Committee of Experts, these recommendations were then presented to the Commission for its decision. On one occasion the Committee of Experts authorised its sub-committee to carry out an interrogation of witnesses. 20/

At the suggestion of the Delegate of Australia, it was agreed at the Seventy-Fourth meeting of the Commission at Geneva, on April 12, that the Committee of Experts, having completed its work, should be dissolved. 21/

## 2. Investigating Teams

It soon became apparent to the Commission that in order to cover as wide an area as possible in its investigation and to hear the maximum number of witnesses, it would be necessary for it to send out investigating teams which could operate while the main body was functioning in its headquarters in Athens, Salonika, Sofia and Belgrade. These teams, the membership of which varied in number and composition, consisted of members of the delegations of the , the liaison representatives and the necessary staff from the

- 19/ The suggestions of the Liaison Representatives were made both in their initial statements and in later communications. For the latter see S/AC.4/65,67 (rev. 1-3, 68,69,70,73,76,78,85,89,95,99, 103, 111....Requests for hearings were also received from numerous private individuals and organizations.
- 20/ S/AC.4/SC.1/1; S/AC.4/W/3. This investigation had to do with Ioannis Xervas and Ioannis Petsas, concerning the alleged torture of Efstathios Valtadoros, who appeared before the Commission as a witness on 27 Feb. 1947.
- 21/ S/AC.4/SR/74, p. 1-3.

Secretariat. The first team sent to the field was under the chairmanship of a member of the Secretariat, but all other teams had as Chairman a principal delegate. The Commission determined in a general way the itineraries of the teams and the categories of witnesses to be heard.

There is set forth in Annexes II an account of the work of the seven investigating teams established by the Commission, including their composition, their itineraries and the lists of witnesses who testified before them.

### 3. Drafting Committees

In addition the Commission, at its Fifty-Eighth Meeting, on March 21, established two drafting committees to prepare its report. 22 The first, under the chairmanship of the Delegate of China, Dr. Wunsz King, prepared drafts of part I of this report, and the second, under the chairmanship of the Delegate of Colombia, Dr. F. Urrutia, prepared Parts II and III.

It was agreed that meetings of the two Drafting Committees should be private except for such cases when it was found necessary to hear the Liaison Representatives. Moreover, it was also agreed that the Liaison Representatives could submit in writing, and orally to the Commission in public meeting, their observations on the draft reports prepared by the Drafting Committees. After that the Commission held private meetings for the consideration of their observations in relation to the report. 23/

The Delegates of Australia, Belgium and the United Kingdom wished to have placed on record their opposition to any publication of conclusions or their discussion with Liaison Representatives before the submission of the report of the Commission to the Security Council. 24/

22/ S/AC.4/SR.58, p.1-3.

23/ S/AC.4/SR/74, p.3-9; S/AC.4/SR/75, p.1-10; S/AC.4/SR/82, p.1-6; S/AC.4/SR/76, p.1-17; S/AC.4/SR/76A, p.1-3.

24/ See especially S/AC.4/SR/75, p.1-10; S/AC.4/SR/82, p.1-6;

4. Establishment of Subsidiary Group of the Commission

The Commission discussed the problem of leaving a "border team" in Greece during the preparation of the Report of the Commission in Geneva, at its Fifty-eighth and Sixtieth Meetings on March 21, 23, 1947, but was unable to reach agreement and the proposal was subsequently withdrawn. 25/ A similar proposal, was presented to the Security Council on March 26, 1947 by the representative of the United States, and was discussed during the sessions of April 7, 10, 14 and 18, 1947, when the following resolution was adopted. 26/

"Resolved: That pending a new decision of the Security Council, the Commission, established by the Resolution of the Council on 19 Dec. 1946, shall maintain in the area concerned a subsidiary group composed of a representative of each of the members of the Commission to continue to fulfil such functions as the Commission may prescribe in accordance with its terms of reference."

The Resolution of the Security Council was discussed by the Commission during the Seventy-Seventh to Eightieth and Eighty-Fourth Meetings on April 21, 25, 29, 30 and May 5, 1947, 27/ In pursuance of the Resolution of the Security Council, the Commission established a Subsidiary Group on April 30, composed of a representative of each of the members of the Commission, with a staff not exceeding one. 28/ The Subsidiary Group, with headquarters at Salonika, was to have "authority to perform its functions in Northern Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia", as it "may decide necessary, or as directed by the Commission or the Security Council."

25/ S/AC.4/SR/58, p. 3-9; S/AC.4/SR/60, p. 1-3

26/ For text see S/AC.4/223. For discussion in the Security Council, see S/AC.4/PV/123, p. 1-11; S/AC.4/PV/126, p. 1-31; S/AC.4/PV/128, p. 1-78; S/AC.4/PV/129, p. 1-76; S/AC.4/PV/130, p. 1-76; S/AC.4/PV/131, p. 1-60;

27/ S/AC.4/SR/77, p. 1-6; S/AC.4/SR/78, p. 1-12; S/AC.4/SR/79, p. 1-10; S/AC.4/SR/80, p. 1-10; S/AC.4/SR/81, p. 1-6; S/AC.4/PV/84, Annex I, page 1-3; S/AC.4/PV/84-I, p. 1-16; S/AC.4/PV/84-II, p. 1-11.

28/ S/AC.4/255.

The procedure of the Subsidiary Group was to be in conformity with the precedents and practices of the Commission. Liaison Representatives of Greece, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were to be attached to the Subsidiary Group "to assist in its work", the staff of each Liaison Representative being limited to one person.

Unless subsequently modified by the Commission or by the Security Council, the terms of reference of the Subsidiary Group were those set out in the Resolution of the Security Council of 19 Dec. 1946, with the following qualifications:

- 1) It was to investigate such incidents as might be brought to its attention which had occurred since 22 March 1947
- 2) It was not to hear evidence which had been or could have been available to the Main Commission;
- 3) No incident was to be investigated nor evidence heard except by formal decision of the Subsidiary Group.

Unless otherwise directed the Subsidiary Group was to submit its reports to the Commission.

The Secretariat of the Subsidiary Group, which was based on the assumption that it could be called upon to serve only one body at a time, was composed of one secretary, one assistant secretary, one administrative officer, two verbatim reporters, one interpreter, one translator and four stenographers.

The Soviet Delegation did not agree with paragraphs 2) and 5) of the directives for the Subsidiary Group, in which the competence and functions of this group were determined. It also proposed an additional paragraph which envisaged the cessation of the activities of this group with the liquidation of the Commission, and made reservations which were recorded in the minutes. 29/ Likewise, the Delegate of Poland raised objections to paragraph 2) of the directives and reserved the right of his government to take a definitive position concerning the Subsidiary Group after the general discussion of the report of the Commission in the Security Council. 30/

---

29/ See especially S/AC.4/SR/79, p. 3-5, and Annex II, p.11.  
30/ S/AC.4/SR/80, p. 5, 8.

The Liaison Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, having expressed by letters their opposition to participation in the Subsidiary Group, the Commission, at its Eighty-Fourth Meeting on 5 May 1947, decided that this question was beyond its competence and transmitted the letters in question to the Security Council. 31 The Liaison Representative of Greece declared that his government was prepared to participate in the work of the Subsidiary Group.

Meanwhile, members of the Subsidiary Group left Geneva for Salonika on May 6 and 10, 1947 to begin their work.

### III. Methods of Operation of the Commission

#### A. Itinerary of the Commission

The Commission assembled in Athens on 29 January, where it held thirty-two meetings between 30 January and 18 February 1947. Its second main base of operations in Greece was established in Salonika where it held twenty-eight meetings - from the thirty-third to the sixty-first, from 25 February to 22 March 1947.

The main body of the Commission also undertook a number of field trips out of Salonika, during the period March 15-19. On March 15, the Commission visited the Mouries sector of the Greek-Yugoslav frontier to study the Sourmena incident. On March 16, the Commission continued to Doiran by train, and entered Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, examining witnesses at Strumitsa and Petrich, respectively. On March 18, the Commission went to Axioupolis and Skra to study the first phase of the Skra incident. On March 19, the Commission went to Idhomeni and Gevgeli (Djevdjelijsa). 32/

---

31/ S/AC.4/FV/84-I, p. 2-3, 15-16; S/AC.4/FV/84-II, p. 2-11. See also the Albanian (S/AC.4/252) and Yugoslav (S/AC.4/253) letters of 2 May, and the Bulgarian letter (S/AC.4/256) of 6 May 1947.

32/ S/AC.4/241, p. 1-3.

The main body of the Commission left Salonika on March 24-25 for Sofia, Bulgaria, where it held six meetings between March 26 and March 28. The Commission then proceeded to Belgrade, Yugoslavia, where it held seven meetings between March 30 and April 2.

It was agreed that the Commission should write its report in Geneva, Switzerland, where the first meeting took place on April 7. Its work ended in Geneva on \_\_\_\_\_.

On 12 May 1947 at its 133rd Session, the Security Council decided that the chiefs of delegations on the Commission, or their alternates, should come to Lake Success to be present during the consideration of the Report of the Commission by the Security Council. The Commission designated the Delegate of Colombia to serve as its Rapporteur to the Security Council. 34/

B. Types of Evidence Heard by the Commission

The Commission received varying types of evidence during the course of its work, in the form both of direct evidence from witnesses and of written and oral statements from the liaison representatives of the Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek and Yugoslav Governments, as well as from individuals and non-governmental organizations, whose representatives were invited to appear before the Commission.

Liaison representatives made their opening statements before the Commission in the following order:

---

33/ For reasons for going to Geneva see S/AC.4/SR/79, p. 1-2.

34/ S/AC.4/SR/54 (2), p. 3-4.

- Mr. Kyrou (Greece), Sixth Meeting Feb. 6 (S/AC.4/13);  
Feb. 17, Twenty-Seventh Meeting (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1)
- Mr. Kulishev (Bulgaria), Tenth Meeting, Feb. 6 (S/AC.4/PV/10);  
Twenty-Seventh Meeting Feb. 17 (S/AC.4/PV/27)
- Col. Kerenzhi (Albania), Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fifteenth and  
Sixteenth Sessions, Feb. 7, 8, 10 (S/AC.4/PV/12, 13, 15, 16),  
Twenty-Seventh Meeting Feb. 17 (S/AC.4/PV/27)
- Mr. Djerdje (Yugoslavia), Eighteenth, Twentieth, Twenty-First,  
Twenty-Second, Twenty-Third, and Twenty-Fourth Meetings,  
Feb. 11-14 (S/AC.4/PV/18, 21-24); Twenty-Eighth Meeting  
Feb. 17 (S/AC.4/PV/28, Annex I).

The following individuals and organizations were heard:

- Mr. Michael Kyrkas (EAM), Twenty-Eighth Meeting, Feb. 17  
S/AC.4/PV/28; S/AC.4/56)
- Mr. Papanigas (General Confederation of Labor), Thirtieth  
Meeting Feb. 18 (S/AC.4/PV/30; S/AC.4/60)
- Mr. Elie Tsimokos (ELD, Socialist Party), Thirtieth Meeting,  
Feb. 18 (S/AC.4/PV/30)
- Gen. N. Grigoriades (Left Liberal Party), Thirty-First Meeting  
Feb. 18 (S/AC.4/PV/31; S/AC.4/31, Annex I)
- Mr. Hercules Petimezas, Pan-Hellenic Federation of Democratic  
Federations, Forty-First Meeting, March 3 (S/AC.4/PV/41;  
S/AC.4/86)
- Mr. Elias Dimitriades, Mr. Denis Christakos and Mr. Rodocanakis,  
Union of Victims and Hostages of the Civil War in Greece  
during Dec. 1944, Forty-First Meeting March 3 (S/AC.4/PV/41)
- Mr. Constantin Philmis, Unified Pan-Hellenic Organization  
of Youth (EPOY), Forty-First Meeting March 3, (S/AC.4/  
PV/41, Annex)
- Prof. Spyridon Dontas, Rector, University of Athens, Forty-  
First Meeting, March 3 (S/AC.4/PV/41, Annex)

The Athens phase of the work of the Commission, indeed, was largely confined to the hearing of such statements. The work of the main body of the Commission in Salonika consisted principally of the examination of witnesses presented by the Greek Government and the Commission. The hearings began on 26 Feb. (Thirty-Fourth Meeting) and ended on 13 March (Fifty-Seventh Meeting. A team finished the examination of witnesses including those proposed by Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Liaison Representatives during the week of 15-22 March, while the Commission was engaged in field trips to the Yugoslav and Bulgarian frontiers.

In its meetings in Sofia and Belgrade, the Commission examined witnesses presented by the Liaison Representatives of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, respectively. A few witnesses, requested by the Greek Liaison Representative, were also heard in these countries.

C. Selection of Witnesses to be heard

The Commission and its subsidiary organs obviously could not hear all those who desired to appear before the Commission. Likewise it was impossible for the Commission to hear all witnesses submitted to it by the Liaison Representatives. It was necessary, therefore, that a selection be made of witnesses to be examined.

The Secretariat interviewed numerous individuals and examined correspondence with a view to possible hearings. The Committee of Experts, after study of the matter, made recommendations to the Commission itself, in connection with individuals and organizations desiring to appear before the Commission.

It was agreed at the Ninth Meeting of the Commission on 5 Feb. that it should advise any individuals or organizations to limit statements "to such points as might be of some use to the Commission in the completion of its task." In the case of well-known organizations, no preliminary inquiry would be necessary before granting a hearing. In principle the procedure was to be as follows:

- 1) All requests for a hearing were to be referred to the Committee of Experts;
- 2) The Committee, without having any power to censure, was to ascertain the standing and purpose of such bodies as were not known beforehand.

The question was further discussed at the Fourteenth Meeting of the Commission on 7 Feb. when the Committee of Experts sought further guidance from the Commission as to 1) conditions to be satisfied by organizations and individuals before the Commission granted requests for a hearing and 2) information required by the



Commission concerning organizations and individuals requesting a hearing. It was ultimately agreed that, except in the case of well-known and important organizations, which, in any case, would be heard by the Commission, information as to the standing of the organization should be submitted to the Secretariat so that the Commission would be in a position to make its decision as to a hearing. There was also agreement that in case of an organization which represented a coalition of groups or parties, only one representative need be heard. The Commission also agreed to the text of a letter to be addressed to organizations and individuals before considering their request to be heard by the Commission. The gist of this letter was that the statements must be confined to subjects which were being considered by the Commission and which were defined by the resolution of the Security Council of 19 Dec. 1946. A copy of the resolution was attached to this letter. 37/

Although under the resolution of the Security Council, it clearly had the right to request government officials, including ministers of cabinet rank, to appear before it, it did not as a matter of practice exercise this privilege in respect of Cabinet Minister. 38/

---

36/S/AC.4/SR/14. p. 1-5.

37/ As a matter of general guidance the Secretariat drew up a brief outline or questionnaire, which was submitted to the Committee of Experts, as to criteria concerning organizations, based on the following: 1) Standing of organization or individual in Greek public opinion; 2) Membership, historical background of organization; 3) Purposes and activities; 4) Prominent members; 5) Presumed contribution to work of Commission; 6) Sources of information to be consulted in gathering above information.

38/ See discussion at the Sixty-Ninth and Seventieth Meetings in Belgrade, on April 1, S/AC.4/PV/69, p. 1-29; S/AC.4/PV/70, p. 1-10).

During the early meetings of the Commission, there was considerable discussion as to its competence to request the Greek government informally and without publicity, to suspend the execution of death sentences. 39/ The Commission on Feb. 6, in its eleventh session decided to refer the question to the Security Council. Accordingly, a cable was sent to the Security Council of the United Nations in which the Commission requested that

"the Security Council deal with this matter immediately and inform the Commission whether the action by the Commission in requesting the Greek government to postpone the executions to be carried out for political offences is covered by the terms of reference of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 19 Dec. 1946 which inter alia empowers the Commission to call on any national who may assist the Commission with information relevant to its inquiry. The Commission is informing the Greek Government of its reference to the Security Council for guidance on the action and procedure adopted hitherto."

The Security Council discussed the problem on 19 Feb, and its decision was read to the Commission on 11 Feb. at the Nineteenth Session, 42/. The resolution of the Security Council declared that the Commission, acting under the resolution of 19 Dec. 1946, was not empowered to request appropriate authorities in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia to postpone execution of any persons sentenced to death unless the Commission had reason to believe that examination of any such person as a witness would assist the Commission in its work, and made its request on this ground, 43/

On the basis of the resolution of the Security Council of 10 Feb. 1947, a team of the Commission interrogated some fourteen condemned persons with a view to ascertaining whether they had evidence of value to present to the Commission. Some were subsequently heard by the Commission, and some by teams.

---

39/ S/AC.4/SR/3, p.2

40/ S/AC.4/SR/11, pp.3-11

41/ S/PV/101, p. 1-20. For text of Commission cable, see S/AC.4/Press/8, 6 Feb. 1947

42/ See S/AC.4/SR/10, p.2 (10 Feb. 1947); S/AC.4/SR/19, p.3.

43/ S/PV/101, p. 1-20

D. Communications to the Commission

The Commission received communications from delegates, liaison representatives, private individuals and non-governmental organization. The communications from delegates and liaison representatives were reproduced and distributed. Communications from private individuals and non-governmental organizations, however, were too numerous to reproduce and circulate. The Secretariat merely filed these communications and circulated lists for the knowledge and use of the Commission. Delegations, were, of course, free to consult these files and to make such use of the information contained therein as they saw fit. 44/

---

44/ For this file see S/AC.4/NC/1 fr.

PART II

SURVEY OF EVIDENCE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION.

CHAPTER I - CHARGES BY GREECE THAT ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA  
SUPPORT THE GUERRILLA MOVEMENT IN GREECE, AND REFUTATIONS BY ALBANIA,  
BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA.

SECTION A - CHARGES AGAINST ALBANIA, AND ALBANIAN REFUTATIONS.

1. TRAINING OF REFUGEES.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

In its complaint to the Security Council, the Greek Government charged that groups of men were being trained in Albania for guerrilla activities in Greece (S/203, p.3). This charge was elaborated in the Security Council (S/PV/83, p.56), and in the Commission the Greek Liaison Representative stated: "Rubig is situated to the north of Tirana not far from the small town of Lesh and according to many statements was used as a preparatory military training centre for the higher school of partisan warfare at Bulkes." (S/AC.4/PV/27, p.7).

The Albanian Government denied these charges before the Security Council (S/PV/84, p.16 ff), and before the Commission (S/AC.4/PV/27, pp.3-4; S/AC.4/PV/12, pp.2-3).

The Greek Government offered evidence that after the Var-  
kiza Agreement many former members of ELAS were advised by members of the KKE or their ELAS comrades to go into Albania to avoid persecution by the Greek Nationalist forces. GEORGHIOS GATSIOS stated in his deposition that, being afraid of arrest for the murder of his cousin, he accepted the proposal of Petalitis, a member of the Party, that he go to Albania where he would receive assistance and avoid being pursued by the National Guard. (GWB-I, p.18). GEORGHIOS ZAFIRIS, in his deposition, asserted that the Chief of the KKE in his village told him he would be

persecuted by the Greek authorities and advised him to leave for Albania. Zafiridis was persuaded and fled to Albania. (GWB-I, p.107).

In his testimony before the Commission Zafiridis said: "Our responsible indoctrination committee told us that there would be a persecution. I personally do not know anything because in May I left for Albania." (S/AC.4/PV/39, p.5). CHRISTOS ZOIS (GWB-I, p.113) and THOMAS ZAHOS (GWB-I, p.110) stated in their depositions that after the Varkiza Agreement in February 1945, they were ordered to leave for Albania. FOTIOS KONTOPANOS said: "On our way (to Rubig) we were facilitated by the KKE's liaison agents who co-operated with the Albanian authorities." (GWB-I, p.58). Some of these KKE liaison agents were identified as Greek by IOANNIS TSEKLARPOULOS (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.7) and DIMITRIOS STAMENIS (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.16) who appeared before Team 1A. STAVROS KENTROS stated he had heard that the guerrilla leader Leonidas Raptis was in Albania in early June 1946, gathering young men from Tirana and other places to form a band. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.5) NIKOLAOS TSIPIIS testified that he returned to Greece from Tirana with Raptis sometime between 5 and 8 June 1946. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.9). Kentros alleged that in August 1946 at Longos in Albania the Security Captain, Ioannis Panos, had addressed a group of Greek refugees and the "the latter made a speech in which he pointed out that the fate of Greece depended on three things: (i) the plebiscite, (ii) the regime, (iii) the revolution. He said that today our companions in arms in Greece are fighting with fire and iron, the Party orders us to go and reinforce them. If anybody disobeys this order of the Party, the Law of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, will be enforced on him; everybody must know that Albania is not a land of loafers, but a refuge of fighters, who owing to unforeseen circumstances, have to cross the border. It is prohibited to those who for various reasons will remain here to discuss or criticize the actions of the bands. He then invited

all of us to join the bands." (GWB-I, p.52). Similar evidence was offered in the deposition of ZAFIRIS who alleged that in October 1945 an Albanian official of the Popular Security visited Rubig and told the inhabitants that very soon a popular democracy would be instituted in Greece with the help of Hodja and Tito. (GWB-I, p.180).

Three Greek witnesses alleged that military training was given at a camp at Rubig where they variously estimated that there were from 200 to 400 Greek refugees, who were transferred to the Yugoslav camp at Bulkes in October 1945 (GATSIOS, GWB-I, p.2; S/AC.4/PV/34, p.22; S/AC.4/PV/35, pp.3, 4, 5; KONTOPANOS, GWB-I, p.58; S/AC.4/PV/45, pp. 10, 11; and ZAFIRIS, GWB-I, p.107; S/AC.4/PV/38, p.19). The Greek Government submitted to the Commission a copy of a military manual in Greek alleged to have been written at Rubig. (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex I, p.7). According to GATSIOS the military manual was published on paper furnished by the Albanian Press Ministry and reproduced by a mimeograph machine supplied by the Albanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.21). In his testimony before the Commission KONTOPANOS described the organisation and program of the alleged military training, stating that he was one of a committee of former ELAS officers who had written the manual at Rubig in July or August of 1945. (S/AC.4/PV/34, pp.10-14). GATSIOS (GWB-I, p.21; S/AC.4/PV/35, p.3) and ZAFIRIS (S/AC.4/PV/38) also testified as to the military training school at Rubig and the existence of the military manual. They stated that they received practical and theoretical military training and practiced with rifles, machine guns and mortars. According to GATSIOS (GWB-I, p.21) and ZAFIRIS (GWB-I, p.108, S/AC.4/PV/38, p.19) the refugees at Rubig received regular political indoctrination. GATSIOS stated that lectures were delivered emphasizing the obligation of KKE to insure the triumph of the principles of EAM; and that "in August, the Albanian military authorities lent us a 50 mm French mortar and an Italian

machine gun. Gherasimos Maltezos (alias Tzoumerkiotis) taught the use of these arms to about 50 men of the camp for about 15 days, after which they were returned to the Albanians." (GWB-I, p.21).

(b) ALBANIAN REFUTATION.

According to the Albanian Liaison Representative, about 23,000 Greeks fled to Albania because of persecutions and terror on the part of the Greek authorities. (S/AC.4/PV/16, p.3).

In his testimony before Team 1A, when asked why he left Greece, ZOIS replied: "We went away after the Varkiza Agreement. We were afraid to be beaten or imprisoned by the National Guard. People were saying that the National Guards were doing such acts. As a matter of fact, when we left the National Guard was not there already, but that is the reason why I left." (S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV/21, p.8).

When ZAHOS was interrogated by Team 1A about the statement in his deposition that he was ordered to Albania, he replied that there had been no such order. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.18).

The Albanian Liaison Representative made the following comments on the evidence submitted in support of the Greek charges:

- (i) TSOKLARPOULOS had said in evidence that he had spent four days near Biglista, (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, pp.6-7) while in the summary statement he had said he stayed near Biglista for eight days.
- (ii) In oral testimony before Team 1A KENTROS had said that on 13 June 1946 he had met Dringos who told him that Raptis had remained in Albania and was forming a band. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.5). Subsequently, Kentros had stated that on 13 June Raptis was in Greece and had entered from Longos (in Albania).
- (iii) The other eight members of the group, including Raptis, with which TSIPIS was arrested, had declared at the trial after which they were sentenced that they had never been to Albania. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.10).

Further, there was no hotel Metropole in Tirana, where Tsipis had testified that he lived at the expense of the People Security. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SF/11, p.12).

- (iv) Estimates of the number of inhabitants of Rubig varied according to the witness: Gatsios, 200 (GWB-I, p.19); Kontopanos, 300 (GWB-I, p.58). Zafiridis in his deposition stated that there were 350 (GWB-I, p.10) and in testifying before the Commission stated there were 400 (S/AC.4/PV/38, p.19).

The Albanian and Yugoslav Liaison Representatives challenged the veracity of the testimony of Kontopanos, Gatsios and Zafiridis pointing out the following differences between the depositions and oral testimony of these witnesses:

- (i) In his deposition KONTOPANOS stated only that in Rubig they were armed and organized along military lines (GWB-I, p.58) while before the Commission he gave details concerning an organized military school (S/AC.4/PV/34, pp.10-11);
- (ii) GATSIOS, in his deposition said that the principal occupation at Rubig was attending political lectures for one or two hours every morning but he had never attended. (GWB-I, p.21). Before the Commission he testified that in May 1945 he was placed in the third class of the military training school and did exercises on a sand table until he was assigned to the bakery. (S/AC.4/PV/35, pp.3-4).
- (iii) ZAFIRIS, in his deposition (GWB-I, p.107), made no mention of military training, while in testifying before the Commission he gave complete details of a training school, but differed from the testimony of Gatsios concerning the number of classes in the school. (S/AC.4/PV/38, p.19).

The witness ZAHOS, who was at Rubig at the same time as Kontopanos, Gatsios and Zafiridis, denied his statement contained in the Greek White Book I (p.110) and declared before Team 1A that no military



or political training was given at Rubig. (GWB-I, p.110; S/AC.4/SCE.2/BR/11). He stated that his first deposition was given under pressure

The Albanian and Yugoslav Liaison Representatives also pointed out the following alleged inconsistencies in the evidence concerning the Rubig training manual:

- (i) GATSIOS testified that the manual was published in July or August 1945, while KONTOPANOS, who stated he was one of the authors, testified that "the book was published at Rubig. I do not remember exactly the date, but I suppose, I think that I remember it was during July or August 1946. I am not sure whether it is 1945 or 1946." ZAFIRIS stated that "in the last day of my stay (end of October 1945) at Rubig a military regulation book was prepared." (S/AC.4/PV/38, p.19).
- (ii) None of the depositions in GWB-I refer to the existence of the Rubig manual.
- (iii) The Yugoslav Liaison Representatives commented on the detailed knowledge of Gatsios, a baker, concerning the Rubig manual, whereas Kontopanos, one of the authors, had no knowledge of the technical means by which the manual was published.

GATSIOS, describing the source of his information about the Rubig manual, said at one time: "I know these details because I lived with another clerk nicknamed Spartacos. I don't know his real name, and who went himself to Tirana to take paper and who took part in the publishing and he himself told me so." (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.21). Later Gatsios said: "In the Rubig camp they were formed in groups where they discussed in common the work each group was doing and they told each other the progress of their work. That is how he learned how this military book was published, was written, and he gave them also the details of his own work." (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.27).

A report of the Commission established on 2 January 1947 by the Albanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to investigate the camp at Rubig was submitted to Team 1A. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/21). The report was accompanied by the depositions of witnesses and stated the conclusion that Greek refugees at the camp had never carried arms nor received military training.

2. PROVIDING GUERRILLAS WITH WEAPONS AND SUPPLIES.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

The Greek Government charged before the Security Council that Albania was supplying guerrilla bands in Greece with weapons and supplies. (S/803/ p.3; S/PV/83, p.51). The Greek Liaison Representative reiterated this charge before the Commission. (S/AC.4/18, p.4). This charge was denied by the Albanian representative to the Security Council, (S/PV/84, p.44), and by the Albanian Liaison Representative before the Commission. (S/AC.4/PV/12 and S/AC.4/PV/27).

Several witnesses, former Greek guerrillas, testified that they had received weapons or supplies in Albania. HRISTOS VELIANIDIS said: "We used to go to Yugoslavia and then to Albania to the Vitsi post, where there was a big storehouse, and we used to take the clothing (S/AC.4/PV/40, p 6). TSOKLAROPOULOS testified that while waiting to cross into Greece, the band of which he was a member received its bread from the village of Biglista. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.2). In his deposition, KENTROS stated that at a dump near Argyrocastro, his band was armed with "7 Ston sub-machine guns, 2 Schmeissers, 1 light machine gun, 2 rifles (one American and one Mauser). They also gave us 4 hand grenades and 300 cartridges each as well as three loaves of bread." (GWB-I, p.50). In his testimony before Team 1A, Kentros said that a man named Afronia, whom he believed to be the secretary of the Communist Party, gave the band their arms, and that Ioannis Panos, the chief of the Security at Argyrocastro, also helped them to get the arms. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.4). In his deposition, ZOIS said that his

band with another band of 13 proceeded from Bulkes by way of Belgrade and Skoplje to Albania, where they were armed at the last moment, and then went to Greece, crossing the border near Kastoria. In Albania their food was supplied by the Albanian villages and all facilities were granted to them by the Albanian military authorities. (GWB-I, p.115). In his deposition, KONTOPANOS said: "We then left our camp and after two hours' march came to a gully, where we found 9 Sten guns, 2 light machine guns, 6 Italian rifles, all ready and cleaned, with which those of us who came from Bulkes were equipped. In addition we received 2 Mills hand grenades each. These weapons had been prepared for us by the leaders and were guarded by two bandits with Tommy guns. After being equipped, our group, reinforced by other bandits, was now 25 men strong, and we crossed the Greek border during the night." (GWB-I, p.65)

In his deposition, VELIANIDIS asserted that reinforcements for Slapkas' unit, which travelled from Yugoslavia via Bitolj and Koritsa received their arms at Vernik. (GWB-I, p.106). In his testimony before Team 1A TSOKLAROPOULOS stated that he was sent to Vernik with two mules where he was given a "piat", ammunition and mines from a warehouse which contained plenty of guns, mortars and other weapons. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.4). Reference to the arms dump at Vernik was also made in the testimony of TERTEROKLIS (GWB-I, p.98, S/AC.4/PV/45, p.11), while TSIPIS in his deposition states that arms and ammunition were distributed to his band at the Albanian town of Longos, near the border. (GWB-I, p.99). MEHMET KOTSINAKO, former chief of Police in Tirana, testified before the Commission that he had taken part in a meeting of the communist party on 15 July 1946 in the Ministry of Interior in Tirana where, in response to a request from the Albanian authorities in Koritsa and Biglista, a decision was taken to furnish German and Italian arms as well as ammunition to the Greek guerrilla units. He did not know whether arms had been supplied. Kotsinako said that in June 1946 in his native village of Bojigrad, near the border,

the population and authorities were talking of the war material, food, clothing and supplies being given to the Greek guerrillas. (S/AC.4/PV 54, pp. 15-18)

(b) ALBANIAN REFUTATION.

TERZOGLU, one of the commanders of the guerrillas, stated before Team 1 that they were receiving no help at all from neighbouring countries, and that they obtained all their arms as the result of disarming rightist bands, gendarmes and soldiers of the Greek Government. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/25, pp.14-15).

Four of the five persons whom KOTSINAKO alleged were present at the secret meeting of 15 July 1946 were interrogated by Team 1A. All four denied participation in or knowledge of any meeting held on that date for the purpose indicated by Kotsinako. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/17). The Albanian Liaison Representative alleged discrepancies in the testimony of VELIANIDIS:

- (i) In his deposition Velianidis said that on 7 November 1946, while the bandits were assembled in the Sfika region, they were attacked by surprise by a military detachment which pushed them back into Albanian territory which they entered near the Z agrebes villages. (TWB-I, p.100). In speaking of this event before the Commission, Velianidis said: "The whole band passed over the border to Albania and from Albania we took our ammunition." (S/AC.4/PV/39, p.30).
- (ii) In his summary statement VELIANIDIS failed to mention that he was a liaison officer between Albania and the bands in Greece (GWB-I, pp.105-7), while before the Commission he said that he was the liaison officer. (S/AC.4/PV/39, p.28).

The Albanian Liaison Representative with Team 1A noted that in the written summary of TSOKLAROFULOS' evidence it was said

that six men went to Vernik, but that in his oral testimony Tsoklaropoulos had stated that he himself had gone to Vernik with two mules to get arms. Tsoklaropoulos replied that he went with two mules to get the pist and bullets and that the others also went and brought ammunition. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.7).

In the same testimony Tsoklaropoulos stated that he went directly to the police station at Vernik to obtain information as to where he should get ammunition for his band. In response to a question as to whether there was a police station there or not, Tsoklaropoulos replied that he did not know whether it was a police station, but that five or six soldiers were there.

GENERAL GRIGORIADES, leader of the Greek left-liberal party, stated before the Commission: "It is entirely false that the andartes - partisans - are armed by the neighbours of Greece. Their arms are made in England and come from soldiers who are taken prisoner and they are disarmed." (S/AC.4/PV/31, Annex I, p.3).

3. DESPATCHING GUERRILLA DETACHMENTS ACROSS THE FRONTIER INTO GREECE.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

The Greek Government charged before the Security Council that the guerrilla movement in Greece was receiving substantial support from the countries on Greece's northern boundaries and that groups of men were being sent into Greece for this purpose. (S/803, p.3; S/PV/83, p.51). The Greek Liaison Representative repeated these charges before the Commission. (S/AC.4/18 and S/AC.4/PV/57, Annex I). These charges were denied by the Albanian representative to the Security Council (S/PV/84, p.44), and by the Albanian Liaison Representative before the Commission, 7 and 17 February. (S/AC.4/PV/12 and S/AC.4/PV/27).

Referring to transportation furnished by the Albanian authorities, KONTOPANOS said in his deposition that when his band arrived at the Albanian-Yugoslav border near Lake Prespa "the officer commanding the post (Albanian) accompanied by the Yugoslav officer who had come with us, went to the Albanian post opposite and communicated with Koritsa from where two military trucks were sent for us escorted by a certain Yorgis, who, I heard say, was a member of the Albanian communist party." (GWB-I, p.63). KENTROS stated that his band was guided to the border by the commander of the Albanian frontier post Longos, after having fed at the post and after having been exhorted to fight bravely by the commander of the Albanian Peoples' Security for that region. (GWB-I, p.51; S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.7). VELIANIDIS stated in his deposition that reinforcements coming down through Albania for the Slankas band were guided to the border by the Albanian frontier post commander. (GWB-I, p.106). Velianidis also testified that these bands were reinforced by about 30 to 300 during the period of September-November 1946. (S/AC.4/PV/40, p.11). GATSIOS stated in his deposition that the band of which he was a member was met in Albania by a liaison agent who guided them to the frontier. (GWB-I, p.29). In his summary statement, TSETTEROKLIS stated that his band crossed over into Greece from Albania guided by a liaison agent who had come from Greece. (GWB-I, p.98). TSOKLAROPOULOS testified before Team 1A that there were about 80 men in his group and the two Greek liaison officers who came from a place called Grupa crossed with them into Greece. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.6). STAMENIS testified that his group was guided through Albania by liaison officers, one of whom was a Greek Macedonian, while the nationality of the second was not mentioned. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.16). VELIANIDIS asserted that he

himself was a liaison officer and that he had crossed the frontier from Greece into Albania about ten times. (S/AC.4/PV/39, p.27). The following witnesses testified that after moving across the border from Albania into Greece they operated in the Mali-Madi and Grammos mountain area; GATSIOS (GWB-I, p.30); KONTOPANOS (GWB-I, p.65); and VELJANIDES (GWB-I, p.106); (S/AC.4/PV/39, p.28) Referring to this mountain area, Kontopanos alluded in his deposition "to the KKE plan of keeping the massif of the Pindus mountains free for the operation of these bandits". (GWB-I, p.64).

(b) ALBANIAN REFUTATION.

The following discrepancies in the testimony of the Greek witnesses were noted: KENTROS had testified before Team 1A that he came by motor car from Vlahopskiloters to Argyrocastro after entering Albania. The Albanian Liaison Representative remarked that this was impossible as the bridge at Petrano on this road had been destroyed by the Germans. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.3).

Kentros had testified that Raptis was the leader of his band. When the Albanian Liaison Representative observed that Raptis himself and the seven other accused members of the band stated at their trial that Raptis was a rank and file combatant, Kentros replied that the military leader was a certain Nassis and that Raptis was the political leader. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.6). TSIPIIS testified that Raptis was a member of the band committee (ibid. p.13).

In contradiction to his deposition that his band consisted of thirty men, (GWB-I, p.97), TSETEROKLIS testified before the Commission that his band consisted of sixty men. (S/AC.4/PV/45-II, p.5).

In his deposition Tseberoklis stated that arms were distributed to them by some members of their band, and he supposed that they had either been hidden somewhere nearby or furnished by the

Albanian authorities. (GWB-I, p.98). In his testimony before the Commission he said: "Those who gave us arms were our people, Greeks. They gave us arms and later we crossed the border... These men were liaison. They used to go in and out of Yugoslavia, and they had hidden arms in certain places, and they distributed them to us. These arms were hidden just outside the village of Vernik... The place where the arms were distributed to us was on Albanian soil, but near the border about an hour from the frontier... There was a hole in the ground and they had hidden them (arms) in the hole." (S/AC.4/PV/45-II, p.11). In response to the final question he answered: "The arms that were distributed to us we had hidden. Greeks were the men who distributed them to us."

The Albanian Liaison Representative pointed out that in his oral testimony TSIPIIS stated that he had remained in Tirana until 5 June and crossed the border into Greece between 5 and 8 June 1946, (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.9), whereas he had deposed that he was in Tirana until 7 June and crossed into Greece on 9 June. (GWB-I, p.19).

The Albanian Liaison Representative noted a discrepancy between the testimony of VELIANIDIS and the Greek document Incidents on the Greek Frontier (cited as GWB-II). In his testimony before the Commission, Velianidis said that his band of 30 men crossed the border into Albania after having been attacked by the Greek forces on 7 November 1946: "The attack was made by day, and we hid ourselves, and then in the night we crossed the border... One member of the band was killed". (S/AC.4/PV/39, p.30). On page 30 of GWB-II the following statement appeared: "On November 7, 1946, army and gendarmerie forces were engaged outside the village Stika southwest of Antartikon, seven kilometers, with a large NOF band. During this clash 23 bandits were killed. Their bodies were found on the spot



of the engagement. The bandits being pursued openly entered the Albanian territory".

4. HOSPITALIZING WOUNDED GUERRILLAS.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

Included in the general charges of the Greek Government made before the Security Council (S/203, p.3; S/PV/83, p.51) was the specific charge that Albania had given assistance to wounded guerrillas fleeing from Greece. (S/AC.4/18, p.4). A general denial of these charges was made by the Albanian representative to the Security Council (S/PV/84, p.44) and by the Albanian Liaison Representative before the Commission (S/AC.4/PV/12 and S/AC.4/PV/27).

VELIANIDIS testified before the Commission: "We had casualties and they were taken during the night on muleback into Albania to the town of Koritsa, and from there into Serbia." He also said: "Personally, I was not wounded, but I transported casualties into Albania". (S/AC.4/PV/40, p.11). KONTOPANOS said in his deposition: "Keratsas after being wounded was sent to Koritsa because all of those who were wounded were transported... if seriously so to Albanian or Yugoslav hospitals." (GWB-I, p.67). Testifying before Team 1A TSOKLARPOULOS said he believed that the wounded were brought to Albanian territory because he had seen one of the wounded men himself, a certain Demetrios Hetzopoulos of Agnics Yerganos who had been wounded in the fighting at Sfika. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.8). In his deposition TSETEROKLIS stated his opinion that the medical care afforded them in Albanian and Yugoslav hospitals was proof of collaboration between EAM, NOF and the Albanian and Yugoslav Governments." (GWB-I, p.98). KONTOPANOS also said in his deposition that he received medical care in a hospital in Tirana after receiving a gunshot wound while at Rubig. (GWB-I, p.98). A medical discharge from a

hospital in Tirana was found on Kontopanos when he surrendered to the Greek authorities. (S/203, p.27).

(b) ALBANIAN REFUTATION.

The Albanian Liaison Representative expressed doubt concerning the statement of TSETEROKLIS. When Tseteroklis was asked if he had himself observed wounded being carried into Albania he said: "In my band there were no wounded bandits, but when I was in Monastir, those who had fought in the hills and had been wounded were taken over to Monastir in Yugoslavia. I saw this myself." On being asked a second time he stated: "I said this morning that I didn't see them with my own eyes, but when I was in Monastir I heard one telling the other that today bandits came from Greece, and so on. I heard all this from hearsay." (S/AC.4/PV/45-II, p.15).

The Greek Government's witness ZAHOS in giving evidence before Team 1A declared that his statements included in GWB-I were signed under coercion. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/12, p.12). Zahos said he believed the same man had prepared the statement of Annivas (Kontopanos) because when he saw the things they made him sign, he knew them to be lies. When he read Annivas' declaration in the newspaper, he saw that it was like his own.

5. CROSSING BY GUERRILLAS FROM GREECE INTO ALBANIA.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

The Greek Government charged that Greek guerrilla bands were sheltered in Albania. A general denial of all the Greek charges was made by the Albanian representative to the Security Council (S/PV/84, p.44) and by the Albanian Liaison Representative before the Commission (S/AC.4/PV/12 and S/AC.4/PV/27).

KENTROS stated before Team 1A that he first entered Albania at Vlahopsilotera on 15 June 1946. There he had met an

officer of the frontier post called "Petro" and he had stayed there about two days before proceeding to Argyrocastro with Petro. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11, p.2). During the same interrogation Kentros asserted that when his group had been hard pressed by the Greek forces they had entered Albania. While in Albania they had dispatched a liaison officer into Greece for instructions from Raptis and they later returned into Greece. (ibid. p.7). TSOKLARPOULOS testified that on 7 and 8 November 1946 his band was at Zagradeb near the lake between this village and Vernik. They stayed at this location for two days and two nights to avoid capture by the Greek forces. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.8). VELIANIDIS also testified to the fact that his band stayed for two days near Zagradetsi having crossed into Albania after a battle with the Greek Forces. He said: "When the Greek Army left, we returned to Greek territory." (S/AC.4/PV/40, p.9). In a summary statement DODA stated that in August 1946, when he was serving as an Albanian soldier, 160 armed Greeks arrived at Biglista from Greece. A reception was arranged by the Albanian Commander, and after two days in Biglista the armed band re-entered Greece. (GWB-I, p.130). Another former Albanian soldier TSELNİK DOKO testified to the Commission that when he had been stationed at Georgonstsad during November 1946, he saw ten Greek officers come from Pogoni in Greece in the company of a man called Janius who was a member of the Security of Argyrocastro. (S/AC.4/PV/54, p.12 and cf. GWB-I, p.130) In his deposition Doko alleged that the job of receiving and dispatching armed bandits into Greece had been entrusted to the Nikas brothers, who came directly under the Argyrocastro section through Lt. Zannia. (GWB-I, p.131). GATSIOS in his deposition also mentioned that when he entered Albania the Nikas brothers of Kousovitsa contacted the

People Security in Argyrocastro and managed to have the group released (GWB-I, p.18)

(b) ALBANIAN REFUTATION.

The Albanian Liaison Representative stated that Doko had been a member of a band led by Abdulla Alaruti, an alleged war criminal. He also noted that Doko stated that he was taken to Georgonstsad in December 1946, but when Doko was asked where he saw Greeks enter Albanian territory he answered: "While stationed in Georgonstsad during November, I saw ten Greek officers from Pogonion." (S/AC.4, PV/54, p.12).

As to the evaluation of the testimony of other witnesses cited in this section see alleged contradictions cited in other sections.

SECTION B: CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA AND BULGARIAN REFUTATIONS

6. GENERAL GREEK CHARGES

Against Bulgaria, the Greek Government made charges of assistance to the guerillas along the same lines as its charges against Albania and Yugoslavia.

The Greek Liaison Representative told the Commission on 3 February 1947 that, until quite recently, a branch of the Bulkes Camp existed near Mandritsa, in Bulgaria, near the Greek border. He added that according to Greek evidence there were "posts within the territory of our northern neighbours quite close to our border which are used as field hospitals for guerillas wounded on Greek territory, as ammunition dumps, and as provisional barracks where the guerillas seek refuge when pursued by the Greek troops" (S/AC.4/18 p.4).

7. GREEK CHARGES OF PROVIDING GUERRILLAS WITH WEAPONS AND SUPPLIES

In support of the charge that Bulgaria has provided the guerilla bands with weapons and supplies, HRISTOS MANTZOURAKIS stated: "When he left Yugoslavian territory for Bulgaria, he passed through the town of Tsaribrod on the way to Sofia. He stopped near a bridge where were distributed 33 automatic rifles, Italian and German, and two machine guns. They then went in two cars. There were in all thirty-five persons and we went to the town of Ivailovgrad." He added that "near Sofia, the arms were given to us by a Bulgarian officer, escorted by a civilian" (S/AC.4/V/38 pp.2-3, GWB I pp.76-83).

In the Commission, STERGHIOS BABAYANIS was asked in which part of Bulgaria arms were issued to his group, and he replied, "It was in Sofia" (S/AC.4/PV/50 p.12). SYMEON VELIKOSTOYANOV said that he had learned that "the Bulgarians look after and arm Greek Communists". He declared that Eliasites "who go to Greece are armed in the camps near Tsanovgrad" (GWB I pp. 139-140).

8. GREEK CHARGES OF DESPATCHING GUERRILLA DETACHMENTS ACROSS THE FRONTIER INTO GREECE

The Greek Liaison Representative charged that Bulgaria gave assistance to guerillas crossing the frontier into Greece.

HRISTOS MANTSOURAKIS testified that when he was returning from

Bulhes to Greece through Bulgerian territory, he and the persons with him took the road towards the Greek frontier escorted by two Bulgarian soldiers. They arrived at the Bulgarian frontier post opposite Derion where "we stayed a whole day at the Bulgarian frontier post. The Bulgarian guards gave us all the assistance possible and when we crossed the border, nobody saw us" (S/AC.4/PV/38 pp.3,11).

STERGHIOS BABAYANNIS who said he was a former Elasite, testified that on 1 November 1946, he was sent with his group to Sofia, making the journey from the Yugoslav frontier by Bulgarian motor transport. From Sofia, he said, they went in two cars to Ortakoi, and on the following day went with a liaison representative to the Greek-Bulgarian frontier. Their guide took them to a frontier post, the number of which Babayannis had forgotten. The soldiers came out of the frontier post and the liaison representative spoke with them. All of the group carried arms when they left the cars. After crossing the frontier, the group joined a group of partisans of Kapetan Kriton Babayannis was taken prisoner during an attack against Greek Government forces (S/AC.4/PV/50 pp.10-11).

CONSTANTINOS ZALATINOUDIS, a fourteen-year-old boy, stated that on 1 November 1946, together with a guerilla detachment, he participated in the attack on Korimvos and Metaxades, the latter from Bulgarian territory. He was with the band on Bulgarian territory and the band was visited by soldiers from the Bulgarian frontier post. He crossed from Bulgarian territory into Greece in December 1946 with a detachment of 100 unarmed people. Zalatinoudis did not receive aid by Bulgarian authorities or the Bulgarian Army to the band of which he was a member (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/3 pp 13-17).

