

THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE UNDER THE TURKISH REPUBLIC:

THE FIRST TEN YEARS *

The theme of this paper is the struggle of the Ecumenical Patriarchate for survival in Kemalist Turkey and the role of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Greek-Turkish diplomacy. The first ten years of the Patriarchate under the Turkish Republic were difficult ones for Orthodoxy, and seriously threatened to disrupt the prospects of peace in the Balkans and the Near East. The need for adjustment and compromise forced upon the Ecumenical Patriarchate by the triumph of nationalism in the Balkans and the Near East, and by the tragic expulsion of Hellenism from Anatolia marks the beginning of a major turning point in the history of the Church of Constantinople.

THE LAUSANNE SETTLEMENT

On December 16, 1922, the Turkish delegation presented to the sub-commission on the exchange of populations a written declaration supporting its previous requests for the removal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey on the grounds that a radical modification had taken place in the organization of the new Turkish state. The declaration maintained that "the Government of the Grand National Assembly intended to grant to minorities resident in Turkey rights identical with those which had been granted to minorities in the States enlarged or newly constituted as a result of the great war". It added that the Turkish Government "...by separating the Caliphate and the State and by establishing a democratic regime, had suppressed the privileges which had been granted in the Ottoman Empire to the non-Muslin communities. The relation between the

* Mr. Psomiades is a Lecturer in Government, Columbia University. The research in which this article is based was made possible by funds granted by the Ford Foundation. The Foundation, however, is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements or views expressed therein.

charitable, educational and philanthropic institutions of the minorities and the State must henceforth be carried on direct; the clergy and its hierarchal chief must not in the future concern itself with any but spiritual matters. The Patriarchate, which had always been a political organ, must be transferred to some place outside the frontier of Turkey, seeing that as a result of the abolition of the political privileges which it had formerly enjoyed and of the organic institutions which depended on it, it had lost all reason to exist"¹.

On January 4, 1923, the Turkish delegation formally demanded that the Ecumenical Patriarchate be removed from Turkey. It drew attention to the very hostile attitude adopted by the Patriarchate towards Turkey in the course of the last war, and reasoned that the abolishment of the temporal power of the Caliph called for the removal of the Patriarchate from Constantinople. It threatened to remove all the Greeks from Constantinople and to withdraw its acceptance in principle of the solution proposed for all the other questions submitted to the sub-commission, if the question of the Patriarchate was not solved to its satisfaction. It suggested that the Patriarchate could transfer its seat to Mount Athos and exercise thence its spiritual influence over the Orthodox world².

In return for the expulsion of the Patriarchate from Turkey, it appeared that the Turkish Government was prepared to make certain concessions to the Greeks. In effect, its delegation made it understood to the President of the sub-commission on the exchange of populations, G.C. Montagna, that, if the Greeks accepted the Turkish demand, it was prepared to extend the scope of some of the clauses for the retention of a greater number of Greeks in Constantinople³.

The Turkish request, however, was unanimously opposed in the sub-commission. The French delegation, in an attempt to facilitate an accord, proposed a compromise formula whereby the Ecumenical Patriarchate would remain in Constantinople with the condition that it give up all its political power. The Greek delegation, from the beginning, accepted and supported

1. Great Britain, *Parliamentary Papers*, "Lausanne Conference on Near Eastern Affairs, 1922-1923", "Records of Proceedings and Draft Terms of Peace, Turkey No 1 (1923)", Cmd 1814, p. 333. Hereafter cited as *LCNEA*.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 336-337. While the Turkish Government was calling for the removal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey at Lausanne, at home it sought to undermine that institution by supporting for a while the Turkish Orthodox Church plan of Papa Efthim Karahissaridis, *infra*, p. 51 ff.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 316-317, 332.

the idea that the Patriarchate should be divested of the political power bestowed upon it by the defunct Ottoman state. The Turkish delegation rejected the proposal and the matter was referred to the First Commission of the Conference¹.