KONSTANTINOS PAPADOULIS stated, in his deposition, that some 300 to 400 partisans came to Greece from Yugoslavia via Bulgaria and another 1,000 were expected, and "before the attack on the Korinvos company took place, about 70 sub-machine guns were brought from Bulgaria to their hide-out. . . Each group received two or three of them" (GWE I p.84).

SYMEON VELIKOSTOYANOV stated, in his deposition, that armed bands

of Greek partisans entered Greece from Bulgaria via Beles (GWB I p. 1).

9. GREEK CHARGES OF HOSPITALISING WOUNDED GUERILLAS

In his statement of 3 February, the Greek Liaison Representative declared that there were posts within Bulgaria which were used as "field hospitals for guerillas wounded on Greek territory. . . ." (S/AC.4/PV/18 p.4).

ZALATINOUDIS stated that wounded members of his band, which had taken part in the attack on Metaxades, had been taken to Bulgaria, although he did not know who cared for them (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/3 p. 10). HRISTOS MANTZOURAKIS declared that wounded guerillas were removed to Bulgaria (GWB I p. 81). KONSTADINOS PAFADOULIS deposed that, following the guerilla attack on Metaxades in November 1946, for example, a certain Major Spyroudis had been transported "into Bulgarian territory for treatment" (ibid. p.83.) KROUM IVANOV said that he had heard that many Greek guerillas had been treated in the hospital at Sveti-Brate (ibid. p.138).

10. GREEK CHARGES THAT GUERILLAS CROSS FROM GREECE INTO BULGARIA

A number of witnesses gave evidence in support of the Greek charges that Greek guerillas had crossed the Bulgarian-Greek frontier.

NODELKOV stated that he was at Stara, in Southern Bulgaria, where he saw 25 to 30 armed Greek partisans, who had come from Greece and taken refuge in Bulgaria. According to Nodelov, they kept their arms and moved about freely (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/5 pp. 16-28).

Concerning the Prosetsni incident of December 1946 CAPTAIN ELEUTHERIADES declared that he had not seen the band, of about 30 men, cross the frontier, although he saw it going towards the frontier, to the left of Levkoia and Exeki. He stated that the band could not have turned off to the left or the right, adding that there was no Greek frontier post at this point. He followed the band, to a point within two or three kilometres from the frontier. He saw rockets sent up from the Bulgarian side, and believed the Bulgarian sentries could see the band approaching (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/1 pp 4-8). The Greek army officer, Lieutenant Marselos, testified that he was in Prosetsni on

20 December 1946 when an engagement took place. A hand grenade of Bulgarian manufacture was found on a prisoner. Merselos did not see the band cross the frontier, although his men reported that they had seen it while it was actually crossing into Bulgaria, and Merselos FOUND TRACKS left in the mud by the band, leading to the frontier. He said that there was a Bulgarian frontier post about 300 metres from where the band was said to have crossed the frontier. During the engagement he saw rockets sent up from the Bulgarian side. On 24 December 1946 the witness saw the Bulgarian officer in charge of the frontier post and requested him to hand over the bandits. He said the Bulgarian officer recognized the grenade as being of Bulgarian origin (S/AC.4/SC.4/FV/1 pp.12-22). NIKOLAS KEKEOGLOU stated that he was about 250 metres away from the band on 20 December 1946, when he saw an armed group crossing the frontier, consisting of five bandits and a captured Greek sergeant and private (S/AC.4/SC.4/FV/1 p. 22).

Concerning the Korimvos incident, ALIMOU DIS testified that while he did not actually see the band, of about 100 men, cross the frontier, he did see it when it was making its way down to the frontier in the region of frontier post no. 51, and saw some 58 young men of the village and 75 carts being carried off by the band. He did not know whether the Bulgarian sentries saw the carts across the frontier, since he saw no sentries that day (S/AC.4/SC.4/FV/2 p.9). Nor did VOITSIS BALIOS see how the carts with booty had crossed the frontier into Bulgaria, although he said he saw how the carts had been unloaded in a ravine near the Bulgarian frontier. He declared that they took the load and carried it on their shoulders to the Greek frontier post no. 53, some five metres from the Bulgarian frontier, where the partisans had their headquarters. Belios was in the guerilla detachment for nine days, and said that two or three days after that he was in Bulgarian territory, after which he returned to Greece. Later, he stated that when he crossed the frontier for the first time, the partisans took the booty into Bulgarian territory, where they had a permanent camp and tents (S/AC.4/SC.4/FV/2 pp. 19, 21, 23).



RGHIOS ALEPOUDIS stated that he was carried off by the band as a literary prisoner and crossed the Bulgarian frontier with the band 3 December 1946. They met two Bulgarian guards, who talked with bandits. The bandits carried arms while on Bulgarian territory (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/3 pp. 1,2,7).

MEHMUD HASSAN CAKIR, a Greek Pomak, said that he was in the sha-Tschouka-Seleste region, on the Greek-Bulgarian frontier, about 20 December, cutting wood. A group of 18 to 20 armed men crossed frontier and he "saw them at the exact moment when they crossed frontier," as well as the "Bulgarian soldiers who were there". Some of the men were in uniform and some in civilian clothing (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/3 pp. 22-25). The witness did not see anybody cross from Bulgaria into Greece.

ZLIFIR LUKANOV, a Bulgarian frontier soldier, testified that 40 armed men crossed the Greek-Bulgarian frontier in mid-December 1946 were arrested by the Bulgarian military police (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/4 34-39).

The Greek Liaison Representative submitted a list of seven incidents on the Greco-Bulgarian frontier between 1 September 1946 and November 1946, which, it was stated, "prove beyond any doubt that frontier of this northern neighbouring state forms not only a bridge but also serves as a springboard of bands, which come and go in and out of the Greek territory, not only with the toleration of Bulgarian frontier authorities, but also with their support" (II pp. 38-39).

KROUM IVANOV stated that in October 1946, whilst an anniversary celebration for Stambouliski was being held, a group of 60 Greek partisans dressed and wearing British uniforms, reached the Bulgarian village of a Dzumaja and got in touch with Bulgarian officers and troops. The witness, at the time, was in prison at Gorno Dzumaja and saw the partisans pass by two metres from the prison (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/2(2) pp. 14-15; GWB I pp. 137-8).

TRILANTAPHYLIDIS KOSTADINES testified that he was taken prisoner

by the andartes on 8 November, crossed the Bulgarian frontier on 10 November and was kept prisoner until 9 December (S/AC.4/PV/63 pp. 1-2).

In support of the Greek charge, IVAN GOLOGANOV, a former colonel in the Bulgarian Army, stated that towards the end of August 1946, three Bulgarians, armed with pistols, were sent to Serres on behalf of the Communist Party of Bulgaria. After communicating with the Greek representatives of the KKE, they returned to Nevrokop (GWB I p.138). RATKO PLEVNELIEV, a private in the Bulgarian Army, stated that once or twice each month two service men arrived at Gaitaninovo, entered Greek territory in civilian clothes and returned some days later. In April 1946 a band of 30 armed Greeks in civilian clothes entered Bulgaria in the Gaitaninovo area, and Plevneliev learned later that the Bulgarian authorities had transferred them to Yugoslavia (ibid. p. 139).

#### 11. BULGARIAN REFUTATIONS OF THE GREEK CHARGES

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative categorically denied all the Greek charges: "The Bulgarian Delegation rejects with the utmost energy all accusations which have been formulated against our country. These accusations have no real basis, and they are a sign of crude tactics of diversion" (S/AC.4/PV/10 p. 18). The Bulgarian Liaison Representative also charged that the Greek Government had made "full use of false witnesses", and had "even the audacity to think that such false witnesses could be employed in the person of refugee Bulgarian and Yugoslav Fascists who have found a hospitable shelter in Greek territory". Many of these witnesses were criminals, terrorists, former German agents and deserters from the Bulgarian Army during the war with Germany, as, for example, Ivan Gologanov. He added that the Greek Government believed "that the stubborn hatred of these criminals towards the new régimes of their countries is a favorable factor" which might be employed "in order to fabricate testimony" (ibid. pp. 14-15).

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative also said that in November 1946, the Greek frontier patrols had been withdrawn from the frontier and for this reason there was a certain area on the Greek frontier "which is not controlled and which could be described as a sort of 'no

an's land.'" Guerilla operations were taking place in this district, since the guerillas could manoeuvre "in territory which is not under the control of Greek Government troops" (ibid. p. 11). It is noted that on 3 October 1946, in Circular No. 708, the Bulgarian Government had given instructions for the disarmament and internment of any Greek soldier or civilian crossing the Greek-Bulgarian frontier. A copy of this document was submitted to the Commission (S/LC.4/SC.4/PV/1 p. 18; S/LC.4/SC.4/4).

It was pointed out that there were discrepancies between the testimony of MANTZOURAKIS before the Commission and his deposition in GVB I. In his testimony he had said that his group had received arms only in Sofia (S/LC.4/PV/38 pp. 3 and 5), whereas in his deposition he had indicated that his group had received arms at Haskovo (GVB I p. 79). The Bulgarian Liaison Representative also drew attention to Mantsourakis' statement that he had passed through Haskovo, and, referring to a map, demonstrated that Haskovo was not the route described by the witness (S/LC.4/PV/38 p. 6A).

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative expressed doubts as to BAYANNIS' testimony on the ground that he was under surveillance and, therefore, not free to speak the truth. He also pointed out inconsistencies between the testimony of Babayannis and the deposition published in the Greek newspaper ELLINIROI VOIRAS in which the witness had stated that he had received arms at Ortakoi, not Sofia (S/LC.4/PV/50 pp. 11-13).

With respect to the testimony of ALEPOUDIS, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative stressed two contradictions: (1) It was stated in GVB I that the band numbered 600 men, while in recent documents the number of 300 was given; (2) BRIGADIER ANDREADIS had said that the guerilla attack had begun at 6 o'clock in the morning, but in the documents submitted by the Greek Liaison Representative, it was stated that the attack had begun in the evening and had gone on all night. He added that on 9 December 1946, 55 persons, who were guerillas, had entered Bulgarian territory, had been interned in a concentration camp and were at the disposal of the Commission

(S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/3, pp. 10,11).

As regards the witness KROUM IVANOFF, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative stated that, according to the documents of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party, the aforesaid anniversary service could not have been held in October 1946 at Gorna Dzumaja, because Stambouliski died in the month of June. The same officer questioned the value of the deposition, on the ground that the witness was wanted by Bulgarian courts for Common Law offences. The Bulgarian Liaison Representative presented a document stating that the alleged memorial service at Gorna Djumaja did not take place.

DIMITRI IKONOMOV, to whom reference had been made in GWB I, was interrogated in Sofia on 26 March 1947. He stated that he had been beaten until he signed his previous deposition before the Greek authorities and that he did not know what he had signed (S/AC.4/PV/62(1) p. 9). The Greek Liaison Representative questioned the witness' identity (S/AC.4/PV/62 (2) p. 7).

BORIS SERBAKOV, who said he crossed the Bulgarian frontier into Greece, with Ikononov, and was afterwards sent back to Bulgaria by the Greek authorities, said that they were both beaten and compelled to state that the Greek guerrillas were receiving help in Bulgaria. (S/AC.4/PV/62(2) p. 13).

As to the incidents in November-December 1946, the witness TRIANTAFYLIDIS STEPHANOS KOSTADINES testified that he had fought as a soldier in the Greek Army in a clash with the guerrillas and remained a prisoner until 9 December 1946. Kostadines declared that he crossed the frontier on 10 November alone, was arrested by Bulgarian soldiers at the frontier posts and taken to Ortakei. He stated that the guerrillas never crossed the frontier into Bulgaria, and that captured guerrillas were compelled by the Greek authorities to say that they had come from Bulgaria (S/AC.4/PV/62- 11 pp. 19-31; S/AC.4/PV/63 pp. 1-12). MERANZAKIS DIMITRIAS, a farm worker from the village of Yotrades, district of Dimitika in Thrace, stated that after the attack on Korinava, the Greek guerrillas, about 150 in

number, penetrated his village from the south on 9 November 1946 and went off in the opposite direction from the frontier. Dimitries said that he had crossed the frontier on 11 November 1946, was caught by the Bulgarian soldiers and taken to the Bulgarian frontier post (S/AC.4/PV/63 pp. 14-28).

ZAFIR LUKANOV and IORDAN GEORGIEV, Bulgarian soldiers stationed at frontier posts nos. 1 and 2 situated opposite the Greek frontier posts nos. 51, 52 and 53, stated that in the district of their posts no Greek guerrillas crossed the frontier in either direction (S/AC.4/SC.4/IV.4 pp. 34-39, 30-34 of French text).

ALEXANDER KAMBUROV, Mayor of Maneritse, stated that he had never seen any Greek guerrillas or any frontier incidents (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/4 pp. 39-40 of French text).

PETROV DIMITROV and LIMITRE MATEV of Mandritsa, and KHRISTO RADEV of the village of Siv. Klasenets categorically denied allegations that Greek guerrillas crossed the frontier in either direction (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/4 pp. 41, 62-63 of French text).

SECTION C - CHARGES AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA: YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

12. GENERAL CHARGES.

(a) GENERAL CHARGES BY GREECE.

In a letter to the Security Council dated 3 December 1946 (S/203) the Greek Government charged that there was "conclusive evidence that the whole guerrilla movement against Greece is receiving substantial support from the countries adjacent to Greece's northern boundaries, and particularly from Yugoslavia, and that this support takes the following forms:

- (i) groups of men are being trained and organised in foreign territory; they are then sent into Greece, together with consignments of war material;
- (ii) armed bands or isolated members of such bands are crossing the boundary line in both directions under the protection and guidance of the frontier authorities of the neighbouring countries."

In support of this thesis evidence of the following witnesses was included in the "Evidence in Support of the Greek Appeal to the Security Council" and these, together with others were heard before the Commission or its teams, as indicated by references:

BARBAYANNIS	(S/AC.4/PV/50)
GEORGE DIMOPOULOS	(S/AC.4/PV/40)
GEORGE GATSIOS	(GWB-I, p.18) (S/AC.4/PV/34)
NIKOLA IVIC	(GWB-I, p.123)
PHOTIOS KONTOPANOS (ANNIVAS)	(GWB-I, p.55) (S/AC.4/PV/34)
BRANKO DIMITROVIC	(GWB-I, p.222)
CHRISTOS MANTZOURAKIS	(GWB-I, p.76) (S/AC.4/PV/38)

MIHAIL MLADENOVSKI	{GWB-I, p.123} {S/AC.4/SC.3/8) {S/AC.4/SC.3/10)
GEORGE PATTOUKAS	{GWB-I, p.92)
ATH. PARTOULAS	{GWB-I, p.91)
PANTELIS PAPAILIAS	{GWB-I, p.85) {S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2)
EFSTRATIOS PAPAYANNIDES	{GWB-I, p.89)
TRAYANOS TSETEROKLIS	{GWB-I, p.127) {S/AC.4/PV/45-I & II)
SIMOS TRAIKOVIC	{GWB-I, p.127) {S/AC.4/PV/55-2)
E. VALTADOROS	{GWB-I, p.101) {S/AC.4/PV/35)
HRISTOS VELIANIDIS	{GWB-I, p.105) {S/AC.4/PV/40)
GEORGE ZAFIRIS (DAVELIS)	{GWB-I, p.107) {S/AC.4/PV/39)

(b) GENERAL REPUTATIONS BY YUGOSLAVIA.

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative, in his statement before the Commission, described the Greek accusations as an attempt to transfer to Yugoslavia the blame for the trouble in Greece. He based the statement made by Mr. Tsaldaris to a "Times" correspondent that the present activities of guerrilla bands in Northern Greece was merely local concern and could in no way be interpreted as a problem in Greco-Yugoslav relations. (S/AC.4/PV/20, p.13).

The first item in the Yugoslav refutation deals with the Greek accusations as a whole. The value of the facts and evidence supplied by the Greek Government, had already been formally refuted and generally denied by the Liaison Representative of Yugoslavia. This point of view seems to be crystallised in the following quotation:

"On two occasions I have informed the Commission of Investigation of my conviction, and I have asserted the same, that the

documents of the Greek Government are unreliable, and that their statements are therefore founded on misleading information. During the interrogation of the witnesses produced by the Greek Government and up to the present time, my convictions, in this respect have become all the stronger". (Letter of 3 March 1947, not circulated).

The Liaison Representative of Yugoslavia expressed the same opinion on all appropriate occasions, among others on the occasion of his general indictment in Athens, (S/AC.4/PV/18, and PV/24), on the occasion of the Velianidis evidence (S/AC.4/PV/39) and in a statement on 4 March (S/AC.4/PV/44).

The argument of the Yugoslav Liaison Representative is essentially based on the following points:

- (1) Discrepancies between the list of facts submitted to the Security Council by Mr. Tsaldaris and that put before the Commission. For example: On page 10 (English text) of Mr. Tsaldaris' memorandum, a definite allegation is embodied, namely: "On 12th November 1946, the regular forces were engaged with an NOF band in the Arhangelos region, after which the bandits took flight into Yugoslav territory, protected by the open fire of a Yugoslav frontier post". Moreover this imaginary incident was repeated on page 53 of the above-mentioned memorandum in these terms: "On 12 November 1946, the regular forces became engaged with an NOF band in the Arhandelos region. The bandits took flight and entered Yugoslav territory, leaving behind three wounded men..." In the memorandum of Mr. Tsaldaris, we read on page 10 the following "On 11 November 1946, a large band of guerrillas entered the village of Paraskevi, 11 km north west of Ferrovra. They looted the peasants' possessions, piled them onto 15 mules and some



tered Yugoslav territory". Now let us see the version in the previously mentioned publication: On page 53 sub. no. 19, it is stated: "On 11th November 1946, a large band entered the village Aghia Paraskevi (I 5617) 11 km north-west of Perroia. They pillaged the stores, loaded them on 15 mules and went off in the direction of Yugoslav territory". (S/AC.4/PV/18, pp. 22-23).

Discrepancies between depositions submitted by the Greek authorities and statements made before the Commission. (S/AC.4/VV/35, pp.14, 15; evidence of Savalakis, S/AC.4/PV/51, pp.3, 19).

For example, HRISTOS ZOIS declared in his deposition that he had left Greece by order of his commander, (GWB-I, p.113) but in the course of his interrogation by Team 1A, he stated that he had left Greece because of his fear of being pursued by the National Guard on account of his participation in the activities of ELAS: "... We left after the Agreement of Varkiza. We were afraid of being beaten or imprisoned by the National Guard. People said that the National Guard did that sort of thing. As a matter of fact the National Guard was not there at the time of our departure but that is the reason we left," (S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV/21, p.8, English text). In his deposition Zois stated that he received a uniform from a Yugoslav army store (GWB-I, p.114), while he declared before Team 1A that he had received it at Bulkes. He also stated in his deposition: "It was at this time that Military Academy was started at Bulkes," (GWB-I, p.114), while before the Team, in reply to the question: "Does the witness know of a military school at Bulkes?" he replied: "I did not serve my time there, I do not know... There was a school called 'Ecole des Cadres',

and people said that military training was given there."  
(S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV/21, p.11).

- (iii) Contradictions between summaries of written depositions, prepared by the Greek authorities, and the verbal statements made by the same witnesses before the Commission. (cf. evidence by DIMOPOULOS, S/AC.4/PV/40, p.29, and evidence by PARTOULAS, S/AC.4/PV/42, p.13).
- (iv) The difficulty of determining exactly the date of the original deposition of certain witnesses, and the difficulty of verifying the number of successive declarations made by the same witnesses. (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.32, and S/AC.4/PV/36, p.9).
- (v) Discrepancies between the French and the English texts presented by the Greek Government.
- (vi) The presence of numerous errors in the text presented by the Greek Government, which were not corrected in the errata. (cf. evidence of VELIANIDIS, S/AC.4/PV/39, p.24).
- (vii) Difficulties in establishing the identity of the witnesses. (cf. evidence of VELIANIDIS, S/AC.4/PV/39, p.40).
- (viii) The moral character of some of the witnesses (cf. evidence of ANNIVAS KONTOPANOS, the declaration by the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, S/AC.4/PV/28, and evidence of Yugoslav deserters, S/AC.4/PV/28).

(S/AC.4/220)  
In his memorandum of 3 March 1947, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative quotes the letters of the two brothers of Annivas Kontopanos, attacking the moral character and political opinions of the witness: "I am also convinced that my interned brother and the wife of Fotios who returned from deportation yesterday..." The memorandum continues: "This phrase is worthy of special consideration, in my opinion."

Is it not natural to think and to believe, that the wife of Annivas Kontopanos was released the very day that he made his declaration before the Commission of Investigation, that is on 26 February of this year? In other words, had the Greek authorities so little confidence in the moral and political qualities of a man like Annivas that they detained his wife in the camp until after he had made his deposition before the Commission of Investigation?" The memorandum also included a letter from Evant K. Davas, who contradicted the evidence of Kontopanos to the effect that he had left Greece for Albania in March 1935, and stated that he, and others, had met Kontopanos in Greece in April 1945. The memorandum also annexed a letter from Apalas which contradicted the declaration made by VALTADERES that he had been in Yugoslavia since 20 October 1945, stating that he had met Valtaderes in Salonika on 30 October 1945.

- (ix) Conditions under which some of the witnesses had been required to make their depositions (torture or moral suasion). (cf. evidence of ZAHOS, S/AC.4/W/5 and S/AC.4/SC24/SR/11; evidence of ZERVAS and PETSAS, S/AC.4/SC.1/1; evidence of GATSIOS, GWB-I, p.35; evidence of PATIS, S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/4, p.3).
- (x) Contradictions in the statements of certain witnesses in the course of the same deposition. (cf. evidence of ZAFIRIS, S/AC.4/PV/39, pp.30 and 34; evidence of MANTZOURAKIS, S/AC.4/PV/38; evidence of KONTOPANOS, S/AC.4/PV/34, p.21; evidence of TOLIOS, S/AC.4/PV/47-I, pp.14 and 15; evidence of PATATOUKAS, S/AC.4/PV/44, p.19; evidence of TSETEROKLIS, S/AC.4/PV/45, p.14).
- (xi) Faulty argument in evidence (cf. evidence of PATATOUKAS, S/AC.4/PV/41, pp.21 to 26).

(xii) Geographical inconsistencies relating to mountain warfare at Bulkes, S/AC.4/PV/18; evidence of TOLIOS, S/AC.4/PV/48, p.17). The Greek Liaison Representative stated: "It was then that the Greeks fantastically removed the Broko-Banovici railway in the north of Bosnia to the Adriatic coast. And behold, the Broko-Banovici railway, a local goods line, is transferred to Dalmatia, runs in an entirely opposite direction with the idea presumably of aggression against Greece and, thanks to the efforts of Messrs. Tsaldaris and Karamanlis, suddenly becomes of supreme strategic importance." (S/AC.4/PV/18, p.19).

"The first batch of students to leave the school after a period of instruction of two months, was composed of about 200 pupils and was called the 'Nicos Zahariadis' Brigade. Reinforced by about 100 ELAS men it left immediately to work on the construction of the Broko-Banovici railway, along the Dalmatian coast towards the Albanian frontiers." (S/AC.4/PV/18, p.18).

(xiii) Inconsistencies in dates and times (cf. evidence of TSETEROKLIS S/AC.4/PV/48; evidence of ANNIVAS, S/AC.4/PV/34, p.21).

### 13. TRAINING OF REFUGEES.

#### (a) GREEK CHARGES.

In his statement (S/AC.4/18, pp.3-4) before the Commission the Greek Liaison Representative stated that after the Varkiza Agreement of 12 February 1945 "seven to eight thousand armed communists known as ELASites crossed the border and entered Albania, or Yugoslavia or Bulgaria. These three countries not only received them with arms but also deliberately offered them succour and moral and material assistance. By former agreements they decided to send most of them to Bulkes Camp in the Voivodina near Belgrade "which... had been turned into a sort of guerrilla war academy for the training of bandits".

In addition to the above-mentioned ELASites there were "a number of Slav-speaking Greek citizens who had collaborated with the Germans and Bulgars during the occupation of Greek Macedonia, and who felt necessary to flee from Greece after the liberation". (See in particular section 14 (a) (iii) below).

The Greek Liaison Representative furthermore stated (S/AC.4/18, p.4) that "in April 1946 a 'special school for chieftains' was established where the elite of the communists in the camp were given special training with a view to reorganising and directing guerrilla operations in Greece", and that they were organised in two grades. This training is believed to have followed on the visit to E on 25 March 1946 of the Greek Communist Party leader Zachariades who according to the testimony of GEORGE GATSIOS (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.21A) told them that "they would soon return to Greece when it was time and that in the meantime they ought to instruct themselves both politically and militarily in order to be ready when the Greek people will need them". The visit of Zachariades is confirmed by several other witnesses including CHRISTOS MANTZOURAKIS (S/AC.4/PV/38, p.10).

POTIOS KONTOPIANOS (Annivas) stated that the camp was also visited by a Bulgarian Commission of three or four officers who spoke to "the people of the community about their common struggle, Greek and Bulgarian struggle for liberty." (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.15).

In support of his claim that some of these refugees were receiving military training the Greek Liaison Representative submitted to the Commission at Salonika a military manual for training in partisan warfare, (S/AC.4/PV/34, pp.8-9, preface and chapter headings see annex to S/AC.4/PV/34). The following witnesses also testified to the same effect:

ORGE GATSIOS, who said that the military manual edited in Rubig was in use in Bulkes and related in detail how and by whom it had had been written up (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.19; S/AC.4/PV/35, p.5);

OTIOS KONTOPANOS, who stated that he was one of the authors of the manual. (S/AC.4/PV/34, p.13);

RISTOS MANTZOURA KIS, who said that "the military groups underwent theoretical and practical military training for they were solely destined to become good officers and band-leaders". (GWB-I, p.78);

ORGE ZAFIRIS (Davelis), who described the say military training was imparted in Bulkes (S/AC.4/PV/38, p.20) to "young men under 28". (GWB-I, p. 109);

EGORIOS HARISMIDES, who stated that he and others were trained in shooting in Yugoslavia: "some were missing totally and then it was said they were wasting shots. After this, we were trained in assembling and disassembling various guns and machine-guns".

(S/AC.4/PV/51, pp.25-26);

ZAROS TMAOUSSIS, who deposed that in Yugoslavia he and others were obliged to receive military training and were threatened with punishment if they refused. (S/AC.4/PV/48, p.21);

PAPAILIAS, who stated that "about 300 young men received military instruction in Bitolj". (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2, p.8);

VKO MMLADENOVIC, who said that "in Monastir (Bitolj) there were camp where they received military training". (S/AC.4/SC.5/8, p.4).

In addition Greek refugees were enlisted in the regular Yugoslav Army, according to the testimony of:

HAIL MLADENOVSKI (or FIVKO MLADENOVIC), a Yugoslav national, who said that there "were Greek fugitives serving in the Yugoslav Army and that they had the same weapons and the same uniform as the soldiers of Tito". (S/AC.4/SC.5/8, p.4);

TRAYANOS TSETEROKLIS, who followed Gotchev, the NOF leader to Yugoslavia as a member of his battalion, "took the oath to the NOF organisation" (S/AC.4/PV/45-I, pp.5-7), "was drafted for two years in the Serbian Army where I served as a private". (ibid, II p.3) "in the towns of Skoplje, Gevgeli, Monastir, Kitchovo and Tetovo" (ibid. p.4) and was eventually given arms in Albania and crossed into Greece with a band (ibid. p.11);

PHILIPPOS VASSILIOU, who said that former members of the Gotchev battalions, who had been incorporated into the Yugoslav Army, were released so that they might penetrate into Greek territory, (GWB-I, p.104);

CHRISTOS VELLANIDIS, who said that Gotchev's men whom he saw in Yugoslav Army uniforms were released in August 1946 and sent to Greece to fight (S/AC.4/PV/40, p.4).

A certificate of demobilisation issued by the Yugoslav Government to the Greek national KOCHE DRENKOPSKY (or KOSTAS TRENCHIS) was submitted by the Greek Liaison Representative to Team 1A at Florin on 11 March 1947. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/9).

(b) YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, all of the Greek evidence was open to the objections of principle suggested above.

He made the following particular objections:

- (i) GEORGIOS GATSIS, in his original declaration under oath, testified that to his knowledge there was no military training at Bulkes (GWB-I, p.28, and S/AC.4/PV/34-35);
- (ii) THOMAS ZAHOS declared before Team 1A that his evidence before the Commission had been extorted under threats. (S/AC.4/W.5, S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11-12);

- (iii) The presence of the witness PANTELIS PAPAILIAS in Skoplje was denied by the witnesses MITRO KARANJOWSKI (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/8), and BISLADZIJEV (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/8);
- (iv) The following witnesses denied the existence of military schools or propaganda agencies at Bulkes:
- THOMAS ZAHOS, in the course of the second evidence given by him before Team 1A (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11-12; S/AC.4/W.5). LAMBROS acknowledge to Team "C" that he had stayed at Bulkes up to 15 May 1946 (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/3).
- (v) M. KOSANOVITCH stated before the Security Council that he, as Yugoslav Minister of Information, has stated several times that there were 20,000 Greek refugees in Yugoslav territory, 4,000 of whom lived at Bulkes, and that this district had been visited by the following Press correspondents: King, Brewer, Shapiro, Davitch, belonging respectively to the A.P., Times, U.P., and Reuter.
- (vi) The Yugoslav Central Committee of Greek Refugees, and the Bulkes Committee of Greek Refugees sent two letters to the Commission denying the Greek allegations and particularly the existence of a training establishment in their colonies. The Yugoslav Liaison Representative, by letter dated 26 February 1947, submitted two memoranda: a. memo of the Bulkes Greek refugees addressed to I.R.O. describing the situation at the camp (S/AC.4/70, p.13); b. memorandum of 14 February 1947 of the Central Committee of Greek Refugees, asking the help of the Commission for their return to Greece: "... As refugees we have to live under the conditions laid down by international law, and we deplore the fact." (S/AC.4/70, p.11)



The Yugoslav Liaison Representative included in his letter of 7 March 1947 thirty-eight declarations of Refugees at Bulkes, describing the reasons for their having to seek shelter in Yugoslavia and conditions in the camp at Bulkes. The Yugoslav Liaison Representative stated: "that the inhabitants having no other alternative, were obliged to seek refuge in the neighbouring country of Yugoslavia, who stretched out a helping hand offering them shelter and the possibility of a peaceful and useful life in the workers organisation in Bulkes and in in the whole of Yugoslavia". (S/AC.4/107).

- (vii) In the course of its visit to Belgrade, the Commission heard the witness EVANGELOS KOSTOUDIS, former leader of the Zacharias brigade, who categorically denied the existence of a military school at Bulkes. (S/AC.4/PV/67, pp.10, 11 and 14). Concerning the composition of the squad at Bulkes which worked on the construction of the railway, Kostoudis stated: "The two parties of young people who returned to Bulkes were not included in the two working parties. Those who belonged to them returned to the groups before their departure". The Commission also visited the village of Bulkes on 2 April without observing any trace of military activity. (S/AC.4/SC.9/PV/1).

It questioned the witness MIHAIL TERZIS, head of the Refugees Organisation. When Terzis was examined at Bulkes, he explained the non-military character of the colony and of the training given there. (S/AC.4/SC.9/PV/1).

#### 14. RECRUITING OF REFUGEES INTO GUERRILLA UNITS.

##### (a) GREEK CHARGES.

According to the testimonies of some witnesses the Yugoslav authorities recruit guerrillas, and also Greek civilians for

despatch to Greece to assist, organise and reinforce guerrillas fighting there. Three distinct types of recruitment were mentioned by witnesses:

- (i) Receiving across the frontier discontented elements from Greece and attempting to persuade others to join guerrilla units for service in Greece. Thus the witness A. TSEMBIS (S/AC.4/PV/57-G, pp. 4, 13) stated: "They took me to the frontier because I was a young man and they wished to make an andarte of me" and added that "in order that we should become guerrillas, he (the leader) told us that all men between 18 and 50 would remain in Greece to fight". A similar proposal was made on a different occasion to the witness TSAKIROPOULOS (S/AC.4/PV/57-H, p.19). The witness P. PAPILLIAS stated that Greek refugees "had indoctrination in the Glavni-Odpor and in the Egeicka Kancelaria" and that "the aim of the instruction was that all people being in Yugoslavia must go to Greece and fight with groups to free Macedonia". (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2, p.3)
- (ii) The witness CLEON TOLIOS stated that: "it is after very careful study that the Bureau of the Party orders that groups move into Greece, and that they move into Greece with means put at their disposal by the Yugoslav Government". (S/AC.4/PV/47, p.15).

Further evidence on (i) and (ii) is provided by the testimonies of:

K. CIPRIGOV	(GWB-I, p.121) (S/AC.4/SC.3/10)
G. DIMOPOULOS	(GWB-I, p.13) (S/AC.4/PV/40)
F. KONTOPANOS	(GWB-I, p.55) (S/AC.4/PV/34)
E. PAPAYANIDIS	(GWB-I, p.29)

E. VALTADOROS

(S/AC.4/PV/36, p.5)

I. TSOKLAROPOULOS

(S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, pp.1-2).

(iii) The four battalions (cf. testimony of L. TSAOISSIS, S/AC.4/PV/48, p.18) of Slavo-Macedonians under the leadership of a certain Elias Dimakis (known as Gotchef) who held the rank of Major in the Yugoslav Army (see testimony of Chr. VELIANIDES, S/AC.4/PV/40, pp.4, 12) were dissolved in May 1945 and incorporated in the Serbian Army in order to get better military and political education and to get Macedonia in an easier way. (Tsaoussis, S/AC.4/PV/48, p.23). Chr. Velianides further states that "Gotchef entered Yugoslavia during 1944 and his unit became incorporated with the Yugoslav Army," (S/AC.4/PV/40, p.3), that these battalions later became the nucleus of NOF bands, and that "in August 1946 NOF men were dismissed from the Army and Militia and were sent to the mountains in Greek territory. Gotchef who was himself a member of the Yugoslav armed forces, a Major, came into Greek territory also". (S/AC.4/PV/40, pp. 4-5).

TRAYANOS TSETEROKLIS stated that in the presence of Yugoslav officers Gotchef told them their unit was to be disbanded and incorporated in the Yugoslav Army. (S/AC.4/PV/45-I, pp.16-17). The witness himself from 1944 to 1946 served in the Yugoslav Army for some months at these frontier posts on the Greek frontier, subsequently being released with the 1917 group at Skopje where he obtained his release certificate. (Ibid. I, p.5; II, p.5).

Further evidence in support is furnished in the testimony of:

G. VELIANIDIS	(GWB-I, p.1=6)
G. DIMOPOULOS	(S/AC.4/PV/40, p.19)
LAZAROS TSAOUSSIS	(S/AC.4/PV/48, pp.18-23)

The Greek Liaison Representative charged that the aim of the NOF organisation was "to incite the few thousand Greek citizens in Central Macedonia who speak Slavic dialects to take up arms against the Greek authorities in order to help and swell the ranks of the guerrillas" (S/AC.4/18, p.5). The witness VALTADOROS (S/AC.4/PV/34 and 36) gave evidence regarding the NOF organisation in Skoplje (see details in Chapter II) and in particular how he himself was instructed by the Second Secretary of NOF to leave for Greece (S/AC.4/PV/36, p.2) and how the Central headquarters of NOF in Skoplje gave directions to the headquarters in Edessa (Greece) through a liaison known as Otse (ibid. p.5). The Greek Liaison Representative further charged in his letter of 9 April 1947 that this guerrilla warfare in Greece had been directed by the Yugoslav General Dapcevic who "should be considered a leading figure in the organisation of Greek guerrillas and... took an active part in the direction of their operations from Skoplje and Bitolj, especially during the period immediately preceding the recourse of the Greek Government before the Security Council". (S/AC.4/203).

(b) YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, all the Greek evidence was open to the objections of principle referred to above.

He made the following particular objections:

- (1) The identity of the witness HRISTOS VELIANIDIS was open to doubt. (S/AC.4/PV/39-40).
- (11) TRAXANOS TSEIOROKLIS stated that he was serving in barracks at Bitolj in September 1944 though this town was only liberated from the Germans on 18 November 1944. (S/AC.4/PV/45-I, p.15).

- (iii) KARANJOWSKI and the two brothers POPNIKOLOV denied the existence of a so-called "Bureau egeen". Karanjowski, when asked if he had ever been head of the "Bureau egeen" replied: "I have never heard of it and know nothing about it". (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/8, p.27). DJORDJE ATANASOV, former secretary of the refugees committee at Skoplje, made a similar declaration: "I have only heard of an economic organisation and I've never heard of a 'Bureau egeen'".
- (iv) EVANGELOS KOSTOUDIS denied that there had been any recruiting (S/AC.4/PV/67).
- (v) The Yugoslav Liaison Representative stated several times that Greeks had certainly served in the resistance army at the moment when the liberation fighting was in progress, but that they had been demobilised later in the ordinary course.
- (vi) At the request of the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, the Commission invited the Greek Liaison Representative to state his reasons for calling upon General Dapoevic to give evidence. The Greek Liaison Representative repeated his statement that this officer had assumed control of general operations at Skoplje in Northern Greece. The Yugoslav Liaison Representative denied that General Dapoevic had ever been at Skoplje, even in a private capacity, (S/AC.4/PV/69, pp.7 and 18), and described the Greek request as a manoeuvre aimed at upholding the prestige of the United Nations, at the expense of the glorious Yugoslav army. (S/AC.4/PV/69, p.7).

# 15. PROVIDING GUERRILLAS WITH WEAPONS AND SUPPLIES.

## (a) GREEK CHARGES.

According to the testimony of a number of witnesses, support furnished by the Yugoslav authorities to guerrillas moving from Yugoslavia to Greece consisted of the following:

Furnishing them with supplies such as food, clothing etc., which were issued before leaving Bulkes or other camps. Thus C. MANTZOURAKIS stated that "when we left Bulkes to come to Greece we received clothing". (S/AC.4/PV/38, p.5). GEORGANTAS, at that time in Greece with guerrillas stated that after 15 January 1947 when the Commission was known to be coming "those who were wearing Serb trousers were ordered to take them off" and "they got into British uniforms as much as possible and into civilian clothes. (S/AC.4/PV/52, pp.7-8). Similar statement was made by Tr. VASSILIOU. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4, p.17). VALTADOROS stated that before leaving Skoplje for Greece, "they went to the store and received seven bundles, five containing clothing and two containing food". (S/AC.4/PV/36, p.2).

Transport by road or rail. The witness KLEON TOLIOS gave circumstantial details of his journey from Bulkes to the Greek frontier at Doiran, being as he stated "sent" and "taken by a man named Saperas, of the Yafka of Skoplje". He also stated: "I knew that they are aided by the Yugoslav authorities and as an instance my band was transported by a group of Slavs in trucks". (S/AC.4/PV/48, pp.11, 12, 13). Valtadoros travelled from Skoplje to the Yugoslav-Greek frontier at Gradesnitcha, after "waiting for the permission of Ozna to pass the Yugoslav frontier" and finally "departed on a Serbian car on which were also three soldiers and one officer". (S/AC.4/PV/36, pp.12-14).

Supply of Arms. The witness THEODOROU VASSILIOU stated that he had been issued with a Sten gun in Yugoslavia by a certain Lazaros before entering Greece (GWB-I, pp.104-105) and this evidence was restated before Team 1A at Florina on 11 March (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2, pp.10-12). VALTADOROS stated that when he was on Greek territory "the commander of his group proposed

that the witness should go to the nearest Yugoslav post and get ammunition". This proposal was not carried out but the witness added that another group-leader, "Prossos, told him that many times he used to go to the Yugoslav frontier post and get ammunition there". (S/AC.4/PV/36, pp.4, 17). The Yugoslav national KOSTA CUPARIKOV stated that "the chief of his own brigade was transporting munition into Greece". (S/AC.4/SC.3/10, p.2).

Arms stated by the Greek Liaison Representative to have been captured from guerrillas were exhibited to the Commission in Salonika.

- (iv) Assistance by frontier guards at Yugoslav frontier and assistance of guides and liaison agents. In the case of the Surma incident, it was stated that assistance included fire from Yugoslav frontier posts on Greek forces pursuing guerrillas in the direction of the Yugoslav frontier. Testimonies may be found regarding this incident by three Greek officers and six Greek soldiers. (GWB-I, pp.145-152). Of these, Captain NIKITAS, Lt. DEROVALIS and DALIS and a new witness HADJOPOULI testified regarding fire from the Yugoslav post before the Commission at Mouries on 15 March 1947. (S/AC.4/PV/57-B)
- The witness P. PAPAILIAS explained that "liaison agents led people across the frontier". (S/AC.4/SC.2A/3R/2, p.2).
- As to the liaison agent Alekos, the witness G. PATATOUKAS stated: "I saw Alekos and the soldiers with my own eyes. Alekos was a true Serb and therefore what he did there I do not know, but I saw in the mountains that he used to inspect the different bands, note down their needs, and come back with supplies... He crossed the border many times", (S/AC.4/PV/44, p.17).

According to Mr. Tsaldaris' statement in New York, the body of the Yugoslav 2nd Lieutenant, believed to be such a liaison agent and named Kotcho Hadjigadrielov of Gevgeli was found on Mount Paikon in August, 1946. (S/203, p.21). On 31 March 1947, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative produced a man in Belgrade whom he claimed to be the same, but this witness gave his name as Kotcho Hadjigeorgiev who lived in Skoplje. (S/AC.4/PV/68-2, pp.9-13).

VALTADOROS stated that "when they arrived at the Serbian frontier post, an officer with six soldiers arrived with Russian machine-guns, accompanied them into Greek territory. They were received there by a NOF band". (S/AC.4/PV/36, p.3). The testimonies of S. KARADATSOS (GWB-I, pp.40-41), E. PAPA-YANNIDES (ibid. p.91), G. TSALDOURIS (ibid. pp.94-95) and T. TSETEROKLIS (S/AC.4/PV/45-II, p.11) also show that liaison agents crossed the frontier to contact guerrillas in Greece, and that bands were helped to cross the frontier with the assistance of Yugoslav frontier guards.

(b) YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative all the Greek evidence was open to the objections of principle referred to above.

He made the following particular objections:

- (1) Two witnesses had made contradictory statements in their depositions:
  - VELIANIDIS (S/AC.4/PV/40 - compare pp. 18 and 19)
  - TSETEROKLIS (S/AC.4/PV/45 - compare pp. 32 and 34),
- (11) The following witnesses stated that the arms and provisions were sent from within Greece;

CONSTANTINE DINOS, a former partisan, (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/2, pp.7-8);



YANI KAJCEVSKI, a Macedonian refugee, (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/2, pp.23-24).

JOHN PATIS, (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/4, p.4).

General BAKIRDJIS, (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/10, p.23).

- (iii) The Central Committee of EAM declared that the partisan units obtained their arms and supplies from the regular troops, from the police and from legal groups in the course of operations. He supported this statement by the production of twenty-six press extracts and partisan communiques. (S/AC.4/55, p.46 and Annex B).

The partisan leader TSERZOGLU stated that the arms in his group were obtained in the course of operations. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/25)

- (iv) At the second meeting of Team "B", several men, formerly partisans, who had been condemned to death, when questioned on this subject, replied that they did not know whether the guerrillas had received help from neighbouring countries or from outside Greece.

16. DESPATCHING GUERRILLA DETACHMENTS ACROSS THE FRONTIER INTO GREECE.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

According to the Greek charges these guerrilla detachments, after having been trained and recruited in groups and supplied in Yugoslavia, were despatched either singly or in groups across the frontier into Greece. Evidence in support of the Greek thesis was provided by the witness P. PAPAILIAS who stated that "groups of twenty-five to thirty men crossed the border to join other andartes. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2, p.2). After crossing the border, the groups were sent to reinforce one band if that band was particularly weak, or split up among various bands, (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2, p.2). The witness G. DIMOPOULOS, after entering Yugoslavia from Greece at Doiran, said that he met a "Captain

Karayorgis who with three other guides had the job of taking people from Yugoslavia into Greece or from Greece into Yugoslavia". (S/AC.4/PV/40, pp.18-19).

Others testified that they were despatched to Greece from Yugoslavia via Albania, (e.g. T. TSETEROKLIS, S/AC.4/PV/45-II, pp.9-10), and Bulgaria (e.g. Chr. MANTZOURAKIS, S/AC.4/PV/38, pp.10-12).

Detailed evidence on the point is given in the depositions of a large number of witnesses such as GEORGE GATSIOS, PHOTIOS KONTO-PANOS (Annivas), CHRISTO MANTZOURAKIS, PANTALIS PAPAILIAS.

Two Yugoslav nationals testified to the same effect:

- (1) ZIVKO MLADENOVIC stated that there were "in Monastir sixty Greeks supported by the Yugoslavs who gave them help to cross the border. They had every right to enter freely and even armed into Greek territory and to come back again". (S/AC.4/SC.3/8, p.4).
- (11) KOSTA CIPARIGOVSKI (or CUPARICOV) stated that "when he was at Strumica, three ELASite partisans came to see his chief who selected fifteen Yugoslav soldiers whose names he did not know and three others and sent them to cross the Greek frontier". (S/AC.4/SC.3/10, p.2).

In addition, Team 1A investigated the incidents of Agia Paraskevi and Kato Klinai in the Florina region of the Greco-Yugoslav frontier. According to GWB-II, p.47, bands coming from Yugoslavia had attacked Greek frontier posts and gendarme stations in that area in July 1946.

According to statements by Mr. Kyras in Athens on 17 February 1947. and by Brig. Ioannou at Skra, attacks on isolated Greek frontier posts, particularly those on frontier posts Nos. 66 and 88, had occurred with the result that Greek guards had been withdrawn from positions on the frontier in certain areas which were thus open for

guerrillas to penetrate unobserved from Yugoslavia into Greece.

(S/AC.4/PV/27, pp.8-10; S/AC.4/PV/57-E, pp.5-6).

In view of the testimony of the witness PANTELIS PAPAILIAS (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2, pp.3-7) heard by Team 1A at Florina to the effect that he had heard that the bands crossed into Greece from the village of Dragos in Yugoslavia, the Team attempted to visit Dragos on 12 March but for reasons explained in the Team report (S/AC.4/SR/56) it was unable to do so.

(b) YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, all the Greek evidence was open to the objections referred to above.

He made the following particular objections:

- (i) IORDANIS ZERVAS and IOANNIS PETSAS declared before a special Investigation Group sent by the Committee of Experts that the evidence of VALIADOROS had been extracted from him under torture. (S/AC.4/W.3).
- (ii) Doubts were raised with regard to the identity of the witness HRISTOS VELIANIDIS. (S/AC.4/PV/39).
- (iii) The allegations by the Greek witnesses concerning the incidents at Aghia Faraskevi and Katoclinai had not been confirmed on the Yugoslav side.
- (iv) The Greek Government itself admitted that ninety-six refugees from Bulkes had been returned in the normal way to the Greek frontier in April 1946. (GWB-II, p.27).
- (v) THOMAS ZAHOS stated that the Yugoslav Government had taken steps to prevent the men of the Bulkes camp from giving aid to the guerrillas in Greece and that he had been obliged to flee himself on account of this. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/11).