The Territorial and Military Commission met on January 10, 1923, to hear the report of Montagna. Lord Curzon, President of the Commission, took the initiative in formulating a final solution of the problem. With the unanimous support of the inviting powers and the Orthodox Christian states, he met the Turkish demand with equal firmness. "There seems to me to be no reason why the Patriarch should not continue to exercise his spiritual and ecclesiastical prepotives without enjoying any sort of political and administrative authority at all. On the other hand, if these spiritual and ecclesiastical prerogatives were to be destroyed and the seat of the Patriarchate removed from Constantinople, a shock would be delivered to the conscience of the whole civilized world"². Venizelos urged the Turks to accept Lord Curzon's proposals and stated that if they were accepted, the Greek delegation would "take steps with a view to the retirement of the Patriarch now in power"³.

In the face of this opposition and the proposal of Venizelos, Ismet Pasha, the chief Turkish delegate, gave a reluctant verbal promise that his Government would retain the Ecumenical Patriarchate provided it would confine itself within the limits of purely religious matters. The Turkish delegation, he said, "taking note of the solemn declarations and assurances which have just been given concerning the future situation and attitude of the Patriarchate and in order to give a supreme proof of its conciliatory dispositions, renounces the expulsion of the Patriarchate from Constantinople"⁴.

Thus, the problem of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which had not only considerably retarded the work of the Conference, but also threatened, for a while, to provoke a complete rupture of the negotiations, was resolved.

Why was it that the Turkish Government was so adamant on this issue? It appears that from the beginning it sought the expulsion of the Patriarchate as a concession for the retention of the Greek minority at Constantinople. Originally, it demanded that both the Patriarchate and the

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 332 - 333.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 319.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 324 - 325; Harold Nicolson, *Curzon: The Last Phase, 1919 - 1925* (Boston, 1934), p. 320.

4. Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Documents diplomatiques, «Conférence de Lausanne», I* (Paris, 1923), p. 268.

Greek minority leave Turkey so as to bring to an end Greek aspirations for the imperial capital of Byzantium. Such a course, it felt, would constitute for Greece a definite abandonment of the *Megali Idea*. Secondly, the anti-Turkish activity of Meletios IV, who had been Ecumenical Patriarch since December 1921, was extremely distasteful to the Turkish Government, and it was only after the promise of Venizelos that Meletios IV would be replaced that Ismet Pasha finally agreed to allow the Patriarchate to remain. Thirdly, it seemed that the Ankara Government may have felt that by expelling the Patriarchate, the most important religious institution in the Ottoman Empire after the Caliphate, the success of its plan to abolish the Caliphate and to expel all the members of the Ottoman imperial family from Turkey would be enhanced. It wanted to prove to its Muslim population that the expulsion of all religious authorities was a general measure and not anti-Muslim, that it was a consequence to the adoption of the fundamental principles of Western democracy¹. Fourthly, its actions were undoubtedly colored by the *Millet* mentality. That the Patriarchate and the Greek Christian minority of Turkey are generally considered as untrustworthy aliens in the Turkish body-politic is a result, in part, of the confusion in the Turkish Muslim mind between what is essentially national with what is essentially religious. For all practical purposes religion is still the dividing line in Turkish society, and a man's creed the determinant of his political and social status². And finally, the Turks had recently fought the Greeks in a bitter military campaign upon which their existence as a nation depended. Turkish public opinion demanded that Greece pay dearly for its Anatolian venture.

Although in the final Treaty and the Conventions annexed, there were no clauses providing for the rights and privileges of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Ismet Pasha's declarations regarding the irremovability of the Patriarchate are clearly in the nature of an international engagement³.

1. Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), *A Speech Delivered by Ghazi Mustapha Kemal...* October 1927, (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 572, 583 - 585, 588 - 589, 598, 681. Roderic H. Davison, "Turkish Diplomacy from Mudros to Lausanne" in G. A. Craig and F. Gilbert, eds., *The Diplomats 1919 - 1939* (Princeton, 1953), p. 199.

2. Alexandre Devedji, *L'Échange obligatoire des minorités grecques et turques* (Paris, 1929) p. 68. Orhan Münir, *Minderheiten im osmanischen Reich und in der neuen Türkei*, (Köln, 1937) p. 147ff. Harry J. Psomiades, "Turkey: Progress and Problems", *Middle Eastern Affairs*, Vol. VIII, No 3, March 1957, pp. 93-95.