- (vi) The control exercised by the Yugoslav authorities in this matter was confirmed by the witness EVANGELOS KOSTOUDIS (S/AC.4/PV/67) and TERZIS (S/AC.4/SC.9/PV/1).
- (vii) The veracity of the Greek accusations in this matter may be compared with that of the allegations presented under the heading I and is therefore subject to the same verification.
- (viii) The Yugoslav Liaison Representative declared that the Greek authorities could have no clear idea of conditions on the Greco-Yugoslav frontier, since in July, August, September and October 1946 the Greek frontier units were withdrawn, abandoning about twenty frontier posts. He also stated that two sectors of the frontier, having a total length of 35 km., had been occupied by Greek units since the end of the war. (S/AC.4/PV/24, pp.9-11).
- (ix) A document submitted by the Central Committee of EAM noted that the movement of forces or of important supplies was impossible on account of the strict guard kept by the Greeks along the frontier. (S/AC.4/56 and Annexes).
- (x) Examination of the geographical areas of the engagements between regulars and partisans, does not reveal any characteristic increase in the latter in the neighbourhood of the frontier. (Declaration of Yugoslav Liaison Representative, S/AC.4/PV/24 and Annexes to the declaration of the Central Committee of EAM, S/AC.4/55).

17. HOSPITALISING WOUNDED GUERRILLAS.

(a) GREEK CHARGES.

Certain witnesses testified that medical aid was given to wounded guerrillas by the Yugoslav authorities. Casualties were transported across the frontier from the scene of incidents to hospitals in Yugoslavia. (This evidence refers specifically to wounded

guerrillas as distinct from medical relief dispenses on humanitarian grounds).

The Greek peasant ANASTASIOS TSEMBIS testified that he had been forced to transport on his donkey a wounded guerrilla to the Yugoslav frontier after the attack on the village of Skra: "When I arrived at the frontier, Serbian partisans and other Greek bandits took over the wounded man and my donkey." (S/AC.4/PV/57-G, pp.2-3),

The witness K. TSAKIROPOULOS testified that on the night of 22-3 July 1946, after a band had attacked the Idhomeni Gendarme Post he was forced by the retreating guerrillas to transport a wounded guerrilla on his donkey to the Yugoslav frontier and "when we had crossed the frontier we took down the wounded man from the mule and there they took him over." (S/AC.4/PV/57-H, p.19).

The witness G. GEORGANTAS gave details of an "infirmary" close to the Yugoslav frontier, where he stayed 32-33 days and to which guerrillas wounded in battles inside Greece were brought before being sent to hospitals in Yugoslavia. (S/AC.4/PV/52, pp.2-3).

The witness G. DIMOPOULOS (a Greek soldier who entered Yugoslavia) stated that he was escorted by a soldier to the town of Djevdjelija where he was taken to an old building used as a hospital. He was told that in this hospital wounded bandits were treated. (S/AC.4/PV/40, p.19).

The Yugoslav national ZIVKO MLADENOVIC stated that sick and wounded Greek guerrillas were treated in Yugoslavia and that he himself saw two. (S/AC.4/SC.5/G, p.4).

Additional evidence is afforded by the testimonies of:

TRAYANOS WSETEROKLIS (S/AC.4/PV/45-I, p.10)

Discharge paper of Kapetan CHRISTOS)

ZEZAS from hospital at Bulkes dated)

31 July 1946 submitted by Greek ) (Attached to S/AC.4/20  
Liaison Representative, ) of February 1947)

ASTANASIOE KONSTANTINIDIS	(GWB-I, p.54)
OMIROS ANASTASAKIS	(GWB-I, p.12)
IOANNIS INEOS	(GWB-I, p.38)
STAVROS ZAHABATSOS	(GWB-I, p.40)
VASSILI GARGAROV (Yugoslav soldier)	(GWB-I, p.120) (S/AC.4/PV/55-2)

Mr. Kyrou stated before the Commission that: "I have here a copy of the NOVA MAKEDONIIJA of Skoplje of 27 February 1947. There is an open letter from the wounded Greek anti-fascists saying they are being treated in the hospital at Skoplje." (S/AC.4/PV/57-G, p.16).

(b) YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, all the Greek evidence was open to the objections referred to above:

He made the following particular objections:

- (i) GEORGHIS DIMOPOULOS simply repeated what he had heard and had no direct observation. (S/AC.4/PV/40).
- (ii) EHIKOUZIS stated that he had transported a wounded man in Yugoslavia, in company with Barikopoulos, at the time of the incident at Idhomeni. He then stated that his original evidence had been given under oath and refused to give further sworn evidence before the Commission.
- (iii) The chief witnesses called in this connection by the Greek Government were collected at Skra. The evidence of SANA PROSHU TSEPI (S/AC.4/PV/57-I, p.12) and of PROSE ZEGA (S/AC.4/PV/71-B), as well as the letter addressed to the Commission by the 273 refugees of Skra (S/AC.4/200) were united in their denial of the Greek allegations as to the nature of this incident.

(17) At the time of the presentation by the Greek Liaison Representative of the open letter of the anti-fascist Greeks who were treated at the Skoplje hospital, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative remarked that a curious anomaly could be noticed here and that the mere fact that the letter had been published in a Yugoslav paper proved that the refugees in question "had no fear either of Yugoslav or of the Commission". (S/AC.4/PV/57-H, pp.16-17).

18. CROSSING BY GUERRILLAS FROM GREECE INTO YUGOSLAVIA.

(A) GREEK CHARGES.

According to the Greek White Book (Incidents on the Greek Frontiers) there were twenty-eight instances of armed bands withdrawing into or towards Yugoslavia between 18 May and 22 December 1946, (pp. 46-58) and in a number of cases these guerrillas were under pursuit from Greek armed forces and sought refuge in Yugoslav territory where they were freely admitted by the Yugoslav frontier guards,

The Commission investigated certain of these incidents, On 15 March the main body of the Commission examined on the spot the Surmena incident of 20 September 1946. Some witnesses stated that guerrillas, pursued by four columns of Greek armed forces, retreated towards the Yugoslav frontier and were seen by Greek officers and soldiers crossing the frontier into Yugoslavia; thus the Greek Captain ANASTAS stated: "There was no other way out for the bandits than the Yugoslav frontier... They had either to surrender to us or to escape to Yugoslavia... I saw them myself with my binoculars in front of the Yugoslav frontier post." (S/AC.4/PV/57-B, pp.11-12).

The Greek Brigadier IOANNOU stated in connection with the guerrilla attack on Skra on 13 November 1946, (investigated by the Commission on 18 March 1947), that "about 6:30 in the evening they transported all they could take and their wounded in the direction of Mujin and Huma", (villages in Yugoslavia). (S/AC.4/PV/57-E, p.7).

The witnesses G. ANDREADIS, I. KASSITERIDES and PANAYIOTIS GABRIELIDES (of whom G. Andreadis was heard by the Commission, S/AC.4/PV/57-F) stated that the day after the incident they had observed from the hill of Ravine armed bands, together with women and children and cattle, being driven from Greece across the frontier in the direction of the Yugoslav village of Mujin. At Idhomeni, investigated by the main body of the Commission on 18 March, the witness K. TSAKIROPOULOS testified that guerrillas entered Yugoslav territory after the attack on the Gendarmerie post (S/AC.4/PV/57-H, p.18), and the Yugoslav witness VASSILI G. CANGAROV stated that "on the night of the attack launched by a band against the Gendarmerie post of Idhomeni on 2 July 1946, he was serving as sentry at the post. He noticed about eighty bandits who entered Yugoslav territory. Among the latter were two wounded men transported to Gevgeli". (S/AC.4/PV/55-2, p.16; GWB-I, p.120).

The Greek military authorities stated that the bands responsible for the Ayia Paraskevi and Kato Klinai incidents (see par. 16 above) withdrew into Yugoslav territory, judging from the noises heard by the Greek soldiers and the tracks left in the fields. The witnesses SPIRIDON TSIRIGOS and DIMITRIOS STEFANIDIS testified to that effect. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/42, pp.1-5).

(b). YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative all the Greek evidence was open to the objections referred to above:

He made the following particular objections:

- (i) GREGORIOS HARISMIDES was questioned although he was only sixteen years of age. (S/AC.4/PV/56).
- (ii) VASSILI CANGAROV's statement contained contradictions.
- (iii) The Greek version of the incident at Skra does not correspond to the version given by the 273 inhabitants of this village



who were refugees in Yugoslavia, and whose leader had been heard in evidence before the Commission. (PROSE ZEGA, S/AC.4/PV/71-B). This deposition attributed the burning of the village to the police and to numerous right-wing irregular bands. It makes no mention whatsoever of the crossing of the frontier by any bands unless it were by the inhabitants of the villages which were attacked by the right-wing bands and by the police. According to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative these movements which are still normal and frequent at the present time, occur because refugees are fleeing from the terror which now reigns in Greece. This account of the incident is found in the evidence of SANA PROSHU TSAPI (S/AC.4/PV/57-I) and in the memorandum sent by the inhabitants of the Department of Goumenitza who had taken refuge in Yugoslavia. (S/AC.4/PV/57-I, p.3).

- (iv) All the frontier activity observed by the Greek authorities in the course of the incidents at Garmena were unobserved by the Yugoslav frontier guards who stated that on the days in question they had only seen a detachment of the regular Greek army who had requested their authorisation to cross the Yugoslav frontier for the purpose of rounding up a band. (Evidence of JORDANOVSKY, S/AC.4/PV/57-C and of ILIEVSKY, S/AC.4/PV/57-C, pp.13-14).
- (v) During the study of the incident at Idhomeni the Yugoslav Liaison Representative drew attention to the contradictions and improbabilities in the Greek case. (S/AC.4/PV/57-H, pp. 5, 15, 16, 21 and 22).

CHAPTER 11 : GREEK CHARGES THAT THE NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF GREECE, AIMING AT DETACHING FROM GREECE PARTS OF HER TERRITORIES (AEGEAN MACEDONIA AND WESTERN THRACE): REFUTATIONS BY BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA.

SECTION A: CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA

19. GREEK CHARGES

(a) CHARGES

The Greek Representative charged that Bulgaria was promoting "intensive propaganda in favour of the incorporation of Greek Macedonia in the Federal Yugoslav State of Macedonia" (S/PV/83, p. 51). The Greek Representative pointed out in particular that Bulgaria's original opposition to the incorporation of Greek Macedonia in the Yugoslav Federation seemed to have relaxed in return for Yugoslav support of Bulgaria's designs on the Greek province of Western Thrace (S/AC.4/18, p. 5; also S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.5).

In support of this charge, the Greek Government presented quotations from statements of Bulgarian officials. It reminded the Commission that for years the acquisition of the territory now included in Greek Macedonia had been one of the main objectives of Bulgarian Foreign policy, and it was alleged that only after a vigorous statement by Marshal Tito in October 1945 had the Bulgarian Government been reconciled to the unification of Macedonia within the Yugoslav Federation. The Greek representative further asserted that this change in Bulgarian policy explained the support given by Yugoslavia at the Paris Peace Conference in 1946 to Bulgaria's claim on Greek Thrace (S/AC.4/174, Brief "B" and S/AC.4/206).

(b) EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY GREECE.

In support of its charge, the Greek Government introduced quotations from GEORGI DIMITROV (S/AC.4/174, Brief "B", p.3) and General Terpeshev, and made reference to quotations from six other Bulgarian officials (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.12; the statesmen referred to are Pavlov, Kolarov, Obov, Velchev, Yugo and

P.76

Georgiev). The Greek case stressed in particular a declaration of Georgi Dimitrov to the Yugoslav paper Borba in August 1945:

" The elections in Pirin Macedonia will be carried out on the general principles for the reinforcement of the Bulgarian Patriotic Front and for the establishment of the most intimate relationships and close co-operation with New Yugoslavia, this being the only way for the final solution of the Macedonian question. The victory of the Patriotic Front in the elections, the brotherhood and unity of Bulgaria of the Patriotic Front and the new Yugoslav Federative will remove the obstacles for the national liberation of the whole Macedonian nation."

(S/AC.4/174,p.3).

Reference was also made to a statement by General Dobri Terpeshev, Chairman of the Supreme Council, in the town of Razlog on 10 October 1946, to the effect that "There is but one Macedonia extending into Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece, and which will ultimately form a single unit." (S/AC.4/FV/27, Annex 1, p.12).

Additional evidence was brought to the attention of the Commission (S/AC.4/192,p.2) by the United States Delegate in a letter in which he quoted an article in the Communist paper Rabotnichesko Delo of 16 November 1946, which welcomed the creation of the Republic of Macedonia within the Yugoslav Federation and asserted that "the unification of the other parts of the Macedonian nation can take place only on the basis of this Republic. Such unification is in the interest of the future peaceful development of Bulgaria in close co-operation with Yugoslavia."

The letter also pointed out that the Bulgarian Government's policy was not "clear cut and well known" as had been asserted by the Bulgarian Liaison Representative (S/AC.4/175), but that on the contrary when faced by the criticism of its Macedonian policy by the opposition in the Grand National Assembly, the decision of that body

p.77.  
had been to accept the Prime Minister's proposal of 18 Decemb  
1946 to postpone indefinitely any discussion of this matter(S/AC.4/198,  
p.2).

## 20. BULGARIAN REFUTATIONS.

In refuting the Greek charges before the Security Council, the Bulgarian Government stated that the attitude of the Bulgarian people towards Greece was not aggressive, and recalled that in 1940 Bulgaria had refused to participate in Italy's attack on Greece. The Bulgarian occupation of part of northern Greece after 1941 was explained as an act committed by a Government which did not have the support of the Bulgarian people (S/PV/84, pp. 46-47). It was further pointed out that, while Bulgaria's interest in an outlet to the Aegean remained active, "this must be achieved solely by pacific procedure, through amiable agreements, or international decisions" (S/AC.4/PV10, p.17, also S/AC.4/24a, p.7).

At a later stage in the Commission's work, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative expounded the views of his Government at greater length. He characterized the Greek charges as "a dishonourable political manoeuvre" intended to divert the Commission from its main problem (S/AC.4/140, p.1.) and said that they were "absolutely groundless" (S/AC.4/175, p.1). The Commission was informed that General Zhekov was not competent to speak for Bulgarian foreign policy, and that this policy was in any case "clear cut and well known", and included no intention of interfering in Greek internal affairs (S/AC.4/175, p.1). As regards the quotation from the article in the Rabotnichesko Delo of 16 November 1946, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative asserted that it had reference only to that aspect of the Macedonian question which concerned Bulgaria and Yugoslavia alone (S/AC.4/202, p.1). In a final summing up of the Bulgarian refutation, the Commission was informed that Bulgaria "does not harbour any aggressive designs against Greece", and that of such misunderstandings as have arisen between the two countries since the war the

page 78

Macedonian problem has never been a cause (S/AC.4/202, p.2).

SECTION B: CHARGES AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA.

21. GREEK CHARGES

(a) QUOTATIONS FROM YUGOSLAV STATEMENTS.

The Greek charge before the Security Council (S/203, pp. 12, 32-34, S/PV/83, pp.48-55, S/PV/94, pp.76-77) and the Commission (S/AC.4/18, p.4) was that the Yugoslav Government was lending support to the guerrilla warfare in Greece and conducting intensive propaganda with the aim of detaching the province of Macedonia from Greece and annexing it to Yugoslavia. In support of this charge, the Greek Representative referred to a number of quotations from statements by Yugoslav Government officials and from articles in the official Yugoslav Press of the Yugoslav Government. One such quotation was that of Mr. Dmitar Vlahov, Vice-Chairman of the Presidium of the Yugoslav National Assembly, from a statement made to the French Press on 18 September 1946:

"The Macedonian people are looking forward to their complete liberation and to their political unification, which will be achieved under the auspices of the Macedonian Republic within the borders of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia."

(S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1 pp.11-12).

Mr. Vlahov was also quoted as stating in a broadcast on 1 October 1946, that:

"Greece has no right to Aegean Macedonia from any point of view whether geographical, ethnological, historical, political or economic." (S/PV/83, p.51)

The Greek Representative likewise quoted from a speech delivered on 11 October 1946 at Skoplje, by Mr. Lazar Kolishevski, Prime Minister of the Yugoslav Federative Republic of Macedonia, who stated that:

"The Macedonian people, in common with all the other peoples of Yugoslavia, is prepared to make the greatest sacrifices for the liberty of its whole native land from Trieste to the southern part of Aegean Macedonia."

(S/PV/83, p.52)

Other quotations, along the same lines, presented by the Greek Liaison Representative include an article and map in the Yugoslav Youth magazine Pionir of August 1945 (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.10), an article published by Mr. Bane Andrejev, Yugoslav Minister of Mines, in the Ilindenski Pat and reproduced in part in the Nova Makedonia on 11 October 1945 (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.11), a resolution adopted by the Congress of the Macedonian Popular Front held in Skoplje in August 1946 (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.11), a speech delivered before the political and Territorial Commission for Bulgaria at the Paris Peace Conference on 6 September 1946 by the Deputy Chief Delegate of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mose Pijade (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.12). The Greek Representative also quoted from a speech delivered by Marshal Tito at Skoplje on 11 October 1945, in which he said:

"We did not renounce the right of the Macedonian people to unite. We shall never renounce this right. This is our principle. And we do not give up principles for temporary sympathies. There are brothers, Macedonians in Aegean Macedonia to whose destiny we are not indifferent. Our thoughts are with them and we care for them. We shall maintain that all Macedonians be united in their country ... May Macedonia, may all Macedonians be one day united in their common Macedonia."

(S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex 1, p.12, as corrected in S/AC.4/21)

Further evidence introduced to the Commission (Letter from the United States Delegate of 1 April 1947, S/AC.4/194) included a speech by Deputy Bane Andrejev before the Yugoslav National Assembly, published

p.80

in the paper Politika of 21 January 1946, a speech of Mr. Lazar Koulichovski, Prime Minister of the Macedonian Republic, before the first Congress of the People's Front of Macedonia on 6 August 1946, an article entitled "Aegean Macedonia and Peace in the Balkans" in the paper Glas on 27 August 1946, an article by Nikola Vujanovich in the paper Borba on 28 August 1946, and another article in the paper Borba on 3 September 1946. As an example of these statements an article entitled "Aegean Macedonia", in the paper Borba of 25 August 1946 was quoted which asserted that:

".. our country cannot remain indifferent towards the annihilation of our people in Greece, nor towards their rights and demands for self-determination and annexation to their brothers in Yugoslavia." (S/AC.4/194,p.5).

(b) TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES.

Certain witnesses testified as to the existence of a Yugoslav organization known as NOF (National Liberation Front) which advocated the severance of the province of Macedonia from Greece and its annexation to the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Testimony indicated that NOF had its main centres in Skoplje and Bitolj, and that its activities included the administration of relief to Greek refugees, propaganda conducted through lectures and private conversations, and miscellaneous training programs (VALTADOROS, S/AC.4/PV/35, pp. 21-22; TSETEROKLIS, S/AC.4/PV/45, Part 1, pp. 6-7, 13-14; and TSAOUSSIS, S/AC.4/PV/48, pp.17-18). Testimony of witnesses relating to other aspects of NOF activity is set forth in Part of this report.

A number of witnesses testified that NOF was a Yugoslav organization which had as its object the annexation of Greek Macedonia. One witness testified that NOF was a Yugoslav organization and its object was to unite all Macedonia together" (VELIANIDIS, S/AC.4/PV/40, p.6). Other witnesses stated that "the object of this organization is the national liberation of all Aegean Macedonia, as

well as Vedar Macedonia, and Bulgarian Macedonia,"and that NOF desired to "unite them into one country and attach this country to the Federation of Yugoslavia" (VALTADOROS, S/AC.4/PV/36, p.18): its object was to render autonomy to our Macedonia and unite it with Serbian Macedonia"(TSETEROKLIS, S/AC.4/PV/45, Part 1, p.17). Another witness stated that he and other refugees were told by NOF members that they "should organize in order to make Macedonia autonomous, to separate it from Greece and to unite it to Serbia," and that the NOF "wanted to make Macedonia autonomous by force." (TSAOUSSIS S/AC.4/PV/48, p.19). Similar statements were also made by seven other witnesses (Mantzourakis, S/AC.4/PV/38, p.6; BOBILIS, S/AC.4/PV/55-2, p. 25; INDOS, White Book S/AC.4/15, p.37; HILANPOS, S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/2,p.10; THEODORU, S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/4,p.10; ATATOUKLIS, S/AC.4/PV/44, p.24; and Harismides, S/AC.4/PV/51, p.3).

The deposition of one witness asserted that after examination by military authorities in Bitolj, and while they were saving their meals, he and seven other fugitives from a Greek village were subjected to "intense propaganda on the liberation of Macedonia by NOF leaders" (INDOS, White Book, S/AC.4/15,p.37). According to the witness VALTADOROS, instructions were issued to their NOF headquarters by the NOF Central Committee in Skoplje (S/AC.4/PV/36, p.5).

Other witnesses testified to the existence of an Aegean Bureau in Bitolj. One witness stated that the Aegean Bureau was the office of NOF which "centralized" all its activities in Bitolj (PAPAILIAS, S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR.2, p.4). The same witness stated in the White Book that about 200 Greek refugees were assembled at the Aegean Bureau to hear an NOF leader tell them that "Our country, enslaved Macedonia, needs us. We must all go there and liberate her". (PAPAILIAS, White Book,p. 86), and that the Aegean Bureau issued to all groups of Greek fugitives re-entering Greece from Skoplje blankets, boots and other clothing. The witness himself was addressed by Gatchev, another NOF leader, at the Aegean bureau on



5 October 1946, who said, "You are setting out today to fight our enemy on our own soil. The struggle will be a hard one. In our struggle, you will be assisted by the EAM, since our aims are common. When we achieve our objectives, we shall settle matters with the EAM" (PAPAILIAS, White Book, p.88).

Another deponent stated that, after crossing from Greece into Yugoslavia in April 1946, he was released from arrest through the intercession of the Director of the Aegean Bureau, and in September 1946 attended meetings organized by leaders of the Aegean Macedonian Movement at which Gotchev and others exhorted Greek refugees living in Bitolj "to return to Greece and undertake the struggle for the liberation of "Aegean Macedonia" and its union with Bulgarian and Yugoslav Macedonia within the Federation People's Republic" (VASSILIOU, White Book, p.104; also TSOKLAROPoulos S/AC.4/SC2A/SR/4, p.2).

## 22. YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS.

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative denied the Greek contention that Yugoslavia was interfering in the internal affairs of Greece, or violating Greek sovereignty (S/AC.4/FV/18, p.6). He also denied the Greek charge that Yugoslavia desired to detach from Greece the province of Macedonia (S/AC.4/FV/50, p.6).

The Yugoslav Representative stated that the quotation from the interview of Marshal Tito of 16 October 1946, which was cited by the Greek Representative in the Security Council (S/PV/83, p.52; S/PV/84, pp.17-25, 51), in confirmation of his charge against Yugoslavia had been "falsified", and he submitted the original text to the Commission (S/AC.4/FV/59, pp.10-11). The Yugoslav Representative also charged as regards a quotation from a speech of Marshal Tito of 11 October 1946, which was cited by the Greek Representative in confirmation of his charge that Yugoslavia intended to detach from Greece the province of Macedonia, that certain sentences of the speech had been deleted, and that the quotation therefore gave a distorted impression (S/AC.4/FV/71, pp.17-18).

AT.NASOV testified that he did not know of an NOF organization in Yugoslavia (S/AC.4/PV/71, p.5). At the same meeting the Yugoslav Representative explained that there did exist in Yugoslavia an organization called JNOF which was created in 1941, and that he regretted that this Yugoslav organization had been confused with the Greek organizations NOF and SNOF, which was the translation into Macedonian of the Greek EAM (S/AC.4/PV/71, p.7).

The Yugoslav Representative denied that an organization such as the so-called Aegean Bureau had ever existed (S/AC.4/PV/71, p.12), and two refugees who had been active in Bitojl testified that they had not heard of such an organization (ATANASOV, S/AC.4/PV/71, p.5; and BOYADJIEV, S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/6, pp.3-8).

TRENCH stated that he was a member of the Macedonian autonomous organization VMRO and that for his activities in this organization he had been sentenced by the Yugoslav court. He testified that during the German occupation this organization had collaborated with the Germans and that after the liberation of Yugoslavia it had gone underground. Speaking about the activities of this organization in that period, he stated that he had been instructed "to create these units and to contact the army in Greece, and the opposition in Bulgaria." He further stated that the purpose of these units was to fight against the present regime in Yugoslavia and to create an autonomous Macedonia under the English and the Americans. (S/AC.4/PV/71, p.34, and the depositions of twelve other witnesses in the Yugoslav Documents, S/AC.4/218, pp. 63-81).

KARANJOWSKI, interrogated at Skoplje on the suggestion of the Greek Liaison Officer, as he was said to be Head of the Aegean Bureau at Skoplje, declared that not only had he never been the Head of this Bureau, but that he had never heard of it. He is only 20 years of age and works in a shop in Skoplje. He further declared that he knew nothing about the existence of the NOF organization at Skoplje. So far as he knew, only the Social Services of Skoplje dealt with refugees arrived from Greece. (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/1, pp.24-25,

French text).

In support of this contention that the Macedonian movement was not of Yugoslav origin, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative made a statement before the Commission on the Macedonian question in which he said that the "Autonomist Great Macedonian" movement was a Fascist organization up to the last war, organized and led by the VMRO, with the objective of creating a source of controversy for the Balkan states in order to pave the way by Fascist renegades in Greece (S/AC.4/PV/50, Annex 1, p.1). Two witnesses likewise testified in this sense NICOLAIDES, S/AC.4/SC.3/7, p.3; and GUMNOPOULOS, S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/5, pp 4-5). The Yugoslav Representative also charged that since the war this movement had been revised by two British consular officers in Florina (S/AC.4/PV/50, Annex 1, pp. 2-3). One witness stated that the Macedonian separationist movement began from the moment when the British Vice-Consul, Mr. Hill, arrived in Florina; and that Mr. Hill had made trips to the villages and told the villagers that, if they wished to be free and independent from Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia, they should unite themselves (IOANNIDES, S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/7, p.3). Two other witnesses stated that they had heard of these British activities (NICOLAIDIS, S/AC.4/SC.3/SR/7, p.3; and SIGANOS, S/AC.4/SC.3/SR11, p.5). This charge was denied by the Delegate of the United Kingdom in a letter to the Commission (S/AC.4/123).

CHAPTER III : GREEK CHARGES IN RESPECT OF PROVOCATION OF BORDER INCIDENTS BY ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA.

SECTION A : CHARGES AGAINST ALBANIA:  
AND COUNTER ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS BY  
ALBANIA.

23. CHARGES AGAINST ALBANIA.

In its Memorandum of 3 December 1946 to the Security Council, the Greek Government sets out a number of incidents which took place on the Greco-Albanian frontier. (S/AC.4/I, pp. 30, 36-43, 48, 53, 55, 131, 133; S/AC.4/I - Add. 1 - S/AC.4/44 A - S/AC.4/44 B).

The Greek White Paper 'Incidents on the Greek Frontier' (cited as GWB II), mentions 109 incidents which took place between 1 January and 21 November 1946, including some already mentioned in previous memoranda.

According to the Greek Government, these incidents mostly come under the following categories :

- a) Violations of the frontier by Albanian soldiers;
- b) Firing on Greek territory or Greek posts; firing duels between Greek and Albanian patrols;
- c) Attacks on Greek localities, units and frontier posts;
- d) Incidents involving armed gangs crossing the frontier from Greece into Albania and vice versa, and numerous incidents involving the theft of cattle or crops; attempts at clandestine frontier crossings etc.

The White Paper emphasises that in the course of these incidents, 20 - 30 persons were killed, wounded or taken prisoners.

The Greek Liaison Representative invited the Commission to verify on the spot the authenticity of his Government's charges. The Greek Representatives to the Security Council adopted a similar attitude. (S/AC.4/18, pp. 1 & 2).

On 17 February M. Kyrrou stated that "incessant disturbances" on a considerable scale were taking place on the Albanian frontier (attacks on Posts 27, 28 and 30 on February 1st). He declared that no Greek soldier had crossed the Albanian frontier. (S/AC.4/PV/27 - Annexe 1, p. 9).

M. Kyrrou, drawing attention to two fresh incidents, described them as characteristic of the "policy of systematic provocation of the Albanian Government which, at the very moment when the Commission is carrying out its investigation, does not hesitate to order its agencies to violate the integrity of Greek territory and to carry off her peaceful citizens." (S/AC.4/128)

24. ALBANIAN COUNTER ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS.

a) ALBANIAN COUNTER-ACCUSATIONS :

In documents submitted to the Security Council and the Commission, the Albanian Government complained of 172 frontier incidents provoked by Greece. (S/AC.4/2, pp. 1-9 and 15-18; S/AC.4/44, pp. 9 & 10; S/AT.4/44A, pp. 1-65; S/AC.4/44B, pp. 1-26; S/AC.4/4, pp. 6-39; S/AC.4/PV.59, pp. 2-5; S/AC.4/189, pp. 17-31; S/AC.4/190; S/AC.4/191, pp. 2-16; S/AC.4/230).

The Albanian Government referred to certain incidents cited by Greece and claimed that the Greek Government was responsible for them.

These counter-accusations are considered in Chapter V of PART II of the present Report.

b) ALBANIAN REFUTATIONS.

The Albanian representatives deny Albanian responsibility for the incidents and for the tense situation prevailing at the frontier, and make the following statements:

(i) The frontier incidents are caused by the Greek Government.

The most important ones were prepared by the Greeks, whose soldiers had received orders to provoke the Albanians whenever possible. These orders are connected with the movement of reinforcements to the frontier posts, the building of shelters, etc. (S/AC.4/PV/15, p.3).

(ii) This is no matter of mere frontier incidents which might have occurred by chance, but rather of a series of successive

provocations caused on the direct initiative of the Greek frontier authorities, acting on orders from a high level. They are real and deliberate incursions, which denote aggressive intentions on the part of the Greeks. (S/AC.4/441, p. 9).

(iii) Albania never had the slightest intention of violating the Greek frontier. Only Greece, who considers herself at war with Albania, has a direct interest in the provocation of incidents.

(iv) Only the Greeks have the technical equipment required for frontier violations by sea and by air.

(v) There is no connection whatever between the allegations of the Greek Government and the facts. They have invented more incidents than really took place. The Greek allegations that Albania provoked frontier incidents are not only shameless mis-statements of fact, but in themselves they constitute provocations. (S/AC.4/PV/12, pp. 17, 18 & 19; S/AC.4/PV/15, pp. 4 & 13; S/AC.4/PV/27; S/AC.4/PV/59, pp. 3, 5 & 8).

(vi) The two Members of an Albanian Commission of Enquiry, as well as the Albanian Liaison Representative, stated that they learned from the Commander of the Greek guerillas in the Grammos district that his own units and not the Albanians, were entirely responsible for the attack, on 3 January 1947, against Greek Frontier Posts Nos. 27, 28 and 30. During this attack one officer and 34 soldiers were taken prisoners.

They also stated that they themselves had seen some Greek soldiers who stated that they were taken prisoners during the guerilla attacks on Posts 27, 28 and 30, and that they had, of their own free will, decided to remain with the guerillas.

Of 109 incidents laid at Albania's door, and 172 of which Greece is accused, Team IA investigated the following :

35. INCIDENTS AT TRESTENIK :

The Albanian Liaison Representative mentioned nine incidents,

as a result of which, he alleged, one Albanian peasant was killed, and one Greek soldier wounded. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/20, pp. 1 and 2).

A document submitted by the Greek Liaison Representative stated that two of these incidents had been caused by Albanian soldiers, and claimed that one Greek civilian and one soldier were wounded. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/20, pp. 1 and 2).

26. INCIDENTS AT TSOLAKIS - PALAMBA :

a) GREEK EVIDENCE.

The Greek witnesses; Lieut-Colonel ATHANATEOS STAMOPOULOS, PHILIPPOS SOURVINOS; IOANNIS KATSARIS, ELIAS LENIS and IOANNIS SAKAS (The evidence of these witnesses is recorded in S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/13), stated, substantially, that the incident occurred when two Greek soldiers, returning to their observation post at the frontier, fell into an ambush in Greek territory, 10 metres inside the frontier. The two soldiers, of whom one was killed and the other wounded, were taken into Albania. The Albanians who had laid this trap were civilians and soldiers. This incident was followed by an exchange of fire between the Greek and Albanian posts. No Greek entered Albanian territory. An old man sent to the Albanian authorities to ask for the return of the two soldiers, was ill-treated and returned after four days, without having obtained an answer.

The Greek Liaison Representative stated in reply to questions that, from what he had been given to understand, the Greek sentries were in no way to blame for the incident. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR.13,p.10).

GHERGIOS CHRISTOYANNIS, a Greek soldier, who had been wounded and captured during the incident, was placed in a camp in Albania; the Albanian Liaison Representative had not caused the soldier to be brought before the Commission, on the pretext that he did not know that the Palamba incident was to be investigated.

b) ALBANIAN EVIDENCE.

A document submitted by the Albanian Liaison Representative (S/AC.4/189, p. 26) stated that Greek soldiers entered Albania and when required to halt opened fire on the Albanian patrol. During the engagement that followed, and in which the Palamba post took part, one Greek soldier was killed and another wounded. The Greeks could not take the body of their dead comrade with them, so they took his weapons. In support of this version, the Albanians present a written statement purporting to have been made by the soldier CHRISTOYANNIS before the Albanian authorities, and in which he says that he and his comrades entered a few metres into Albanian territory where his companion opened fire on the Greek patrol. The statement added that the officers in command of the battalion invited the soldiers to provoke incidents and that this fact was proved by the speed with which the Palamba post went to the assistance of the two soldiers, and opened fire immediately the incident began. The soldiers belonging to the Greek post advanced some 200 - 300 metres into Albania.

23. INCIDENTS AT LIKOJAN : (S/AC.4/SC.2A/29).

a) GREEK EVIDENCE :

In reply to the Albanian allegations concerning the Likojan incidents, the Greek Liaison Representative produced two witnesses, Privates THOMAS STEFANOS and IOANNIS CHARITOS. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/14).

The former stated that on 1 November, 1945, three Albanian soldiers came up to the boundary stone and from there marched toward the Greek post, which was on the opposite slope. The Greek soldiers fired on them and the Albanians withdrew; but one who, had advanced too far, was taken prisoner in Greek territory. An engagement took place between the Greek and Albanian posts, which had been reinforced, and continued until sunrise.

The Greek Liaison Representative stated that the captured Albanian soldier, who was not produced to give evidence, was in a



camp; when requested to leave Greece. he is stated to have refused to do so.

The witness stated that on 3 November, the post was attacked by seventy well-armed men who captured it. They looted it and withdrew after two or three hours.

ICANNIS CHARITOS confirmed that version of the two incidents, and added that during the first, the Albanians were the first to open fire. He was also questioned about an incident on 2 June 1946, and stated that the Albanians attacked the Greek frontier post in the hope of capturing it in a surprise attack. This witness said that he and his comrades were under strict orders not to cross the frontier.

b) ALBANIAN EVIDENCE :

FAIK LAMCHI, an Albanian officer (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR.17, pp. 4 & 5) said that eight incidents, during which the Greeks provoked the Albanians, took place between 21 September 1945 and 2 November 1946. Four of these incidents consisted of firing between Greek and Albanian patrols. The Greek document mentioning one of these incidents, on the other hand, refers to an Albanian ambush in Greek territory.

The incident of 1 November 1945, is stated to have been caused by an attack by 20 Greek soldiers on an Albanian patrol. An Albanian soldier named ARNI SEFERI was wounded, and is said to have been taken away by the attacking forces.

The incident of 2 June 1946, is said to have consisted of an engagement on Albanian soil, following an attack by 15 Greeks on an Albanian patrol. The latter received reinforcements, and the Greeks withdrew to their territory.

The incidents of 11 October and 7 November 1945, are said to be connected with cattle thefts, following which an Albanian farmer was found dead in his field.

MADAN BALIAN (S/AC.4/SC.2A/LR.17, p. 5) stated that on

11 October, 20 or 25 Greek soldiers entered the field of FIEHRAT HUSCO and took him and his cattle away. Three months later, FIEHRAT HUSCO's body was found in his field.

HAHRI KORO (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/17, p. 6) claimed that he was attacked at night in his field by Greek soldiers. He confirmed the Albanian version of the incident of 1 November 1945.

The Albanian Liaison Representative produced written statements in confirmation of the Albanian version (S/AC.4/SC.2A/29' Add.1, pp. 1-5).

29. INCIDENTS AT SKIPI (KAFALIA-RADAT) (S/AC.4/17, p.19; S/AC.4/189, pp. 21 et seq).

a) INTRODUCTION.

This incident took place at Frontier Post No. 13 of Skipi, on 7 July 1946, and is described by both parties as the most serious of all those that took place on the Greco-Albanian frontier in 1945-46. Team IA decided to limit the witnesses to 2 for either side.

b) GREEK EVIDENCE. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR.20, pp. 1, 2, 3, 4).

SGT. EVANGELOS KONTOGEORGIOS stated that, on 7 July 1946, the post that he commanded was attacked by some 40 Albanian soldiers, among whom were also a few Greeks. Two of these - GEORGE YOTARIS and DONSTANTINOS MANDALIS were taken prisoners. One Albanian was wounded and taken away by his comrades. The witness himself was wounded, but was able to hide in a field while the Albanians were masters of the post and were pillaging it. That same evening the Greeks regained possession of the post without fighting. According to the witness, four similar attacks had already taken place in April and May, 1946.

Private ALEXIS DALAGEORGIOS stated that on 1 July he was on duty at a neighbouring post, when he saw 5 or 6 Albanians firing on Skipi and then crossing the frontier into Greece. This firing went on for 4 hours. During that time, it also spread to the neighbouring post.

The Greek Liaison Representative assumed that this attack was intended to cover the entry into Greece of 25 bandits, who entered the country in the neighbourhood of another post. By way of material evidence he produced some shell cases, chiefly of Russian origin, and the wounded Albanian's cap, which he said were found on the spot after the Greeks re-occupied the post. The Yugoslave Representative observed that the cap badge depicted a six-pointed star, while the Albanian Army badge is a five-pointed star.

According to Greek documents, repeated requests from the Greek Sector Commander to his Albanian colleague, for the return of the prisoners, remained unanswered.

c) ALBANIAN EVIDENCE.

TRAMIS NIKOLAOS (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/20, pp. 4 & 5) stated that on 7 July 1946, he was in command of an Albanian Company in the Skipi district. He said that the incident of 7 July had been preceded by a series of provocations on 25 June and on 2, 4 and 5 July 1946. On these dates, Greek civilians were forced to enter Albanian territory to cut the crops, under cover of Greek mortar and machine-gun fire. On 7 July, the Greeks set fire to a field close to the Albanian frontier post. During the fighting that ensued one Greek soldier was wounded and another taken prisoner. One Albanian soldier was killed. The fighting took place on Albanian soil.

The Liaison Representative drew attention to the fact that the Greek soldier supposedly killed in Albanian territory was SERGEANT KONTOGEORGIOS who had testified in the course of the same meeting.

PRIVATE MESTAN RAMANDAN (S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV/21, pp. 1, 2, 3. & 4), confirmed the fact that the incident of 7 July had been prepared about ten days in advance and had been preceded by Greek provocations

He related, as did the preceding witness, the incident of 7 July.

The Greek Private GEORGES YOTAKIS (S/AC.4/44, pp. 35, 36, 37), having been made prisoner during the incident and detained in Albania was not present before the Commission. However the Albanian representative made great play with a written declaration in which Private YOTAKIS was supposed to confirm the Albanian presentation of the Skipl incidents and to declare notably: "Propaganda against Albanian partisans was very strong in that unit; we also had to try to upset the system existing in Albania.

On no account were we to leave the region in peace - we had to create disturbances .... Our orders were to keep on finding new pretexts to provoke the Albanians .... The following day, after having opened fire, we commenced our advance into Albanian territory .... We continued to penetrate into Albanian territory under the threat of being shot by our officers and other royalists .... I was wounded and could not retreat so I was captured in Albanian territory. Near me Corporal EVANGELOS KONDOJORGOS and a soldier whose name I do not know were killed. A little earlier an Albanian corporal had been killed ... I feel that the army to which I belonged is no different from the armies of Hitler and Mussolini. Now I understand why in that army the men who fought for liberty and democracy against the armies of occupation are persecuted by the present Greek authorities ... The content of my declaration is such that even a small child could understand how much I regret having been myself also a tool of the monarcho-Fascists and an enemy of the people who are striving for liberty."

SECTION B : CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA: AND COUNTER-  
ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS BY BULGARIA.

30. GREEK CHARGES AGAINST BULGARIA :

In a memorandum (S/AC.4/I, pages 59, 62 and 63), presented by the Greek Representative to the Security Council, five incidents are mentioned for which the Bulgarian Government is alleged to be

responsible, and, in a letter from His Excellency Mr. Dendremis, of 2 January 1947, mention is made of flights over Greek territory.

GWB II mentions 32 frontier incidents which took place between 1 January and 31 December 1946. Among these are included the 5 incidents mentioned in the above Memorandum.

These incidents fall mainly into the following categories :

- a) Exchanges of firing between Bulgarian and Greek patrols, shots fired against Greek frontier posts;
- b) Attacks against Greek localities, units and frontier posts (the incidents concerning the passage of armed gangs or guerilla attacks are dealt with in Chapter I);
- c) Thefts of sheep and wood; raids on Greek villages; provocations by songs, shouts, throwing of explosives etc;
- d) Clandestine attempts at crossing the frontier by unknown individuals.

According to the Greek document, two Greek shepherds and "several Turks" are said to have been kidnapped. Eleven Greek soldiers are said to have been killed and thirteen wounded in the course of engagements, either with guerilla bands, or with Bulgarian patrols. (S/AC.4/17, p. 31-36).

After recalling the Greek accusation (S/AC.4/18, p. 1), which led the Security Council to form the Commission of Enquiry, an accusation according to which "the disturbances have been inspired, provoked or encouraged from outside," M. Kyrrou, the Greek Representative, invited the Commission to proceed without delay to an investigation on the spot.

Having set forth the three phases of a plan (S/AC.4/18, pp. 5 & 6) which, according to him, was intended to lead to the conquest by Bulgaria of Western Thrace, and having recapitulated the various proofs presented on the Greek side (S/AC.4/18, p. 6), M. Kyrrou presented the White Book (S/AC.4/18, p. 6) and referred the matter to the investigation of the Commission on the spot (S/AC.4/18, p. 6).

In his reply to a statement made by the Bulgarian Liaison Representative (S/AC.4/PV.27 Annex I), M. Kyrrou showed that Greece "has no aggressive plans against her neighbours" (S/AC.4/PV.27 - Annex I, p. 3) and that the southward movement of Greek frontier posts (S/AC.4/PV.27 Annex I, p. 6) does not coincide with the Bulgarian Liaison Representative's statement that the Bulgarian frontier was continually being violated by Greek soldiers. (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 15) These incidents had been brought before the United Nations because the three representations sent to the Allied Control Commission at Sofia had not been followed up. (S/AC.1/ pp. 134, 138, 170, 181).

Although diplomatic relations had not yet been re-established between the two countries, the Greek Liaison Representative emphasised the fact that Greece had kept scrupulously to the spirit of the special military arrangement, signed with Bulgaria in 1931. The Greek Liaison Representative attributed the discontinuance of the operation of this arrangement in the spring of 1941 to the presence of German military personnel on the frontier between Bulgaria and Greece. (S/AC.4/PV.27/PG).

Finally, in various letters, M. Kyrrou pointed out two new incidents and the crossing of two "gangs" from Greece into Bulgaria, and he asked the Commission to look into these matters.

### 31. BULGARIAN COUNTER ACCUSATIONS AND REFUTATIONS.

#### a) BULGARIAN COUNTER ACCUSATIONS :

Before the Security Council as well as before the Commission the Bulgarian Government imputed the responsibility to Greece for the numerous frontier incidents which had taken place, as much in Greece as in Bulgaria. (S/AC.4/PV.10, pp. 12, 15; S/AC.4/96 and S/AC.4/24a, p. 7, Annexes 3, 4 & 5). The Bulgarian Liaison Representative declared that "the Bulgarian Government had 24 times running informed the Allied Control Commission of incidents on the Greco-Bulgarian frontier." (S/AC.4/24a, p. 3).

As to the incidents brought up in the GWB II, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative considered that most of these incidents were not of a political character, and that they were almost all provoked by the Greeks. (S/AC.4/PV.10, pp. 13, 15; S/AC.4/24a, pp. 2, 6 and 7).

The Greeks had often done nothing to bring these incidents to the knowledge of the Allied Control Commission at Sofia. (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 15).

These counter-accusations are examined in chapter VI of the present report.

b) BULGARIAN DEFECTIONS.

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative pointed out the trivial nature of the accusations made against Bulgaria. (S /PV.84, p. 32; S/AC.4/PV.10, pp. 13 & 14; S/AC.4/96, 144, 148, & 154). He mentioned the fact that partisans control the Greek territory in the frontier region (S/PV.84, p. 36; S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 14), that Bulgaria is at present under the Allied Control Commission of Sofia (S/PV.84, p. 37; S/AC.4/PV.10, pp. 15 & 16), and that incidents take place throughout Greek territory (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 3 S/AC.4/24a, p. 1). He added that "in the regions bordering the Greco-Bulgarian frontier there reigns as a general rule, a state of order and calm, and that during the last two years no large-scale incidents have been noted. (S/AC.4/24 A/ p. 2).

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative attributed to the Greek Government the responsibility for the discontinuance of the Agreement of 1931, abandoned in 1941. The Greek Government was said to have failed to reply to a letter proposing the meeting of a mixed Commission for the renewal of the Agreement. (S/AC.4/24a, S/AC.4/24g).

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative added that "the origin of the disturbances in Greece has nothing to do with the frontiers and frontier incidents" (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 12). and he concludes

that Bulgaria has no part in these disturbances and denies the Greek accusations. (S/PV.84, p. 41; S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 200. Taking up the arguments already presented before the Security Council the Bulgarian Liaison Representative considered that Bulgaria was the country which had the right to complain about the numerous frontier incidents provoked by Greek nationals. (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 15; S/AC.4/96); he wondered at the rarity of Greek appeals to the Allied Control Commission at Sofia (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 16). He considered the testimony of the White Book to be false and rejected the Greek accusations made against his country (S/AC.4/PV.10, pp. 17, 17 bis, 18).

31 A. INCIDENTS INVESTIGATED.

The incidents of PROSSOTCHANI, KORIMVOS and METAXADES were investigated by group "D" (S/AC.4/PV.10, p. 20; S/AC.4/24a, p. 2).

According to the Greek Liaison Representative the Prossotchani incident consisted in the crossing of the frontier by a group of men, pursued by Greek troops (see Chapter I-B above).

The incidents of Korimvos and Metaxades concerned the activity of gangs who, according to the Greek Liaison Representative had their base in Bulgarian territory (See Chapter I).

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative declared that only refugees had passed from Greece into Bulgaria, where they were interned. He denied that guerillas had ever crossed the frontier.

Witnesses for both parties were heard. (See Chapter I).



SECTION C: CHARGES AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA: YUGOSLAV REFUTATIONS

32. GENERAL CHARGES

(a) GENERAL CHARGES BY GREECE

The Greek Government submitted a White Book on incidents on the Greek frontier from 1 January to 31 December 1946, (cited as GWB II) which listed more than 40 incidents on the Greco-Yugoslav frontier (pp. 45-58). During the course of its work, the Commission made an investigation in the areas where they occurred, of 3 incidents on the Greco-Yugoslav frontier at Sourmena, Skra and Idhomeni. These enquiries were made at the request of the Greek Liaison Representative who believed that the incidents there illustrated "the freedom the bandits enjoyed in entering and leaving Yugoslav territory, and their co-operation with the Yugoslav military authorities".

(b) GENERAL REFUTATIONS BY YUGOSLAVIA

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative declared that the Greek accusations as to the Yugoslav complicity in frontier incidents were unfounded. He stated that the frontier was insufficiently guarded by the Greek authorities, that many frontier posts were withdrawn in July and August 1946 and that some sections of the frontier, therefore, were unguarded. The alleged incidents had taken place, he said, primarily in the unguarded sections of the frontier, and the absence of guards deprived the Greek authorities of the possibility of knowing the exact situation on the frontier (S/AC.4/PV/24, p. 8).

34. THE SURMENA INCIDENTS

(a) GREEK EVIDENCE

The Commission investigated the Surmena incident on the spot, on 15-16 March 1947 (S/AC.4/241). The Greek Liaison Representative submitted memoranda to the Commission (S/AC.4/146) listing 9 incidents which had allegedly occurred in the Surmena area between 20 September 1946 and 13 January 1947. According to the Greek charge, in the case of the incident at Surmena, 20 September 1947, Greek forces pursuing guerillas were fired upon with automatics near the frontier and the ensuing fight lasted some four hours. The firing, it was charged, came both from the Yugoslav frontier post and from positions on the border or somewhat south. It was alleged that the guerillas withdrew into Yugoslav territory.

BRIGADIER KINELLOPOULOS submitted the Greek version of the events of 20 September, explaining the situation on the ground and adding that there were 5 infantry companies and 200 to 300 guerillas (S/AC.4/57B/pp. 2-5).

CAPTAIN GEORGIOS NIKITAS testified that he commanded the fourth company and participated in the operations on 20 September 1946 against the guerillas and that from his company a soldier had been taken prisoner and abducted by guerillas into Yugoslav territory. He also stated that the guerillas went to Yugoslavia and that he based his statement on the supposition that the guerilla unit had no other escape than into Yugoslavia and "on the story of the men who were captured and on that of the soldier who was taken prisoner by the bandits and was subsequently liberated". He added "I saw them (the guerillas) with my binoculars in front of the Yugoslav frontier post" (S/AC.4/PV/57-B p.12). Nikitas ordered Lieutenant Berovolis to follow the crest of the mountain and attack the guerillas from the rear, to cut off the retreat into Yugoslavia (ibid 5-18).

One of the soldiers, Perikles Soumnis, told him that the

Yugoslav soldier in the frontier post had enquired whether the men were partisans and motioned for them to enter Yugoslavia. When the contrary was indicated, they were told to leave. Berovalis said he took a soldier, Balis, who spoke Serb, to the frontier, and noted eight Yugoslav soldiers, 7 crouched behind rocks with arms pointed in his direction. The Yugoslavs asked them to withdraw, although the Greeks were on Greek territory.

LIEUTENANT BEROVALIS testified that he saw how guerrillas crossed the frontier from Yugoslavia into Greece, that when he was 30 metres from the frontier he was fired on from Yugoslav territory by sub-machine guns and hand grenades. No casualties resulted, though the barrel of a Greek machine was destroyed by a hand grenade. He admitted that in reply to the shooting from Yugoslav territory, he gave the order to fire, though it was contrary to orders and he had received a reprimand for doing so (S/AC.4/PV/57B pp. 19-26).

PRIVATE SOTIRIOS BALIS testified that his company had been ordered to follow the frontier line to take the bandits from the rear. He confirmed that the Yugoslav frontier soldier had enquired whether the troops were partisans, and being told that they were Greek soldiers, advised them to withdraw from the frontier area.

He said that "fire came from the Yugoslav side. It could have come from Greeks in Yugoslavia, but it was certainly from the Yugoslavs with whom we had spoken a few minutes before because the shots came from that direction" (S/AC.4/PV/57-B p.36).

As an annex to the Greek memorandum regarding this incident, there is reproduced a letter dated 25 September 1946 addressed by Brigadier Kanelloupioulos to his Yugoslav colleague requesting a meeting on the frontier in accordance with the border convention in operation between Yugoslavia and Greece before the war. The Yugoslav Liaison Representative contended that in the opinion of his Government such communications should only be exchanged through diplomatic channels. He asserted that "we have answered every note and we have notified that this was a provocation and that the answer has been given to this letter" (S/AC.4/PV/57-B pp. 31-32).

EUTHIMIADES SAVAS testified that he was in the village of Sourmont when it was attacked by guerrillas on 5 November 1946. He stated that the guerrillas left the village in three directions, all towards Mt. Beles on the Greco-Yugoslav frontier (S/LC.4/PV/57-A pp. 3-12).

MAJOR CHRISTOS KONTASIS testified that on 19 November 1946 guerrillas attacked the gendarmerie at Mouris Station and after setting buildings on fire and killing four civilians, retreated towards Mt. Beles on the Yugoslav frontier. He added that he knew that because his unit pursued the guerrillas to Summit 1686 near the Yugoslav frontier. He also stated that "a dead bandit wearing a Serbian cap was found. He was a captain, trained at Bulkes". (S/AC.4/PV/57-A pp. 13-15).

#### (b) YUGOSLAV EVIDENCE

In rejecting the Greek Government's accusation that Yugoslav soldiers had supported with fire a retreating group of guerrillas who had attacked the village of Sourmont on 16 September 1946, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative referred to an order issued by the Staff of the Third Greek Army Corps of 22 September 1946, which was published in ELLIKON IMA stating that "the mapping-up operations on the morning of the 20th September which have been undertaken against the anarchist bands in the triangle Doiran have ended, with flight of the groups in the direction of the Yugoslav frontier. The early published figures as regards casualties have been exaggerated. The

frontier troops did not open fire on the Greek units" (S/AC.4/PV/24 p. 14). The Yugoslav Liaison Representative charged that the assertions in the memoranda of Mr. Tsaldaris, presented to the Security Council, were not only unfounded, but were inventions (S/AC.4/PV/24 p. 16), and pointed out that in an interview published in the London TIMES, 14 August 1946, Mr. Tsaldaris had indicated that "the disturbances in Northern Greece were the internal affair of Greece which in no way concerned the relations between Yugoslavia and Greece" (ibid., p. 16).

Concerning the SURMENI incident, the Commission interrogated the Yugoslav soldier, KRSTO TODOROV IORDANOVSKY, who stated that on 20 September 1946, he was on sentry duty as a frontier guard and saw a Greek officer with one star approach the frontier line, together with some 40 soldiers. This officer asked permission to cross the frontier into Yugoslav territory with his soldiers in order to attack from the rear a guerilla group which was on Greek territory. Iordanovsky refused to permit the Greek platoon to cross the frontier. He also stated that there was no clash or shooting affray between Yugoslav and Greek soldiers on 20 September 1946, although he heard firing on Greek territory at a great distance from the frontier, which came nearer and then ceased at a distance of 1.5 kilometres from the frontier on Greek territory. Iordanovsky declared that, in the sector which he was guarding, nobody had crossed the frontier in either direction while he was on duty at the post (S/AC.4/PV/57-C pp. 3-10). Another Yugoslav soldier, GEORGE STOYANOV ILIEVSKY, confirmed the testimony of his comrade, stating that neither Yugoslavs nor Greeks had fired on each other on 20 September 1946 (S/AC.4/PV/57-C pp. 11-12).

As to the statement of the Greek LIEUTENANT BEROVALIS, concerning the Surmeni incident, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative said that his Government had received a long protest from the Greek Government, which had contained no mention of the fact that Greek troops had fired on the Yugoslav frontier post (S/AC.4/PV/57-B p. 25).

#### 34. THE SKRA INCIDENTS

##### (a) GREEK EVIDENCE

According to the Greek White Book, on 13 November 1946, at 4.00 a.m. a large group of guerillas coming from Yugoslavia and from Mt. Paikon attacked the Greek company in the village of Skra. The Commission heard an expose of the Skra incident from ERIGADIER IOANNIS who stated that on 13 November 1946 guerillas numbering about 700 attacked the village of Skra. As a result of the fight, some guerillas fled to Yugoslavia taking with them their wounded. In Skra, the battle lasted from 4.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. While it raged, the bandits were alleged to have burned some 150 houses out of 170, and to have killed 19 soldiers and 55 civilians (S/AC.4/PV/57-E pp.2-8).

LIEUTENANT GEORGIOS HOURIS, who, as commander of the Skra company, took part in the action, testified that many mortars were used in the attack. He expressed his belief that the guerilla attack was well organized and he personally supposed that it was organized by Yugoslav officers. Although he saw no Yugoslav soldiers in the engagement, he indicated that he did see men in Yugoslav uniforms (S/AC.4/PV/57-F pp. 2-7). GEORGIOS ANDRIADES, a peasant from the village of Emilio, some ten kilometres from Skra, testified that he heard the engagement from Skra from the summit of the Ravine height, near his village. Between 9.00 a.m. and 10.00 a.m. on 13 November 1946, he said that he saw a large group of armed men, women and children, cows and sheep, about 500 metres away, on Yugoslav territory, moving from the frontier in the direction of Muin, but he did not see them as they had crossed the frontier. Nevertheless, he insisted that "they came from Greek territory and descended

into Yugoslav territory. I saw them with my own eyes" (S/AC.4/PV/57-F pp. 3-13). ANASTASIAS TSEMBIS, a peasant, said that he was in the village of SKRA on 13 or 14 November 1946, during the attack, and that he was taken from the village by the guerrillas and was with them for four days, on Greek territory in the region of the Greek frontier post no. 83. He declared that he was told by Kapetan Dimtsis, the guerrilla commander, about the latter's telephone conversation from the Yugoslav frontier post with the town of Skoplje, in which the order was received that the women, old men and children were to be sent across into Yugoslavia and the men from 18-50 years of age were to be left in the guerrilla detachments in Greece. The witness himself did not hear the telephone conversation and did not cross the frontier (S/AC.4/PV/57-G pp. 1-17).

#### (b) YUGOSLAV EVIDENCE

Concerning the SKRA incident, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative expressed doubts regarding the evidence presented by the witness Georgios Andriades, asserting that the distance between the "Ravina" height and the point where he saw the column of people on Yugoslav territory was 7 kilometres (S/AC.4/PV/57-F pp. 8-13).

### 35. IDHOMENI INCIDENT

#### (a) GREEK EVIDENCE

On 30 March 1947, the Commission investigated on the spot the Idhomeni incident (S/AC.4/PV/57-H). According to the memorandum previously submitted by the Greek Liaison Representative (S/AC.4/146) "a band of piston strength" had entered Greek territory from Yugoslavia on the night of 2/3 July 1946 and attacked the gendarmerie station of IDHOMENI, a Greek village situated only a few hundred yards from the frontier. After the attack the band is said to have withdrawn into Yugoslav territory, making use of the services of two inhabitants of the village for the transport of their wounded across the frontier. The Commission's investigation was carried out from the small height on which the Greek frontier post no. 88 (not occupied since the incident) is situated. The Greek BRIGADIER IOANNIS gave a short summary of the incident.

The Commission first heard as witness the Greek sentry IONNIS GIOUMOURTAZOGLOU, who was on duty at frontier post no. 88 on the night of 2/3 July between 10.00 p.m. and midnight, when he heard a body of men moving on the Yugoslav side of the frontier, and being halted by the Yugoslav sentry, who was some 150 metres away, by the call "STCW". He commented to his fellow sentry on the apparent size of the supposed patrol, which he estimated to be about 30 men; but as nothing further occurred until their watch ended at midnight, the pair of sentries then came off duty. About a quarter of an hour later, firing was heard coming from IDHOMENI; the guard of 12 was called out and remained in trenches round the frontier post for the remainder of the night. He was closely questioned as to whether he had seen guerrillas cross the frontier with his own eyes. He said that, although he had not seen persons actually cross the frontier, he had seen in the dark a body of men close up against the frontier and assumed these were the guerrillas who carried out the attack on the IDHOMENI gendarmerie station. CONSTANTINOS TSALKIROPOULOS was next heard. He stated that "Andartes" had knocked at his door between 1 and 2 a.m., had forced him and his shepherd IOANNIS GHIKOURIS who lived in the same house, to take two donkeys (or mules) and to load two wounded guerrillas on them. Accompanying the "Andartes" they then passed 300-500 metres west of the Greek frontier post no. 88 and turned down a shallow ravine some 200-300 metres beyond the Yugoslav look-out post, crossing the Yugoslav frontier with the Andartes to a field where the wounded men were unloaded from the donkeys, and where two men, alleged to be Yugoslav soldiers, were waiting. The

The route followed was pointed out on the ground to members of the Commission. On reaching the field, the andartes asked TSAKIROPOULOS and GHIKLOUDIS whether they wished to join them and become andartes. They refused, and on being warned under threat of death, not to tell anyone what had occurred, TSAKIROPOULOS and GHIKLOUDIS were released and returned to the village. TSAKIROPOULOS also testified to an exchange of words between the guerillas and one of the Yugoslav soldiers. Finally, the witness GHIKLOUDIS was heard and stated that he had also entered Yugoslav territory in the same circumstances and had encountered persons whom he believed to be Yugoslav soldiers.

(b) YUGOSLAV EVIDENCE

In connection with the testimony of the witness heard regarding the IDHOMENI incident, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative pointed out that while in GWB II (p.47) the band was described as being of 15 men, the witness estimated the number as between 30 and 50 men. The number, he alleged, had since been increased in order to attach more importance to the incident. The Yugoslav Liaison Representative also considered that the sentry could not, as he stated, have heard the word "Stoy" for the first time on the night of the incident, since this challenge was in normal use by Yugoslav sentries throughout the night (S/LC.4/PV/57-H p. 5). He entertained doubts as to whether the sentry Gioumourtaoglou had ever served on the frontier at all. Other criticisms were that (a) it was surprising that the Greek frontier guards had not taken other measures to prevent persons coming into Greece from Yugoslavia than merely to remain on the alert, and (b) the fact that when the witness Ghikoudis was asked to give his statement under oath, he replied "I cannot do it" (ibid. pp.25-26). It was also pointed out that the sentry Gioumourtaoglou had not actually seen guerillas cross the frontier with his own eyes (ibid. pp.8-10).

CHAPTER IV: ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTIONS  
THAT THE PRESENT GREEK REGIME IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A STATE OF  
CIVIL WAR IN GREECE AND FOR THE DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTHERN  
DISTRICTS OF THAT COUNTRY: AND GREEK REPUTATIONS.

SECTION A: CHARGES THAT A STATE OF CIVIL WAR EXISTS THROUGHOUT  
THE WHOLE TERRITORY OF GREECE AND NOT ONLY IN THE NORTHERN  
DISTRICTS OF THE COUNTRY: AND GREEK REPUTATIONS.

36 ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CHARGES

In their statements before the Commission in Athens in February 1947, the Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia asserted in opposition to the Greek accusations, that the present Greek regime was directly responsible for a civil war in Greece and for the disturbances in the northern districts of the country. The Representatives of the above-mentioned countries drew the attention of the Commission to the fact that civil war was taking place not only in the northern districts of the country but also in districts situated hundreds of kilometres from the frontier. (S/AC.4/PV 10, 12-13, 15, 16, 18, 20-24).

In support of this argument the Bulgarian Liaison Representative submitted a list of battles and clashes between Government troops and guerillas, based on the official communiques of the Greek Ministry of Public Order published in the newspaper "Kritimerini" (S/AC.4/24M). The list mentions 922 armed clashes which took place in the period from 1 June - 31 December 1946. It appears from this list that guerilla actions took place in 31 Greek prefectures, namely, Argolide-Korinthia, Arkadia, Ait., Attika-Brochia, Achaia, Drama, Irawlion, Kavalla, Karkyra, Kefalonia, Kilkis, Kozani, Salonica, Serres, Trikkala, Florina, Elassiotis-Fokis, Khalkidiki, Xanthi, Eubea, Evros, Aetolic-Akarnania, Yania.

Annexed to the memorandum submitted to the Commission by the Central Committee of EAM are three maps, based on the official communiques of the Ministry of Public Order, showing that guerilla warfare is taking place in many different districts of Greece. According to the appended list the guerilla clashes with Government troops and gendarmerie are distributed in the following manner: of 1,038 armed clashes that took place between 22 June and 31 December 1946, 6 occurred in the Ionian islands, 107 in Peloponnesus, 66 in Sterea Ellas, 317 in Thessaly, 44 in Epirus, 499 in Western Macedonia, 54 in Khalkidiki, 112 in Central Macedonia, 10 in Eastern Macedonia, 101 in Thrace and 19 in the Aegean provinces (S/AC.4/56, Annex 24, Part "D", p.4).

The Greek press reported that on 14 February 1946 guerillas captured the town of Sparta (Peloponnesus) and held it for several hours, liberating 200 political prisoners. (EAM Bulletin, 15 February 1947).

Interrogated by Team 2 at Katerini, VASIOLOS DAMBASIS stated that all the former Governments contributed to the guerilla movement, particularly the Populist Government after 31 March, and that this movement existed throughout Greece (S/AC.4/SC.3/12, p.4).

At the same meeting of the Team the Greek Representative stated that the first action by the guerillas took place at Litchori (situated approximately 150 kilometres from Greece's frontier). (S/AC.4/SC.3/12, p.4).

Team 1 which went to investigate the district of Agoriani, near Demokos (south-west Thessaly), met guerillas in this neighbourhood. According to the statements of witnesses who were heard by the Team at Agoriani, there is a guerilla district in this locality. The witness Terzoglou, "commander of the democratic army" of the guerilla district of Agrafa, (Southern Thessaly), interrogated by Team 1 at Agoriani, stated that all the guerillas under his command came "from the district of Thessaly and the interior part of Thessaly and therefore they could not have direct information regarding frontier incidents. I know that nobody from Thessaly went to neighbouring countries. All who were persecuted in Thessaly fled into the hills...." (S/AC.4/SC.2/4/PV/25, p.16).

Lilis, referring to the causes of the civil war in Greece stated:

"The internal tragedy of Greece is entirely an internal matter and has nothing in common with other countries. These disorders are stirred up by the British". (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/15, p.17).

On 28 March 1947 the Soviet Delegate sent a letter to the Commission reporting that the Representatives of the Soviet and Polish Delegations, and also the Representatives of the three countries concerned had met General Markos, the Commander-in-Chief of the Greek Democratic Army at his headquarters in the village of Krisomilia (district of Trikkala, Thessaly).

NOTE: The U.K. Delegation did not agree to this paragraph being inserted in the report.

### 37. GREEK REFUTATIONS

In his initial statement before the Commission on 3 February 1947, the Greek Liaison Representative stated that "this phase is marked by an attempt to efface and so far as possible to destroy the evidence and, secondly, an attempt to transpose guerilla activities southward with the object of proving to your Commission that there is a state of civil war throughout Greece that has nothing to do with our northern neighbours," (S/AC.4/18, p.5).

The analysis of armed clashes quoted by the Bulgarian Representative (S/AC.4/24M) and based on communiques of the Greek Ministry of Public Order listed between 1 June and 31 October 1946, 628 incidents in the northern frontier provinces of Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, 163 in the adjacent province of Thessaly and 141 incidents in the remainder of Greece.

Several Greek Government witnesses who were interrogated by the Commission at Salonika stated that the guerilla warfare in Greece was receiving support from neighbouring countries. Among others these were Efstathios, Valtadoros (S/AC.4/PV.16, p.12) Hristos, Mantzurakis.

page 105

(S/AC.4/PV.48) TESTIMONY OF TESTERCKLIS (S/AC.4/PV.45, p.21) AND  
LACARUS TSAUSTIS (S/AC.4/PV.48, p.16). THE TESTIMONY OF THESE  
WITNESSES IS SET OUT IN CHAPTER I.

SECTION B: CHARGES OF PERSECUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC FORCES IN  
GREECE BY THE GENDARMERIE, REGULAR TROOPS AND RIGHTWING BANDS:  
AND GREEK REFUTATIONS.

38 ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CHARGES

The Liaison Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia assert that a civil war was brought about in Greece by terrorism of the gendarmerie, the regular army and Rightwing bands supported by the Greek authorities. (S/AC.4/PV.10-24). This terror, which began after the Varkiza Agreement of 12 February 1945 and was greatly intensified after the elections of 31 March 1946, obliged the democratic elements to seek refuge in the hills. The Liaison Representatives of the above-mentioned countries also asserted that the present Greek regime, in spite of the Varkiza Agreement, had failed to purge the Government apparatus, the army and gendarmerie of collaborators who, instead of being arrested, continued to occupy important places in the Government organs and in Parliament, and were persecuting the democratic elements.

In support of this statement the Yugoslav Liaison Representative gave details concerning the presence in Greek Government organs and in the army of a considerable number of persons, who, he alleged to be collaborators (General Spiliotopoulos, Kostopoulos, Chief of Police Evert, Gonatas and others). (S/AC.4/45, pp.4-6) Annexes III, IIIa, IV, V and VI).

Attached to the memorandum submitted to the Commission by the Central Committee of EAM there is also a list of persons who are said to have been collaborationists who continue to occupy high posts (Teotokis, Kakaras, Vcusikidis and others). Furthermore, the Commission was given a list of 1300 Greek officers



alleged to have served in Quisling units and now in the service of the Greek Government. (S/AC.4/56 Annex 11a.) A list was also given of officers at present in the Greek gendarmerie who were alleged to have served in the Quisling gendarmerie during the war and to have been decorated for bravery (S/AC.4/56, Annex 11b).

The Representative of the Central Committee of EAM, referring to the causes of the civil war in Greece, declared:

"The disturbances are exclusively due to internal causes. These disturbances are taking place throughout the whole continental territory of the country and are even affecting the islands. This disorder is due to the fact that for two years the Government has been doing everything in its power to stifle the will of the people, and on the other hand the people replied to this with resolute resistance....." (S/AC.4/56, pp.4-5).

A statement in this sense was made by the General Secretary of the Socialist Party, Elie Tsirimokos;

"The disturbances which are taking place throughout the country are the result of internal causes and were not brought about by one neighbouring or any other country." (S/AC.4/PV30 - Annex).

The Representative of the Left Liberal Party, General Grigoriadis, stated that the tense situation in Greece was explained by internal and not external causes.

"In August 1945 we realised that the persecution of democracy would plunge the Greek people into despair and would lead to fatal results.... We declare that the assertions of the Rightists that the rebels are coming into Greece from abroad are false from beginning to end, because the guerillas are operating not only in Macedonia but also in Thessaly, throughout the whole of continental Greece, in Peloponnesus and in the islands of Kefalonia and Mytilene...." (P/AC.4/PV/31, Annex 1, p.3)

The Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia declared that the gendarmerie, the regular troops and the Rightist bands, supported by the Greek authorities, began immediately after the conclusion of the Varkiza Agreement of 12 February 1945 to annihilate the democratic elements of the country by means of punitive expeditions, mass arrests, and the murdering and beating of democratically-minded citizens. (S/AC.4/PV/10-24).

A number of witnesses testified concerning persecution and terrorism by the gendarmerie, Rightist bands and the regular army:--

a) LULIS, the representative of the Central Committee of Political Exiles, interrogated at the concentration camp on the island of Ikaria, reported that there were 1,500 exiles in the camp, coming from all parts of Greece. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV15, p.18).

b) GEORGE SKEMBIS, MARIA FALAINA, PARASKEVI PAPADOPOULO, THEODORE IKONOINOI, GEORGIA MANDALOVA, CONSTANIDA TEODOROPoulos, NIKOS DORAS, ELIAS MAKRIS and others interrogated at Agoriani gave evidence of terrorism by the gendarmerie and Rightwing bands, which they said took the form of murders, and the plundering and burning of the houses of democratically-minded citizens. On behalf of the inhabitants of their villages these witnesses presented memoranda regarding the terrorism practised by the Rightist bands and the gendarmerie. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/25/pp.25-45).

c) ZOGAS, commander of a guerilla cavalry squadron, stated: "Surlas' bands, gendarmes and some officers who were in the German army during the occupation are together killing, plundering and ruining Greece." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/25, p.23).

Witnesses interrogated on the island of Ikaria stated that as a result of cruel persecution by Government organisations thousands of Greeks were obliged to take refuge in the hills and that the terrorism on the part of the gendarmerie, the army and the Rightwing bands was the main cause of the civil war

(Nicholas Terjopoulos - a member of the Agrarian Party), Panafotis Konstantinopoulos - a member of the Demo - (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/15, 18 ff ).

The memorandum of Markos, Commander-in-Chief of the Greek Democratic Army states that in the district of Agrafa during the period from April 12, 1945 to the end of 1946, sixty-five villages were attacked by the army, the gendarmerie and the Rightist bands. According to this memorandum 1,184 attacks were made on the above-mentioned villages, 2,381 persons were subjected to beatings and indignities, and a considerable number of houses were destroyed. (S/AC.4/177).

The U.K. Delegation does not agree to this paragraph being inserted in the report.

Several witnesses stated that the Greek authorities compelled them to vote for the monarchy and that the persecutions and terrorism were the main causes obliging thousands of persons to flee to the hills or to escape from Greece into Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania:-

a) ELEFTHERIOS SAVVINIDIS stated that he had heard how people of his village who went to a neighbouring village to vote were killed and how a certain Captain Georgis, who had previously served in the Gestapo, "Terrorized the population in order to oblige them to vote for the King." (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV(I), pp. 9-10).

ALEXANDRIDON SCFIA of the village of Kristoka, near Kilkis. (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV(I)), STAVRIDU ARGIRULA (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/2, pp.1-9), LAMBROS (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV3, pp. 1-8\* and others heard by Team "C" at Salonica; APOSTCLOS VITANIOTIS, TSENGOS, JEAN-BATIS (S/AC.4/SV.7/PV/3 and 4); DJORDJ ATANASOV and KOSMOS KROMSEKBI

(S/AC.4/PV/71) also gave evidence concerning terrorism and persecution by the gendarmerie, the regular army and Rightist bands operating against the democratically-minded elements and they stated that this terrorism had particularly increased since the elections.

b) TRIANDAPHILLIDIS KOSTADINIS stated that he was forced to flee to Bulgaria as a result of cruel persecutions on the part of the Greek authorities. (S/AC.4/PV/63, pp. 5-6).

c) MORANZAKOS DIMITRIOS stated that he was compelled to vote for the monarchy:

"During the plebiscite I was tortured by gendarmes. They put me in a cart and compelled me to vote... One gendarme and one hitos were at the polling station. They took all the information, entered it in the books containing the results of the voting and thus it came about that everybody voted for the King..." (S/AC.4/PV/63, pp. 14-17 and 24).

The Liaison Representative of Yugoslavia submitted to the Commission a memorandum on behalf of 420 refugees from the village of Notia, who are at present living in the village of Grusevo in Yugoslavia. The memorandum stated that they were obliged to flee to Yugoslavia, as a result of the persecutions, arrests and vilifications carried out by the gendarmerie, Rightist bands, and the regular army. The memorandum was signed by 189 inhabitants. (S/AC.4/94).

The Representative of the Socialist Party (ELD) declared that Greek authorities carried out mass punitive expeditions against the democratically-minded elements. According to his assertion the Rightist bands of Lazakis and Budurakis destroyed the village of Kairovrisi, where 47 persons were killed and 20 houses were burnt. (S/AC.4/SR/319 documents annexed to the statement of Tsirimokos, ch.V.p.5).

In the village of Kairovri1, the witness IOANNIS PAGANIS stated that his neighbours told him that his parents had been killed by a Rightwing band. (S/AC.4/SC.3/19,p.1).

Referring to the possible reasons for the attack on Kairovri OLGA MARANTIDOU stated:

"The village was a Republican one and this perhaps was the only reason for the attack." (S/AC.4/SC.3/20. p.1.).

DR. V. DAMBASIS, gave evidence concerning the village of Katerini. Dambasis declared that his son was seized by gendarmes and tortured as a result of which he went out of his mind. Dambasis also stated that about 55 inhabitants with Leftist sympathies had been killed in Katerini since Jan. 1946. (S/AC.4/SC.3/12, pp. 3, 8. 2-3).

Speaking of the events in Greece since the Varkize Agreement, EVANGELOS KOSTUDIS declared:

"All the arms, which we surrendered, immediately came into the hands of those who had collaborated with the enemy during the occupation. These arms with which we fought against the Germans were given to murderers and oppressors who used them against us. The terrorism which then began in our district was no different from the terrorism of the Germans and collaborators during the occupation. Many persons who had taken part in the resistance movement were arrested. In another district 5 battalion command and captains of ELAS, and also many rank and file guerillas, were thrown into prison. They were tortured and beaten by collaborators ... We thought that the British would try to rectify this situation, considering that they were in our country for that purpose. However, we were disappointed when we saw that British tanks and armoured cars were helping the collaborators to blockade villages and arrest patriots."

These were the reasons, as EVANGELOS KOSTUDIS stated further on, which obliged him to leave his country and take refuge in Yugoslavia. (S/AC.4/PV67, pp. 7-8).

(S/AC.4/PV/71) also gave evidence concerning terrorism and persecution by the gendarmerie, the regular army and Rightist bands operating against the democratically-minded elements and they stated that this terrorism had particularly increased since the elections.

b) TRIANDAPHILLIDIS KOSTADINIS stated that he was forced to flee to Bulgaria as a result of cruel persecutions on the part of the Greek authorities. (S/AC.4/PV/63, pp. 5-6).

c) MORANZAKOS DIMITRIOS stated that he was compelled to vote for the monarchy:

"During the plebiscite I was tortured by gendarmes. They put me in a cart and compelled me to vote... One gendarme and one hitos were at the polling station. They took all the information, entered it in the books containing the results of the voting and thus it came about that everybody voted for the King..." (S/AC.4/PV/63, pp. 14-17 and 24).

The Liaison Representative of Yugoslavia submitted to the Commission a memorandum on behalf of 420 refugees from the village of Notia, who are at present living in the village of Grusevo in Yugoslavia. The memorandum stated that they were obliged to flee to Yugoslavia, as a result of the persecutions, arrests and vilifications carried out by the gendarmerie, Rightist bands, and the regular army. The memorandum was signed by 189 inhabitants. (S/AC.4/94).

The Representative of the Socialist Party (ELD) declared that Greek authorities carried out mass punitive expeditions against the democratically-minded elements. According to his assertion the Rightist bands of Tsakal and Budurakis destroyed the village of Kairovrisi, where 47 persons were killed and 20 houses were burnt. (S/AC.4/SR/319 documents annexed to the statement of Tsirimokos, ch.V.p.5).

In the village of Ksirovrisi, the witness IOANNIS PAGANIS stated that his neighbours told him that his parents had been killed by a Rightwing band. (S/AC.4/SC.3/19, p.1).

Referring to the possible reasons for the attack on Ksirovrisi, OLGA MARANTIDOU stated:

"The village was a Republican one and this perhaps was the only reason for the attack." (S/AC.4/SC.3/20, p.1.).

DR. V. DAMBASIS, gave evidence concerning the village of Katerini. Dambasis declared that his son was seized by gendarmes and tortured as a result of which he went out of his mind. Dambasis also stated that about 55 inhabitants with Leftist sympathies had been killed in Katerini since Jan. 1948. (S/AC.4/SC.3/12, pp. 3, 8, 2-3).

Speaking of the events in Greece since the Varkiza Agreement, EVANGELOS KOSTUDIS declared:

"All the arms, which we surrendered, immediately came into the hands of those who had collaborated with the enemy during the occupation. These arms with which we fought against the Germans were given to murderers and oppressors who used them against us. The terrorism which then began in our district was no different from the terrorism of the Germans and collaborators during the occupation. Many persons who had taken part in the resistance movement were arrested. In another district 5 battalion commanders and captains of ELAS, and also many rank and file guerillas, were thrown into prison. They were tortured and beaten by collaborators ... We thought that the British would try to rectify this situation, considering that they were in our country for that purpose. However, we were disappointed when we saw that British tanks and armoured cars were helping the collaborators to blockade villages and arrest patriots."

These were the reasons, as EVANGELOS KOSTUDIS stated further on, which obliged him to leave his country and take refuge in Yugoslavia. (S/AC.4/PV67, pp. 7-2).

Andreas Djimas, interrogated in the island of Ikaria, stated:

"All of us are victims of terrorism...As a result of this terrorism thousands of people have been killed, tens of thousands thrown into prison or exiled, and hundreds of thousands are being persecuted. The whole Greek people, especially those who took part in the resistance movement, have been placed in most intolerable conditions since the liberation". (S/AC.4/3C2/15 p.1).

In support of the assertion that the families of guerillas are being persecuted the Representative of the Central Committee of EAM referred in his statement before the Commission to Order N° 1498 of the 2nd Army Corps of Larissa (Central Thessaly), which stated that the families of guerillas, should be arrested and their houses burnt. (S/AC.4/55, p.34).

The memorandum of the Central Committee of EAM gave the following details of the results of the persecution of the "democratic elements" by the gendarmerie, troops and Rightist bands. From 12 February 1945 to 31 March 1946, 1289 persons were killed, 6,671 wounded, 31,632 beaten and 84,531 arrested. From March to December 1946 1,111 persons were killed, 3,516 arrested, 5,817 deported. From October 1946 to January 1947 the number of persons under detention was about 12,000. From July 1946 to Dec.1946, 109 persons were executed after being sentenced by court-martial. (S/AC.4/55, pp.11,36).

According to the same statement there were 206 Rightwing bands. These bands were distributed throughout the provinces as follows: Epirus-18, Macedonia and Thrace-34, Thessaly-67, Euboea-5, Sterea Ellas-34, Kefalonia-2, the Peloponnesus-46. (S/AC.4/56, Dossier 22, p.4).

Constantine Dinos and Ioannis Paganis, gave evidence concerning the co-operation of the Rightwing bands with the gendarmerie and Government troops who, they said, persecuted the democratic



elements. (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV.2, pp.1-9).

In support of the assertion that the Greek authorities were deporting citizens en masse to the Greek islands, Aspirides Kissilov, interrogated on the Island of Ikaria, stated:

"In our group of exiles and hostages there are 176 workers. 324 peasants, 122 artisans, 73 scientific workers and 71 civil servants. The exiles include 149 women, including 10 pregnant; many are with children, even children at the breast; 120 persons, aged 50-60; 20 old people aged 70-80. Here on the island you may learn the story of 998 persons who sacrificed their lives and shed their blood for the cause of the Allies and for their native country. All of us were accused by the Government of anarchistic activities, but nothing positive about a single one of us was stated in any of the decrees. We were arrested without warrant and kept in prison 3-6 months without trial. This could only happen in Fascist countries...."

Kissilov also stated that most of the men in the camp were veterans of the first world war or fought in the guerilla warfare against the Germans. "Nine men were hostages of the Germans and now, under the British occupation, they continue to be hostages. All of them shed their blood on the side of the nations which are now represented in your Commission". (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV18, pp.2-3).

Referring to the question of the position of the Trade Unions in Greece, Papparigas, the Representative of the Greek General Confederation of Labour, the Executive Committee of which was elected at the 8th Congress of Trade Unions, stated that the working class of Greece was deprived of the freedom of Trade Unions. After giving many cases of the breaking up of the Trade Unions and the arrest, exile and murder of Trade Union leaders, Papparigas said:

"If every régime is characterised by its attitude to the Trade Unions, the present régime in Greece, which has destroyed the liberties of the Trade Unions and is carrying out a system of unbridled terrorism against the working class must undoubtedly be characterised as a Fascist regime. This régime receives no support whatever from the people, the working class. It is the régime of a reactionary clique, imposed upon the country and maintained in power thanks to foreign intervention and support.

"The working class and the whole people of Greece are now fighting against this régime in order to win back their democratic rights.

"The efforts of this reactionary clique are aimed at crushing and eliminating the democratic forces of the nation and are the origin of the civil war, unrest and disturbances in our country." (S/AC.4/60, pp.1-8).

The Representative of the United Pan-Hellenic Youth Organisation (EPON) stated that the members of EPON were being terrorised by the gendarmerie and that the Greek authorities were persecuting EPON in an endeavour to liquidate this organisation. He also stated that "the plan to disband EPON is an illustration of the Fascist tactics that are being used and further evidence of the systematic persecution of this organisation by the Government and State organs, various terroristic organisations such as 'X', Rightist bands and so forth." (S/AC.4/SR.41 Annex).

### 39. GREEK REFUTATIONS

In his first statement to the Commission in Athens, the Greek Liaison Representative declared:

"The question before your Commission is that of the relations between Greece and her three northern neighbours. It is not

either the domestic policy or the political complexion of any one of the four Governments concerned.....

"You will recall that an attempt was recently made by the Ukrainian Government to direct the attention of the Security Council to the conduct of the Greek Government in its domestic sphere and that the Council took a decision which amounted to a dismissal of that complaint on behalf of the Ukrainian Government. The Council has taken the view that it has no competence to enter into such questions. The political complexion of Greece or of any other United Nation is out of reach by the very terms of the Charter (Article 7) which require us to respect the political independence of member-States.

....."The assertion that the Commission has the obligation to investigate the causes of the internal situation of Greece could have been plausible only if it could be demonstrated that Greece or the Greek way of life constituted a threat to our neighbours. But it was decided more than once by the Security Council that the internal problems of Greece do not constitute a threat to anybody. That the internal situation of my country, after all she has suffered in the common struggle, leaves much to be desired, we are the first to admit. But we maintain that it is our own job to deal with that problem. And all we ask is to be left alone by our neighbours to work out our own salvation. We ask to be given a chance to solve the many problems that the war has bequeathed to us in its wake.....

"For, where is such an investigation of internal conditions to commence and where is it to end? Moreover, were internal conditions to become the object of this investigation, on what grounds could our neighbours refuse the Commission the right to inquire into the nature of their own regime, which, in our opinion,

permits and encourages the introduction of trouble in this country?" (S/AC.4/19, op.1,2,3).

The Greek Liaison Representative also replied to several specific accusations. In reply to the accusation that the régime in Greece is a "fascist" one, he stated that there were in Greece a great number of political parties and a great variety of opinions, declaring that "this variety of attitudes and views regarding our internal problems is the chief characteristic of our form of government". He also said that in Greece many believe in constitutional government and only a few (EAM-EKE) do not believe in it. (S/AC.4/PV27, Annex 1, p.1)

In reply to the accusation of collaborationism he stated that the Communists in Greece, "who turn their arms against their own fighting people and its allies in the war, are now skilfully and cunningly exploiting the question of collaborationism". (ibid.p.3).

Prof. Dontas, Rector of the University of Athens, and the Representative of the Union of the Families of Hostages and Victims of the Civil War, stated that only the Communists were carrying on terrorism in Greece and that the disorders in Greece were not due to social or political causes but to foreign interference. Memoranda, in which this situation was also referred to, were presented to the Commission and its Teams by non-Governmental groups and organisations.

As regards the alleged violations of the Varkiza Agreement by successive Greek Governments, Fotios Kontopoulos stated that: "When the Varkiza Agreement was signed .... he (Nemertsikas) announced to us that as ELAS had double or perhaps triple the number of weapons that should be handed over, the Party had ordered us to select all the good arms and hand them." (CWS I, p.57).

Regarding the destruction of the village of Ksirovrisi, Ioannis Tsendarlas, who was a member of a guerilla detachment, stated that "his Commander said that their own band was to be blamed for the destruction of Ksirovrisi". (S/AC.4/SC.3/19,p.3).

As regards the elections the Greek Liaison Representative stressed the fact that the elections in Greece on 31 March 1946 were "the only elections to be held in any country after the war under international control and observation".

Savvinidis stated: "I voted freely, without hindrance." (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/1 W, p.9).

Nikitas Thiolopitis denied the charges made by EAM that the trade union representatives in the Cyclades had not been freely elected. Referring to the administration of the Labour Centre of Cyclades after October 1944, the witness said:

"All the appointed members were communists. We immediately called the representatives with the right to vote and to be elected and in the presence of the general political administrator of the prefecture of Cyclades elections were conducted." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/12, p.16).

SECTION C: CHARGES THAT PERSECUTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES (MACEDONIANS AND TCHAMS) IS ONE OF THE CAUSES OF THE TENSE SITUATION IN GREECE AND GREEK REPUTATIONS.

40. ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CHARGES

The Liaison Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia asserted that one of the causes of the tense situation in northern Greece was the persecution of national minorities, Tchams and Macedonians. In their statements they emphasised that terrorism by the gendarmerie, arly and Rightist bands in the northern districts of Greece inhabited by Macedonians and Tchams, was even more ferocious and severe than in other districts of the country, and would intensify the opposition of the population. They declared further that the persecution of national minorities by Greek Government organs was obliging the Macedonians and Tchams

to leave their homes and take refuge in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.

The Liaison Representatives pointed out that over 20,000 Greek citizens, mainly of Macedonian origin, had fled to Yugoslavia, and 10,000 to Bulgaria, and that refugees are still arriving from Greece at the present time. (See S/AC.4/147, S/AC.4/24a, p.3).

On 18 July 1945, the Yugoslav Government addressed a memorandum to the Governments of U.K., U.S.S.R. and U.S.A., stating that the Greek Government, a signatory of the Declaration and of the Charter of the United Nations was guilty, in relation to the Macedonians of Aegean (Greek) Macedonia, of numerous and open violations of the principles of international law concerning fundamental human rights, and freedom from fear embodied in the Atlantic Charter and in the Declaration and Charter of the United Nations.

The Liaison Representative of Yugoslavia asserted that the persecution of Macedonians in Greece took the form of the mass annihilation, and the plundering and burning of whole villages such as Skra, Ksirovras, Stefanini and others. (S/AC.4/PV.22, pp.8-9).

Maria Slavi stated that gendarmes burnt the Macedonian village of Skra. (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV2, pp. 1-5).

Prose Zega stated that, as a repressive measure, Greek gendarmes burned the Macedonian village of Skra, and that the inhabitants of this village, fearing further persecution by the authorities, were obliged to flee to Yugoslavia. (S/AC.4/PV71, pp.23-27).

Djordre Atanasov described terrorism by Rightist bands and the gendarmerie against the Macedonian population, murders, torture and violence, the falsification of the elections and of the denial of UNNRA help to the Macedonians.

Evidence regarding the persecution of the Macedonian minority was also given by Atistolos Vitamiotis, (who stated, among other things, that a law had been published in Greece fining anyone who spoke Macedonian) (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV3, pp.13-14), Tisi Tokupolos (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV2, pp.9-10), Kaichevski, (id.pp.27-32), Kosmos Kronsemkei (S/AC.4/PV71, pp.27-33) and many others.

The Commission received a delegation of refugees from the Greek village of Skra who presented on behalf of the 300 Macedonian inhabitants of this village a memorandum regarding the persecution of Macedonians by the Greek authorities and the reasons why they fled to Yugoslavia. (S/AC.4/PV57 1, pp.2-5).

Numerous memoranda regarding the persecution of the Macedonian minority by the Greek authorities were also presented to Team "E" which went to Skoplje. (S/AC.4/SC.8/14).

The persecution of Macedonians, according to the assertion of the Yugoslav Representative, is evidenced by the fact that a large number of citizens of Macedonian origin are in concentration camps (S/AC.4/PV22, pp.9-11).

The memorandum of the NOF Provincial Committee of Florina, which was handed to a group which met Mzrkos, refers to the persecution of Slavo-Macedonians by the Greek authorities. According to this memorandum, in May 1946 about 1,000 persons were arrested in the village of Ksino Nero alone, 100 persons in the village of Aito and so forth.

(The United Kingdom delegation objected to this paragraph being included in the report).

Interrogated in the prison of Poligoros, Ioannis Niklaidis (Macedonian) stated that the terrorism carried on by the Greek authorities against Macedonians "is obliging part of them to go into the hills and the other part to take refuge in neighbouring countries." (S/AC.4/SC.3/7, p. 3).

Ioannis Samoladas stated that Macedonians were being persecuted and no schools, could not use their own language when dealing with government authorities, and were subjected to various punishments for speaking their own tongue. (S/AC.4/SC.3/11, p.5).

Nikolas Siganos stated that there were 200 Macedonians confined in the prison of Pavlos Mellas (S/AC.4/SC.3/11, p.2).

In his statement before the Commission on 7 February 1947 (S/AC.4/PV/12) and 10 February 1947 (S/AC.4/PV/16), the Representative of Albania declared that the Greek authorities were terrorising the Tchams residing in Greece. In support of this the Albanian Representative referred to the fact that 23,000 Tchams had fled from Greece to Albania.

On 3 June 1946, the Government of Albania forwarded to the Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris a memorandum dealing with the atrocious persecution of the Tchams by the Greek authorities and requesting them to solve the Tcham problem. (S/AC.4/PV/16, p.12). The memorandum stated that the terrorism carried on by the troops of General Napoleon Zervas between June 1944 and March 1945 took the form of the mass murder of Tchams, the burning of Tcham villages and mass plundering. As a result of these operations, 2877 persons were killed, 5800 houses were burnt, and 69 villages were razed.

Four Albanian witnesses interrogated at Konispoli asserted that the Greek authorities were persecuting and terrorising the Tchams.

Nusrat Ali declared at Filatas that at present no more than 10 families of Tchams remained in Greece. (S/AC.4/SC.2/SR/15, p.8).

Mustafa Bobura showed the marks of knife wounds which he said were inflicted upon him by Greek gendarmes when he and his brother were trying to escape a massacre in his village. (S/AC.4/SC.2A/16, p.8).



The Antifascist Committee of Tcham Refugees now living in Albania presented to the team a detailed memorandum concerning the persecution of Tchams by Greek authorities. (S/AC.4/234, Annex 19)

The Albanian Liaison Representative submitted to the Commission a book a "Actes aggressifs du gouvernement monarcho-fasciste grec contre l'Albanie", containing numerous documents regarding the persecution of the Tchams in Greece (S/AC.4/189, p.68-104).

This book referred to the statement by the British Member of Parliament, Mr. Hutchinson, published in the newspaper Hertford Times of 9 November 1945, in which he said "During my stay in Albania, I had the opportunity to speak with a good number of refugees who came from Tchamouria. It is a matter of 25,000 Tchams who were driven from their homes by terrorist Greek bandits under the command of General Zervas." (S/AC.4/189, p.109).

#### 41. GREEK REPUTATIONS

##### (a) CHAM MINORITY

In a statement before the Commission the Greek Liaison Representative stated that the "Albanian speaking minority of 17000 persons turned traitors and collaborators during the war"..... and became "agents of the Italians during the period before the Fascist invasion of Greece". He added that they did not choose to stay in Greece when they realised that the withdrawal of the Germans became imminent. "Mr. Lambert of the International Red Cross, acting with General Zervas' approval, tried in vain, towards the end of the German occupation, to convince them to stay in Greece. Most of them fled into Albania." (S/AC.4/PV.27 Annex 1 p.7).

Constantine Frontzas stated that "the entire Moslem population was allowed to carry arms. Some of them were organised into a permanent military group under the command first of the Italians and later of the Germans. The rest of them carried arms but were not organised. The military organisation.... exerted pressure on the Greek population." (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR14, p.8). This witness stated that "it was possible there had been some cases of reprisals against the Cham population. In Paramythia there had been none" idem p.9). Efstratios Athanaskos gave evidence of the good treatment afforded by the Greek Government to Chams before the war but added that "one or two months before the war they were incorporated in a corps called Militia Voluntaria Fascista and were used as an advance body when the Italians attacked Greece." Similar evidence was given by Georghios Tsouyepoulos (S/AC.4/SC.2A/15 p.12) and by the Cham witness Mersen Hadji (idem p.16).

b) MACEDONIAN MINORITY.