3. It can be argued that Ismet Pasha's declarations regarding the Patriarchate was an oral agreement and as such binding under international law. Although both Brierly and the Harvard Research group exclude oral agreements from their de-

While the Treaty of Lausanne assured the Ecumenical Patriarchate a seat in Constantinople, it did not, in effect, prevent the Turkish Government from interfering with the liberty of the Patriarch and the free exercise of his ecumenical function. In fact, the future of the Patriarchate was to depend, as it had since Greek independence, upon the temper of Greek-Turkish relations.

PAPA EFTHIM AND THE TURKISH ORTHODOX CHURCH

The anti-Turkish statements and activities of the reigning Patriarch, Meletios IV, considerably weakened the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople¹. While the Turkish Government was moving for the dismissal of the Patriarchate from Turkey at Lausanne, it was also seeking to undermine the Patriarchate by supporting, for a while, factions within the church and Papa Efthim Karahissaridis' Turkish Orthodox Church project².

Papa Efthim, with the apparent support and approval of the Turkish Government, attempted to organize a Turkish Orthodox Church antagonistic to and independent of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In the Autumn of 1922,

finitions of "treaty", neither denies the possibility that oral agreements may be binding under international law. Cf. the opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the Eastern Greenland Case, P.C.I.J., Ser. A/B, No 52 (1933), p. 71. In this case the Court upheld that oral agreements between states have the effect of treaties. See Also Herbert W. Briggs, *The Law of Nations*, (New York, 1952), p. 838. For oral agreements as treaties in British practice see Arnold D. McNair, *The Law of Treaties: British Practice and Opinion* (New York, 1938), pp. 47 - 50. It is argued that the international position of the Patriarchate is supported by the Treaty of Paris, March 1836, Article IX and the Treaty of Berlin, July 1878, Article LXII, which it is claimed, retained their full value, even after the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne. Because the Lausanne Treaty made no mention of the Patriarchate, it is maintained that the pre-existing situation is not in any way influenced by that settlement. It is also argued that Articles 40 and 41 of the Lausanne Treaty provide for the non-Muslim minorities the right to establish their own religious, social and educational institutions. The fate of the Ecumenical Patriarch, who is also Archbishop of Constantinople, is directly connected with that of the Greek minority in Turkey. Cf Basil S. Giannakakis, "International Status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate", *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, (Brookline, Massachusetts) II, No 2, December 1956, pp. 10 - 26 and III, No 1, Summer 1957, pp. 26 - 46.

1. *The Speech*, pp. 9 - 10, 5 - 29. *Atatürk Söylev ve Demeçleri*, III (1918 - 1937) (Ankara, 1954), p. 57.

2. *Times* (London), February 7, 1923; June 29, 1923, and September 25, 1923, *LCNEA*, p. 324.

Procopios, Metropolitan of Konia and the highest ranking prelate left in Anatolia, along with two subordinate titular bishops formed a "Synod" and took other action at variance with Orthodox Christian canon law. They co-opted two other priests, one of whom was Papa Efthim, and this body of five prelates claimed to be the governing body of the "Turkish Orthodox Church". Papa Efthim was chosen as the "General Representative" of the Turkish Church¹.

Meletios IV declared, at that time, that the *Phanar*, was considering the difficulty but was unwilling to take immediate disciplinary action as it feared that the peccant prelates may have been coerced into schismatical behavior by the Ankara Government. He explained that the *Phanar* was willing to meet the Turkish speaking Orthodox Christians halfway by being prepared to set up in a canonical manner a special ecclesiastical province, autonomous but subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, in which the liturgical language would be Turkish². Papa Efthim answered that only by severing themselves completely from the Phanar, which was subject to a foreign power and on very bad terms with the Ankara Government, would the Turkish Orthodox Christians find peace in Anatolia. He bitterly complained that the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Meletios IV, in particular, had plotted to undermine the Turkish Orthodox Church movement by removing him from Turkey and by making false promises³.

At the time, there were about 50,000 Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians left in Antolia, who were either descendents of Turks that embraced Christianity under the Byzantines, or Greeks that adopted Turkish as a mother tongue in the Seljukid or Ottoman period. It appeared, for a while, that these Turkish-speaking Christians were to be exempted from the compulsory population exchange agreement between Turkey and Greece. On December 12, 1922, Lord Curzon declared, at Lausanne, that the ex-

1. Teoman Ergene, *Istiklâl harbinde Türk ortadoksları*, (The Turkish Orthodox in the War of Independence) (Istanbul, 1951), pp. 25 - 26. This book was, in all probability, written by Papa Efthim. It presents a detailed account and defense of his program and action as leader of the Turkish Orthodox Church movement. Cf. Clair Price, *The Rebirth of Turkey* (New York, 1925), pp. 147 - 153. Earlier, on November, 30, 1921, Papa Efthim proclaimed the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church and on December 29, 1921, the Ankara Government discussed the issue but took no official action. See Gotthard Jäschke and Erich Pritch, "Die Türkei Seit dem Weltkriege Geschichtskalender, 1918 - 1928" *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. 10, 1927 - 1929, pp. 56 - 57.

2. *Times* (London), February 7, 1923, p. 9.

3. Ergene, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 - 27, 69 - 70.

change of populations would result in the almost complete disappearance of the Greek population from Antolia, "though there will, I suppose, remain the reconciled Ottoman Greeks numbered at about 50,000 persons"¹. On the following day, Ismet Pasha explained that the Orthodox Turks had never asked for treatment differing in any respect from that enjoyed by their Muslim compatriots, and it is most improbable that they would ever make such a request"². Apparently, Venizelos also agreed with Lord Curzon and Ismet Pasha that "50,000 Turkish-speaking persons of the Orthodox faith would stay [*in Antolia*] in any case"³.

Notwithstanding the declarations at Lausanne and the growing belief in Ankara that the Turkish-speaking Christians and many of the Greek-speaking Christians were formerly Turks, all the Greek and Turkish-speaking Christians of the Orthodox faith in Antolia were shipped to Greece under the compulsory population exchange agreement concluded at Lausanne; thus depriving the Turkish Orthodox Church movement of popular support. In Greece, the Turkish-speaking Christians were easily assimilated into the population as they considered themselves Greeks by race and religion.

THE ABDICATION OF MELETIOS IV

During the spring of 1923, Papa Efthim, with the aid of the Turkish authorities, seized the church of Panagia Kaphatiani in Galata, Istanbul, and directed a systematic and violent campaign against the Patriarchate⁴. On June 1, 1923, in an obvious attempt to show their allegiance to the Turkish Government and to win its support, partisans of Papa Efthim, led by Damianos Damianides of Galata, attacked the *Phanar* and injured the Patriarch. The Turkish police, although present throughout the demonstrations, did not interfere, and the French military police (the Allies were still on occupation duty in the City) were called in to restore order⁵. A few days later, Papa Efthim announced to the Turkish press and Government that there was an enemy and adversary of the Turkish people in the *Phanar*,

1. *LCNEA*, p. 208.

2. *LCNEA*, p. 208.

3. *LCNEA*, p. 224.

4. A. A. Pallis, *Ξενητεμένοι Έλληνες*, (Greeks Abroad) (Athens, 1953), p. 184. Mr. Pallis was the Director of the Greek Red Cross at Constantinople and often acted as liaison between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Turkish Government and foreign government representatives in Turkey.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 185 - 186; *Times* (London), June 2 and 4, 1923, September 25, 1923.

and called for the immediate resignation of Meletios IV. He commended D. Damianides and his followers for assaulting the Patriarchate ¹.

Sensing his precarious position in Turkey but most reluctant to vacate the Ecumenical Throne, Meletios IV seriously advocated the removal of the Patriarchate to Thessaloniki or Mount Athos. In October 1922, he remarked to Italian newspapermen that it might be necessary to transfer the Patriarchate to Mount Athos if it could not freely exercise its functions in Turkey. In the same month, the Holy Synod met twice to discuss the transfer of the Patriarchate to a place outside of Turkey ². After the attacks against the Patriarchate in June 1923, Meletios IV renewed his bid to relocate the Patriarchate. He reasoned with Mr. Alexander A. Pallis, the Director of the Greek Red Cross in Turkey, that, although the Patriarchate was allowed to remain in Kemalist Turkey, the limitations imposed upon it by the Turkish authorities would weaken its prestige and authority in the Orthodox world. As a result of the exchange of population only a few Greeks would be allowed to remain in Turkey and such a situation would render it very difficult to find intelligent and able clerics with the necessary Turkish citizenship to assume the vacancies in the Holy Synod and the church administration. The future of the Patriarchate, he pleaded, could only be assured by removing it outside the boundaries of Turkey. Pallis, voicing the opinion of the Greek Government, replied that as long as Greeks were settled in Constantinople the Ecumenical Patriarchate should remain in that city ³.