The Greek refutation of the charge of persecution of the Macedonian minority falls into two parts :

(1) Assertions that many members of this minority collaborated with the German and Italian occupying forces. Thus the Greek Liaison Representative stated (S/AC.4/PV.27 annex 1 p. 5), that "The Bulgarian representative stated that "The Bulgarian representative .... preferred not to mention the thousands of Slav-speaking emigrants who crossed into Bulgaria in the fall of 1944 at the time of or just after the retreat of the German troops whose close collaborators these emigrants had been. I have at the disposal of the Commission a nominal list of these Slav-speaking individuals and of the crimes they committed during the German occupation. Both of the groups as well as those who crossed into Yugoslavia, together with the ELASITES who fled from Greece after December 1941, make up the elite of the army of the guerillas who are fighting in Greece at present." (S/AC.4/PV.27 annex 1 p. 5).

GEORGIOS FOURKIOTIS stated that "in the middle of 1944 Kalochev started a greed movement in order to give arms to Slavo-Macedonian villagers and that he was helped in that by the Germans and some Slavo-Macedonians." (S/AC.4/SC.2A.SR7, p. 6-7).

(11) Denials that the Macedonian minority is in fact being persecuted.

The Greek Liaison Representative stated that the "Slavophone population of Greece is barely one percent of the Greek population and there are 2.000.000 Greeks living in Macedonia, and Thrace, and of these two million only four percent are Slavophones." (S/AC.4/PV/50, p.2). He denied to the Yugoslav Liaison Representative the right to be the protector either of all the Greeks in Macedonia or even of the Slavophone minority (idem p. 3).

As regards the burning of the village of Skra and the massacre of a number of its inhabitants the witnesses TSEMBIS (S/AC.4/PV57 3

BRIGADIER IOANNOU (S/AC.4/PV57 - E. p. 4) and others stated before the Commission that these acts had been committed by guerillas. A memorandum to this effect was presented to the Commission by the refugees from Skra who were still living in Greece (S/AC.4/PV 51-1, p. 14).

Certain witnesses were examined at Florina regarding the alleged persecution of the Slavo-Macedonian minority. VELLIANO BOZINIS stated that "his people were free to speak their language in court and as far as he knew, there had not been any persecution of Slav-speaking persons in his village except by the Germans." (S/AC.4/SC.24/SR7, p. 11). The Slavo-Macedonian witness STEFANOS KALANTZIS, arrested "because they had found arms in his house" (S/AC.4/SC.24/SR7, p. 11) stated that in his prison Greek and Slavo-Macedonian detainees received the same treatment. In reply to a question whether he were free to speak the Slavo-Macedonian language, he said "Yes. Only one day a warder forbade them to speak Slavo-Macedonian, but a complaint was made to the Public Prosecutor and since then everyone is free to speak his own language." Freedom to speak the Slavo-Macedonian language was also affirmed by the following witnesses :

MARIA SLAVI who, although herself a Vlach, learnt to speak Slavo-Macedonian (in which she was interrogated) from the neighbouring villages, (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV2, p. 7).

ILLIA CONSTANTINIDIS who stated, "we Greeks live as good neighbours with the Macedonians and thus we learnt a certain number of words of their language." (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV3, p. 11).

IOANNIS NICHOLAIDES who stated that he "was not arrested for political reasons but because he was a Slavo-Macedonian and was accused of having been an OKRANITE." He added that "all the people of his village spoke Slavo-Macedonian." (S/AC.4/SC.3/7, p. 3).

Finally the Greek Liaison Representative with Team IA stated in a letter to the Commission (S/AC.4/SC.24/17) that the allegation that the Slavophone Greeks of the Florina area were forbidden to speak their own language was "absolutely untrue" and enclosed "certified copies of several records of the Florina Courts by which it is established that the Slav-speaking Greeks use official interpreters before the Greek Courts. I also submit a certificate of the Public Prosecutor in Florina that ANDRONIKOS ZAVOS is used by him and by the military authorities of the town as interpreter and translator for these cases."

CHAPTER 7

Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Contentions that the Greek Government conducts a policy of provocations on the borders of those countries.

2. Charges by Albania

The Albanian Government submitted memoranda to the Security Council (S/AC.4/42 and Add. I; S/AC.4/4) charging 111 Greek provocations and incidents on the Greek-Albanian frontier during the year 1946. These incidents ranged from shots exchanged between border patrols, sheep-stealing, kidnapping and extended fights between patrols, to penetrations of Albanian territory by Greek soldiers, violations of Albanian territorial waters and flights over Albanian soil by Greek military planes. In about twenty-five of these instances Greek troops were alleged to have penetrated Albanian territory.

In statements before the Commission the Albanian Liaison representative charged Greece with provocations and border incidents, alleging that these were tied up with the fact that Greece considered itself in a state of war with Albania and with its aim to seize Northern Epirus and destroy Albania as a state. (S/AC4/PV/12, 17-18, S/AC4/PV/13, p. 3-6; S/AC.4/PV/59, p. 2). The Liaison representative of Albania stated before the Commission that Greek frontier authorities systematically made provocations on the border of Albania. In this connection he stated: "I have dealt with the question of border violations as a part of a series of other Greek provocations against the integrity and the independence of Albania, because in our opinion border violations can be explained as a part of a series of incidents and not as a separate problem." (S/AC.4/PV/15, p. 12). In the same speech the Albanian representative quoted from the deposition of a Greek soldier, Jorgo Simon, captured in Albanian territory, "We did not act like that on our own initiative, but because we had received orders to make provocations against Albania (S/AC.4/44B, p.25). The Liaison Representative summed

up the charges concerning provocations and incidents between Dec. 1944 and the end of Dec. 1946, noting sixty-one provocations or incidents before 1946 and one hundred eleven in 1946, or a total of one hundred and seventy-two provocations and incidents during the two year period (S/AC.4/PV/15, p. 4-5). The damage resulting from these incidents was said to have been as follows:

- 6 persons killed
- 16 persons captured
- 2 persons wounded
- 20 cows, 60 sheep, 70 horses, mules and donkeys carried away
- 1 motor boat carried away
- 1 boat and one frontier post destroyed

In a statement on 17 Feb. 1947 the Albanian Liaison Representative reiterated charges that Greece was creating incidents against Albania (S/AC.4/PV/27, p. 9-12).

At this time he referred to letters from the Greek sailors Emmanuel Papanikilian and Thomas Voucias from which it appeared that the Greek fleet acted against Albania without reason. In the same speech the Albanian Liaison representative quoted from a deposition of Jorgo Jotagis, another Greek soldier captured by the Albanians: "Our orders were to always find new pretexts for provoking the Albanians." (S/AC.4/44A, p. 14).

In a deposition made before the Albanian authorities by the Greek soldier JORGE KOTOJAMI who was captured by the Albanians on October 21, 1946, Kotojami stated that the Greek patrol of which he was a member fired at the Albanian patrol which ordered them to halt when they entered Albanian territory. Kotojami said in his deposition: "As far as the provocation of the incident on the above date is concerned, the truth is that it was the battalion commander and the forces which came at the commander's orders which incited the trouble." (S/AC.4/44A p. 36).

PAPAXISTOPOULOS who was interrogated by Team I on Ikaria, contended that frontier incidents on the Albanian border are the result of provocations from the Greek side. (S/AC.4/SC.2/4).

The most important of these incidents were alleged to have been at Radat in the region of Argyrocastro, in July 1946. The Albanian soldiers MESTAN RAMADAN and TEANIS NICHOLAOS testified before Team IA concerning this series of incidents. Ramadan said that after a series of minor incidents commencing on June 25, 1946 a force of 120 Greek soldiers and 40 civilians crossed the border on July 5 and cut the wheat. On July 7 "in the morning they were firing with machine guns and mortars...when we saw they were setting fire to the fields, we opened fire ourselves. In that action, one Greek soldier was killed, one was captured, and one of our soldiers was killed also". (S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV/21, p.2).

The Albanian Liaison Representative also submitted memoranda to the Commission in support of the Albanian contention as to Greek frontier provocations and incidents. Details were given both as to the 1944-1945 and the 1946 provocations and incidents (S/AC.4/44A, Annex I, p.1-23 and Corr. 1; S/AC.4/44B, p. 1-8). In addition, a forty-page memorandum (S/AC.4/44A) was submitted to the Commission containing some fifty-nine sworn and registered statements as to some of these incidents. Among these were one statement signed by fifty-nine citizens of the village of Hocharitzza concerning an incident of March 25, 1946, one by twelve citizens of Radat as to the incidents of July 1946, and three statements signed by a total of more than sixty citizens concerning the incidents near Trestenik in July-August 1946 (S/AC.4/44A, p. 1-40).

The Albanian Liaison Representative also submitted in evidence a printed volume, entitled Actes agtresifs du gouvernement monarcho-fasciste grec contre l'Albanie (S/AC.4/199). This volume (p.18-33) listed one hundred seventy-six incidents or provocations on the Greek-Albanian frontier between 15 April 1945 and 5 February 1947. With the exception of those cited for the year 1947, these are repetitions of earlier charges. Five violations of territorial waters are cited and three by air. A number of depositions are included as evidence to support the charges advanced against the Greek Government.



Team IA visited Trastenik on 13 March 1947 for the purpose of making an on the spot investigation of the incidents of June and July 1946 (S/AC.4/SC.2A/43). A detailed memorandum describing the events was submitted to the Team, listing ten provocations between June and July (S/AC.4/SC.2A/20). Four Albanian farmers from Trastenik presented by the Albanian Liaison Representative testified on March 14 concerning the incidents, and Tefik Sherif testified that his brother had been killed by a Greek shot (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/9, p. 1-6). He had once heard the Greeks shouting "Long live George" and saying they would take Korçe and Argyrocastro.

The Albanian representative also submitted a memorandum concerning the incidents in the Konispol area at Likojan Hill (S/AC.4/SC.2A/29), listing five between 11 Oct. 1945 and 2 June 1946. The incidents were attested by seven depositions, signed by some fifty people (S/AC.4/SC.2A/29/Add.1). On 19 March 1947, Team IA visited Konispol and interrogated three witnesses concerning these incidents (S/AC.4/SC.2A/57, p. 17). An Albanian officer, FAIK LAMOC testified that he was present during the incidents of 11 Oct. 1943 and 1 Nov. 1945 and those of 2 June, 7 Nov., 24 Nov. and 16 Oct. 1946. A second witness declared that on 11 Oct. 1945 some twenty to twenty-five Greek soldiers had entered Albanian territory between pyramids 55 and 56 and kidnapped a man with his two horses, two cows and his donkey, while a week later Greek soldiers again had entered Albanian territory. A third witness testified that on 7 Nov. 1945 he saw a Greek patrol of about twenty men enter Albanian soil and attack an Albanian patrol of three men.

#### 43. Charges by Bulgaria

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative stated before the Commission that during the past two years border incidents on the Greek-Bulgarian frontier had been few and of no serious consequence. The incidents that did occur were of an ordinary type that might have happened on any frontier and had no political significance. (S/AC.4/24 (a), p.2).

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative, while denying the charges made by the Greek Government, at the Commission's meeting of 6th Feb. 1947, stated that Bulgaria had some serious, well-founded reasons to complain against Greece because of the numerous violations of the Bulgarian frontier and the provocations organised against Bulgaria. (S/AC.4/PV/10, p.15).

In 1946, it was charged that there were in all 3 incidents provoked by the Greeks. Among them were several cases of unknown planes flying over the frontier from Greece. Of the penetrations on land, the largest groups were Greek patrols of 15 to 20 men who came across the frontier and stole sheep and cattle. Of the clashes that took place during the year, there were in all three Bulgarian casualties. (S/AC.4/24d).

In support of his charges against Greece for border provocations, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative presented before the Commission number of witnesses:

The Bulgarian citizen IKONOMOV testified that he and Serbakov during their presence on Greek territory were asked many questions regarding Bulgaria by Greek officers. They were beaten and then asked to sign certain applications "without knowing what they were signing. Ikonov further testified that after they were led back to the border "we were threatened that if we did not become partisans, in a few months they (i.e., the Greeks) would come to Bulgaria and ask us to come to occupy Southern Bulgaria." (S/AC.4/PV/62-I, p.9).

SERBAKOV testified that they were "given instructions to go to the mountains, into the Balkans, and fight with the partisans against the Government for the establishment of an anti-Communist government." (S/AC.4/PV/62-II, p.13).

MUSTAFOV testified that there were armed incursions of bands into Bulgarian territory from Greece. In his written deposition which was read before the Commission there is the following statement: bands composed of deserters, Pomak deserters who were living in Greek territory under the protection of and with the authorisation

of the Greek authorities, were the same bands that were sent into Bulgarian territory for scouting purposes and for political purposes and in order to create diversions. These bands make propaganda amid the population of Pomaks, They spread rumours that the region of Rhodope is annexed to Greece and they invite the Pomaks to make illegal actions and they encourage them and invite them to escape into Greek territory." (S/AC.4/FV/66, p. 13).

IBRAHAMOV URUCHEV testified that Suleiman Ademov Parov (Parcho) crossed several times into Bulgaria from Greece (S/AC.4/FV/66, p.5).

In a letter of 5 March 1947, the Bulgarian Liaison representative stated that on 28 Jan. of this year three armed bandits made an incursion into Bulgarian territory from Greece and that on 18 Feb. 1947, two others made a similar incursion. In both cases it was alleged that one of the bandits was Suleiman Ademov Parov (Parcho) who had fled from Bulgaria and was on Greek territory. On 25th Feb. 1947, it was alleged that two armed bandits of the group of "Parcho" were killed while attempting to cross the border from Greece into Bulgaria (S/AC.4/96, p.2). The Bulgarian Liaison Representative, in a letter dated 20 March 1947, presented further information on the matter of border violations, 45 cases were presented. Of these 13 were alleged to have occurred in 1947, the others in 1946. Of the 13, 6 cases pertained to alleged violations by planes. He further alleged that there were 46 violations of the Bulgarian border from 23 Jan. to the end of Feb. 1947. (S/AC.4/156).

He stated that on 11th March 1946, the Bulgarian Government communicated to the Greek Government their readiness to renew the 1931 Border Agreement, but he declared that no Greek reply had been received (S/AC.4/24d).

#### 44. Charges by Yugoslavia

On Feb. 14, 1947 the Yugoslav Liaison Representative stated before the Commission that "the military organizations and their chiefs in Greece, organized continuous and systematic provocations on the border between Greece and Yugoslavia, creating brutal incidents

and violations of the sovereignty of the Popular Federative Republic of Yugoslavia." (S/AC.4/PV/24, p.2).

He then gave ten examples and described them as "characteristic". These incidents allegedly occurred in the period between 25th August and 17th Nov., 1946, mostly in the sector of Djevdjelija. In one case, one Yugoslav soldier was wounded. In the others, no casualties were mentioned. Four of these examples are given below:

"18 May 1946: at 1.00 o'clock p.m., in the mountain of Belasica, fifteen Chetniks crossed the border and entered our territory. Four of them who were armed with automatic pistols, marched ahead of the others with a guide in plain clothes. They penetrated between our two frontier posts. They were followed by 11 people, two of whom were armed with machine guns, and the others carrying rifles. When this group drew near to our sentry, our sentry fired two shots. The group opened fire and when they saw reinforcements coming from our frontier posts, they withdrew into Greek territory.

3 July 1946: At 11.30 a.m., a shot was fired between Sehovo and Djevdjelija. On the same day at 11.30 a.m., a group composed of 15 Greeks, 6 English and 8 Chetniks, among whom was a former officer of the Yugoslav Army, passed near the border.

23 July 1946: At 4.00 p.m., on the slopes of Kozuh, near Huma, one of our patrols was ambushed by 8 Greek soldiers. The ambush was composed of 4 positions of two soldiers, at a distance of 50 to 60 meters from one another. It had the form of a horse-shoe, leaving only one way out to our patrol. Two soldiers of the ambush were positioned on our territory. Four shots were fired from automatic pistols against our patrol. Our soldiers opened fire and the Greeks fled to their territory. (See also S/AC.4/115).

17 Nov. 1946: A Greek ambush was laid in Greek territory between the villages of Lazec and Mijedli and opened fire against one of our patrols which was on its beat. Seven shots were fired. "We didn't answer". (Sector of Djevdjelija), (S/AC.4/FV/24, p.3, 4; S/AC.4//: S/AC.4/48."

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative gave a list of 35 incidents from 13th June 1945 to 18th Dec. 1946. This list included the ten given in his statement on 14 Feb. 1947. (S/AC.4/4B, Annex I).

It was also alleged that during the period between 18th May 1945 and 3rd Dec. 1946, Greek air force made 43 flights over the Yugoslav border with 77 planes, opening fire in several cases on Yugoslav frontier units. (S/AC.4/48 Annex II and S/AC.4/3 also S/AC.4/115).

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative stated that in reply to the protest of the Yugoslav Government, the Greek Government gave orders forbidding Greek aircraft to approach the Yugoslav frontier (S/AC.4/24 p.7).

#### 45. Greek Refutations

Chapter III deals with the Greek refutations of the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav contention that the Greek Government conducts in regard to those countries a policy of border provocations.

PTER VI - ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTIONS THAT THE  
EK GOVERNMENT CONDUCTS IN RESPECT OF THOSE COUNTRIES A POLICY OF  
VOGATION BY THE MAINTENANCE IN GREEK TERRITORY OF QUISLINGS AND  
VERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF THESE QUISLINGS IN RESPECT OF ALBANIA,  
BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA : AND GREEK REFUTATIONS.

ALBANIAN CHARGES

(a) GENERAL ALBANIAN CHARGES

In his statement before the Commission on 7 February 1947, Albanian Liaison Representative charged Greece with sheltering Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav war criminals and quislings, of giving them preferential treatment, and encouraging them to "organise a conspiracy against the regimes in Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria", (S/AC.4/PV/12, p. 4).

(b) ALBANIAN CHARGES THAT GREECE IS SHELTERING WAR CRIMINALS  
AND QUISLINGS OF THE THREE COUNTRIES.

In a memorandum the Albanian Liaison Representative gave a list of 19 Albanian war criminals, allegedly photographed at Salonika on 31 April 1946. (S/AC.4/44 Annex 7).

Giving the newspapers Agonistis and Laiki Foni as references, stated that there were more than 70 Albanian war criminals in Yannina more than 1,000 Albanian, Serbian and Bulgarian war criminals on the island of Syros. (S/AC.4/PV/13, pp. 7-9).

On February 1947, Team I went to the camp at Piraeus and saw a number of persons alleged by the Albanian Liaison Representative to be quislings and Albanian war criminals. The names of the persons seen there and their past activities as described by the Albanian Liaison Representative were :

- 1) Husni Dima, former head of the gendarmerie during the German occupation (S/AC.4/SC.3/PV/4, p. 12);
- 11) Alouch Leshanake, secretary of the Fascist Party who had led the fascist persecution in Elbasani, and armed struggles with the partisans (idem. pp.15-16);

- iii) Berwitz, minister of National Defense in Albania during the German occupation who had received promotion to the rank of general during the Italian occupation (idem, p. 18);
- iv) Abas Bermini, a nationalist, who was a member of the Central Committee of Bali-Kombatar.
- v) Fiqri Dina, minister of Internal Affairs during 1942-43 and premier of Albania during the German occupation;
- vi) Mouharem Baraiktari gave the same information as his brother, concerning his crossing into Greece (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/2, pp. 40-41);
- vii) Nesimi Emeni Asemi, speaking of the activity of the Albanians in Greece, declared : "When we got down on the Island of Syros coming from Petkas and Salonika, we were from 900 to 1000 men strong; when we were all together one of the Albanians made a speech telling us that we should organize ourselves, form a committee in order to collaborate with the Greeks and the British. A committee of 13 men was elected. It numbered among others Glivitsa, Ali Rezi, Zefi, Adas Laiki was chairman of the committee... One day we were told that everything would go quite smoothly and that in the near future we would be in a position to return our country together with the Greeks and the British (S/AC.4/PV/71A, p. 4).

The witness Tsimas, on the Island of Ikaria, stated : "I know personally chetniks and members of the Bali-Kombatar, quislings and war criminals who crossed the borders of those countries (the neighbouring countries), who came to Greece. They attacked the population and offended the people. I know what happened with the population of Kastoria as a result of their activities. We have here a witness who can confirm it, because he himself was one of their victims. I know personally". (S/AC.4/SC.2-Y, pp. 3-4).

(c) ALBANIAN CHARGES THAT GREECE IS GIVING THE WAR CRIMINALS AND QUISLINGS PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

The Albanian Liaison Representative charged that "since the beginning, the Albanian war criminals have been very well treated by Greek authorities. They live in the best hotels, and they receive additional rations, eating more than the Greek people". (S/AC.4/PV/11)

He then quoted the newspaper Agonistis of Yannina, of 13 June 1945, as follows: "We find in Yannina Ali Nivica and 73 other Albanians who receive an additional ration above their ordinary rations of the month of June". (S/AC.4/PV/13, p. 7; S/AC.4/44 Annex 5). He said that according to the newspaper Rizospastis, 9 June 1946 : "The democratic population of Syros is embarrassed by the presence in this town of more than eight hundred Serbian, Albanian and Bulgarian fascists, all of them war criminals. As soon as they arrived, the official authorities put at their disposal the biggest house in Syros, the house of the reserve officers, and the authorities installed their electric lights either in the town school or in two-thirds of the housing accommodations of the town" (S/AC.4/PV/13, p. 8). He further stated that according to the newspaper Laliki Foni, 31 August 1946 .

"Mr. Mavromichalis, Minister of Defense, personally visited at Syros the Albanian, Yugoslav, and Bulgarian fascists, in order to see for himself that they had all that they needed". (S/AC.4/PV/13, p. 4).

The witness Iskanderi heard at Skoplje, on 2 April, declared that the band of Ishan Tarpeza, composed of bandits and war criminals, crossed from Yugoslavia to Greece in September 1945 and circulated there freely. (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/4).

(d) ALBANIAN CHARGES THAT GREECE IS ENCOURAGING THE WAR CRIMINALS AND QUISLINGS TO ORGANIZE A CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE REGIMES IN ALBANIA, YUGOSLAVIA AND BULGARIA,

The Albanian Liaison Representative charged : "To organize more solidly the Albanian criminals, militarily as well as politically, the Greek authorities around the month of May 1946, settled them in different Greek centers, such as the island of Syros in the Aegean, in Halandrice, 30 km. from Patras, at Messallonghi and at Crete" (S/AC.4/PV/13, p. 8).



In support of this charge, he said that the newspaper Rizospastis, June 3, 1945, stated that these people "hold secret and public conferences and that they make nationalistic and fascist propaganda directed at the inhabitants of the town of Syros" (S/AC.4/PV/13 p. 8). He asserted that according to the newspaper Laiki Foni, 31 December 1945, Zachariadis said in a speech, "Towns such as Yannina, Florina, Salonica, Serres, Drama are the hot beds of conspiracy against the Balkans". (S/AC.4/PV/12, p. 4).

The Albanian Liaison Representative stated that a pamphlet published by the Committee of Northern Epirots, and addressed to the Greek people of Northern Epirus, stated "Albanians conceal many things from you. Soon, you will see the soldiers on the borders, the defenders of the nation, with their blue flag which will fly in the sky and which will send messages to your land martyried. If the Albanians raise their heads, then the Greek bayonet will accomplish its miracle and the Allies will draw their border where it should be drawn". (S/AC.4/PV/12, pp.4-5) He further stated that in 1945 there was at Bari a Greek Military Mission which established liaison between Albanian war criminals on Greek territory with those residing in Italy in order to provoke complaints against Albania. (S/AC.4/PV/27, pp. 12-13).

The Representative of Albania stated that "the Greek authorities organized and prepared Albanian war criminals to use them as armed bands against the present regime of Albania". (S/AC.4/PV/13, p. 15). As an example, he pointed out the passage from Greece into Albania of Ditar Kurtezi, an Albanian war criminal. According to this statement of the Albanian Liaison Representative, at the trial Ditar Kurtezi stated that he and eight others penetrated into Albanian territory with the object "to establish contact with Albanian reactionary elements and organize armed bands against the present regime". (Ibid. p. 16-17). It was further alleged that a war criminal Dule Alarupi, was killed in a fight against an Albanian patrol on 27 November

1946. He was sent from Greece with the order of organizing a band to stir up troubles in Albanian territory. (Ibid. p. 17)

The Albanian Liaison Representative further charged that on subsequent occasions similar groups were sent to Albanian territory by Mousakitis, and that according to a confession of Philip Pandaziu, and contained in Annex 1b (S/AC.4/44, pp. 13-13), the purpose of these Albanian bands formed in Greek territory and sent back into Albania was to spread panic in the region of Kónispoli, to distribute money for espionage work, and to send arms to dissatisfied elements in Albania.

The witness Bairam Baraktari questioned in Belgrade, stated that he was a member of a band of the Albanian quisling, Mouharem Baraktari. This band, according to the witness, fought against the Albanian partisans during the struggle for liberation. After the eviction of the occupants, "Mouharem had taken a decision to fight against the people's regime even if it was to lead to incidents on the frontier between Albania and Greece". (S/AC.4/PV/68, pp. 20, 23). Baraktari also stated : "Afterwards Mouharem and Marki agreed about a meeting in Shemrea. They decided that should the bands organized in Greece enter Albania before the meeting they also would begin action themselves. After this talk Mouharem sent a note to a certain Mafoil Zalazi to meet him. Mouharem gave this man instructions to establish at all costs a contact with the gangs which were being organized in Greece" (S/AC.4/PV/70 pp. 11-12).

On 28 March 1947, the Albanian Liaison Representative submitted to the Commission a document concerning the trial in Korce, Albania, (S/AC.4/166). In the course of the trial, on 12 March, it is stated that the defendant Josef Gini testified "I participated in the second meeting of the committee which took place in the village of Germada Tembes".

In the same document it is stated that Xhako Koseroka declared "We created an organization EAV directed against the Albanian Government which had as its aim the overthrow of the People's regime. Our organization will establish relations with the Greeks and the Albanians who took refuge in Greece. They will extend help to us". The deputy chief of this organization, Michael Cini, presently under arrest, is stated to have testified "In November of last year, I met a man from my village called Xheko Ismaili, presently in Greece as a refugee. He proposed to me an organization aiming at the overthrow of the government. He also stated that he would establish contact with the Greeks - 10 to 12 days later (after the first encounter). I had a second meeting with X. Ismaili who notified me that he received a letter from Dodo Tesha in Yannina, one of the members of the committee of Northern Epirus at Yannina. Dodo recommended the creation of a Northern Epirus organization in Leskovik and the co-operation with our colleagues in Greece".

47. BULGARIAN CHARGES:

In his statement before the Commission, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative charged that "refugee Bulgarian and Albanian and Yugoslav fascists... have found a hospitable shelter in Greek territory and are present now and can be found now in the so-called camps such as Pavlos Melas in Salonika and camps of the islands of Syros and Crete where they enjoy the particular care of Greek fascists". (S/AG.4/PV/10 p.15).

At the island of Syros, the Bulgarian Liaison Representative charged further that certain persons "had taken part in the fighting against the partisans of Yugoslavia, Greece and my own country. They formed groups which crossed the border into our territory and provoked disorders, crossing the boundary to and fro. The brothers Barev were with them. They are connected with incidents and in certain cases are responsible for them". He said that the newspaper Vima stated on 11 May 1946, "Greece is the only country occupied during the war which shows

tolerance towards those who have collaborated with the enemy. Greece could be called the paradise of collaborators". (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/8 pp. 5-6).

In a memorandum submitted by the Bulgarian Liaison Representative on 6 February 1947, there was a list of 13 Bulgarians who fled from Bulgaria into Greece. Among them were Lt. Col. Ivan Ivanov Gologanov and five others sought by the Bulgarian authorities (S/AC.4/21).

It was charged that illegal Pomak groups acted from Greece against Bulgaria with the support of the Greek authorities. In the same memorandum (S/AC.4/21) 9 examples are cited. Among them were the following :

"Group 'Belotinzi' - comprises 17 Pomaks, who fled from Bulgaria into Greece during 1944-45. The task of this group is to make assaults and to do intelligence work in Bulgaria. It is divided into two groups of 8 persons each. It is armed by the Greek authorities. The leader of the group is Faik Halilov Gasiev.

"Group 'Ali Kehaioff' - In the region of Devin are operating several illegal Pomak groups, the most active being that of the Pomak Ali Riza Ismailov Kehaioff from the village Tchavdartzi, Devin. The task of this group is to disturb the peaceful population and to stir up a revolt. The intelligence work is entrusted to specially trained members of the group. The group is armed and supported by the Greek authorities".

Team No. 1, which visited camps in Piraeus and on the island of Syros, saw Stoiko Stoikov, Tsenko Barev and Ivan Barev, Popov Mutaftschiev and others, who, according to the Bulgarian Government, collaborated with the Germans during the war.

4d. YUGOSLAV CHARGES:

(a) General Yugoslav Charges

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative charged that "Greece after the war became the meeting point of war criminals and Yugoslav quislings" (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 4). It was charged that they were well treated and that there was "a premeditated plan to make full use of Yugoslav quislings in order to undertake enemy actions and provocation directed against Yugoslavia" (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 12).

(b) Yugoslav Charges that Greece is Sheltering Yugoslav quislings.

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative alleged that the bandit Abdul Dina declared: "During a meeting Bajram Nazir told us that Mouhareme Baraktari invited all the bandits who could not remain in Yugoslavia to prepare their escape into Greece. The Greek Government will guarantee us a free life and will give us food and clothing". (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 5). Another bandit, Bislim Sali, declared "Our band departed for Greece because we are convinced that in Greece the Greeks and the English will give us good food, clothing and above all, freedom". (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 5)

In a letter from Apostalis Vitaniotis and Evangelos Ifantis dated 23 February 1947, it was alleged: "1. Armed 'balistes' who crossed the Albanian border have been hospitalized by the Greek authorities. They have not been disarmed. They walk on the main square of Lerina City (Florina) carrying their revolvers; 2. Armed 'chetniks', coming from Yugoslavia, have crossed the border many times. . . . They used to walk freely in groups and to carry weapons" (S/AC.4/89 Annex 1). Vitaniotis Apostalis later appeared as a witness before Team No. 1 and stated "The Albanian Balistes cross the frontier and they remain armed in Florina. They were armed with pistols, and they were circulating in the town in a provocative manner. The Chetniks came with cars from the frontier.... These groups took part in guarding the district and in cooperation with the gendarmerie...." (S/AE.4/SC.2-X, p. 2).

It was charged that there were several hundred Yugoslav war criminals in Greece. Among them the following were cited: Adam vica, Cazim Lugadjija, Isen Trpeza, Ramiz Bjegunac, Hamdi Jasari, Ram Velijadu. (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 9-10).

It was further charged that Yugoslav quislings passed into Greece in large groups, with the assistance of the Greek authorities. In support of this charge an example was given of the alleged statement of Hamid Emin: "I have received an order to cross into Greece to establish contact with our committee there.... In agreement with me the Committee had to decide what day the rebels should find themselves in proximity to the border line. On the agreed day, the attack would have been launched by Greek sentries in a sector not far from the spot which has been picked for our passage, in such a way that the Yugoslav frontier guards would rush to the place of attack and leave unguarded the place where we were to cross the border..." (Ibid, p. 10; See also S/AC.4/PV/28, Annex 1, p. 10).

On 16 April 1947, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative presented a document concerning the hostile activity directed against the Yugoslavia. The witness Komal Ishenderi stated that following concerning the reasons for the criminal activity of the quisling elements: "We saw monarcho-fascist power in Greece and hoped that someday would come when we would be able to establish a similar regime". He also stated at Skoplje that Mouharem Baraktari promised in a letter that aid would be given them by the Greeks and the British. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/4, p. 20).

LEWAN GACH, electric engineer and leader of the Youth Organization of the Balli-Kombatar, stated: "In November 1945, we defended the frontier, fighting with a group of a hundred men. As a consequence of the fighting, our losses were three men killed and a similar number wounded." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/8, p. 31).

MOUHAREM BARAKTARI stated that in September 1946, he and his band crossed the Yugoslav frontier close to Bitolj and made their way into Greece. His brother, BAIRAM BARAKTARI, stated that Mouharem Baraktari had crossed from Yugoslavia into Greece and that a fight had taken place." (S/AC.4/PV/70, p. 11- 21).

The witness NAZMI EMINI AZEMI stated that he knew about the crossing from Yugoslavia into Greece of four armed groups (S/AC.4/PV/71A, p. 14).

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative stated that the points of concentration of Yugoslav war criminals and quislings in Greece were the island of Crete, the localities of Citia, Neapol and Merambalo, the island of Syros and the towns of Piraeus, Salonika and Florina. It was further alleged that 1,500 refugees were on the island of Merambalo. (S/AC.4/PV/28, Annex 1, p. 8).

Team B saw that in the place of detention at Salonika, Yugoslav citizens were to be found, amongst whom according to the statement of the Yugoslav Liaison Representative, were war criminals (S/AC.4/SC.3/8, p. 1). The witness SIFKO BLADIMOVIC gave evidence that he was a chetnik of Mihailovic (S/AC.4/SC.3/8, p. 5). The Team saw slogans and pictures which, according to the Liaison Representative were anti-Albanian, anti-Bulgarian and anti-Yugoslav (S/AC.4/SC.3/8, p. 2, 7).

(c) Yugoslav Charges That Greece Gives Preferential Treatment to Quislings

In his statement before the Commission, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative declared that according to Emin Emini writing from the island of Syros, "We rest, we eat, we drink, we have all we want in Greece. We have as much food as we can eat." (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 6). He further charged that "the masses of the people live in Greece in poverty and misery, whereas war criminals and quislings of foreign countries receive money, food, clothing and shoes without working for them." (Ibid, p. 7).

quoted the bandit Nazmi Bmini Azeni as saying: "At Florina, we were welcomed by two British Officers and one Greek Officer who allotted us in a big building and each of us was given four blankets and the following day, they gave us shoes and clothes." (S/AC.4/PV/28, Annex I, p. 9). He alleged that Hassen Murselji wrote from Crete: "Until we reached Crete we were given rations as in the army. Now we get 60,000 drachmas per month. Apart from that we can eat as much as we wish, and we go for a walk in town all day." (Ibid, p. 10; see also S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 7).

It was alleged that Isuf JACOBI, in a letter from the Island Syros, June 18, 1946, wrote: "We have all the riches of God, good clothes, good food, we bathe every day, and we do a lot of walking...." Haki AHMETI wrote from Syros "She must not be worried about me for I am well and in good health. I just had false teeth made, which cost 100,000 drachmas." Mehmet Fazlia MAKRES wrote: "Fifteen hundred comrades of Kossovo are here with me. We are in good health. We have enough pocket money and good shoes...." Haki ALITI wrote from Crete: "Here in Greece we are very well fed, and we drink well and we are free. Do not be troubled about us." (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 17).

(d) Yugoslav Charges That Greece Encourages Yugoslav Insurgents to Undertake enemy actions and provocations directed against Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative charged that Yugoslav insurgents took refuge in Greece in the hope that "they would receive moral and material help in their struggle against the Federated People's Republic of Yugoslavia." (Ibid, p. 3). He also stated that insurgents in Greece continued to maintain contact with those in Yugoslavia. It was alleged that Ali BARBOS RAMA stated: "In the autumn of 1946, two men approached me, then one of them gave me a letter, written to me by Eloup Binak from Greece, who wrote that he was in Greece together with Mouharek Baraktari and that one third of his men were killed in an action with the Yugoslav army when they crossed the border...Eloup sent his letter by courier from the other side of the frontier...." (Ibid, p. 13).



The Yugoslav Liaison Representative submitted to the Commission a book entitled "Documents Concerning the Hostile Activities Directed Against New Yugoslavia." (extracts from the verbatim records of the trial) concerning the terrorist Macedonian organization VMRO. This book gives the statements of witnesses at the trial in Skoplje regarding the connections of the defendants and the organizations to which they belonged with Greece. (S/AC.4/

The witness Rysta APOSTOLOV stated on the 19 of March at Gevgeli that he was in liaison with two Greek officers who illegally crossed the frontier five times and on one occasion wounded a Yugoslav soldier. (S/AC.4/PV/57-I, pp. 16-19). He also declared that these officers suggested to me that I should find a man who could give them information regarding the troops in the region of Gevgeli, the equipment they had, etc." (S/AC.4/PV/57-I, p. 20).

On 2 April 1947, the Yugoslav citizen Nezmi Emini ASIMI testified: "When we crossed the frontier the Greek authorities took us to Florina. We were received by English and Greeks." (S/AC.4/PV/71A, p. 3). He also declared that in Greece some members of his group were offered entry into the X-Organizations and a few agreed. (S/AC.4/PV/71A, p. 3). He also testified that there was the organization in Greece of an Albanian committee of refugees from Albania and Yugoslavia who collaborated with Greek authorities (Ibid, p. 14).

The witness TESKOV declared that he crossed the frontier from Greece into Yugoslavia with the Selim band. The Greek frontier guard let them pass after Selim and showed him a paper. A member of the band named Georgi Nikolov told Teskov that Selim was working as an anti-tcheka agent and a spy against Yugoslavia and that he was receiving arms and money from the Greek authorities. (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/4, p. 2-19).

The witness Tesich KOSTA stated that on the island of Syros there were to be found Ustachis who had killed thousands of Serbs during the war in Croatia. When the Yugoslav Liaison Representative asked the names of these Ustachis, he refused to answer. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/7, p. 10-15).

Milan MAXIMOVIC stated that he sent the paper SRBOBRAN, published in the United States, to his friends who were in camp, with a view to keeping them as well informed as possible on events taking place in the world. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/5, p. 11). The Yugoslav Liaison Representative, while the examination of the witness was taking place, stated that this was "an anti-democratic paper published by anti-democratic groups in the United States and that in that way the refugees lead their propaganda against the existing regime in Yugoslavia". (Ibid, p. 12).

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative said that Radjepagic AMIR stated "Major Michic saw us in Salonika....There were rumours that he was sent by the emigre Government. He assembled us every night in the Cafe American, and he told us that he would obtain weapons for us." He quoted Nezmi Azemi as having said, "Our camp commander, a Greek officer, made a speech which was transmitted by an interpreter who told us that we should all be united since we fought for the same cause, and that together with the Greeks and the British, we would attack Yugoslavia and return to our homes." (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 13). Radje Pagic AMIR stated "At Lerin (Florina) I was put in an UNRRA camp for refugees. The next day Captain Douchan Popovic approached me. He wore British uniform. Immediately after my arrival at the camp, he called me aside and asked me whether I knew which division and brigade and which units are between Skoplje- Bitolj and the border. He asked me also whether there were Russians at the border." (S/AC.4/PV/28 Annex 1, p. 11).

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative further said that the Greek authorities encouraged the quislings to go to Italy and join the fascist Albanian committees there. In support of this allegation, he quoted Nazmi Emini Azemi as having said: "The leaders of our camp committee urged us to state if we desired to go to Italy and place ourselves at the disposal of the Albanian fascist committee, the leader of which was Mithato Frasseri, or if we preferred to go to Cairo to serve King Zog. The majority of us decided to go to Cairo. The lists were given to the super prefect at Syros..." (S/AC.4/PV/23, pp. 14-15). Ristitch Papovic MILOCH was quoted: "In September 1946 the camp of 'Emigres' in Athens was visited by the 'Royal Delegation of Yugoslavia' with Major Golubovic Tivan at the head. In this delegation were also Flight-Lt. Manic Bora and Lt. Acimovic. They introduced themselves as the 'Royal Delegation of Yugoslavia' coming from Cairo with the Mission of gathering all the Yugoslavs and sending them to Italy where the forces of the Royal Army of Yugoslavia are being concentrated. They tell us stories about terrorism in Yugoslavia, which will soon be liberated with the help of the 'Allies'." (S/AC.4/PV/28 Annex 1, p. 11).

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative charged that quislings guard the Greek frontier together with Greek soldiers and that they undertake armed provocations against Yugoslavia. In his statement before the Commission, the Yugoslav Liaison Representative quoted a report of the Yugoslav frontier forces on 18 May 1946: "On the 18th of May 1946, at 1:00 p.m., 15 Chetniks, coming from Greece entered into our territory in the sector of Bjelasica. Four of them were armed with automatic pistols, and they led the column, guided by a man in civilian dress. They crossed the line between two of our frontier posts. Immediately after them, came another group of 11 people, two of whom carried light machine-guns. The others had rifles

"When they approached the sentry of this particular sector, the sentry opened fire, firing two shots. The Chetniks opened fire in their turn, but when they saw reinforcements arrive, they withdrew into Greek territory." (S/AC.4/PV/23, p. 18)

The EAM district committee of Florina submitted a memorandum on 30 January 1947, wherein it was stated on p. 5: "The ballistes and chetniks who fled to Greece to escape the wrath of the people found refuge here. Mr. Hill gathered them together and placed them at the disposal of the Greek authorities who are using them as night guards in the town and villages near the frontier, namely Kato Kline, Kratero, Etniko, etc. Before the arrival of the Security Council Commission, they were hidden so that the Commission might not discover them and as soon as the Commission goes back, they will be used for the same purpose and also to cross into Yugoslavia for the purpose of this terror."

Apostolos VITANIOTIS stated that "on the Greek-Yugoslav border in the village of Asia Paraskevi there is a gendarmerie force with Balistes forces." One day they started shooting against the villages. They surrounded whole villages. They pillaged houses. They arrested all the people whom they ill-treated. They brought the people to the prison where I was imprisoned. I heard this story from them. "The second fact is that from shooting by the Balistes certain villagers have been injured while they were working in the fields which are next to the boundary there, and those Balistes who were shooting from the Greek side across." (S/AC.4/SC.2-X, p. 2); see also testimony of Evangelos Ifantis, S/AC.4/SC.2-Y).

Statements to the same effect were given by Vitaniotis before Team C in Salonika. (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV/3, p. 11; see also S/AC.4/73).

49. GREEK REFUTATIONS OF THE CHARGES OF MAINTENANCE IN GREEK TERRITORY OF QUISLINGS AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF THESE QUISLINGS, IN RESPECT OF ALBANIA, BULGARIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

(a) GREEK REFUTATIONS OF THE CHARGE THAT GREECE IS SHELTERING WAR CRIMINALS AND QUISLINGS OF THE THREE COUNTRIES.

1) In his statement before the Commission on 17 February 1947, the Greek Liaison Representative declared :

"The Albanian Representative objected to the fact that the Greek Government has moved these Albanian refugees to the south of Greece. The Greeks would be ever so grateful if the Albanian Government and the other two Governments concerned would similarly move all emigrants from Greece as far north in their countries as possible" (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex I p. 6)

The Greek Liaison Representative added :

"He, (Mr. Djerdja) likewise accuses the Greek authorities of having suggested to the emigrants, detained in Syria, to leave for Egypt or Italy, and ends his charges by complaining that the Greek authorities do not follow the example of the Yugoslav Government who use the mutineers of the ELAS and the Slav-speaking emigrants from Greece in "productive" works. For my part I would have felt much happier if I knew that the cadets of Bulkes were not used in the type of productive work, the fruit of which we reap so tragically in Greece in the form of criminal acts of all sorts. In any case, I am particularly gratified at the decision of the Commission to visit some of these emigrants as I am confident that they will establish that these emigrants' stay in Greece does not constitute a menace to anybody" (Ibid. p. 8)

11) In a letter dated 25 March 1947 and addressed to the U.S.A. Delegate (S/AC.4/174, Brief C) the Greek Liaison Representative gave detailed information regarding the number and location of Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav refugees in Greece, declaring :

"The Greek Government would be very happy if, with due regard to the international custom of shelter to political refugees, it could be arranged for these persons to return to their native country. In any event, while their stay in Greece continues, any political activity on their part is strictly forbidden".

iii) In a letter of 16 April the Greek Liaison Representative gave a list of 1346 Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav refugees arranged in alphabetical order according to nationality. (S/AC.4/231)

Husni Dema, at the Pireus Camp, said, "I was never free under observation" (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/4, p. 10, English text). Prenek Previzi confirmed the fact that refugees entering Greek territory were not free but under permanent custody (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/4 p. 18 English text).

(b) GREEK REFUTATIONS OF THE CHARGE THAT GREECE IS GIVING THESE WAR CRIMINALS AND QUISLINGS PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT

The Commander of the Florina Camp Vassilios Dimopoulos, explained :

"These people (i.e., refugees of the neighbouring countries) are immediately disarmed and then brought to him, to be placed in a concentration camp called the hostages camp. This camp was established when the hostages coming from Germany started to arrive. There they get food and stay two or three days, a maximum of a week, only during the time required to fill certain formalities. They are sent further south. The time of their stay in Florina varies on account of the difficulties of transport".

The witness said that all registers of the camp were at the disposal of the Team (S/AC.4/SC.2A/B7/p. 5, English text). The Greek Liaison Representative submitted a list of the refugees detained in the camp of Florina according to nationalities, (S/AC.4/SC.2A/13).

Mehmet Kotsinako, an Albanian political refugee, stated on March 12, 1947 that he "found difficulties and suffered in Greece", and that he "lived on a soup kitchen ration consisting of 140 drams of bread and two courses". He also said that he "came to Salonika and is now in a camp for refugees" where the immigrants "are always guarded". Before leaving the meeting, Kotsinako asked the Chairman "to intervene with the Greek Government that all these emigrants who are here for their ideals may have more freedom in their camp, that they may leave their camp and have better conditions".

The Yugoslav Milan Maximovic, in the camp at Pireaus, stated that "he lived for the moment by selling his wife's jewels" and that "he had no other source of income". (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/5 p. 12, English text). Another Yugoslav witness, Philovic Mihailo, explained that all clothing distributions were made by UHRRRA. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/5, p. 12, English text).

In the camp at Syros, the camp Commandant, Warrant Officer Tsoufis, said, "at various times we had protests and I think they were justified. These were protests about the food and clothing. They were right in doing so because we did not give them any clothing and we have given them cigarettes only twice". (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/7, p. 16). W/O Tsoufis, in reply to the Yugoslav Liaison Officer's question as to how long a period the Public Security Grant of 50,000,000 drachmae was supposed to cover, said : "The Ministry of Public Security has allotted a maximum of 2,000 drachmae (2 shillings) a day to be spent on each internee, including all his expenses such as food, water and all purposes in general. It also includes clean linen of the camp and everything else. This money is sent to a committee which is made up of the Prefect, of the Commander of Gendarmerie and an employee for taxes. They spend the money and give an account of it to the Ministry. Under no circumstances are they allowed to spend over 2,000 Drachmae (2 shillings) per person per day". (Ibid, p. 16-17).

- c) GREEK REFUTATIONS OF THE CHARGE THAT GREECE IS ENCOURAGING WAR CRIMINALS AND QUISLINGS TO ORGANIZE A CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE REGIMES OF THESE THREE COUNTRIES.