Meletios IV again presented the issue of the removal of the Patriarchate to the Holy Synod and dispatched a telegram to his friend Venizelos at Lausanne requesting his advice on this matter. Pallis was with Meletios IV when the latter received the counsel of Venizelos to abdicate. According to Pallis, Meletios IV was very incensed at this recommendation but decided to follow it because it was supported by the Greek Government.

1. *Times* (London), June 9, 1923. *Ileri* (Istanbul), June 2 and 9, 1923 quoted in Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, *Bulletin Periodique de la Presse Turque* (Paris), No 29, September 13 1923, p. 9. Hereafter cited as *B.P.P.T.*

2. *Oriente Moderno* (Rome), November 15, 1922, pp. 382 - 383. Hereafter cited as *O.M.*

3. Pallis, *op. cit.*, pp. 186 - 187. *Interview with A. A. Pallis*. April 7, 1958, (Athens). During this transition period, the Turkish Government might have approved the removal of the Patriarchate to one of the Turkish islands in the Bosphorus. Such a transfer would have had the advantage of retaining the Patriarchate within the historical limits of Constantinople and at the same time make it less vulnerable to Turkish pressure.

Notwithstanding several changes of mind, he finally withdrew from Constantinople on July 10, 1923 for a monastery at Mount Athos¹.

The aspirations of Meletios IV and the objectives of Greek foreign policy were clearly at odds. In January 1923, Venizelos had assured Ismet Pasha at Lausanne that Meletios IV would abdicate and to the Greek press he pronounced that the maintenance of the Patriarchate at Constantinople was an important Hellenic interest and that Meletios IV would resign immediately following the conclusion of peace. "He (Meletios IV), agrees on this point". Although he was a personal friend of Meletios IV, Venizelos felt that his removal would improve the situation of the Patriarchate and that of the Greek minority in Turkey². On the other hand, Meletios IV was very reluctant to abdicate, at least not until normal relations between the Orthodox Church and the Turkish Government were re-established and the future of these relations properly secured; he refused to believe that normal relations could only be obtained by his abdication. Although he withdrew from Turkey, he did not abdicate; instead, he appointed Nicholas, Metropolitan of Caesaria, as *Locum Tenens* and continued his campaign to win support for the transference of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to Greece³. Meletios IV was a very active person whose good judgement was often marred by his ambition. Notwithstanding this trait, he did much to improve the position of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in its relations with the other Orthodox Churches, and his concern for his Church was real. The future of the Patriarchate was left in complete uncertainty and, for a while, it appeared that the Patriarchate would either be treated as extinct or reconstituted in such a fashion that its composition and direction would be identical with Papa Efthim's Turkish Orthodox Church.

When Meletios IV withdrew from Turkey, Papa Efthim intensified his efforts in Ankara to gain support for his church program and, although the father of four children, to have himself nominated as the Ecumenical Patriarch. Upon his return to Constantinople in the autumn of 1923, the Turkish press gave his proposed project full and sympathetic coverage; his plans seemed to be close to realization⁴.

On October 2, 1923, an hour before the Allied evacuation of Con-

1. *Ibid.*, p. 187. *Vatan* (Istanbul), June 26, 1923 (*B.P.P.T.*, No 29 September 13, 1923, p. 9). *Times* (London), June 27, 1923.

2. *Πατρις* (Athens), January 20, 1923 (*O.M.* February 15, 1923, p. 527).

3. *Times* (London), July 12, 1923.

4. *B.P.P.T.*, No 31, November 19, 1923, p. 10.

stantinople was completed, Papa Efthim, accompanied by an adequate body of Turkish police and some of his partisans, forced his way into the room where the Holy Synod was in session and presented an ultimatum to the attending bishops ordering them within ten minutes to declare Meletios IV deposed. In spite of the vigorous protest of two of the eight members of the Holy Synod, the required declaration was voted for, and six of the eight members of the Holy Synod, whose Sees were situated outside the boundaries of Turkey, along with the *Locum Tenens* of the Patriarchate were virtually expelled from the *Phanar*. Papa Efthim then announced that he intended to remain at the Patriarchate until seven new members, nominated by him, were admitted to the Holy Synod and a new Ecumenical Patriarch, agreeable to Ankara, was elected. His demands, save for the election of a new Patriarch, were conceded to and he returned to Ankara as the "official representative" of the *Phanar*¹.