In the camp at Piraeus, ABAS ERMINI denied that he had participated in any political activities and declared that "no one took it upon himself to form a political committee in Syros." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/2, p. 29). Another Albanian witness, Fiqri Dini, said that he had had no liaison with political refugees in Albania and denied that he had had any contact with Greek political refugees while hiding in Albania or with Albanian political refugees who were already in Greece (Ibid. p. 36). MOUHARREM BAIKAKTARI testified: "We came to Greece of our own free will. We are in this camp in which are concentrated people of all nationalities who simply live here in exile. We have no military organization of any kind. We came to Greece because Greece is a democratic country where freedom does reign. Freedom of speech also exists here ...." (Ibid., p. 42).

The Bulgarian witness, STOIKO STOIKOV, testified that he had had no contact with any forces which were fomenting trouble in Bulgaria, or with the brothers BAREFF, concerning whom he had been asked, although he had heard of them. He added: "I heard they were sent to the Islands. I did not see them personally, and I do not know of any organisation that exists at the present time in Greece whose aim would be to stir up trouble in Bulgaria. I have no contact with any of these organizations." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/5, p. 4).

The Commander of the Camp on the Island of Syros, Warrant Officer TSOUFIS stated that there had been many misunderstandings among groups and some conflicts, although the authorities had been "very strict." He added: "We told them that they are only being given hospitality in this camp, that political discussions are prohibited. Sometimes, some of them presented themselves and said that they wanted to volunteer to go and fight for the liberation of their



country at the boundary. We answered that the Greek State will never permit them, that they are only receiving hospitality in this camp, that, whenever they want to submit a petition to return to their own country, then we will help them to do so." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/7, p. 17).

The Bulgarian witness IVAN BAREFF indicated that "our work is only physical. We received our food from the camp. We received no other help and we did not receive any instructions. We were at liberty to go out into the city but we had to come back here at 9 o'clock as was fixed by the camp authorities." (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV/7, p. 7). REDJEB RAMADAN also testified: "Politically we are not organised. We help each other economically with money and things like that." (Ibid., p. 10). KOSTA TASIC stated: "We are free to discuss political questions and we do that without any influence." (Ibid., p. 14, 15). The Bulgarian witness YANJO POPOV stated: "while I was in camp there were many refugees of Bulgarian, Yugoslav, and Albanian origin, and some of the refugees, Albanian and Serbs wanted to go back to their own countries and asked the Greek authorities to only allow them to enter their own country illegally in order to stir up trouble there and to fight against the regime there, but the Greek authorities would not allow us to do that." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/18, p. 14).

A number of witnesses denied that any attempt was ever made to recruit refugees in the camp to create incidents along the Greek frontier. The Bulgarian witness TZENKO BAREFF, for example, said: "To me and my friends of the Agrarian Party the Greek Government never made any proposal and never put any pressure on us." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/8, p. 17). He also said that he did not know of any activity on the part of the Greek Government to give military training or political indoctrination to those who are interned in the camps. He added that he had "food from Greek authorities and got

some from UNRRA" and that the exiles got 2000 drachmas a day in food and clothing." Baroff stated that he and his friends "crossed the frontier without any arms." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/7/ p. 1-2, 4-5, 6). HAKI RUCHITI also denied knowledge of any such proposition made either to him or to anyone else (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/8, p. 29). Captain Nikola MUTTACHIEFF, as to any attempt to recruit him or others to go to the frontier to incite border incidents against Bulgaria, Yugoslavia or Albania, replied: "Never did the Greek authorities ask for it, but even had they asked for it, I would have refused because I would never fight against my own countrymen." (Ibid., p.20). Likewise, Lujan GACH categorically denied that a committee had been formed on the island of Syros, consisting of 12 men, presumably Albanians, or that the head of the camp had held a political speech saying that Albanians and Greeks must be united, and together with the English, they would attack Yugoslavia. He also denied that the Greeks had ever tried to recruit him either for the purpose of preventing or creating border incidents (Ibid., p.29). Similarly, Tomas KAMILIAS denied that Greek authorities had attempted to encourage him to return to the border or to return home in order to create border incidents. (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/11, p.6). Peter COBASIC stated that the Greek authorities did not help them, but brought them "into the interior of Greece. When we are near the boundaries, they intern us for some time." (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV/12,p.4). The Bulgarian witness DUDUMOV stated: "The Greek authorities did not organize armed groups composed of ..... deserters." (S/AC.4/PV/66. p. 22-24).

The witness BAIRAM BLIRAKTLARI stated that there had been no "collaboration with the Germans in the practical field. This collaboration started in the two months before the German retreat. During the whole period, there was only indirect collaboration with the Germans, that is, they did not fight against the Germans.

Another reason for Muharam not being able to agree with the liberation movement was the lines which existed between this movement and the Yugoslav majority, that is democratic Yugoslavia." (S/AC.4/FV/70, p.19).

CHAPTER VII -ALBANIAN, BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CONTENTION THAT THE GREEK GOVERNMENT CONDUCTS AN EXPANSIONIST FOREIGN POLICY WHICH IS A PROVOCATION TO THOSE COUNTRIES: AND GREEK REFUTATIONS.

50. ALBANIAN CHARGES THAT GREECE'S FOREIGN POLICY IS EXPANSIONIST.

The Albanian Government alleged that Greece was in a state of war with Albanian. It was charged that such an allegation was tied up with Greek territorial claims on Southern Albania (Northern Epirus) which were the deep and essential cause of Greek provocations on the border. (S/AC.4/PV312, pp. 17-18 and S/AC.4/PV 27 p.11 ). It was further charged that the imperialistic foreign policy of Greece had its roots in the internal policy of oppression, terror and murder, especially in its treatment of the Cham minority (S/AC.4/PV/12 pp 2-4, 11). A pamphlet ACTES AGGRESIFS DU GOUVERNEMENT MONARCHO-FASCISTE GREC CONTRE L'ALBANIE (p.7ff) was presented to the Commission. It was charged that there was Greek intervention in Albanian internal affairs through the organization of Albanian gangs and of EAVI (S/AC4/69).

The Albanian liaison representative referred to speeches of Greek political personalities and passages from Greek newspapers on this matter. It was stated that after the Paris Peace Conference the Deputy Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Philip Dragumis, said: "We request the whole of northern Epirus so that the border should follow the line Pogradets-Valona. The town of Valona will remain in Albania, but the bay which has the same name, as well as the peninsula, will be given over to Greece. We shall also request that the Island of Saseno should become Greek as an integral part of the Ionic Islands..." According to the Albanian Liaison Representative: "Greece always openly considered herself to be in a state of war with Albania and considered Albania as an enemy State" (S/AC4/PV 59 p.3)

Speaking of Greek territorial claims, the Representative of Albania declared: "These claims were expressed in two ways, legally and illegally. The second way, the illegal one, which

is accompanied by hostile propaganda against Albania through newspapers and pamphlets brought into Albania is also characterised by the employment of enemies of Albania, more specifically the organization...EAVI, which is engaged in anti-Albanian activities. (Ref. S/AC.4/PV.59, page 3).

The newspaper Vorios Epirus 24 November 1946 declared: "We already wrote in our paper that the nationals of Northern Epirus, without any thought of the consequences, decided to defend in another way the lives and honour of their enslaved bretheren. We turn to all freedom-loving nations of our planet with the request to extend help to them in their struggle for existence." (S/AC.4/PV59, page 4).

The Albanian Representative declared that the Greek authorities were inciting hatred towards the people of the neighbouring countries and preparing public opinion for aggression. He referred to the following passage in the Athenian newspaper "Acropolis" 5 December 1946: "What is Albania? A comedy not a state. Since Albania has been proclaimed an independent state, the reins of power were held first by a sheep stealer, then by an adventurer, then by a priest indulging in propaganda". (S/AC4/PV/15 p.3).

The witness AZEMI testified on 2 April 1947: "One day we were told that we would be united all together and that the time had come now when the English, the Greeks and we would go altogether to Yugoslavia". (S/AC.4/PV/71a, p.5).

The witness BAIRAKTARI stated: "Afterwards Muharem and Marko agreed about a meeting in Shemree. They decided that should the bands organised in Greece enter Albania before the meeting they also would begin action themselves. After this talk, Muharem sent a note to a certain Mafail Zalazi to meet him. Muharem gave this man instructions to establish at all costs a contact with the gangs which were being organized in Greece." (S/AC4/PV/70 p.11-12)

The Albanian Liaison Representative submitted to the Commission a pamphlet "ACTES AGRESSIFS DU GOUVERNEMENT MONARCH-FASCISTE GREC CONTRE L'ALBANIE" in which passages were quoted from speeches

allegedly made by Greek political leaders and of Greek newspaper articles on the relations of the Greek Government with Albania (S/AC.4/PV/189, pp.7-16).

51. BULGARIAN CHARGES THAT GREECE'S FOREIGN POLICY IS 'EXPANSIONIST'.

The Bulgarian Liaison Representative declared on 6 February 1947: "After the Second World War and for alleged strategic amendment of the frontier, the Greek chauvinistic circles did not fail to tender claims for the seizure of new parcels of Bulgarian land. Even now, after the termination of the work of the Peace Treaty, attempts are made by Athens to maintain these provocative claims, supported by a frightfully malicious campaign of insults, slanders and threats, not only in the press but also in the statements of responsible persons... A most recent, but not most insignificant example in that respect are the threats which were made lately by the Greek General Papanikolaou about invasion of Bulgarian territory, and which, considering the attack made by General Pangalos in 1925 and the whole present attitude of the Greek Government, could not be taken only as silly talk on his behalf..." (S/AC.4/2A,p.6)

The Greek, M. Jekovi, a member of the Greek Parliament spoke about the claims on Bulgarian territory at the meeting of June 24 1946. He was in favour of the Greek Bulgarian frontier being drawn on the Balkan ridges running out to the Black Sea in the area of the villages Artos, Firgos and Anhilaos (Ref.S/AC.4/PV.21 p.4)

A resolution of the Pan-Hellenic Congress published on 30 October 1945, claimed the return of Northern Macedonia and Northern Thrace (Eastern Rumelia) with the historical, ethnographical, geographical, geo-economical and strategical boundaries of these areas." (Ref S/AC.4/PV 21, p.3)

The Bulgarian Representative stated before the Commission that there were a series of anti-Bulgarian declarations in the Greek press and in the statements of Greek political personalities (Ref. S/AC.4/24 dated 11.2.47.

The witnesses IKONOMOV and SERVAKOV testified before the Commission in Sofia, 26 to 28 March 1947: "Then we were led to the borderland we were threatened that if we did not become partisans in a few months they (Greek Officers) would come to Bulgaria. (S/AC.4/PV/62 1 p.9; s/AC.4/PV/62 11, pp.5, 13).

52. Yugoslav. CHARGES THAT GREECE'S FOREIGN POLICY IS EXPANSIONIST.

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative charged that after the end of the war Greek foreign policy consisted of the following elements: 1) acquisition of territory at the expense of Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria as far as Tirana and Sofia, and a large part of Southern Yugoslavia: 2) development of Greek chauvinism aiming at a Greater Greece; and 3) a policy of extermination of the national minorities in Greece. In general, it was alleged that post-war Greek foreign policy had been characterized by a spirit of adventurous plans to be realised by armed attacks against the neighbours of Greece (S/AC.4/PV/21, p.6-11).

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative declared on February 13 1947: "The official press, the political leaders as well as the official and unofficial representatives of Greece through their unceasing campaign directed at the realisation of imperialistic aims at the expense of their neighbours created an atmosphere of uncertainty which is menacing peace in the Balkans." He quoted the Minister for Foreign Affairs Mr. Tsaldaris, as saying: Our national claims are not limited to the territories recognised as being Greek territory in international acts and from the historical and legal point of view. Our rights to these territories are obvious to all. The Dodecanese, Northern Epirus and the security of our frontier cannot satisfy us. There are other Greek territories which are obviously Greek in the south and in the north. Our claims begin in the north in order to complete our national State and to solve the problem of space." (S/AC.4/PV/21 p.5).

Mr. Jekova, a member of the Greek Parliament declared, it was stated, at the Parliamentary session on 24 June 1946: "I also have a

plan of ratification of boundaries. I submit my draft to the chair so that it would be filed in the Parliamentary archives. Our frontier must begin at the outlet of the river Izmi on the Adriatic, follow the summit of the mountains Sar Planina, include the springs of the Vardar and Orvila further to the west. Then along the river Struma up to the railway junction of Katerinovo, from there follow the summit of Mount Skopion in the direction of the Trayan pass and the height No. 1573 on the chain of the Balkans. It should follow this chain to reach the Black Sea in the area of the localities Aetos, Firzes and Anhilas," (S/LC.4/PV/21 p.4).

It was stated that the Vice-Admiral and ex-Minister Argiropoulos wrote on 20-25 May 1946: "It is indispensable to rectify our border with Yugoslavia. We desire that the Government of the Populist Party give attention to this question as the most important one for Greece... It was stated that Mr. Argiropoulos wrote in the same newspaper 29-30 April, 1946: "The Greek claims will ensure to Great Britain and the U.S. the rule of the Mediterranean." (S/LC.4/PV 21 p.11)

The Yugoslav Liaison Representative also quoted an article by Mr. Mavromichalis, then War Minister, in Ethnikon Mellon, 27th June 1946, which said: "I also propose a ratification of the boundary with Serbia. I consider it indispensable for it was in following this valley that the Germans entered our territory." (S/LC.4/PV/21 p.4).

The Yugoslav Representative cited a book of General Vagos, published in Athens in 1946, with maps, in which it was stated that Yugoslavia should understand the Greek need for space and cede to it the areas of Bitolj and Stumitsa (S/LC.4/PV/21 p.6). The Salonica journal, Nea Ellithia, 9 September 1946 was quoted as follows:- "Greece is obliged to raise the question of Bitolj and Skoplje. It is high time that we should square accounts of an unjust past..." (S/LC.4/PV/21, p.6).



It was charged that the Greek newspaper, Ephimeris Ton Hiton the  
29 July 1946, published the claim to the whole of Macedonian  
Republic for Greece. In the book "Proclamation of the Greek  
people addressed to the Peace Conference" it was written :  
"Greece has the right to ask Yugoslavia for the restitution of  
Northern Macedonia up to the limit between the watershed of the  
Danube and the Aegean Sea...." (S/AC4/PV/21, p.7)

It was stated that the question of the transfer of  
Yugoslav Macedonia to Greece is raised in the newspaper Politikos  
4 September 1946. (S/AC.4/PV/21 pp.7-8). The article of  
General Margaritis in Elithia, 6 June 1946, stated that Bitolj,  
Gevegli, Doran, Strumitsa, Vales and other towns and villages  
of Macedonia ought to be transferred to Greece (S/AC4/PV/21, p.8).

53. GREEK REFUTATIONS OF THE ALBANIAN BULGARIAN AND YUGOSLAV CHARGES THAT GREECE'S FOREIGN POLICY IS EXPANSIONIST

a) In Relation to Albania

In his address of 17 Feb. Mr. Kyrou declared that "The Union of Northern Epiraeus, the mother country, constitutes one of the most ardent desires of all the Greek people, and you will not find one Greek who denies that fact. Let us state also in passing that even the Committee of EAM has proclaimed it on many occasions. Greece has also presented this claim by peaceful means and it has also presented it in front of the competent international bodies...Nobody in Greece has ever thought of occupying Northern Epiraeus by force...." (S/AC.4/PV27/Annex 1, p.3).

At the fifty-ninth meeting of the Commission, the Greek Liaison representative said that the Greek People were not vindictive and were ready to "forgive and forget...."

b) In Relation to Bulgaria

The Greek Liaison Representative denied the Bulgarian charge of chauvinism, pointing out that Greece had been attacked by Bulgarian armies three times since 1913.

In a memorandum submitted to the Commission by EAM, there was quoted the cable sent by the EAM Central Committee to the Paris Peace Conference 31 July 1946:

"But it is also just that the regions of North Epirus and eastern Thrace be adjudged to Greece; their populations were Greek in majority before their forced displacement during recent times. This has been acknowledged even by previous international treaties.

"It is also imperatively necessitated that the security of the Greek frontier to Bulgaria be safeguarded. Efforts will be made afterwards to secure stable conditions of peace, mutual confidence and close collaboration of the Balkan peoples, which we believe can be achieved under democratic regimes. To this the Greek people are principally, firmly and sincerely aspiring, in the common interest of the peoples of the Balkan peninsula." (EAM Annex 29, p.4-5).

(c) In Relation to Yugoslavia

Concerning the charge that Greece was pursuing an aggressive policy toward Yugoslavia, with territorial ambitions, the Greek Prime Minister, the present Foreign Minister, Mr. Tsaldaris, declared at the Eighty-Fourth session of the Security Council on Dec. 16, 1946.

"In my capacity as Head of a Government freely elected, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity to state, for my part, that, faithful to the spirit that actuated our Prime Minister in 1914, Greece has not at any time formulated, and will not at any time formulate any claims at the expense of Yugoslavia's territory..." (S/PV84, p. 78).

As to the Yugoslav charge before the Commission that Greek foreign policy was a menace to the other Balkan countries, the Greek Liaison Representative, on 17 Feb. 1947, declared:

"There is no secret connected with the fact that at the present moment when the Greek state is facing seditious bands, the total of the Greek armed forces does not exceed 130,000 men. But according to the most conservative estimates, the Yugoslav Government are keeping under arms 400,000 men in the regular army; 100,000 men in the GEMA Secret Police; 50,000 in the Militia; and to these should be added 100,000 men in the military labor battalions. That makes a total of 650,000 men. In addition, Bulgaria, who by the Peace Treaty just signed, is supposed to maintain a total force of troops and gendarmerie not exceeding 55,000 men, has actually under arms 120,000 men in the regular army, 50,000 in the militia, 20,000 in the frontier garrisons and 50,000 in the Trudovak battalions. That makes a total of 240,000 men. Albania, with a population of hardly 1,000,000 inhabitants, maintains an army of 65,000 men, including the militia. Grand total. 955,000 men." (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex I, p.8):

(Note: U.S.S.R. Delegation opposes to this paragraph as it is irrelevant and because they think the size of armament is not the Commission's concern.)

---

Note: Citations with the symbol "QWB" (Greek White Book) refer to depositions made to the Greek Authorities before the arrival of the Commission in Greece.

CHAPTER IV      United Kingdom Reservation

In agreeing to the adoption of the survey of evidence contained in Part II of the Report the United Kingdom Delegation must make the following reservation:

In Chapter IV of Part II, three references are made to the documents S/AC.4/177 and Annexes which is composed of a letter from the Secretary-General covering certain documents obtained from the guerrilla band Markos. The United Kingdom Delegation is unable for the following reasons to agree that these documents are documents which can be placed as valid evidence in this part of the report.

In the first place, the Commission agreed at the invitation of Markos to send a team to meet him as a simple witness, to hear his oral evidence and not to receive written statements from him (see S/AC.4/SR73 and SR83 of 25 February and 11 March). This team did not in fact meet Markos. The allegations contained in the documents attached to S/AC.4/177 and Annexes were never investigated by the Commission and had they been investigated any importance which could otherwise have been attached to them might have been completely altered.

The United Kingdom Delegation's second objection concerns a matter of principle. The documents in question were obtained by the representatives of two delegations composing the team sent to meet Markos after the team had, by a majority decision, returned to its base (see report of General Delvois at S/AC.4/S16 of 26th April). In acting as they did these two delegations acted in the opinion of the United Kingdom Delegation as private individuals and not as members of the Commission or of one of the subsidiary groups. The Delegation therefore feels that the manner in which these documents were obtained was irregular and that to accept them as evidence would create a most undesirable precedent as regards the work of a future United Nations Commission of Enquiry.

**CHAPTER IX**  
**RESERVATIONS BY THE SOVIET DELEGATION REGARDING**  
**PART TWO OF THE REPORT**

---

55. (a). The Soviet Delegation considers it necessary to delete from Chapter I, Section A, Albania, the statements of witnesses alleging that the Greek Communist Party recommended former members of ELAS to take refuge in Albania in order to escape persecution by the Greek regime, since they can in no way serve to confirm the Greek charge against Albania regarding the training and recruiting of refugees (p. I, para. I and 2).
- (b). To delete the references to the statements of witnesses concerning operations in the district of Gramos in the territory of Greece, since these statements can in no way be cited in confirmation of the Greek charges against Albania regarding the sending of guerrillas across the frontier into Greece, but relate rather to the theme that civil war is taking place in Greece (p. 7, last paragraph before the Section 'Albanian Refutations').

YUGOSLAVIA I, Section C (Greek Charges)

- (a). To delete from page 2 (French Text) the words:

"Moreover, Greek refugees were enlisted in the Yugoslav Army, since not one of the witnesses spoke about Greek refugees being enlisted in the Yugoslav Army, but mentioned several instances of Greek guerrillas joining the Yugoslav Army during the struggle against the German occupation forces.

- (b). To delete the extracts from Mr Kyrrou's statement regarding the aims of NOF, and also the statements of Velianidis on this subject, since this question is dealt with in Chapter II and has no relation to Chapter I (delete page 4, paragraph 3 as far as the words Otse)

(c) Delete the Section regarding the recruitment of Greek refugees in guerrilla detachments, since not a single witness made any statement to the effect that the Yugoslav authorities carried on such recruitment (Section 2, pp. 3 and 4).

#### Chapter II

(a) To delete from Section B of this Chapter the references to the historical arguments put forward by the Greek Representative in regard to Bulgarian claims to Western Thrace, and also Mr. Kyrou's suppositions regarding the reasons for the alleged change in Bulgaria's foreign policy, since the examination of territorial questions does not come under the terms of reference of the Commission (delete the second sentence of paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 on page 5).

(b) To delete the reference to the discussion of the Macedonian question in the Bulgarian National Assembly, since no documents were submitted on this subject and the question itself has no relation to the terms of reference of the Commission (delete paragraph 3 on page 6)

#### Chapter IV

To delete on page 8 the extract from the statement of the Greek Representative that the investigation of the internal situation of Greece does not come under the terms of reference of the Commission, since the terms of reference of the Commission are determined by the Security Council and not by the Greek Representative.

#### Chapter V (The expansionist policy of Greece)

To delete from the Greek refutations on page 41 the quotation in which the Greek Representative refers to the strength of the armed forces of three neighbouring countries, since these data cannot be regarded as trustworthy and, on the other hand, have no relation to the question that is being considered by the Commission.

P A R T    I I I    :    C O N C L U S I O N S

CHAPTER I

SECTION A:    A L B A N I A ,    B U L G A R I A    A N D    Y U G O S L A V I A    A N D    T H E    G U E R I L L A S    I N    G R E E C E

1.    I N T R O D U C T I O N

The charge by the Greek Government that its northern neighbours were supporting the guerilla warfare in Greece was directed jointly against Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. The evidence submitted, however, related primarily to Yugoslav intervention in this regard, and only to a lesser degree to that of Albania and Bulgaria. Although the Liaison Representatives repeatedly denied these charges, and attacked the credibility of the witnesses who testified in their support, little direct evidence was brought forward to disprove them. On the basis of the facts ascertained by the Commission, it is its conclusions that Yugoslavia, and to a lesser extent, Albania, and Bulgaria, have supported the guerilla warfare in Greece.

2.    Y U G O S L A V I A

a. The Commission heard a considerable amount of evidence by direct testimony and by deposition that assistance had been rendered in Yugoslavia to the guerillas, taking the form of training refugees from Greece within the borders of Yugoslavia, recruiting and dispatching them to Greece for action with the guerillas' units there, as well as supplying them for this purpose with arms, supplies, transport, guides, hospitalization, etc., and providing an avenue of escape for guerillas fleeing from Greek Government forces.

b. The Commission heard the testimony of several witnesses that in the spring of 1946 a special course for guerilla leaders was established in the refugee camp at Bulkes in Yugoslavia, which was designed to give theoretical and practical training to refugees from Greece in guerilla warfare. There was presented to the Commission a copy of a military manual for training in guerilla tactics and several witnesses testified that it was used as the



text book in the Bulkes school. Indeed, one witness, a Greek refugee, testified that he was one of the authors of the manual when it was written in the summer of 1945. The evidence indicates that during the spring and at least through the summer of 1946 actual training in partisan warfare was given to selected persons among the refugees at the Bulkes camp. Furthermore, the Commission heard evidence which demonstrated that at least some of the refugees who had received military training returned to Greece and participated in the operations of the guerilla bands. Certain witnesses testified that they had served in the Yugoslav Army and had later been released so that they might return to Greece and join the guerillas.

c. The Commission was provided with considerable evidence indicating that preparatory to returning to Greece, Greek refugees at the Bulkes camp and in other places in Yugoslavia were provided with arms and other military supplies, clothing and food. Other refugees testifying before the Commission stated that in crossing the frontier to or from Greece, transportation was provided there in Yugoslavia, that they were conducted by Yugoslav guides, including Yugoslav soldiers, and that they were provided with a network of liaison agents who facilitated the crossings. According to the evidence Yugoslav frontier guards permitted guerilla bands to escape into Yugoslavia when pursued by the Greek army. This was clearly demonstrated to the Commission by its investigation of the incidents at Sourmena and Idhomeni. For the attitude of various delegations to the conclusions set out in Chapter I, see Chapter III.

d. In addition, the evidence showed that as part of the pattern of assistance to the guerilla movement, arrangements were made for the transportation of guerillas wounded in Greece into Yugoslavia where hospitalization was provided. Three witnesses testified that they themselves had transported wounded guerillas on donkeys to or across the Yugoslav border.

e. At the time of its visit to the camp at Bulkes on April 2, 1947, the Commission was unable to find evidence of military activities or of the military training which had therefore been carried on.

f. There is no doubt, however, that at the Bulkes camp the refugees from Greece were subjected to political indoctrination and propaganda looking toward the overthrow of the Greek Government. Witnesses uniformly testified that on March 25, 1946, Greece's Independence Day, the leader of the Greek Communist Party, Zachariades, visited the camp at Bulkes and made a speech urging the refugees to prepare themselves to return to Greece "when the Greek people will need them". The evidence also indicated that the refugees at Bulkes heard similar propaganda from other official personnel, including the Yugoslav Minister of Education for Viovodina, and a Bulgarian Commission of several officers, who paid visits to the camp. While at Bulkes Novi Sad, Djevdjelija and Strumitsa, the Commission witnesses political demonstrations antagonistic to the present Greek Government, which indicated that political activity among the refugees continued to be sanctioned.

### 3. ALBANIA.

a) In the case of Albania, evidence presented to the Commission indicated that at Rubig, a village about 50 miles north of Tirana, a camp for Greek refugees had been in existence from the Spring of 1945 to October 1945. During that period the refugees there received political instruction as well as practical and theoretical military training. A military training manual, written in Greek at Rubig, similar to the one used at Bulkes, was presented in evidence to the Commission. Moreover, the Commission heard testimony that one manual, which was published in Albania, was mimeographed on paper furnished by the Albanian Press Ministry.

b) Witnesses testified before the Commission that after the Varkiza Agreement of February 12, 1945, former members of ELAS (the military arm of EAM) were advised by KKE (the Communist Party of Greece) or their ELAS comrades, to cross into Albania, as well as into Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, to avoid persecution. The evidence indicated that officers of the KKE made arrangements with Albanian security authorities for the reception, transportation, feeding and housing of refugees. Witnesses testified that before returning to Greece they were supplied in Albania with food, clothing, military equipment and transportation to the border. Evidence was also brought forward that refugees were given assistance by Albanian military personnel in their efforts to cross the frontier between Greece and Albania.

c.) The evidence presented to the Commission indicated that there was no military or other training of Greek refugees in Albania after October 1945 when the refugees in the camp at Rubig were transferred to Pulkes in Yugoslavia. However, the evidence indicated that as late as November 1946 Albanian assistance to the Greek guerrillas continued in the form of providing arms and ammunition, as well as making available routes of entry, guides and liaison assistance for guerrilla groups returning to Greece from both Albania and Yugoslavia.

#### 4. B U L G A R I A.

d.) The evidence submitted to the Commission regarding Bulgarian aid to the Greek guerrilla movement indicated that Greek guerrillas, in groups and individually were assisted in crossing Bulgarian territory from Yugoslavia to Greece, and that sizeable Greek guerrilla groups had on a number of occasions taken refuge on Bulgarian soil, with the assistance of certain instances Greek guerrillas, travelling to Greece from Yugoslavia, were given arms in or near Sofia; and that hospital facilities were offered to Greek guerrillas who were transferred for this purpose to Bulgarian territory.

- b.) The Commission feels that the weight of the evidence indicates that aid was provided the Greek guerrillas by the Bulgarian Government in the form of assistance in entering and leaving Bulgarian territory, provision of transportation for guerrillas crossing Bulgaria to and from Yugoslavia, and hospitalization of guerrillas wounded in Greece. Less evidence was provided the Commission, however, as to the arming and equipping of guerrillas.

SECTION B:

Movement to Detach Macedonia from Greece.

5. a) The Greek government charged that support was being given by the Yugoslav and Bulgarian Government; through propaganda and otherwise, looking towards the detachment of the province of Macedonia from Greece and its incorporation together with Bulgarian and Yugoslavian Macedonia into the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia.
- b) Evidence was introduced in the Commission, consisting of these quotations from speeches by responsible Yugoslav and Bulgarian statemens and from the government-controlled press, which indicated that these governments adopted a policy of support for a separate Macedonian state within the Yugoslav federation, and exploited the aspirations of Slavo-Macedonians in Greece for an autonomous Macedonia. This exploitation had the natural consequence of fomenting dissatisfaction and disturbances among the Slavo-Macedonians.
- c) In addition, the Commission heard witnesses who testified that there was in Yugoslavia an organization known as NOA

(National Labour Front), one of whose objects was to detach Greek Macedonia from Greece and to incorporate it into the federation of Yugoslavia. These witnesses testified that the activities of NOF were directed from its headquarters in Skoplje and during its most active phase through a special "Aegean Bureau" in Bitolj (Monastir). The program of NOF included propaganda supporting the Macedonian movement.

- d) In explanation of the organization called NOF, it was stated that it was in fact no more than the name of the Greek EAM in Slavic translation. Both the Yugoslav and Bulgarian Representatives denied, however, that NOF was engaged in activities of the type described in the Greek charge. Although certain witnesses testified to the Commission that they had not heard of this aspect of the functions of NOF, the references to NOF's relationship to the Macedonian movement were so numerous and so uniform as to leave little doubt on this point in the minds of the Commission.
- e) Furthermore it is quite clear that Bulgaria also supported the movement for the unification of the three parts of Macedonia as a republic within the Yugoslav federation. As late as November 16 1946, an article in the official Communist paper Rabotnichesko Delo welcomed the creation of the Republic of Macedonia within the Yugoslav Federation, and asserted that "unification of other parts of the Macedonian nation can take place only on the basis of this republic. Such unification is in the interests of the future peaceful development of Bulgaria in close cooperation with Yugoslavia."
- f) In explaining the attitude of his Government with regard to the Macedonian question the Yugoslav Liaison Representative stated that Yugoslavia could not be indifferent to the "terrible state" of the Slav minority in Macedonia. He stated that Yugoslavia's interest was in assisting this minority in its

achievement of full political and cultural rights and that this was to be achieved within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations.

- g) It was pointed out to the Commission, and not disputed, that after the Varkiza Agreement over 20.000 Greek citizens had fled into Yugoslavia, (either directly or through Albania or Bulgaria) and approximately 5.000 into Bulgaria, a substantial proportion in each case being of Slavo Macedonian origin. Evidence was also presented in support of the charge that Greece has sanctioned persecution of its Slavo-Macedonian minorities. Furthermore, the Commission heard some testimony that the Slavic dialect spoken by the Slavo-Macedonians who comprise about 85.000 persons was not taught in schools, and that in certain areas the use of this dialect by Greek nationals had on occasions been prohibited.
- h) The Commission is of the opinion that such treatment has resulted in unrest and discontent on the part of the Slavic minority in Greek Macedonia and has provided fertile breeding ground for separatist movements. This does not, of course, absolve the Northern neighbours from their responsibility for their support of the Macedonian movement.
- i) Although it is undoubtedly true, as pointed out by the Yugoslav Liaison Representative that during the war the Axis occupying authorities had themselves supported a Macedonian autonomist movement in an effort to create controversy among the Balkan states, it seems equally clear that since the war the Yugoslav and Bulgarian governments, by speeches of responsible officials and articles in the press, have themselves revived and promoted a separatist movement among the Slavo-Macedonians in Greece.

### III. SECTION 2.

#### FRONTIER VIOLATIONS NOT INVOLVING AID TO GREEK GUERRILLAS.-

##### 6. INTRODUCTION.

The Greek Government charged that Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were deliberately provoking incidents on their common frontier. In turn, Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia made similar accusations against Greece. In each case a substantial number of witnesses were heard by the Commission as well as extensive documentation in support of the charges. The incidents brought to the Commissions attention ranged from penetrations across the border of a few yards, to sheep stealing and exchanges of shots between frontier guards. In these conclusions the Commission clearly distinguishes between the activities of Greece's three northern neighbours in support of the guerrillas in Greece as set forth above, and frontier provocations and incidents not connected with aid to the guerrilla movement, as set forth in the present chapter.

##### 7. THE GRECO-ALBANIAN FRONTIER.

a. The Greek Government submitted a list of 108 incidents on the Greco-Albanian frontier during 1946, declaring that they were characteristic of a "policy of systematic provocation adopted by the Albanian Government". The majority of these incidents concerned the theft of livestock, shooting affrays between Greek and Albanian patrols, and the abduction of Greek soldiers and civilians into Albanian territory. The total casualties resulting from these incidents amounted to between 20 and 30 persons killed, wounded, and captured.

b. Similarly, Albania charged Greece with 111 provocations on the frontier during the year 1946, including violation of Albanian territorial rights on land, on sea and in the air as well as the traditional sheep-stealing incidents and skirmishes

between border patrols. The total casualties resulting from these incidents amounted to 4 persons killed and two wounded, as well as a certain relatively minor damage in property rights. The Albanian Liaison Representative charged that these incidents were deliberately provoked by the Greek Government in pursuance of its claim to the Albanian region of Northern Epirus, and further, that they were deliberate incursions evidencing the aggressive intentions of the Greek Government.

8. THE GRECO-BULGARIAN FRONTIER.

(a) It was charted in the Greek case that thirty-two incidents had occurred in 1946 and two in 1947, on the Greco-Bulgarian frontier for which it regarded the Bulgarian authorities as responsible. These incidents had cost the lives of 11 Greeks, although the majority of them were minor incidents and of a non-political character. The Bulgarian case, in turn, made mention of thirty-three incidents attributed to Greek initiative in 1946 and forty-six violations of the frontier from 23 January to the end of February 1947 including numerous territorial violations by planes.

(b) These charges were denied by the Greek and Bulgarian Representatives, respectively. To the Bulgarian assertion that the provocations were a result of the fact that Greek frontier posts had been withdrawn to a depth of several kilometres and that the Greek territory along the frontier was not under the control of Greek authorities, it was replied that the frontier posts had been withdrawn for the very purpose of preventing undue friction.



(c) In reply to the Greek charges, the Bulgarian representative pointed out that its government had faithfully notified the Allied Control Commission in Sofia of all frontier incidents, and that during the two years since the war there had been no disturbances or disorders on the Bulgarian side of the frontier. In the spring of 1946 the Bulgarian Government expressed its willingness to put into effect again the Greek-Bulgarian frontier accord of 1931, which has been inoperative since 1941, and requested the Greek Government to execute a protocol to implement the 1931 accord with the modifications necessary to give effect to the changes which have taken place in the border service since the original agreement. The Greek Government did not respond on the ground that diplomatic relations did not exist between the two countries, stating, however, that it, on its part, had lived up to the spirit of the 1931 agreement.

9. THE GRECO-YUGOSLAV FRONTIER

a) It was charged by the Greek Representative that fifty-seven incidents had occurred along the Greco-Yugoslav frontier in 1946 which had cost the lives of nineteen Greek military personnel. The Yugoslav representative, in turn, cited thirty-five frontier incidents alleged to have occurred between 13 June 1945 and 18 Dec. 1946, in addition to forty-three flights over Yugoslav territory by seventy-seven Greek planes between 18 May 1945 and 3 Dec. 1946.

b) In estimating the violating on all three frontiers the evidence showed clearly that there have been since the war a large number of violations on each side. On the other hand, no evidence of probative value was introduced which tended to indicate that the frontier violations not connected with guerilla activities were deliberately provoked either by the governments of the northern neighbors or by that of Greece, or that there was any policy of systematic provocation on either side, or that the incidents themselves were evidence of the aggressive intentions of either country.

c) The conclusion is inevitable, however, that the large number of incidents, the accusations and counter-accusations made by the governments against one another, and the willingness of the authorities on both sides to magnify minor incidents into important skirmishes, accompanied by shooting and bloodshed, is evidence of the strained relations between the countries.

SECTION D:

GREEK DOMESTIC POLICY IN RELATION TO THE COMMISSION'S INQUIRY

- 10(a) The Commission, in considering the relation of Greek internal policy to the area of its inquiry, recognized that the disturbed conditions in Greece are a heritage of the tragic events of the war and of the consequent problems facing the Greek Government since the liberation in its efforts to carry on a program of economic rehabilitation. Furthermore, the experience of the Committee in Greece, especially in Athens and Salonika, showed that there existed a considerable degree of political freedom, freedom of speech, press, and assembly, despite disturbed conditions. Indeed, of the four countries visited by the Commission, only in Greece did it hear witnesses who criticized the policies of their government or receive delegations from free organizations which presented it with evidence against the government.
- (b) The Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia charged that the present regime was responsible for a state of civil war in Greece and for the disturbed conditions in the northern provinces. The Greek government took the position that an investigation of this charge would involve the internal affairs of Greece which were not within the Commission's competence. Accordingly the Greek government did not on these grounds present evidence in refutation and in consequence the evidence before the Commission was inevitably one-sided. Nevertheless it was felt by the Commission that insofar as it might constitute a factor contributing to the disturbed conditions in Northern Greece along the Greek frontier, the Greek internal situation could not be ignored.
- (c) The evidence presented to the Commission revealed that the great majority of the clashes between the guerrillas and the forces of the Greek Government had occurred in the northern Greek provinces of Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace. Of two estimates submitted to the Commission, one showed that 707 out of 922 clashes had occurred in the three northern provinces of Greece, and the other 769 out of 1,338 had taken place there. A sufficient number of incidents were recorded in central and southern Greece, however, to impress the Commission that while conditions in Northern Greece were far more acutely disturbed than elsewhere there

was a general condition of unrest in Greece as a whole. The Commission does not find, however, that this condition amounts to a state of civil war. It noted however that an important factor in this unrest is the persistent existence of the Greek Communist Party, which directs the EAM coalition and the operations of the Greek guerrillas, to participate in the government without elections.

- (d) In connection with the present situation in Greece the Commission was presented with a body of evidence in support of the charge that responsibility for the situation lay in Greek domestic policy. This evidence was presented not only by the representatives of Greece's three northern neighbours, but by three Communist-controlled groups: the EAM (National Liberation Front), the Central Committee of the General Confederation of Labour, and the EFGY youth organization. In addition the Commission heard Representatives of the Left Liberal Party as well as a number of individual witnesses. This body of evidence was to the effect that opposition political groups in Greece had been subject to persecution in violation of the Varkiza Agreement of February 12, 1945 and that the civil rights of the Macedonian and Chamuriot minorities had been restricted. The persecution of opposition groups was said to have taken the form of large scale arrests, of imprisonment or exile, beatings and other brutalities and the burning of houses as a punitive measure. The evidence indicated that this persecution was conducted by some members of the Greek gendarmerie and by officially tolerated right wing bands and extended to a wide variety of political groups, especially the parties of the EAM coalition.

- (e) On the other hand, the Rector of the University of Athens who said he represented some sixty organizations, including certain labour groups, testified to the contrary asserting that it was the Communists who carried on terrorism in Greece. Moreover, there was a considerable body of evidence to show that EAM had itself violated the Varkiza Agreement by failing to carry out its obligation to surrender all its arms to the Greek Government, and by urging its members to hide their arms and to leave Greece or go underground. Furthermore, although EAM charged before the Commission that the Greek regime was wholly responsible for the

disorders in Greece, the Commission noted that EAM had refused to take part in the 1946 elections, despite the fact that these elections were held under international observations in the spirit of the Varkiza Agreement.

- (f) The Commission received sufficient evidence, however, to warrant the conclusion that immediately after the liberation of Greece the small Slav-speaking and Chamuriot minorities in Greek Macedonia and Epirus had been the victims of retaliatory excesses. As a result the numbers of the Chamuriot minorities who had not already left with the Germans were forced to flee. In reply the Greek Government asserted that the acts in question were committed before it had re-established control of the areas concerned, and that members of these minority groups had collaborated with the Axis occupying forces during the war.
- (g) The Albanian Representative charged that numerous Albanian war criminals and Quislings had been granted asylum in Greece. It was alleged that they were not only given exceptionally favourable treatment in Greece as regards rations, housing, and personal liberty, but were encouraged in their political activity by the Greek authorities. Similar charges were made by the Yugoslav Representative, who claimed that Greece had become "the meeting point" of Yugoslav war criminals and quislings. To a lesser degree charges of this character were also made by the Bulgarian Representative.
- (h) In reply the Greek Liaison Representative asserted that, while indeed a considerable number of refugees from the three Northern countries had entered Greece since the end of the war, the Greek Government had dealt with them in accordance with international practice. It was pointed out that all of these refugees had been established in camps in the Southern part of Greece and they had not been permitted to engage in any activity whatsoever which could be regarded as inimical to Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. A team of the Commission visited a number of places where these refugees were held, and although there was some testimony indicating political activities on the part of the internees directed against Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the Commission does not feel that the Greek Government itself had encouraged

it. On the basis of the team's visit the Commission also is of the opinion that the charge ~~that the~~ internees received preferential treatment was refuted. "It should be mentioned in this connection that following requests to each of the four governments for information in respect to refugees within their borders, only the Greek Government furnished the Commission with the detailed information requested."

- (i) In summation, the Commission is of the opinion that the discrimination and persecution to which minorities and political opposition groups were subjected by the Greek Government in the atmosphere of bitterness and reprisal following the civil war of 1944-1945 as well as communist propaganda had caused several thousand persons to flee to the mountains or take refuge on the soil of Greece's three Northern neighbours, where they formed groups actively hostile to the Greek regime. To this extent it is the Commission's opinion that the present general disturbed conditions in Greece which have existed since the beginning of the war are factors which help to explain and thus bear an indirect relation to the situation investigated by the Commission. On the other hand, the existence of disturbed conditions in Greece in no way relieves the three Northern neighbours of their duty under international law to prevent and suppress subversive activity on their territory aimed against another Government, nor does it relieve them of direct responsibility for their support of the Greek guerillas.

SECTION E:

TERRITORIAL CLAIMS

- 11(a) The Albanian Representative charged that Greek insistence that a state of war still existed between Albania and Greece and Greece's continued assertion of its territorial claim on Southern Albania (Northern Epirus) were important factors contributing to strained relations between the countries. In reply, the Greek Representative recalled that it was the Albanians who had initiated the state of war when they participated in the Italian aggression against Greece in 1940, and that such territorial claims as the Greeks might have against Albania had been placed before the appropriate international bodies.

/(b)

- (b) The Commission did not investigate these charges regarding Greek foreign policy, as they related more to official territorial claims and to traditional Greek-Albanian revalry than to matters coming within the scope of the Commission's inquiry. The Commission believes, however, that the fact that Greece has maintained an uncompromising attitude on these questions has undoubtedly increased the tension between the two countries and contributed to the psychological atmosphere evidenced in part by the frontier clashes.
- (c) Bulgarian charges with regard to the alleged expansionist foreign policy of Greece made reference both to Greek claims made at the Paris Peace Conference and to extremist statements which have been made in the Greek press and at public meetings. To these charges Greece replied by pointing out that Greek claims against Bulgaria had been restricted to strategic frontier rectifications, while Bulgaria had persistently made claims for the whole province of Western Thrace.
- (d) Yugoslav charges, alleging that Greece desired to annex a portion of Southern Yugoslavia, were based on several unofficial statements and newspaper articles. These charges were categorically denied by the Greek Representative, and were not investigated by the Commission.
- (e) The Commission did not regard the settlement of territorial claims raised before appropriate international bodies as within the scope of its work. It nevertheless felt that the continued reiteration of Greece's claims against Bulgaria, and Bulgaria's claim to Western Thrace, after they had been rejected at the Peace Conference, as well as Greece's claim against Albania, was a factor which tended to increase the tension between the countries. The Commission noted that the EAM coalition had supported Greek territorial claims, both against Albania and Bulgaria, and was therefore in the same position as the Greek Government in this regard.

## CHAPTER II (x)

### Section A: WITNESSES AND WITNESSES STATEMENTS ON BEHALF OF GREECE

12. The Security Council Commission possesses sufficient evidence that in many cases the Greek authorities selected their witnesses for the Commission from Fascist and criminal elements.

Thus, the Greek Government's White Book (p.144) contains the statements of the former Colonel Ivan Gologanov of the Bulgarian Army. During the German occupation of Bulgaria Gologanov was President of the Field Court-Martial at Plevna. He sentenced many Bulgarian anti-Fascists to death and is regarded in Bulgaria as a war criminal. For his grievous crimes against the Bulgarian people Gologanov was sentenced to death in Bulgaria. (S/AC.4/PV.10, p.16).

Mr. Kyrou, the Representative of the Greek Government, in his letter of 25th Feb. 1947, insisted on Vlahos Christos being interrogated in the Commission. It was this Vlahos who on 20 March 1947, killed in the streets of Salonika the former Minister Zevgos, a member of the Central Committee of EAM. Lazaros Tsausis and Partulas Anastasios, witnesses on behalf of Greece, were also implicated in the murder of Zevgos.

One of the chief witnesses on behalf of Greece, Fotios Kontopanos (Annivas) is characterised by his own brother (F. Kontopanos and M. Kontopanos) as an amoral person and provocateur connected with the neo-Fascists (Memorandum of 5 March 1947, Annexes 1 & 2). A letter by K. Davas published in the Greek Press on 28th Feb. 1947 draws attention to the fact that the statements of Kontopanos before the Security Council Commission were of the nature of a provocation (id., Annex 4). Kontopanos own admission that "additional statements were made after the Security Council Commission arrived in Greece" (S/AC.4/PV.34, p.6) indicate that these statements were premeditated.

---

(x) For the attitude of various delegations to the conclusions set out in Chapter II, see Chapter III.



Here also attention must be drawn to the witness Valtadoros . Almost immediately after Valtadoros made his statements in the Security Council Commission these were exposed one after the other in the Greek Press. In their statement published on 4 March 1947, 161 Slavo-Macedonians in the prison of Pavlos Mellas call Valtadoros Van-der-Lube, and his statements "false and confused" (S/AC.4/220,p.14

The fact that four men sentenced at the same time as Valtadoros were executed in October 1946 and that Valtadoros was not executed cannot be regarded as accidental. Nor can one regard as accidental the fact that Valtadoros made his new statements, according to his own words, two weeks after he had been sentenced to death. Finally, Valtadoros' own admissions before the Security Council Commission are not without importance since he stated: "I am unable to explain why I have not yet been executed. I think they wanted to keep me so that I might make statements to you today against neighbouring countries." (S/AC.4/PV.36, p.10).

A letter received by the Commission stated that Harismidis, who gave evidence before the Commission regarding Boulkes and foreign aid to the Greek guerillas, had never left Greece. The same letter also reported that Harismidis gave evidence as a witness on 2nd Feb. 1947 in the Court-Martial at the village of Metalikos at the trial of twelve peasants against whom he made statements of a provocative nature. (S/AC.4/220, p.3).

The Greek Press published a letter written by the "witness" Patatukas, a copy of which was sent to the Security Council Commission. This letter revealed the way in which his statements were falsified (S/AC.4/220, p.7).

The witness Jivko Mladenovich, who is more than once referred to in the Report in support of the Greek charges, admitted that he was a Chetnik who had fled from Yugoslavia (S/AC.4/SC.3/PV8, p.5, French text).

Among the witnesses on behalf of Greece are large-scale and petty thieves: Kotsinako, who stole 5,500 dollars at Tirana, and was put forward by the Greek authorities as one of the principal witnesses against Albania (S/AC.4/PV.34, Part II, p.9), and Krum Dimitr, sentenced by a Bulgarian court for the theft of tin for a factory and who fled to Greece and was put forward as a witness against Bulgaria (S/AC.4/PV52, Part II, 11 March 1947).

A number of witnesses stated that threats, torture and blackmail were used in the prisons of Greece in order to obtain appropriate statements for the Security Council Commission. Gatsios, one of the principal witnesses on behalf of Greece, stated that "gendarmes tortured Kontopanos before sending him to prison" (White Book, p.34).

The prisoners Zervas and Petsos stated at the interrogation that they themselves had witnessed threats, blackmail and also torture to which Valtadoros was subjected continually for three or more days in order to get him to state that Yugoslavia was aiding the guerillas (S/AC.4/W.3).

On 11th March the Greek Press published a statement by Anis Manovis that after he was sentenced to death the officer on duty who was trying to get provocative statements from him, said that Valtadoros would get out of his predicament, but that five men would be shot as they were making no statements (S/AC.4/220, p.12).

On 14th March 1947 there was published a letter by Ioannis Mizamidis (who was in prison together with Valtadoros), stating that at Salonika Valtadoros had had a long conversation with Captain Varikopoulos who declared that to save one's life one had to give evidence before the Security Council Commission regarding the aid given by Yugoslavia and Bulgaria to the guerillas and regarding the aim of EAM and the Communists to detach Greek Macedonia (id.p.13).

The same Valtadoros was compelled to admit - "In the prison of Ardea I was tied up from 10-18 August" (S/AC.4/W3).

Similar statements were made by other witnesses.

Patie Djen - "Every member of the resistance movement who was arrested was beaten till the blood flowed" (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV4, p.9).

Kirinakis - "Several others who spat blood were beaten in my presence" (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV.6, p.5).

The Bulgarian civilians Ikonomov and Serbakov who happened to enter Greek territory by accident met the same fate. They were bound and beaten by gendarmes who demanded that they should make false statements regarding aid to the guerillas by Bulgaria (S/AC.4/PV62, Part II, pp.11, 12, 18).

An open letter to the Commission (published in the Greek Press on 26 Feb.), reported that the inhabitants of the villages of Karp1, Onalo, Grivo (district of Gumenitsa) were being subjected by the Greek authorities to terrorism and blackmail for the purpose of obtaining statements for the Commission regarding the northern neighbours of Greece (S/AC.4/220).

On 11th March the Greek Press published a letter by Anis Manovis who was under sentence in which he stated that after he had been condemned to death he was blackmailed in every way and promised pardon if he would make false statements (id. p. 12).

On 2nd Feb. 1947 the Greek Press published a letter by Karainianis in which he stated that the Greek authorities were putting pressure upon him and trying to persuade him to make statements before the Commission against Yugoslavia and other neighbouring democratic States.

Tomas Zahos stated before the Team of the Commission that he was compelled by threats to sign a statement alleging that the neighbouring countries were aiding the Greek guerillas. He also stated that the admission of Kontopanos were obtained in the same way (S/AC.4/SC2A/SR.12, p.2).

On 3 April 1947 the Greek Press published a statement by Nikolas Sidiropoulos (one of the accomplices in the terroristic attack on Zevgos). A copy of this statement was afterwards received by the Security Council Commission. It reported that after the arrival of the Commission in Greece, the Greek representative on the Commission had a personal conversation with several prisoners and

invited them to sign statements that were required "in order to save Greece from the Slavs". Sidiropoulos himself was given money for provocative statements and saw Zafiridis, one of the witnesses on behalf of Greece, receive money for the same purpose on two occasions.

According to his own admission Catsios first made statements regard the school and military training at Boulakes at the beginning of Feb. 1947 (S/AC.4/PV.34, p. 5 French text), that is to say, at the time of the arrival of the Security Council Commission in Athens, although he had said nothing of the sort in his previous statements (White Book, p. 27, French text). This shows beyond question the provocative character of his statements.

Interrogated by Team IA at Yanina, the witnesses Kentros and Tsipis stated that they had been in the territory of Albania with Raptis, the leader of a guerilla group. At the trial of Yanina on 6 Sept. 1946, however, Raptis stated that neither he nor his group and consequently neither Kentros nor Tsipis had ever been in Albania.

The fact speaks for itself that as the result of these two statements Kentros and Tsipis who were tried at the same time as Raptis saved their lives, whereas Raptis was shot (S/AC.4/PV.27, p.10).

Bobtsis, who was under sentence of death, submitted to the Security Council Commission a statement to the effect that he could give important information to the Commission especially regarding Government terrorism. At the same meeting of the Commission while admitting that such a statement had actually been submitted to the Commission, Bobtsis began to make absurd statements against Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria, and declared that no terrorism was being carried on by the guerillas (S/AC.4/PV.54-II, p.41 French text). The Security Council Commission rejected this witness and ceased to interrogate him further. The statements made by Bobtsis before the Commission were undoubtedly due to the fact that he was blackmailed. The Security Council Commission has at its disposal documents confirming the fact that persons who did not wish to bear false witness were subjected to cruel repression.

According to "Elefteri Ellada" of 16 April 1947 a special Court sentenced to death K. Papadoulis (village of Ellinonori, district of Didimotihon) who refused to bear false witness. Georgios Kirinakis, aged 20, a member of EPCN, who was under sentence of death, stated that the Greek authorities demanded from him false statements for the Commission. At the preliminary interrogations he was severely beaten (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV.6, p.4).

Patis Djen, under sentence of death, also stated that he had been subjected to beatings because he refused to admit that "he was the mouthpiece of the Slavs". During the preliminary interrogations Patis was also subjected to cruel beatings (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV.4, pp. 3 and 7).

Regarding the repressive measures taken by the Greek authorities against the persons and organisations who appealed to the Security Council Commission, the following documents supply the best evidence:

1. The Memorandum from the participants in the demonstration on 7 Feb. 1947 at the Hotel Agropoli Palus protesting against attempts by "X" to kill two participants in the demonstration (S/AC.4/SC.12 of 26th Feb. 1947).

2. A delegation of the employees of the Ministry of Supply reported that on 7 Feb. 1947 the Memorandum prepared for transmission to the Commission was confiscated by gendarmes, and that two employees of the Ministry were arrested in this connection. They also reported that in attempting to enter the building of the Commission to report this fact they were beaten (S/AC.4/PV.15).

3. A letter of the Central Committee of EAM regarding the arrest of those who submitted a Memorandum to the Commission in Athens (S/AC.4/NC/17 of 5 March 1947, No.1).

4. A telegram from the EAM Committee, Piraeus, protesting against the fact that the Vice-Director of the City Police, Kanellopoulis, forbade the EAM Committee to meet Team No. 1 of the Security Council Commission that was visiting Piraeus (S/AC.4/NC/17 of 5 March 1947, No. 25.).

5. A letter signed by the Delegation of EAM stating that persons submitting memoranda to the Commission were being arrested in Athens (S/AC.4/NC/19, 7 March 1947, No.3).

6. A telegram from the Island of Icaria from Georg Tanasekos, a member of the Political Bureau of the Agrarian Party and member of the Central Committee of EAM, stating that among the 600 persons exiled from Athens on 4 March 1947, the majority consisted of those who had submitted memoranda to the Commission (S/AC.4/NC/22, 12 March 1947, No.1).

7. A telegram from Antonio Rousos and Christos Maheropoulos, members of EAM and Trade Union leaders, stating that during the mass arrests in Athens at the beginning of March, many of those who submitted memoranda to the Commission had been exiled to Icaria (S/AC.4/NC/22, 12 March 1947, No.22).

8. A telegram, received after the departure of the Commission from Greece, from 30 exiles in the Island of Icaria stating that they had been exiles in the Island of Icaria stating that they had been exiled merely because they had appealed to the Security Council Commission.

9. A letter from the Organisation of National Solidarity stating that according to the complaints which they had received the administration of the prison at Yanina (Epirus) and Naouplion (Peloponnesus) had forbidden the political prisoners to send telegrams to the Commission (S/AC.4/NC/26, 19 March 1947, No.12),

The Security Council Commission possesses evidence that a number of statements contained in the White Book "Evidence in confirmation of the Greek complaint to the Security Council", are falsified.

Hatsios, the chief witness on behalf of Greece, characterises the credibility of his statements contained in this Book as follows: "I deny them because they were false" (S/AC.4/PV35, p.11 French Text).

Zahos - "did not make the statements published in the White Book" (S/AC.4/SC.2A/3R12).

Ikonomov denied the statements published in the White Book and at the interrogation in the Security Council Commission described the methods by which these statements had been obtained from him (S/AC.4/PV52, Part II, p.6).

The White Book (page 112) contains the statements made by Zois. When Team IA wished to question Zois, the Representative of the Greek Government attempted under various pretexts to avoid this, and it was only after emphatic insistence that Zois was presented to the team for interrogation. At this interrogation Zois made statements entirely at variance with those which were published in the White Book. This justifies the conclusion that the statements of Zois in the White Book had been falsified.

Apart from the contradictions and fictions in the statements of witnesses on behalf of Greece contained in Chapter I regarding the crossing of guerrillas from Greece to Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania and regarding individual instances of medical aid being given to guerrillas in the territory of these countries, it should be noted that these statements by Greek witnesses cannot be taken into account for the further reason that to give shelter to political refugees and also to give them medical treatment is not contrary to the universally recognized standards of international law .

SECTION B: A L B A N I A.

13. The information collected by the Commission regarding Albania (interrogation of witnesses, documents and other evidence submitted in confirmation of the Greek charges, the refutations thereof submitted by Albania) and set forth above, enables one to come to the following conclusions:

The starting point of the Greek charges is the fact that after the December events of 1944 and the Varkiza Agreement, a considerable number of Greek citizens, including former combatants of the ELAS army, emigrated to neighbouring countries, particularly Albania. This fact was interpreted by the Greek Liaison Representative as a premeditated act aimed against Greece, inspired by neighbouring countries and having for its object the transfer abroad of the operational base of the guerilla movement. In confirmation of this the Greek Representative referred in particular to the written statements made under oath by a number of witnesses (ZOIS, ZAHOS and others) in which they declared that they had fled to neighbouring countries in fulfilment of the instructions or directions which they had been given (vide White Book, pp/113,110). On being questioned by the Commission or its Teams, however, these witnesses stated that there were no special orders to former ELAS men to go into neighbouring countries and that they took refuge there merely for reasons of personal security in view of the persecution that had begun (vide S/LC.4/SC.2A/PV 21, p.8 and PV 11, p.18).

Moreover, numerous facts now at the disposal of the Commission clearly show that this version put forward by the Greek Liaison Representative's statements made in the Commission by the representative of various Greek democratic organizations, the statements of political exiles in the Islands of Sirois and Icaria, the thousands of telegrams, letters and memoranda received by the Commission from various non-governmental organizations and private persons bear witness to the fact that the real cause of the mass emigration from Greece to



neighbouring countries of the former combatants of ELAS and democratically-minded citizens of Greece was and is in general the terrorism and persecution carried on against this category of citizens.

It should be considered as established that Greek democrats and former participants in the resistance movement fled in thousands to Albania and other countries bordering on Greece from the terrorism carried on by rightist bands, the police and gendarmerie in order to save their lives and not in order to organize any hostile actions directed against Greece (vide statements by the representatives of the Central Committee of LAM, S/AC.4/55 and 56; Left-wing Liberal Party and ELD Party Greek General Confederation of Labour, S/AC.4/FV 30 and 31; Pan-Hellenic Federation of Democratic Organizations and Pan-Hellenic Youth Organization EPOY, S/AC.4/FV 41; documents received from the Staff of General Markos, S/AC.4/SC.2/FV 1-25 and many other documents).

The accusation that the military training of Greek refugees was taking place in the territory of Albania cannot be regarded as proved.

The witnesses presented to the Commission by the Greek Government in support of this charge made conflicting and confused and therefore altogether unconvincing statements. For instance, the witness Gatsios declared in his original statements, taken from him under oath by the Greek authorities, that at Rubig (a place in the territory of Albania where a camp of Greek refugees was situated) only lectures of a political character were given, which he had never attended (White Book p.21). But in the Commission he stated that in May 1945 he was enrolled in the third class of a military school and that he carried out exercises there with a sand-table (S/AC.4/FV35, pp.3, 4). In his statements to the Greek authorities the witness Zafaris also said nothing about the military training of the inhabitants of Rubig, but in the Commission he gave all sorts

of details regarding the so-called "military-school", which was alleged to exist there. Moreover, regarding the question of the number of classes in this school his statements contradicted the statements made by GATSIOS (conf. White Book, p.107 and S/AC.4/PV38 p.19) Previously the witness KONTOPANOS had merely told the Greek authorities that the inhabitants of Rubig had arms and were organised on military lines, but in his statements before the Commission he said there was a military school there and gave various details of its organization (conf. White Book p.58 and S/AC.4/PV34, pp.10-11). Finally, the witness ZAHOS, who was at Rubig at the same time as KONTOPANOS, GATSIOS and ZAFIRIS, stated at the meeting of Team 1A that his previous statement regarding the camp at Rubig (White Book p.110) was false and extracted from him by force and that in reality no military or political training took place there, (S/AC 4/SC.2A/PV 11)

Likewise the "military text-book" alleged to have been published at Rubig and submitted by the Greek Liaison Representative as "material evidence" cannot be regarded as having any value as evidence both on account of its contents and the contradictory nature of the witnesses' statements concerning it and of the theatrical manner in which it was submitted to the Commission by the Greek Delegate. The fact that when the witnesses were asked by the Greek Representative whether they knew this book (which he showed them without opening it and which had a red jacket without any title, and they immediately replied without hesitation in the affirmative left one with the impression that the demonstration of this "text book" at the meeting of the Commission had been previously rehearsed by the Greek Delegate and the witnesses presented by him.

The witness GATSIOS stated that this text book was published in August 1945, whereas ZAFIRIS said that it was only "prepared for the press" in October 1945 and KONTOPANOS recalled

page 194

that the text book was published, perhaps in 1943. KONTOPIAKOS, one of the "authors" of the text book, was unable to give the Commission any details regarding the technical side of the preparations for its publication, whereas GATSIOS, who worked as a baker at Rubig and seemed to have nothing to do with this matter, revealed a strange familiarity with all the circumstances of its publication.

Besides the contradictions noted in the statements of the Greek witness, the Commission had at its disposal other facts and evidence directly refuting the Greek charges.

Team 1A was given the report of the Albanian Government Commission which investigated the camps at Rubig. This report gave the statements of the Albanian witnesses who unanimously declared that "the inhabitants of Rubig did not carry arms or engage in military training" (S/AC.4/SC.2A/21).

Likewise the accusation that the Albanian authorities supplied the Greek guerrillas with arms and food cannot be considered as founded.

In support of this accusation the Greek witnesses made such contradictory statements that they could in no wise be regarded as convincing.

The fact that the witness VELIANIDIS stated in the Commission that the guerrilla detachment to which he belonged was given arms in the territory of Albania (S/AC.4/PV.38, p.30), whereas in the statements he made under oath to the Greek authorities regarding this episode (White Book, page 100) he said nothing about being given arms in Albania, is evidence that VELIANIDIS' statements were especially prepared for the Commission. Moreover, it should be noted that the Commission doubted the identity of VELIANIDIS.

The witness, KOTSINAKO, who fled from Albania to avoid persecution for theft said that he was present at a meeting of the Albanian Communist Party at Tirana where a resolution was said to

have been passed to give German and Italian arms to the Greek guerrillas. But the witnesses STEFO GRABOTSKI, MOHAMED MEKEMEA, ILO KOSTA, PILO PERISTERI, who were named by KOTSINAKO himself as persons who were able to confirm this fact, completely denied his statements and said that no such meeting of the Communist party had ever taken place (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR 17).

A number of contradictions were also noted in the statements made by the witness TSOKLARPOULOS who was heard by Team 1A (vide S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV 14).

The charges brought by the Greek Government and the statements made by Greek witnesses are also refuted by the evidence of TERZOGLU, Commander of the guerrilla district of Agrafa, who told Team 1 that the Greek guerrillas did not receive any aid from neighbouring countries and that they obtained the necessary arms by disarming Rightist bands, gendarmes and Greek soldiers (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV 25, pp.14-15).

General Markos, Commander of the Greek Democratic Army, stated that his army was equipped exclusively with booty captured in engagements with the gendarmerie, regular troops and Rightist bands (S/AC.4/177 and annexes).

General Grigoriadis, leader of the Greek Left-Wing Liberal Party, stated in the Commission that all the stories about the Greek guerrillas being armed by neighbouring countries were absolutely false and that the guerrillas used captured British weapons which they took during operations (S/AC.4/PV 31, Annex 1, p.3.). Similar statements were made by other persons, for instance, many political exiles, former participants in the resistance movement who were interrogated in the Islands of Sirois and Icarin.

The accusations that guerrilla detachments crossed the Greek-Albanian frontier in both directions and that wounded guerrillas were sent to Albanian hospitals for treatment must also be considered as unconfirmed on the basis of the interrogation of witnesses and the examination of the material submitted.

KENTROS, one of the Greek witnesses interrogated in connection with these charges, contradicted himself at every step in his statements. Thus, he stated that the Commander of a guerrilla detachment which was being formed in Albanian territory for despatch to Greece was a certain Raptis and that he had been with him in Albanian territory: afterwards, he said that Raptis was not the Commander but the political director of this detachment. But Raptis himself, as appears from the information received by the Commission, stated at the trial at Yanina that he was a rank and file guerrilla and had never been in Albania in an automobile from Vlahopiskiloteris to Argirokastron, whereas in fact this road could not be used because the bridge at Petrani was blown up by the Germans (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR11, pp.3, 6). It is significant that Raptis was shot, but the witnesses KENTROS and TS who were tried with him at Yanina and made statements against Albania, were spared.

The witness TSETSEKILIS made contradictory statements regarding the strength of the guerrilla detachment alleged to have crossed from Albania to Greece. In the White Book (p.97) he stated that the detachment consisted of 30 men, but in his statement before the Commission he gave the figure as 60 men (S/C.4/PV45-11 p.5). This witness also made very conflicting statements regarding the so-called hospital treatment of wounded guerrillas in Albania. At first he said that he had himself been a witness of this fact, but afterwards he stated that he had merely heard about it (id., p.12). The witness ZAHOS himself denied all his own statements contained in the White Book, declaring that he had signed them under threats and pressure (vide S/AC.4./SR12, p.12).

DOFO, a deserter from the Albanian Army who was presented as a witness and made statements regarding the alleged crossing of Greek guerrillas into Albania, turned out to be a member of the

page 197

band of the Albanian War Criminal Abdulla Alaruti. Moreover, DOKO was confused in his details, declaring for instance that he arrived at Georgonstad in December and that he had seen in November 1946 the Greeks who arrived there. The statements of such a witness who makes a point of slandering Albania cannot, of course, be taken seriously.

The statements by the witnesses who appeared before the Commission with regard to these points of the Greek charges/ (KENTROS, VELANIDIS, TSOKLARPOULOS) turned out to be as contradictory, confused and inconclusive as in the other instances mentioned above.

The Commission possesses data which bear witness to the fact that the Greek authorities specially prepared false statements against Albania. A clear instance of this is provided by the witness Zahos who stated that he made his statements against the neighbouring countries of Greece under threats. It is clear from all this that the witnesses' evidence and consequently the Greek charges against Albania are unfounded.

SECTION C: BULGARIA.

14. The Greek Government accuses Bulgaria of supporting the guerilla movement in Greece.

The study and analysis of the documents received by the Commission and also the results of investigation have shown that these charges are unfounded.

That these charges are unfounded is confirmed by what follows:

The Greek Representative asserted, for instance, that the Bulgarian authorities were aiding guerillas crossing the frontier from Bulgaria to Greece. In confirmation of this charge, however, the memorandum and the White Book give only one instance of a guerilla group crossing from Bulgaria to Greece during the whole of 1946. It must be noted that if this single instance of a guerilla group crossing from Bulgaria to Greece actually took place it could not have had any influence on the armed struggle which had developed on a wide scale throughout Greece.

The majority of the witnesses on behalf of Greece interrogated by the Commission's Team stated that they themselves did not see the guerilla groups cross the frontier. Statements to this effect were made by Captain Elefteriadis, Lt. Malsulga, Voitsis B-lios and others.

Some of the witnesses merely saw the guerillas going in the direction of the frontier, but "did not actually see" them cross the frontier (Ailimpoudis).

Other witnesses stated that they allegedly saw Greek guerillas in various places in Bulgaria. For instance, Krum Ivanov, a criminal wanted by the Bulgarian authorities, stated that from the prison he saw a lorry carrying guerillas pass at a distance of two metres from the prison. He also said that this occurrence took place in October on the day a memorial service was held on the occasion of the anniversary of the death of

Stamboliski. This statement shows how false Ivanov's assertions are, because Stamboliski died in June and consequently there was no, and could not have been in October a memorial service on the occasion of his death.

Put forward to confirm the Greek charges, Ivan Golomanov, a fascist agent who had been sentenced to death by a Bulgarian court and fled to Greece, was unable to give any evidence except a fabricated story about 3 Bulgarians who, armed with pistols, were alleged to have crossed into Greek territory in August 1946 and afterwards returned to Bulgaria.

As regards the assertion that Bulgaria was supplying arms to the guerillas, the few contradictory witnesses' statements on this question also cannot serve as evidence either.

For instance, the White Book gives the statements of Christos Mandzurakis that groups of guerillas were given arms at Boukes. At the meeting of the Commission, however, he stated that the guerillas at Boukes were only given clothes but not weapons. He also stated that at a "place near a bridge" his group was given 35 semi-automatic rifles of German and Italian origin and two British machine-guns and that he was given a German automatic, although he did not name other types of weapons apart from the semi-automatic rifles and machine-guns already mentioned. The facts stated by Mandzurakis are entirely unconfirmed.

The 14 year old boy Zlatinoudis, who had been in a partisan detachment since 1 Nov. 1946, was also put forward as a witness on behalf of Greece. This witness told the Commission that he knew nothing about aid being given to the guerilla detachment by the Bulgarian army or the Bulgarian authorities (S/AC-/SC-/PV/Op.12-17).



The statements of Papadoulis, given in the White Book, that the Greek guerillas received from Bulgaria 70 perfectly new light machine-guns of American and British manufacture are unconfirmed and could not, of course, be supported with any evidence. The absurdity of these statements is quite obvious.

In confirmation of the charge against Bulgaria that it had posts on its territory which were used as "field hospitals for guerillas", reference was made to the statements of the above-mentioned criminal Krum Ivanov, Mandzurakis, the statements of Papadoulis who was not presented to the Commission and to the statements of the 14 year old boy Zlatinoudis. It should be noted that in all these statements there is no mention of special posts - "field hospitals" and that only the dispatch of individual wounded guerillas to Bulgaria is mentioned, and then only on the strength of rumours. Naturally, evidence of this kind is no confirmation of the above-mentioned charges.

Witnesses on behalf of Bulgaria, heard by the Commission, denied all the assertions that Bulgaria was aiding the Greek guerillas, and the statements on this question by witnesses on behalf of Greece.

At the interrogation of witnesses in Bulgaria it was found that the Greek frontier authorities had specially fabricated false evidence against Bulgaria by torturing persons who fell into their hands. For instance, Triantafilidis Stefanos Kostadinis a captured Greek soldier of the frontier guard, stated at the meeting of the Commission in Sofia that the Greek authorities compelled captured guerillas to say that they had come from Bulgaria (S/AC.4/PV.2-11, pp.19-31; S/AC.4/PV.2, pp.1-12).

The witness Dimitri Ivanov, whose statements regarding aid to the guerillas by Bulgaria are given in the Greek White Book, told the Commission that finding himself by accident on Greek territory, he was beaten and compelled to sign false

statements drawn up by the Greek authorities. This statement by Ikonomov was confirmed by the witness Serbakov who was with him in Greek territory and was also beaten and compelled to sign unknown papers.

The Bulgarian representative submitted to the Commission a document (Order No. 708 of the Minister of Internal Affairs), from which it appears that guerillas crossing in individual cases into Bulgarian territory were disarmed in accordance with international custom and sent to a special camp.

Thus, it is evident from the documents examined by the Commission that the evidence submitted on behalf of Greece and founded on the contradictory and false statements of witnesses, among whom there are also Fascist and criminal elements, in no way confirms the accusations brought against Bulgaria of aiding the Greek guerillas.

-----

SECTION D: YUGOSLAVIA

15. The Greek Government accuses Yugoslavia of supporting the guerilla movement in Greece. This support is said to take the following forms : recruitment and military training of Greek refugees in Yugoslav territory, the arming and equipping of groups and individuals, their transfer across the frontier to Greece for the purpose of helping the guerrilla detachments operating there.

In support of the Greek charge that Greek refugees in the territory of Yugoslavia received military training, reference is made chiefly to the statements of the following witnesses on behalf of Greece : Gatsios, Kontopanos, Mandzurakis, Zafiris, Harismidis, Tsaussis, Papailias and Jivko Mladenovich.

Moreover, in support of this charge the Greek representative submitted to the Commission at Salonica (S/AC.4/PV34, pp. 8-9) the so-called military text book of guerrilla warfare.

This is the whole of the evidence submitted in support of the charges in this part.

The statements made before the Commission by witnesses on behalf of Greece regarding the military training of refugees at Boulkes and Bitol and also regarding the book on military instructions do not correspond to, and in many parts, including the principal ones, contradict their own statements contained in the White Book. Moreover in the statements of these witnesses before the Commission there are substantial and serious contradictions both as regards the date of the beginning of instruction in the school and as regards the length of the training; the number of trainees, the programme and method of instruction and many other things.

In the statements of Kontopanos and Gatsios published in the White Book there was no mention of the book of military instructions. Nevertheless, at the meeting of the Security Council Commission Kontopanos and Gatsios, without looking at the book of military instructions that was submitted, began to make statements regarding the circumstances connected with its preparation, publication and use at Rubig and Boulkes. Moreover, Gatsios, who worked as a baker at Rubig, made a more extensive statement on this subject than Kontopanos, who, according to his statement, was one of the authors of this book. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that these statements were obviously prepared beforehand for the Commission.

The reference to the statements of Harismidis cannot be regarded as evidence in this part of the accusation, since according to his statement (S/AC.4/PV61, p. 20 French text) he had never been to Boulkes.

The statements of Kontopanos, Gatsios and Zafiris, as has been pointed out above, are clearly of a provocative nature. The statements of Mandzurakis, Tsauessis, Papailias and Jivko Mladenovich must also be emphatically rejected as unproved.

Thus, the statements of Jivko Mladenovich that "at Monastir there were camps where military training was given" (S/AC.4/SC.3/8, p.4) are in themselves unsubstantiated and exceedingly unconvincing. Moreover, they are refuted by the statement of Jivko Mladenovich himself that he fled from Yugoslavia on 8 June 1946, whereas the training in the military camp, according to his assertions, was carried out in June and July 1946 (id., p. 6).

Nor can the statements of Papailias be taken into account that "about three hundred young men received military training at Bitol" (S/AC.4/SC.2A/BR2, p. 8) because they are completely refuted by the statements of Karanovski (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV.8) and Bisadjiev (S/AC.4/SC.2/PV.6)

The statements of witnesses on behalf of Greece that a military school existed at Boulkes are completely refuted by the following evidence :

The witness Zahos in his second statement at the meeting of Team Ia (S/AC.4/SC.3A/SR.11-13; S/AC.4/WW) and the witness Lambros, who was heard by Team "C" (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV.3), categorically denied the existence of a military school at Boulkes.

In his original statement Gatsios also said that no military training was carried on at Boulkes (S/AC.4/PV.34-35);

Zahariadis Evangelos Kostoudis, a former Brigade Commander, also emphatically denied the existence of a military school at Boulkes (S/AC.4/PV.67, pp. 10, 11, 14).

Interrogated at Boulkes the witness Terzis, President of the Refugees Organisation, stated that the colony of Boulkes was a peaceful one both before and now (S/AC.4/SC.9/PV.1).

The statement of the representative of Yugoslavia Mr. Kusanovitch in the Security Council that as Yugoslav Minister of Information he repeatedly gave out reports regarding the Greek refugees who had arrived and were in Yugoslav territory, in particular Boulkes, and about the repeated visits of foreign correspondents to the Boulkes camp.

The letter received by the Security Council Commission from the Committee of Greek Refugees at Boulkes categorically denies the Greek assertions that military training was carried out at Boulkes (S/AC.4/70).

The memorandum received by the Security Council Commission from the Greek Refugees at Boulkes describing the situation in the camp (S/AC.4 170, p. 13).

The statement of thirty-eight refugees at Boulkes regarding the living conditions of the refugees there (S/AC.4/107).

As regards the book of war instructions, attention must be drawn to the following facts :

The first page of the book is missing and therefore there are no details regarding the place, time and purpose of the publication of this book.

The very contents of the principal chapters of this book prove beyond doubt that it was a manual on the operations of large military units, but as regards the guerrilla detachments they are given only an auxiliary role, and in conjunction with joint military operations.

Thus, the book of military instructions which was submitted is a "document" of extremely doubtful origin.

From the analysis of the evidence at the disposal of the Security Council Commission on this part of the Greek charges, the conclusion is bound to be drawn that the statements of the Greek witnesses are for the most part provocative and falsified. These statements are completely refuted by the documents submitted by the representative of Yugoslavia and by the statements of the witnesses interrogated by the Commission - Zahos, Lambros, Kostoudis, Terzis, Karanovski and Bisadjiev, and thus the Greek assertions regarding the military training of Greek refugees in Yugoslav territory are unfounded.

The Greek witnesses Mladenovich, Tseteroklis, Vasilion and Velianidis, stated that several Greek citizens were serving in the Yugoslav army. Apart from the contradictory nature of these statements it must be pointed out that they signify nothing in themselves.

The representative of the Yugoslav Government repeatedly told the Commission that during the tense struggle against the occupying forces Greek citizens who had been demobilised in 1945 after the expulsion of the invaders served in the Yugoslav National Liberation Army.

In support of the charges that the Yugoslav authorities recruited guerrillas and Greek citizens for the purpose of sending them to aid the guerrilla detachments in Greece references are made to the statements of Tsembis, Papailias, Kleon Tolios, Tsauessis, Velianidis, Tseteroklis and Valtodoros.

What these witnesses really are may be gathered from the fact that Valtodoros, as was established by the Commission, is a false witness, and the identity of Velianidis has not been established at all.

The statements of Tsembis (S/AC.4/PV.57-C, pp.4 & 13) cannot serve as evidence because they are unsubstantiated and far-fetched.

The statements of Papailias (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR.2, p.3) are completely refuted by the witnesses Karanovski and the brothers Popnikolov who were heard by Team "E". They categorically denied the existence of the so-called Aegean Bureau at Bitol and Skoplje (S/AC.4/SC/PV.8, p. 27). Similar assertions were made in the statements of Atanasov (formerly secretary of the Committee of Refugees at Skoplje).

The statements of Tseteroklis are fictitious. He stated that he was recruited at Bitol in September 1944, whereas Bitol was only liberated from the German occupation forces on 18 November 1944 (S/AC 4/PV.46).

The statements of Tsauessis are not founded on facts. They contain no references to the sources from which the data he reported were obtained. This witness made the most absurd statements before

the Security Council Commission regarding NOF and the equipment of the guerrillas and tried to assert a number of facts with which he was not at all acquainted (S/AC.4/PV.48, pp. 19 and 24; S/AC.4/PV.48, part II, p. 2)

In his statements before the Security Council Commission the witness Evangelos Kostoudis categorically denied the recruitment of Greek refugees (S/AC.4/PV.67).

Apart from the contradictions and frictions in the statements of these witnesses on behalf of Greece, it should especially be pointed out that not one of them stated anywhere that the Yugoslav authorities were involved to any extent in the recruitment of Greek refugees.

The statements of the Representative of the Greek Government that the general direction of the guerrilla operations in Greece was carried out by the Yugoslav General Dapchevich are unsubstantiated. In spite of the Commission's special request, Mr. Kyrou, the Greek Representative, was unable to submit any data to substantiate this assertion.

In support of the charge that Greek guerrillas were supplied with weapons and material by Yugoslavia, reference was made to the statements of Mandzurakis, Georgantas, Valtadoros and Vasiliou.

The statements of the witnesses on behalf of Greece in connection with these charges in no way differ from previously mentioned statements as regards their contradictory and confused nature.

Thus, Mandzurakis, who asserted in his statements (White Book, p. 79) that groups were given at Boulkes "a full outfit of clothes and weapons" before being sent to Greece, denied at the meeting of the Commission the main part of his statements and said that they were only given clothes (S/AC.4/PV.38, p. 5).

The statements of the witness Georgantas that he and the Greek guerrillas who were with him on Mount Paikon (Greece) changed their Yugoslav clothes for British Army uniforms cannot be taken as



evidence of the support of the guerrilla movement in Greece by Yugoslavia.

Of course, the statements of Valtodoros and Vasiliou about the supplying of arms to the Greek guerrillas cannot be taken into consideration. Valtodoros himself admitted that he was not actually given weapons (S/AC.4/PV.36, p. 18, French text), and Vasiliou stated that he was given a rifle by Lazaros and that he did not know who had given it to the latter.

Contrary to his previous statements (White Book, p.88, English text) the witness Papailias, who gave evidence on behalf of Greece, on being asked before the Team whether he had personally seen the transport of weapons to Greece, stated: "Personally I did not see anything like that" (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR2, p.4).

The weapons of British, American, German and Italian manufacture, submitted by the Greek Government as material evidence, can in no way serve as confirmation of the accusation against Yugoslavia of aiding the guerrilla movement.

The Security Council Commission possesses very convincing evidence of how and where the guerrilla troops operating in Greece are actually being supplied with arms and other material.

In his statement before the Commission the representative of the Central Committee of EAM pointed out that the guerrillas obtained weapons and food by capturing them from the regular units, gendarmerie and Rightist bands. 26 extracts from newspapers were submitted by way of confirmation (S/AC.4/56, p. 46 and Annex 3).

At the meeting of Team 1 B at Agoriani, Terzoglou, the leader of the guerrillas of the district, stated that the weapons of his detachment consisted of military booty captured in the course of operations (S/AC.4/SC.3/PV.25).

The witnesses Dinos, a former guerrilla heard by Team "G" (S/AX.4/SC.7/PV.2, pp.7 & 3), Kaichevski, a Greek Macedonian refugee heard by Team "E" at Skoplje (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV.2, pp. 23-24), Patie (S/AC.4/SC.7/PV.4, p. 4) and General Bakirdjis (S/AC.4/SC.4/PV.18 p. 23) categorically declared that the guerrillas obtained their weapons and food in Greece itself.

General Markos, the Commander of the Greek Democratic Army, also informed the members of Team "B" who visited him that the weapons and equipment of his army consisted of booty captured in engagements with the regular army, the gendarmerie and Rightist bands.

The above-mentioned evidence refuting the Greek charges shows how completely groundless these charges are.

In support of the accusations against Yugoslavia of sending guerrilla detachments and individuals across the frontier into Greece, references are also made to the statements of a number of witnesses on behalf of Greece. These accusations, however, cannot be admitted to be well-grounded and proved.

Thus, the statements of Papailias (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR.p.2) are completely refuted by the statements of Bisadjiev and Karanovski who were interrogated at Skoplje.

The statements of Dimopoulos (S/AC.4/PV.40, pp. 18-19) are mere assertions and entirely unsubstantiated.

The statements of Tseteroklis (S/AD.4/PV.45-II, pp. 9-10) cannot be considered trustworthy. The witness was unable, for instance, to explain why the group went to Greece from Bitol through Albania. First he said that there were 60 men in the group and afterwards that there were 30. His statements regarding the equipment of the group are equally confused.

The statements of Mandzurakis (S/AC.4/PV.38, pp. 10-12) are utterly confused : first he stated that the group was equipped at Boulkes, then he named Ortakioi and finally Sofia as the places where the group was equipped.

The statements of Jivko Mladenovich, a Chetnik, who fled from Yugoslavia, are biased and false.

The statements of Kuparigovski (S/AC.4/SC.8/10, p.2) are vague and confused. He did not mention a single name in his statements but only the number (15 men, 3 men, etc.) Speaking of the date of his service in the Yugoslav Army, he first stated "from the autumn of 1945 to January 1946" and afterwards "from March 1945 to 12 September 1946" and so forth. The village of Gobrovo, which is 40 kilometres from the frontier, this witness "transferred" to the frontier itself. According to his admissions he was 17 years old in 1945, he did not join the army as a volunteer and was not liable to conscription, therefore it is not clear how he came to be in the Yugoslav Army. All men of less than 20 years of age were demobilised from the Yugoslav Army in 1945, but according to his statements he remained in it till 1946.

The witness on behalf of Greece, Zois, stated before the Team of the Commission that he left the camp of refugees at Boulkes and went to Greece of his own accord (S/AC.4/SC.2A/PV.31, p. 10).

The Representative of the Greek Government submitted to the Commission a written statement by the witness Gikoudis that he conveyed a wounded guerrilla into Yugoslav territory, and pointed out that this statement was made under oath. At the meeting of the Commission Gikoudis denied that his statement had been made under oath.

asked whether he could take an oath in support of his statements before the Commission itself, Gikoudis replied that he could not take an oath.

It is evident from this that the statements made by Gikoudis were falsified.

It is proved by the statements of Zahos (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR11), Kostoudis (S/AC.4/PV.67) and Terzis (S/AC.4/SC.9/PV.1, French ext) that the Yugoslav authorities took firm measures to prevent in every way the inhabitants of Boulkes and other camps from leaving the camps and going to Greece.

On the basis of these data the conclusion must be drawn that the Greek charges are completely refuted in this part also.

In support of the Greek charges against Yugoslavia that medical aid was given to wounded guerrillas, the statements are put forward of such witnesses on behalf of Greece as Georgantas, Dimopoulos, Jivko Mladenovich , etc.

The statements of Dimopoulos in this part cannot have any value as evidence, because they are founded on the words of other persons who are unknown (S/AC.4/PV.40, p. 19).

The statements of Tsakiroopoulos (S/AC.4/PV.57-H, p. 19) deal with an entirely individual case and cannot be taken into account. The statements of Georgantas (S/AC.4/PV.52, pp. 2-3) and Jivko Mladenovich (S/AC.4/SC.3/8, p. 4) are mere assertions and entirely unsubstantiated.

The witness Gikoudis refused to take the oath in support of his statements before the Commission that he conveyed a wounded guerrilla into Yugoslav territory.

Thus, the Greek charges against Yugoslavia are absolutely unproved in this part also.

Taking into consideration that, as the Security Council Commission has established, false witnesses' statements were specially prepared by the Greek authorities by means of bribery, blackmail and

compulsion (Kontopoulos, Valtadoros, Zahos, Zafiris and others) and that the concoctions of the witnesses on behalf of Greece are refuted by the documents submitted by the Yugoslav Representative and by the statements of witnesses, all the charges brought against Yugoslavia by the Greek Government must be considered as unfounded.

SECTION E.

16. In a series of documents submitted to the Security Council and to the Security Council Commission, the Representatives of the Greek Government assert that the Yugoslav Government is carrying on intensive propaganda and giving support to the guerrilla movement in Greece with the object of detaching Greek Macedonia and annexing it to the Federated People's Republic of Yugoslavia. In this connection the Greek Representative referred to statements made by Vlahov, Vice-President of the Yugoslav National Assembly, Kulishevski, Prime Minister of the Yugoslav Macedonian Republic, and Marshal Tito and to some articles published in the Yugoslav newspapers "Borba" and "Nova Makedonia" (S/AC.4/PV/27, Annex I, pp.11-12; S/PV/83, p.52; S/PV/27 and others).

It should be noted that the Greek Representative submitted to the Commission only brief extracts from the above-mentioned statements and articles without presenting the full texts. The Yugoslav Representative stated that he had compared with the original texts two of the quotations given by the Greek Representative, namely, the interview given by Marshal Tito to an American journalist on 16 November, 1946 and Marshal Tito's speech at Skoplje on 11 October 1945. As a result it was established that both quotations were torn from their context and falsified (S/AC.4/PV/69, pp.9-11).

All the statements referred to by the Greek Representative were widely publicized and relate to October 1946 and to an earlier period, namely, to the time when the Council of the four Foreign Ministers and the Paris Peace Conference were discussing the draft peace treaties and when in this connection various aspects of territorial and other questions connected with the peace settlement were being discussed in many countries. It must also be noted that in all these statements there is nothing of such a nature as would

The witness Patakukas stated: "I know nothing about the Macedonian question". (S/AC.4/PV/44, p.23).

The witness Mandzurakis was unable to say anything about the Macedonian question except that he had heard Macedonians speak about the autonomy of Macedonia. (S/AC.4/PV/38, pp.8-9).

The statements of Baltadaros cannot be taken into account not only because they are extremely contradictory, but also because they were made by him after he had been sentenced to death and, as has been established, as a result of torture and beatings.

The statements of the witness Velianidis must also be rejected, inasmuch as the Commission had doubts regarding his identity and took a special decision regarding verification, which was not done.

It is significant that the Greek witnesses Vasiliou, Ysoklaropoulos and Teodorou, who were at Bitol at the same time as Papailias, said nothing about the so-called Aegean Bureau or its military activities in their statements.

The statements of Papailias and other Greek witnesses were also refuted by the Greek witnesses, the brothers Papanikolou and Besadjiev, who were interrogated at Skoplje.

No importance can be attached to the statements of the witness Bobtsis, as he was rejected by the Commission as a false witness. (S/AC.4/PV/57, p.14).

In opposition to the Greek witnesses; the witnesses Siganos (S/AC.4/PV/11, p.5), Karanjevski (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/8, p. 27), Nikolaidis (S/AC.4/SC.3/PV/7, p.3), Ganopoulos (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/5, pp.4-5), Ioannidis (S/AC.4/SC.2A/SR/7, p.3), Nikolaidis (S/AC.4/SC.3/SE/7, p.3) and Atanasov stated that they knew nothing about the existence of a special NOF organisation, which carried on propaganda to detach Greek Macedonia from Greece.

Asked whether he admitted

Asked whether he admitted ever having been the head of the Aegean Bureau, Karanjevsky, who was named by Greek witnesses as the secretary of the Aegean Bureau, replied: "I have never heard of it and don't know what you are talking about." (S/AC.4/SC.8/PV/8, p.27).

There may be noted in the statements of the above-mentioned witnesses on behalf of Greece a tendency to lead the Commission astray by giving confusing evidence regarding what NOF really is. For instance, they frequently confused NOF with the Committee (in Serbo-Croat 'Cibor') of refugees, which was formed at Bitolj for the purpose of aiding the Yugoslav authorities in providing accommodation and supplies for the Greek refugees, of whom there are more than 20,000 in Yugoslavia. Others confuse NOF with the Yugoslav National Liberation Organisation ENOF. In reality NOF, which is referred to in Part Two of the Report, is merely the Greek National Liberation Front, which in its abbreviated form is called EAM in Greek and NOF in the Macedonian language.

It is quite obvious that NOF (in Greek EAM) which is a national liberation organisation formed on the territory of Greece during the German occupation for the purpose of uniting the democratic forces of the country in the struggle against the invaders, has nothing whatever to do with Yugoslavia. The statements of witnesses who tried to represent NOF as an organisation directed from Yugoslavia are a worthless attempt to back up the unwarranted Greek charges.

As regards the so-called "Macedonian autonomy movement" mentioned in the statements of several witnesses; it is evident from the documents submitted to the Commission by the Yugoslav Representative, and also from other material at the disposal of the Commission that this movement is aimed against Yugoslavia, that its object is to complicate the relations between the Balkan States and that the



leaders of this movement are in touch with reactionary circles in Greece.

It is evident from the records submitted to the Commission of the public trial at Skoplje (in February 1947) that during the German occupation of the Balkan States the activities of the Macedonian autonomy organisation VMRO, headed by the collaborator Pavelich Vancho Mihailov, were intensified under the protection of the occupation authorities. At the Skoplje trial it was established that the organisation VMRO collaborated with the German occupation authorities in combating the National Liberation movement of Yugoslavia. At the same trial it was proved that after the expulsion of the Germans from Yugoslavia the organisation VMRO began an underground struggle against the democratic regimes of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

The defendants at this trial stated that having started its illegal activities, the organisation VMRO maintained liaison with the reactionary circles of Greece. The doctor Trenchev, who was sentenced in connection with a VMRO group, stated before the Commission that he was instructed to form detachments which were to establish contact with the Greek Army and with the opposition in Bulgaria. He stated that these detachments were intended to carry on a struggle against the existing regime in Yugoslavia, and for the setting up of an autonomous Macedonia under the protectorate of England and U.S.A.

The Greek Representative's statement that Bulgaria allegedly was carrying on intensive propaganda to annex Greek Macedonia to Yugoslavia, and his surmise that Bulgaria was doing this in order to get Yugoslavia to support its claims to Western Thrace, are entirely uncorroborated.

In the statements made at various times by Bulgarian Representatives regarding Bulgaria's desire to obtain an outlet

to the Aegean Sea by peaceful means through the relevant international bodies, there is nothing that could be taken as constituting any danger to Greece, or having an influence on the internal situation of that country.

In this connection it should be emphasised that the Representatives of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria clearly stated before the Commission that their countries had no aggressive intentions in regard to Greece.

In the extracts from the speech by Dimitrov and from the newspaper "Rabotnichesko Delo" given in Chapter II there is no mention of Greek Macedonia. In both these cases the subject concerns Bulgarian-Yugoslav relations.

Since the assertions of the Greek Government that Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are interfering in the internal affairs of Greece by inspiring and supporting the guerrilla movement are unfounded, consequently the arguments concerning the causes of this interference are likewise completely unfounded.

As regards the territorial aspects of the Macedonian and Aegean questions, they do not come under the terms of reference of the Commission, and therefore cannot be considered by it.

It is quite obvious that the Greek Government raised the Macedonian question in order to conceal from the Commission and from the Security Council the real causes of the civil war in Greece and to disclaim responsibility for the tense situation inside the country.

SECTION F

17. The Greek Government's Memorandum of 3 December 1946 addressed to the Security Council and the White Book on "Greek Frontier Incidents" submitted by the Greek Representative to the Commission give a list of 198 frontier incidents alleged to have taken place on the frontiers of Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

Among these incidents are 59 cases of violation of the frontier by guerilla groups, in 12 cases in the direction of Greece and in 47 cases in the direction of Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

According to the data in the Memorandum and the White Book, there were 14 incidents in which Greek frontier posts were attacked from Albania. There were two incidents in which frontier posts were fired on from Bulgaria and one incident in which a Greek post was fired on from Yugoslavia. Shooting affrays are also alleged to have taken place between Greek patrols and the patrols of neighbouring countries of Greece. The same documents mention 39 incidents: 35 of which took place on the Albanian frontier, one on the Yugoslav frontier and three on the Bulgarian frontier.