The bold and theatrical actions of Papa Efthim resulted in adverse criticism and a reversal of public opinion. His violence and arrogance were publicly reprimanded and officially disavowed. Hussein Cahid, the editor of *Tanin*, declared that his first impulse was to laugh at Papa Efthim's vaudevillesque actions but argued that they were really serious, and that while it was admittedly impossible for Meletios IV to remain Ecumenical Patriarch and a change was necessary, it would have been possible to arrange the affair in accordance with the interests as well as the honor of the State. If, he continued, Papa Efthim acted on his own responsibility, he should be punished for the outrage, whereas if he acted with the knowledge of the authorities, such conduct was unworthy of a properly constituted government. The Turkish Press Bureau, on October 12th, reported that the Ankara Government received with astonishment the nomination of Papa Efthim as "official representative" of the *Phanar* to Ankara, and denied that the Patriarchate, a purely religious organization, had the right to send such a representative to it².

The change in attitude of the Turkish Government was also influenced by internal difficulties, Christian public opinion abroad and by the correct behavior of the Greek Government. Although Papa Efthim's actions caused considerable indignation and animosity in Greece and the Orthodox world, the Greek Government, on October 12th, reported to the press that it was desirous of re-establishing friendly relations with Turkey and was prepared

1. *Times* (London), October 3, and 6, 1923; November 21, 1923.

2. *Times* (London), October 6, 1923. *Tanin* (Istanbul), October 5, 1923 (*B.P.P.T.* No 31 November 19, 1923, p. 11) and October 6, 1923 (*O.M.*, October 15, 1923 p. 272). Luke, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

to recognize a new Ecumenical Patriarch at Constantinople provided that his election was carried out strictly in accordance with the ecclesiastical rules and regulations. On the same day, Chrysostom, the Metropolitan of Athens, was sent to Thessaloniki to obtain the abdication of Meletios IV. The Greek Government and Venizelos were opposed to the plans of Meletios IV, who appeared determined to remove, temporarily, the Patriarchate to Thessaloniki, for fear that once removed the Turks would never permit the restoration of the Patriarchate in Turkey. They told Meletios IV that another creation of the Patriarchate at Thessaloniki would be against the best interests of the Orthodox Church and the nation¹.

Meletios IV finally gave in to the reasoning of the Greek Government and the document of abdication was actually signed when news was received of Papa Efthim's incursions. The official document containing the formal and canonical abdication of the Ecumenical Patriarch was dated September 20, 1923 and was to be read at the meeting of the Holy Synod scheduled for November 10, 1923. But the activities of Papa Efthim prompted Meletios IV to postpone the announcement of his abdication².

However, under pressure from all sides, he abdicated, and the Holy Synod received friendly instructions from the Turkish Government to make ready for a new election with the understanding that the new Patriarch would be a Turkish subject, sympathetic to Turkey and elected by Turkish subjects³.

GREGORIOS VII

On December 6, 1923, Gregorios, Metropolitan of Chalcedon, was elected Ecumenical Patriarch by a vote of ten to one and, after vehement opposition from Papa Efthim, was enthroned as Gregorios VII on December 13. On the day following the election and prior to the enthronement, Papa Efthim, who was not allowed to attend the election, and his protégé, Kyrillos, Metropolitan of Rhodopolis, again descended upon the *Phanar*, drove out all its occupants and declared that in his position as "general procurator" he had taken over the Holy Synod and would continue to occupy the *Phanar* until a new election for a legitimate Patriarch took place. In an open letter to Gregorios, he wrote, "You know that you do not have the confidence of the Government [Turkish]. By accepting

1. *Times* (London), October 13, 1923.

2. *Times* (London), November 21, 1923. *O.M.*, November 15, 1923, p. 349. Technically the document of abdication rendered invalid the illegal acts of Papa Efthim.