In connection with the alleged frontier incidents the Greek casualties were as follows:

Soldiers killed	3
Soldiers wounded	3
Detained (taken prisoner)	7

Also 3 Greek citizens were killed and 3 detained.

In clashes between Greek troops and guerilla groups, who violated the frontier according to the White Book, the casualties of the Greek troops were: 3 officers and 7 soldiers killed, 12 soldiers wounded. Also one Greek civilian was killed and 5 were seized by the guerillas.

Many other incidents mentioned in the Greek White Book (theft of timber, singing of songs, for "provocative purposes", crossings of the frontier by smugglers, etc.) are of little importance and undeserving of attention.

In this connection it should be noted that the Greek Memorandum and the White Book contain many important contradictions, for instance :

a) In the White Book in the part entitled "Incidents on the Greek-Albanian frontier" there are 67 contradictions and discrepancies between the English and the French texts namely, in 23 cases the details of the incidents are different, in 30 cases the items of the incidents are different, in 14 cases the time (hours) of the occurrences are different;

b) In connection with the incident in the district of Skra on 13th November 1946 the Memorandum states that the majority of the guerillas attacking this village retreated into Yugoslavia. The White Book, however, states that the majority of the guerillas retreated in the direction of Yugoslavia and the rest in a southerly direction;

c) The White Book states on page 45 of the French text that on 15th November a "band" burned 20 houses at Kato-Surmena but regarding this incident the Memorandum says that it took place on 5 November and that 29 houses were burned;

d) The Memorandum reports that a group of guerillas after a clash with Greek troops in the district of Archangelos on 12 November 1946 retreated into Yugoslav territory under cover of fire from a Yugoslav post.

In view of the fact that Archangelos is situated 5 kilometres as the crow flies from the nearest Yugoslav frontier post, it is most improbable that the retreat was covered by rifle fire from such a distance especially in the conditions of a mountainous

locality. It is important to note that unlike the Memorandum the White Book (page 45 of the French text) says nothing about a Yugoslav post covering the retreat with fire;

e) The English text of the White Book mentions on page 58 incident No. 7 and states that the "band" went off into Yugoslav territory. Regarding this incident, however, the French text says that the "band", being pursued, went off in the direction of Yugoslav territory:

f) The Memorandum states that 21 of September 1946 "Terrorists" entered the village of Eksoli (6 kilometres northwest of Konnitsa). Being pursued they took refuge in Albanian territory. The White Book, however, does not say that the "terrorists" took refuge in Albanian territory;

g) Similarly, in connection with another incident, it is stated in the first instance that on 3 November 1946 the "band" retreating from the village of Trigonon took refuge in Albanian territory; in the second instance it is stated that the "band" retreated in the direction of the Albanian frontier on 5 November 1946.

Thus different details of the incident are given and, secondly; it is not stated that the "band" went off into Albanian territory.

The contradictions between the data of the Greek Government's Memorandum of 3 December 1946 and the White Book, and also the contradictions between the English and the French texts of the White Book itself are far from being exhausted by the above-mentioned examples.

In view of the great number of important discrepancies and contradictions between the Memorandum and the White Book, and also between the English and the French texts of the White Book itself, these documents cannot, of course, be accepted as proof of the

Greek assertions regarding the violation of the frontier by Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania.

Of the 197 frontier incidents with which the Greek Government charges Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, 8 were investigated on the spot by Teams of the Commission. Of the 284 frontier incidents with which Greece is charged by her northern neighbours, 3 on the Greek-Albanian frontier were investigated.

Many witnesses interrogated by the Commission made contradictory statements. They stated that they knew about one or the other incident, or that they knew about them from other persons; personally they did not themselves see any groups or individuals cross the frontier in one or the other direction. For instance:

Interrogated concerning the incident alleged to have taken place on the Greek-Yugoslav frontier in the district of Skra on 13 November 1946, Andriades, a witness on behalf of Greece, made statements differing from the interpretation of this incident given by the Greek Brigadier Ioannou. The witness did not see a file of women, children and armed guerillas cross the frontier, but saw this file in Yugoslav territory. It was established that the witness was at a distance of 7 kilometres from the spot in Yugoslav territory where, according to his statement, he saw armed guerillas. In view of the fact that it would be impossible to distinguish these details at such a distance and also taking into consideration other contradictions in his statements, it should be held that the statements of this witness are an invention and cannot be accepted as evidence.

The witness Fotios Kikudis, although he stated that he was compelled to convey a wounded guerilla into Yugoslav territory, refused however to swear on oath in support of his statements. (S/AG.4/PV 57-H, pp. 16-23).

The witness Lieutenant Georgios Kouris, presented by the Greek Representative, who asserted in his written statements that

the engagement at Skra was directed by Yugoslav officers, stated at the interrogation by the Commission that he did not see either Yugoslav officers or Yugoslav soldiers and that he could only surmise that Yugoslav officers took part in the engagement at Skra on the grounds that this engagement was well organised by the partisans (S/AC.4/PV 57-F, page 6).

Interrogated by the Commission regarding the incident alleged to have taken place in the district of Surmena on 16 November 1946, the Greek officer Nikitas Georgios stated that he did not personally see the guerillas cross the frontier into Yugoslavia and his surmises that the guerillas went off into Yugoslavia were based on common information obtained from prisoners. (S/AC.4/PV.57, pp. 6 - 12).

Yugoslav officers and soldiers interrogated by the Commission stated that there was no incident on Yugoslav territory on that day but engagements were observed taking place on the territory of Greece.

The Greek Representative's assertion regarding the frontier incident in the district of Surmena in fact is also refuted by the order issued by the Staff of the 3rd Greek Corps on 22 September 1946, which states that "Yugoslav frontier troops did not open fire on the Greek units". (S/AC.4/PV24, p. 14).

Witnesses on behalf of Greece, interrogated regarding incidents on the Bulgarian and Albanian frontiers, also made contradictory statements based for the most part on surmises.

Witnesses presented by Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria denied the Greek assertions and the statements of Greek witnesses regarding frontier incidents.

A soldier's forage cap of the uniform of the Albanian army alleged to have been found at the place of the engagement and submitted to the Commission by the Greek Representative as material evidence turned out to be falsified, as it has a six-pointed star

inspired by the Greek Government and the Greek army.

In the light of the above, the Commission of the Security Council of the United Nations, in its report of the Commission on the Greek Frontier Incidents, submitted by Greece in many sectors, and in particular where the incidents are alleged to have taken place. (S/AC.4, p. 23, S/AC.4/PV24, pp. 9-10).

Taking into consideration that the Memorandum of 3 December 1946 submitted to the Security Council by the Greek Government and the White Book on "Greek Frontier Incidents" transmitted to the Security Council Commission contain a great number of important discrepancies and contradictions; that the statements of witnesses on behalf of Greece are contradictory and for the most part at variance with the official interpretation of incidents; that the "material evidence" submitted to the Commission by the Greek Representative (forage cap with a six-pointed star mentioned above, weapons of British, American and Italian types) can in no way serve as proof of the violation of the Greek frontiers by Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria; that several sectors of the frontier in which incidents took place according to the Greek documents were entirely unguarded by the Greek frontier authorities and that in these conditions the Greek frontier authorities were unable to observe and far less to describe these incidents in detail, the conclusion should be drawn that the charges brought by the Greek Government against Albania, Yugoslavia, that the frontier incidents were instigated by them and that these States were aiding the guerrilla detachments in Greece are without foundation.

The conclusion that the incidents in Greece are in no way connected with the so-called "Balkan crisis" can be drawn from the fact that the incidents in Greece are not connected with Greece charges and are not related to the "Balkan crisis" incidents which the Commission found it necessary to reject on the basis of the evidence.

There can be no doubt that there were crossings of the



frontier into neighbouring countries from Greece (10,000 persons crossed into Bulgaria, more than 20, 000 into Yugoslavia, and more than 20,000 into Albania), but in all these cases the persons who crossed into the territory of these countries were escaping from persecution and terrorism in Greece. The Governments of Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria cannot be charged with unfairness towards Greece by giving shelter to these refugees.

From the documents submitted to the Commission, from the interrogation of the witnesses and from the investigation of individual frontier incidents one is bound to draw the conclusion that on the part of Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria there have been no violations of the Greek frontiers, which could be a cause of disorder and civil war in Greece.

SECTION 2

18. While in Greece the Commission collected a large number of documents in the form of direct statements by witnesses, as well as numerous memoranda and more than 3,000 letters from organisations and individuals, which show that there is a tense situation in Greece at the present time. Disorders and armed clashes are taking place not only in the northern districts but also in the centre and in the south of the country, and at the present time this tense situation may be characterised as a state of civil war throughout the whole territory of Greece.

The Greek Representative admitted at the meeting of the Commission on 5 February that the internal situation of Greece left much to be desired (S/AC.4/PV27), but questioned the power of the Commission to deal with this matter. At the same time he tried to prove that Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia were allegedly supporting the guerilla movement and thereby contributing to the complication of the internal situation.

The Commission, however, was unable to agree with the assertion of the Greek Representative that questions concerning the internal situation in the country did not come under its terms of reference, as it considered that the tense situation and disorders in Northern Greece were directly connected with the situation throughout the country.

It may be seen from the official communiques of the Ministry of Public Order given in the memorandum of the Central Committee of EAM that in the period alone between 22 June and 31 December 1946 there were 1,338 armed clashes between the guerillas and the Government troops and gendarmerie. These clashes took place in 32 prefectures, 317 occurring in Thessaly in the centre of Greece, 107 in the Peloponnesus and more than 600 in Macedonia and in a number of other provinces.

The fact that Team I of the Commission met guerillas in the district of Agorieni and thereby established that there were guerilla districts in the very centre of Greece is evidence of the fact that civil war is taking place not only in the northern districts but also in the central and southern provinces of Greece.

Some members (the Soviet and Polish Representatives, and also the  
/Representatives

Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia) of Team B, which was instructed by the Commission to meet General Markos, the Commander of the Greek Democratic Army, met him in the province of Trikkala and established that it is in Thessaly, where the General Staff of the Democratic Army was quartered.

Numerous witnesses and political organizations appeared before the Commission and submitted a great number of irrefutable documents, showing that the cause of the tense situation in Greece was the persecution and terrorism carried on by the Greek authorities against the democratic elements.

At the meeting of the Commission on 17 February the representative of the Central Committee of EAM stated that "the disorders were taking place entirely as a result of internal causes and they were taking place throughout the whole continental territory of Greece and even in the islands." (S/AC.4/55, pp.4-5).

At the meeting of the Commission on 18 February Tsirimokos, General Secretary of the Socialist Party, also stated that "the disorders taking place throughout the country were the result of internal causes and were not instigated by any of the neighbouring countries" (S/AC.4/SR30). General Grigoriadis, the representative of the Left-Wing Liberal Party stressed in his statement on 18 February that the persecution of the democratic elements had led the Greek people to desperation and had brought about an exceedingly tense situation which exists throughout the whole territory of Greece (S/AC.4/PV31). A similar statement was made before the Commission by Petimetsas, President of the Pan-Hellenic Democratic League (S/AC.4/36).

General Markos, Commander of the Greek Democratic Army, stated that the civil war in Greece was brought about by internal causes - by the persecution and terrorism carried on by the Greek authorities against democratically-minded citizens. (S/AC.4/177, Annex 6).

The persecution and terrorism, as was established from the statements of a number of political organizations and individual witnesses, began immediately after the signing of the Varkiza Agreement of 12 February 1945 and was particularly intensified after the elections of 31 March 1946,

/and

and on this account tens of thousands of democratically-minded citizens were obliged to flee into the mountains or to neighbouring countries in order to find refuge there and to escape from the persecutions.

Representatives of political organizations heard by the Commission produced irrefutable evidence that the Greek authorities were terrorising the democratic elements of the country with the help of the gendarmerie troops and Rightist bands and covering Greece with an enormous network of concentration camps in which were tens of thousands of men, women and children.

The Greek Representative asserted that the only persons subjected to repressive measures were those who had allegedly collaborated in the past with the German or Italian occupation authorities. This thesis, however, is refuted by numerous witnesses who were heard by the Committee. It appears from the statements of these witnesses that the Greek authorities are persecuting precisely those elements which took an active part in the resistance movement, and on the contrary they are encouraging those elements which collaborated with the occupation authorities. According to the data submitted by the Central Committee of EAM in the single period between 12 February, 1945 and 31 March, 1946, 84,931 persons were arrested and 12,000 between October, 1946 and January, 1947. The persecution of the democratic elements of the country takes the form of mass arrests, banishment to the islands, beatings and murders. According to the same data between 12 February, 1945 and 31 March, 1946, 1,289 persons were killed and 31,632 were subjected to beatings and tortures by the gendarmerie together with Rightist bands. Between July and December, 1946 alone, the Greek military courts passed 109 death sentences under the pretext that the condemned persons had taken part in the guerilla movement or intended to join the guerillas (S/AC.4/55, pp.11,36).

On 12 March, 1947 the Commission heard the 17 year-old youth, Hadjilambrou, who was sentenced to death by a Greek military court merely because a police agent had reported that he allegedly intended to go into the mountains (S/AC.4/PV54-II).

The Commission also received a letter from a lawyer requesting the Commission's intervention to save the life of the 15 year-old boy

/Odiseus

Odisseus Doukas, who had been sentenced to death by a military court for similar reasons (S/AC.4/SC.2).

These facts show that the Greek authorities are carrying on terrorism not only in regard to adults but also minors.

Even while it was in Greece the Commission received a number of communications reporting the passing of 30 death sentences by the military courts.

The mass terrorism and persecution of the democratically-minded elements takes the form, as the statements of witnesses show, of punitive expeditions carried out by Greek gendarmes and Rightist bands against villages whose inhabitants took an active part in the struggle against the occupation forces. Instances of this may be found in the case of such villages as Ksirovrisi, Stefanini, Skra, Notia and others which were partially or completely destroyed by the gendarmerie and Rightist bands.

It is necessary to note that Team A which investigated the ruined village of Ksirovrisi established at the interrogation of the witnesses that the only reason for the destruction of the village was that it consisted of democratic citizens who did not wish to vote for the monarchy.

To realise against whom the Greek authorities are directing their repressive measures it suffices to give a few instances from the interrogation of witnesses. The witness Kostoudis Evangelos, a former officer of ELAS, stated that after the Varkiza Agreement ELAS surrendered to the Greek authorities all its arms which were immediately handed over by the Greek authorities to those who had collaborated with the occupation forces, and that these arms with which ELAS had fought the Germans were turned against those citizens who had taken an active part in the resistance movement. As a result of the persecution Kostoudis was obliged to flee to Yugoslavia (S/AC.4/FV57, pp.7-9).

Interrogated by Team I in the concentration camp on the island of Icaria, Andreas Djimas stated that the whole Greek people and especially those who took part in the resistance movement had been placed in the most intolerable conditions since the liberation and that as a result of the terrorism carried on by the Greek authorities thousands of persons had

/been

been killed and tens of thousands imprisoned or banished to desert islands (S/AC.4/SC2-V).

Evidence regarding the facts of the terrorism carried on by the Government troops is also supplied by order No.1498 of the 2nd Army Corps of Larisa, Central Thessaly, which states that all the families of guerrillas should be arrested and their houses burned (S/AC.4/55,p.34).

On 20 March, 1947 while the Commission was at Salonica the former Minister Zevgos, a member of the Central Committee of EAM, was killed in one of the streets of that city. It appears from the documents published in the Greek Press that this murder was prepared by the Greek gendarmerie and police.

The Greek authorities are also carrying on a persecution, as has been established from the statements of witnesses, against the Trade Union organizations recognised by the International Federation of Labour, against the Youth Organization EPON and so forth.

Paparigas, the representative of the Trade Union Organization, stated in the Commission that the Greek authorities were carrying on "unbridled terrorism against the working-class" and had disbanded the lawfully elected Trade Unions in an attempt to crush the democratic forces of the nation. Paparigas also stated that this terrorism was "the cause of the civil war and disorders in Greece" (S/AC.4/60,pp.1,8).

It appears from the considerable quantity of evidence received by the Commission (witnesses, memoranda, letters) that besides the terrorism throughout the country against the democratic elements there has been a ferocious persecution of national minorities (Macedonians and Tchams) (S/AC.4/SC.8/14; S/AC.4/PV22, pp.9-11; S/AC.4/PV7L, pp.1-5; S/AC.4/PV22, pp.8-9).

One of the most convincing proofs of the persecution of national minorities in Greece by the Greek authorities is the fact that tens of thousands of Greek citizens have been compelled to take refuge in other countries. For instance, in Yugoslavia there are over 20,000 Greek refugees, over 5,000 in Bulgaria and more than 23,000 in Albania. At the interrogation of a number of witnesses from among these refugees it was established that during the occupation of Greece the refugees had taken an active part in the struggle against the Germans and the Italians and

/had

had after the liberation and especially after the conclusion of the Varkiza Agreement they were subjected to terrorism and persecution by Rightist bands and the Greek gendarmerie. Among these refugees there are old men, women and children.

A number of witnesses from among the victims of terrorism who had fled to Yugoslavia stated that they had lost their families during the German occupation, for instance, the witness Slabi (SC/AC.4/SC.8/FV2), Prose Zega (S/AC.4/FV71) and others.

The witness Atanasov, formerly Secretary of the Committee of Greek refugees, gave detailed information regarding the terrorism and the persecution of the Macedonian population carried on by Rightist bands and the gendarmerie in Greece. Evidence was also given that there were no schools in the Macedonian language in Greece and that the Greek authorities forbade the Macedonians to speak their native language. Some witnesses referred to the fact that a special law had been published in Greece punishing anyone who conversed in the Macedonian language (the witness Vitamiotis) (S/AC.4/SC.7/FV3).

On 18 July, 1945 the Yugoslav Government made a special appeal to the Governments of Great Britain, USSR and the United States in order to put an end to the ferocious persecution of the Macedonian national minority living in Greece, which had taken the form of the mass destruction, plundering and burning of entire Macedonian villages (S/AC.4/FV22, pp.8-9).

Witnesses presented by the Greek Representative in connection with the treatment of the Slavo-Macedonian minority stated that they could use their language in the courts. These witnesses, however, were under arrest and one of them, Ioannis Nikolaidis (S/AC.4/SC.3/7, p.3) stated frankly that "he was not arrested for political reasons but because he was a Slavo-Macedonian and was accused of being a member of the Ohrana".

Incontestable evidence was also submitted to the Commission regarding the ferocious persecution of the Tchams by the Greek authorities, as a result of which almost all the Tchams had fled to Albania.

A committee of Tchams submitted to Team 1A, which went to Albania, a memorandum giving detailed information on the persecution of the Tchamour population in Greece (S/AC.4/234, Annex 19). Witnesses interrogated in

/Albania

Albania stated that they had been compelled to flee from Greece as a result of ferocious persecution by the Greek gendarmerie and Rightist bands.

The statement of the Greek witness Noursrat Ali, who said that not more than 16 families of Tchams remained in Greece at the present time, may also serve as evidence of the persecution of the Tchams (S/AC.4/SC.2/15).

At the meeting of the Commission on 7 February, 1947 the Albanian Representative stated that the Greek authorities were terrorising the Tchams living in Greece and pointed out that the best proof of this assertion was the fact that 23,000 Tchams had fled from Greece to Albania (SC/AC.4/189, p.109).

In a special memorandum addressed to the Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris on 3 June, 1946 the Albanian Government drew attention to the persecution of the Tchams by the Greek authorities.

The statement of the representative of the Greek Government that the Macedonians and Tchams had fled from Greece to Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia because they were afraid of being called to account for co-operating with the occupation authorities does not refute the fact of the persecution of national minorities in Greece, but is rather an attempt to justify this persecution, since there can be no doubt that among the Greek refugees in Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia there are many who took an active part in the resistance movement and the overwhelming majority of the refugees are precisely those who suffered under the occupation.

Thus the conclusion is bound to be drawn from the documents at the disposal of the Commission that the tense situation and civil war exist throughout the territory of Greece and not only in the northern districts of the country.

It must be considered as established that the tense situation and civil war are the result of internal causes and, above all, of the persecution and terrorism carried on against the democratically-minded citizens and national minorities by the gendarmerie, regular troops and Rightist bands, and that the assertions of the Greek Government regarding the alleged interference of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia in the internal affairs of Greece are absolutely unfounded.



19. SECTION H.

The Representatives of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia drew the attention of the Commission to the fact that the present ruling circles of Greece were carrying out a provocative policy in regard to their countries. In this connection they submitted evidence in confirmation that the Greek frontier authorities were instigating provocations on the borders of these countries. It is evident from the documents submitted to the Commission that in many cases war-criminals and collaborationists who had fled from the neighbouring countries of Greece took part in the provocations on the frontier. It is evident from the documents at the disposal of the Commission that after the expulsion of the occupation forces from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania and after the establishment of a democratic regime in these countries the former agents and direct accomplices of the occupation authorities and all kinds of war criminals fled from these countries to Greece. It is established that in 1945-46 whole bands of Albanian Bulists and Yugoslav Chetniks crossed in an organised way into Greece, fighting as they went (Isen Trpeza, Adem Glavitsa, Bairaktari and so on). The numerical strength of the bands which retreated to the territory of Greece sometimes amounted to 70-100 men armed with rifles, machine guns and grenades (vide statements of the brothers Bairaktari). There are over a thousand men belonging to this category in the territory of Greece at the present time.

Team No.1 of the Commission established the fact of the presence at Piraeus, in the Island of Siros and at Salonica of former collaborators of the occupation authorities and war-criminals who had fled from Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria. These included (a) Aliush Loshanake, former secretary of the Albanian Fascist Party, who took an active part in the armed struggle against the Albanian guerillas during the German occupation.

- (v) Bervits, Albanian Minister of War during the German occupation.
- (e) Fikri Dina, Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs of Albania during the German occupation.
- (d) Haxhi Dina, Chief of the Albanian gendarmerie under the Germans.
- (e) Adam Glavitsa - Chief of the Police at Ureshevichi during the occupation of Yugoslavia by the Germans.
- (f) Haxhi Yllari - he was Chief of the Yugoslav gendarmerie during the occupation.
- (g) Muharem Bektari, Albanian nationalist, collaborator of the German and Italian occupation authorities.
- (h) Ivan Gologanov, former President of the Military Court at Plevna during the German occupation, who sentenced many Bulgarian anti-fascists to death.

When the Team of the Commission visited the camps on the island of Siros it was established that all the refugees were entirely dependent on the Greek Government. A great part of them were working in Greek enterprises and in institutions in spite of the fact that there were many unemployed Greek citizens on the Island.

The Commission received a number of statements in written form from witnesses showing that the Greek authorities were not only welcoming the quislings crossing into the territory of Greece, but were also making wide use of them in the struggle against the democratic elements of Greece. For instance, Albanian Balists who crossed the frontier retained their arms and were included in Greek gendarmerie units for the purpose of "guarding the districts" (vide statements by Apostolos S/AC.4/SC.2-X p.2, and Nazmi Elini Azemi S/AC.4/PV71A, p.3,4). Albanian Balists, as is evident from the documents in the possession of the Commission, served in the gendarmerie of the village of Agia Parashevi (Greek Yugoslav frontier). They carried out raids on other villages, arrested and beat democratically-minded citizens (S/AC.4/SC.2-X, pp.2,7).

Yugoslav Chetniks and Albanian B-lists were also recruited into detachments of "X", equipped with arms and used in the operations against the guerillas (S/AC.4/PV71A, p.3).

War criminals and former collaborators of the occupation authorities who had arrived from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania were enabled to engage in political work on the territory of Greece. The Commission was informed that a committee under the leadership of Adm. Laski, who maintained liaison with the Greek authorities and also with Yugoslav and Albanian criminals, living now in Italy, was formed among the Yugoslav and Albanian citizens of Albanian nationality on the island of Siros (S/AC.4/PV71A, pp.3, 4. 5).

The activities of the war-criminals and collaborationists concentrated in the territory of Greece are directed against Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria and against the democratic regimes of those countries. From the statements of witnesses and other documents it is known that a "committee for the liberation of Northern Epirus" was founded in the Greek town of Yanina (EAVI). Refugees of the above-mentioned categories were induced to take part in this Committee. Evidence was submitted showing that the Northern Epirus Committee was sending into the territory of Albania, agents and terrorists from among Albanian war-criminals for the purpose of organising diversions and disorders in Albania.

The trial of a criminal group from Lushoviki which took place at Korce (Albania) in March 1946 revealed the connections of this group with the Committee at Yanina. The defendants at this trial stated that they received instructions from the Northern Epirus Committee at Yanina regarding disruptive work against the Albanian State. They also told of the connections between the Committee and the Greek authorities. The trial in connection with the Fascist organisation "National Democratic Shiptar" which took place at Skopje at the beginning of 1947 revealed the

connections of this organisation with the Committees of Yugoslav and Albanian Quislings in Greece from which this organisation received instructions.

The Commission was able to see documents from which it appears that in the course of 1945-46 a campaign was carried on in Greece to extend its frontiers at the expense of its northern neighbours. This campaign was expressed in the Greek press and also in parliamentary and other official and non-official statements by Greek representatives setting up claims to southern Albania as well as to part of the territory of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. In this connection reference must be made to the speech in parliament of the Deputy Yankovou on 24 June 1946, who proposed the absurd plan of extending the Greek frontiers at the expense of a considerable part of the territory of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania (S/AC.4/PV/21, p.4). These expansionist tendencies of the present ruling circles of Greece in regard to its northern neighbours, should be noted because in many cases they are connected with the disruptive work of war criminals and collaborationists against Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, and also with the provocations on the frontiers of these countries. The Committee for the liberation of Northern Epirus at Yanina not only engaged in propaganda for the detachment of Southern Albania, but as is evident from the documents, sent spies, diversionists and terrorists to Albania for the purpose of preparing the conditions for detaching a part of Albanian territory (S/AC.4/PV/1-).

The documents of the trial at Korche, and of the two trials at Skoplje (Shiptar and VAKRO) also reveal the connection between the criminal groups of war-criminals and quislings and the expansionist plans of the aggressive circles of Greece.

Thus, it must be considered as established that war-criminal and accomplices of the occupation authorities who fled from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia are being sheltered in the territory of Greece and that they are carrying on disruptive work against these countries under the protection of the Greek authorities. The Greek authorities have not infrequently used these criminals and quislings for frontier and other provocations against Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia and also for the struggle against the democratic elements in Greece itself.

CHAPTER 3.

SECTION A.

The Delegations of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, Syria, United Kingdom and United States, subscribed to the conclusions set out in Chapter 1.

The Delegations of U.S.S.R. and Poland did not approve these conclusions.

The Delegations of Belgium and Colombia made the following statement:-

In spite of the numerous presumptions, which fit in with each other, tending to substantiate the charges brought by Greece against her northern neighbours, the Belgian and Colombian Delegations consider that it is not for this Commission, which was set up in the spirit of conciliation of Chapter VI of the Charter, to give any decision as to the possible responsibility of the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslave Governments.

The Delegation of France abstained from approving the conclusions set out in Chapter 1 and made the following statement:-

After a methodical study of the first part of the report of Committee No. 2 and in the light of experience gained in the course of the work of the Commission, the French delegation is not without some doubt as to the necessity and some apprehension as to the advisability of including a chapter devoted to formal conclusions between "the report of the facts disclosed by its investigation" mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Security Council's resolution dated December 19th, 1946, and the proposals for recommendation provided under the last paragraph of the same documents.

The various reasons which led the French delegation to form this opinion are here summed up one by one:

1. With great wisdom and a real sense of the possibilities the Security Council instructed the Commission to "verify the facts and to make a report. That is indeed the part of our task which Committee No.2 has performed. Now we must decide whether our Commission has an order authorising it to continue beyond this point by pronouncing a judgment on these "facts", which would inevitably imply condemnation of one party or the other.

The French delegation for its part holds that, according to the resolution of December 19th, it is the Security Council alone that has the power to take this step if it deems necessary. It seems indeed to have expressly reserved this eventual right for itself, when it specifies in the preamble to its resolution, that "the disturbed conditions should be investigated before the Council attempts to reach any conclusions regarding the issues involved. It is difficult to see how the Commission could draw conclusions on the given facts classified by Committee No.2 without encroaching on a task that the Security Council only envisages for itself in a tentative and prudent manner.

2. The Commission can perfectly well propose definite recommendations to the Security Council without basing them on formal conclusions. One example will suffice to make this statement clear. Certain delegations are considering pronouncing themselves in favour of the establishment, for a certain length of time, of an international Commission in Greece, and of that country's signing a frontier pact with its northern neighbours; these proposals, seem to them likely to remedy to a certain extent the troubled situation analysed by our report, follow logically from the facts noted by the Commission; they take into account the complaints formulated and the accusations brought by Greece against her neighbours or by them against her, without making it necessary

define the part played by each of the plaintiffs in the frontier incidents, the responsibility for which they each attribute to one another. These proposals have, therefore, infinitely more chance of being adopted by the Security Council and put into practice willingly by the States in question, than if they came as a corollary to a formal division of responsibility. This division, whatever it might be, could not fail to revive old grudges and arouse new disputes which would not be favourable to the activities of the proposed commission or to the success of the negotiations recommended. Therefore proposals for recommendations can be firmly based on a methodical analysis of the facts, setting forth the problems in detail, without implying formal conclusions. In fact, if such a method was adopted, this would entail a considerable advantage: it would make the carrying out of the recommendations much less onerous. It would, in fact, prevent the recommendations from taking on the appearance of sanctions, or at any rate punitive measures. For they would certainly appear to be such, if they were represented as the logical consequence of a verdict of "guilty".

The Security Council has left the Commission considerable latitude in this direction. The latter, by reason of its experience, is, indeed, better qualified than anyone to initiate practical and constructive suggestions.

3. Conditions under which the enquiry was carried out were not, probably, such as to allow us to draw from it any conclusions based on sound juridical principles. Even if some delegations feel that it is possible to reach conclusions dealing with isolated facts, this method involves considerable risks. For indeed, by throwing a bright light on one particular aspect of the question, while leaving others in the shade, the perspective of the investigation might be distorted. Partial conclusions,



therefore, would of necessity be unjust to the parties concerned, and misleading to the Security Council. Our cumbersome organization and its slowness in moving and in making decisions; the need for devoting considerable time to the careful elaboration of a procedure for which there was no precedent; the conditions under which the witnesses were brought forward and heard; our complete dependence, from a material point of view, upon the governments of the nations involved, all these factors, among many others, constitute the main reasons why the Commission was unable to pursue its task with all the necessary firmness.

These conditions as a whole were not conducive to our establishing a body of evidence in the juridical sense of the word. Therefore if it appears unjustified to base conclusions upon incomplete evidence, it would be as unjustified to plead the lack of complete evidence as a pretext for reaching the reverse of these conclusions. In fact, the investigation may have revealed a number of presumptions. But the notion of presumption, which is considered as appealing too much to elements of subjective appreciation in cases of internal law, is even more risky if applied to international questions by a body like this Commission which, being similar to the Security Council, is itself a political body. At the conclusion of an investigation where political argument has so often been in the foreground, the authority of our recommendations can be safeguarded only by applying increased juridical caution. In this connection, let it be sufficient to recall the manner in which - directly or indirectly, implicitly or explicitly - some of the nations represented on the Commission were implicated by witnesses or liaison representatives. Having due regard to the conditions under which the work was carried out and to the political questions confronting it, our Commission has made what may be des-

cribed as a meritorious effort to conduct as objective an investigation as possible, despite all the obstacles mentioned. The report on the facts, drawn up by the Committee No. 2, constitute a complete expose of the results we have achieved. It contains, in dry and methodical form, a contradictory but objective sum-total of all the information placed at the Commission's disposal; and it should enable the attentive reader to follow the enquiry through all its stages, and also if he so desires, to draw his own conclusions.

We may wonder whether the interpretation and the transforming into evidence of presumptions and convictions, does not jeopardise this achievement, modest though it be, especially if, in view of the aim we set out to achieve, such action is not necessary.

4. No conclusions implying condemnation could, in most of the cases dealt with in the Report, be formulated, except in the light of what has happened in Greece and elsewhere in the Balkans since 1940. War and occupation have deeply and cruelly marked the Balkan States; the disturbances with which the Commission has had to deal are in large measure due partly to the struggle waged by the Greek people against Italy and Germany, and partly to the way in which the various populations of Northern Greece were mixed together following the German occupation and Bulgaria's annexation of Yugoslav and Greek provinces.

Ever since 1944, Albanians, Yugoslavs and Bulgarians have crossed their Southern frontiers to take refuge in Greece; Greeks, on the other hand, have crossed into the countries to the north of Greece by the thousands. These exiles, in their own countries, are treated as "Quislings", traitors, agents-provocateurs and terrorists. In order to form a complete idea of the situation

and to enable the Commission to pronounce judgment, it is necessary to take into account the history of the Greek resistance, the events of December 1944, the Varkiza Agreement, etc. Boulkes is the conclusion of a tragedy that began in the spring of 1941; and to give a correct interpretation to the heated but contradictory statements of the various witnesses, and also to their reticences, we must take into account a number of events not covered by our investigations.

We are dealing here with struggles and tragedies from which other nations of Europe too are still suffering, although not to the same extent. Every member of the Commission was aware of this immediately upon entering Greece. It was emphasized partly because the Commission was obliged to deal fairly with the investigation itself and with the report on supplementary questions; and partly by the Commission's constant struggle to maintain the investigation within the limits of its terms of reference.

5. The task of this Commission in unhappy Europe should aim at pacification and reconciliation. The future is in this case of more consequence than the past. It is to be feared that in reaching conclusions with insufficient legal foundation we might only aggravate an already critical situation and do unnecessary harm to perfectly natural sensitivities. In the course of conversations, certain delegates have stressed the prestige of the United Nations, and the necessity, in this test case, of asserting its authority. But the very situation with which our enquiry has been concerned, seems too complex; the facts, in the legal sense of the word, too insufficiently ascertained to be susceptible to an easy solution based on a firm judgment in which the wrongs of both sides would be defined with strictness and impartiality. Moreover, the

United Nations are faced not only with a critical but with a chronic situation; not with flagrant aggression which requires sanctions and immediate intervention, but with a tension which, owing to a multiplicity of causes, has given rise to a series of incidents, complaints and counter-complaints. Stability can only be reestablished in this part of Europe by hard work and much patience. The problem which has to be solved was initiated before the birth of the United Nations; a summary decision and a simple solution are equally impossible.

In the course of three months' work, the French Delegation never ceased to use its influence to uphold, on the one hand, the work of the Commission in its fact-finding task with regard to objectivity and legality, and at the same time to direct the work entrusted to it by the Security Council towards conciliatory ends.

With these objects in view, and inspired by such ideals, the French Delegation declares that it favours a Report limited on the one hand to the statement of facts and on the other hand to the proposing of practical measures to ensure pacification in the troubled area.

Geneva, 10-23 May 1947.

(signed) GEORGES DAUX.

#### SECTION B.

The Delegation of U.S.S.R. subscribed to the conclusions set out in Chapter 2.

The Delegation of Poland supported these conclusions and presented the following declaration:

Part I - The Commission did not determine that the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Governments have provoked or supported the civil war in Greece. Appraisal of the insufficient and contra-

dictory evidence furnished in support of the Greek Government's appeal permits the conclusion that these accusations are without foundation.

Part II - The Commission did not determine the existence in Greek Macedonia of a separatist movement inspired by Yugoslav avia or by Bulgaria. A scrutiny of the evidence and the documentatio collected by the Commission leads to the conclusion that the Gre accusation in this respect is equally lacking any foundation wha soever.

Part III - The Commission did not determine that the Albanian, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Governments are responsible for the front incidents investigated pursuant to the Greek appeal. These incidents are not, either in their importance or in their character, substantially different from incidents which frequently occur on the borders of other countries immediately after a war. It is obvious that they did not exercise any influence upon the development of civil war in Greece.

Part IV - The following conclusions follow from the enquiry made by the Commission on several aspects of the internal situation in Greece, the study of which was made necessary by the Greek appeal concerning the alleged intervention of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia in Greek internal affairs as well as the refutation and counter-accusations of these countries:

(a) The civil war which is taking place on the whole of Greek territory including the districts which are the farthest away from the Northern frontier, such as the Peloponnes and the Islands, constitutes the principal cause of disorders in Northern Greece. The civil war in Greece originates directly from the abnormal internal political situation of that country.

(b) The disturbed situation in Northern Greece and along the frontier is considerably increased by the persecutions which sometimes take the form of mass exterminations directed by the Greek Government and the political elements supporting it against national minorities living in the Northern districts, particularly against Slavo-Macedonians and Tchamourians, who are deprived of elementary rights enjoyed by national minorities in other civilised countries.

Parts V and VII - The Commission is not competent to examine territorial claims formulated by the countries concerned before international organizations or evoked by the public opinion of these countries. The existence in Greece of a Gingoist propaganda must, however, be observed: a propaganda patterned on the model of racial propaganda, and directed particularly against the Slavs. There are facts indicating that this propaganda, which does not encounter any hindrance from the Greek Government, is sometimes linked with frontier incidents directed against the three neighbouring countries.

The Delegations of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Syria, United Kingdom and United States did not approve the conclusions set out in Chapter 2.

PART IV : PROPOSALS MADE IN PURSUENCE OF THE FINAL PARAGRAPH  
OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION OF 19 DECEMBER 1946\*

CHAPTER I : PROPOSALS

Before coming to its actual proposals the Commission feel it would be useful to recapitulate in brief the situation along Greece's northern border which these proposals are designed to alleviate and remedy. "First there are the allegations by the Greek Government that its three northern neighbours are assisting the guerilla warfare in Greece." "Secondly, there is the present disturbed situation in Greece which is a heritage from the past and the causes of which are to be found in Greece's tragic experience during the war, in her occupation by the Italians, Germans and Bulgarians, in the guerilla warfare waged during the occupation and the political bitterness and economic difficulties to which this war gave rise.

Next to be mentioned is the refusal of most of the countries concerned to accept as final their frontiers as at present defined. Some of these claims have been advanced in a perfectly legitimate manner before the forum of the United Nations or other competent international instances but their reiteration has undoubtedly exacerbated an already dangerous situation.

Furthermore in the case of the Macedonian question, claims have been ventilated not before the United Nations but in speeches by representatives of individual Governments or in government controlled organs of press. The exploitation of the Macedonian question in this manner is in the Commission's opinion a positive threat to the tranquillity of the Balkans and can only add to existing tension and suspicion and increase national passions which, far from being decreased as the result of the experience of

\*For the attitude of various delegations to the proposals set out in Chapter I, see Chapter II.

the war, have been sharpened by their identification in many cases with political ideas.

Also to be mentioned is the presence in Greece on the one hand and Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania on the other, of political refugees from each other's territory, many of whom have taken part in the political struggles which have raged in their own countries both during and since the war. Some of these refugees have been quartered near the frontier of the country from which they came. Some again have, during their exile, engaged in political and military activity, and all too many live in hope that there will be some violent turn of the tide which will enable them to return to their homes on the conditions they choose. Other of these refugees have been victims of panic flight and would, if given a free choice, gladly return to their homes. The continued presence of all of them under the conditions in which they live at present is however all too clearly a serious contributory factor to the present situation.

Lastly the violence and scale of the propaganda used by some of the protagonists in their relations with each other could not escape the notice of the Commission during its stay in the four countries. Such propaganda always serves to inflame passions which are already too high.

In such a set of circumstances it would be idle to believe that the situation in northern Greece could be cured by a stroke of the pen but the proposals which now follow have been framed in the spirit of Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations with a view first to preventing any aggravation of the situation, and secondly to alleviating it and eventually restoring it to normal.

The Commission has not made any suggestions in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the



countries concerned as they would be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter. However, in the event the Greek Government decides to grant a new amnesty for political prisoners and guerrillas, the Commission suggests that the Security Council make known to the Greek Government its willingness, if that Government so requests, to lend its good offices in order to secure by all possible means the realisation of this measure.

The following are, the Commission's proposals :

A. The Commission proposes to the Security Council that it should recommend to the governments of Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the other, to do their utmost to establish normal good neighbourly relations, to abstain from all action direct or indirect which is likely to increase or maintain the tension and unrest in the border areas, and rigorously to refrain from any support, overt or covert, of elements in neighbouring countries aiming at the overthrow of the lawful governments of those countries. Should subjects of complaint arise these should be made not the object of propaganda campaigns, but referred either through diplomatic channels to the Government concerned, or should this resource fail, to the appropriate organ of the United Nations. "In the light of the situation investigated by it the Commission believes that, in the area of its investigation future cases of support of armed bands formed on the territory of one State and crossing into the territory of another State, or of refusal by a government in spite of the demands of the State concerned to take all possible measures on its own territory to deprive such bands of any aid or protection, should be considered by the Security Council as a threat to the peace within the meaning of the Charter of the United Nations."

B. With a view to providing effective machinery for the regulation and control of their common frontiers, the Commission proposes that the Security Council recommend to the governments

concerned that they enter into new conventions along the lines of the Greco-Bulgarian Convention of 1931, taking into account the needs of the present situation.

U. For the purpose of restoring normal conditions along the frontiers between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the other, and thereby assisting in the establishment of good neighbourly relations, the Commission recommends the establishment of a body with the following composition and functions:

a) The body should be established by the Security Council in the form of either a small Commission or a single Commissioner. If the body is a small Commission it should be composed of representatives of Governments. If the body is to consist of a Commissioner he and his staff should be nationals of States who are neither permanent members of the Security Council nor have any direct connection or interest in the affairs of the four countries concerned.

b) The Commission or Commissioner should have the staff necessary to perform their functions including persons able to act as border observers and to report on the observance of the frontier conventions referred to in recommendation (B), the state of the frontier area, and cognate matters.

c) The Commission or Commissioner should have the right to perform their functions on both sides of the border and the Commission or Commissioner should have the right of direct access to the four Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece. The functions and duties of the Commission or the Commissioner should be :

- (i) To investigate any frontier violations that occur;
- (ii) To use its good offices for the settlement, by the means mentioned in Article 33 of the Charter, of:
  - a. Controversies arising from frontier violations;
  - b. Controversies directly connected with the application of the Frontier Conventions envisaged in (B);

- c. Complaints regarding conditions on the border which may be brought by one Government against another.
- (iii) To use its good offices to assist the Governments concerned in the negotiation and conclusion of the frontier conventions envisaged in recommendation (B).
- (iv) To study and make recommendations to the governments concerned with respect to such additional bilateral agreements between them for the pacific settlement of disputes relating to frontier incidents or conditions on the frontier, as the Commission considers desirable.
- (v) To assist in the implementation of Recommendation D below; to receive reports from the four governments with respect to persons who have fled from any one of such countries to any of the others; to maintain a register for their confidential use of all such persons and to assist in the repatriation of those who wish to return to their homes, and in connection with these functions to act in concert with the appropriate agency of the United Nations.
- (vi) To report to the Security Council every three months, or whenever they think fit.

It is recommended that this body should be established for a period of at least two years, before the expiry of which the necessity for its continued existence should be reviewed by the Security Council.

D. The Commission recognises that owing to the deep-rooted causes of the present disturbances and to the nature of the frontiers it is physically impossible to control the passage of refugees across the border. As the presence of these refugees in any of the four countries is a disturbing factor each Government should assume the obligation to remove them as far from which they came as it is physically and practically possible.

These refugees should be placed in camps or otherwise segregated. The governments concerned should undertake to ensure that they should not be permitted to indulge in any political or military activity.

The Commission would also strongly recommend that if it is practicable the camps containing the refugees should be placed under the supervision of some international body authorised by the United Nations to undertake the task.

In order to ensure that only genuine refugees return, their return to their country of origin shall not take place except after (1) arrangement with the government of such country and (2) notification to the Commission or Commissioner or to the international United Nations body if such is established. The Commission would here point out the desirability of the governments concerned encouraging the return of refugees to their homes.

E. The Commission proposes that the Security Council recommend to the governments concerned that they study the practicability of concluding agreements for the voluntary transfer of minorities. In the meantime minorities in any of the countries concerned desiring to emigrate should be given all facilities to do so by the government of the State in which they at present reside. The arrangements of any such transfers could be supervised by the Commission or Commissioner who would act as a registration authority for any person desiring to emigrate.

## CHAPTER 2

The Delegations of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, Syria, U.K. and the U.S. subscribed to the proposals set out in Part IV Chapter I.

The Delegation of USSR did not approve these proposals and made the following statement :

The Soviet Delegation objects to the proposals put forward by the Delegations of USA, United Kingdom, France, China, Brazil, Belgium, Colombia, Australia and Syria on the Greek question for the following reasons :

1. The above-mentioned proposals in no way proceed from the facts and documents gathered by the Commission during the investigation of the situation in Northern Greece and on her northern frontiers, but are based merely on the unfounded assertions of the Greek Government regarding aid to the guerrillas by the northern neighbours of Greece.

2. The proposals admit the possibility of frontier incidents, conflicts and even acts of aggression in the future in the relations between Greece on the one hand and Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania on the other, although the Commission has no grounds whatever for proposals of such a nature.

3. The proposals contemplate measures concerning not only Greece but Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania as well, although it is evident from the documents at the disposal of the Commission that there is a tense situation in Greece and that disorders are taking place there, not only in the northern part but throughout the country, and that the tense situation and disorders in Greece are due to internal causes.

4. The establishment of a permanent frontier commission or body representing the Security Council, as contemplated in the proposals,

and also the conclusion of conventions and agreements between Greece, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania is tantamount to a limitation of the sovereign rights of these States in settling their relations among themselves.

The Delegation of Poland did not approve the proposals set out in Part IV Chapter I and made the following statement :

The Polish Delegation cannot approve of the measures proposed by some delegations in part IV for the solution of the problem which have formed the object of the investigation of the Commission.

The Polish Delegation makes the following objections :

1. The measures as a whole seem ineffectual, since they take into account only the symptoms and not the causes of the troubles existing in Northern Greece and along her Northern frontiers. The fact that the measures proposed are ineffectual could easily prejudice the prestige of the United Nations.

2. Some of the measures proposed do not seem to take into account the fact that diplomatic relations do not exist between Greece on the one hand and Bulgaria and Albania on the other.

3. Concerning proposal C, which suggests the establishment of a permanent body of control, this measure appears inadequate for the following reasons :

a) such a body of control would prejudice the sovereign rights of Greece as well as those of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.

b) it would constitute a measure of coercion towards Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. This measure would be in no way justified by the results of the Commission's investigation. Therefore instead of improving the existing difficulties it could quite well do the opposite.

The Polish Delegation considers that the choice of recommendations for the solution of the problems which form the object of the inquiry should be left to the Security Council.

LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex 1 - Composition of the Commission
- Annex 2 - Teams of the Commission
- Annex 3 - List of witnesses heard by the Commission and its teams
- Annex 4 - Bibliography of Commission documentation
- Annex 5 - Field investigations of the Commission and its Teams
- Annex 6 - Comments and oral statement made by the Liaison Representative of Albania on parts II and III of the Report
- Annex 7 - Comments and oral statement made by the Liaison Representative of Bulgaria on parts II and III of the Report
- Annex 8 - Comments and oral statement made by the Liaison Representative of Greece on parts II and III of the Report
- Annex 9 - Comments and oral statement made by the Liaison Representative of Yugoslavia on parts II and III of the Report