3. *Times* (London), November 12, 1923, and December 7, 1923.

the office of Patriarch you have harmed the interests of the community. I advise you to resign"¹.

However, two days later, the Turkish police with order from Ankara, expelled Papa Efthim and his followers from the *Phanar* and restored it to its legal occupants. The Turkish Minister of Justice explained in the Grand National Assembly that the Patriarchate was solely a religious institution and that the election of Gregorios VII had the approval of the Turkish Government. "So far as the Government is concerned the Patriarch is the head of the priests and the Government has the right to watch over his election in which the candidate and voters must be Turkish subjects. The Government does not know of any foreign intervention nor believes it possible, if it had discovered such intervention the election would have been annulled". On December 25, Kemal Pasha sent Gregorios VII a telegram thanking him for his favorable expressions toward the Republic².

The second crisis in the reign of Gregorios VII resulted from the dissolution of the Caliphate in Turkey, March 1924. *Akşam* and the other Turkish newspapers proposed that as a natural complement to the abolishment of the Caliphate, the Ecumenical Patriarche should be removed from Turkey. *Tanin*, however, urged its readers not to confuse the issue of the Caliphate with that of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It was impossible, it stated, to suppress the Patriarchate due to commitments made at Lausanne³. Although Kemal Pasha was reported to have said, "now that the Caliphate has been suppressed, it would be necessary also to suppress the Patriarchate", the Turkish Government remained loyal to its pledges given at Lausanne⁴. In spite of the constant charges that Gregorios VII was working for the interests of Greece and that he was an agent of the Greek foreign office, and notwithstanding the incursions of Papa Efthim and the reaction resulting from the dissolution of the Caliphate, the eleven month reign of the Patriarch was a comparatively peaceful one and he achieved what relatively few Patriarchs before him were able to achieve—a quiet death in office (November 16, 1924)⁵.

1. *O.M.*, January 15, 1924, p. 30.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 31. Papa Efthim was subsequently unfrocked (February 19, 1924) by the Holy Synod for his irregular behavior. *Ileri* February 20, 1924 (*B.P.P.T.* No 34, May 3, 1924 p. 13).

3. *O.M.*, March 15, 1924, p. 177 and April 15, 1924, p. 210. *Vatan*, March 10 and 13, 1924; *Akşam*, March 12 and 13, 1924 and *Vakit*, March 11, 1924 quoted in *B.P.P.T.*, No 34, May 3, 1924, p. 13.

4. *Times* (London), May 6, 1924.

5. *B.P.P.T.*, No 38 February 21, 1925, p. 6 - 7. *Échos d'Orient*, (Paris) Vol. XXIII, 1924, pp. 23 - 101. *Times* (London), December 8 and 16, 1923.

CONSTANTINE VI

The comparative calm was broken by the stormy events following the election of Constantine Araboğlu on December 17, 1924 as the new Patriarch. His election generated such a bitter quarrel between Turkey and Greece that war appeared imminent. Prior to his election, the Turkish press gave due warning that Constantine Araboğlu was not eligible for the Patriarchal Throne because he was not a native of Constantinople as defined in Article 2 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations signed at Lausanne, January 30, 1923. On the day before his election, the Turkish police reiterated the warning, and the exchangeability of the cleric was referred for a ruling to the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Populations after the Constantinople sub-commission declined to give a decision on this delicate matter¹.

Meanwhile, the Turkish Legation in Athens, anticipating the reaction of Greece to these proceedings, issued a *communiqué* on December 30, 1924 assuring Greece that Turkey would respect the Patriarchate, but maintaining that the new Patriarch, Constantine VI, by virtue of being born outside the city of Constantinople, albeit in Turkey, was an exchangeable Greek as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of the exchange Convention. The *communiqué* announced that the Turkish Government deplored the exaggerated impressions given by the Greek press that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was in danger, and was waiting for the decision of the Mixed Commission before taking action against the Patriarch².

On January 28, 1925 the Mixed Commission with the abstention of its Greek members made the following declaration:

"...while noting the facts contained in the report of the Sixth Sub-Committee, No. 2360, dated December 17, 1924 in regard to the possibility of exchanging Mgr. Constantine Araboğlu, having been born in Asia Minor and having gone to Constantinople after October 30, 1918 fulfilling in his person all the conditions necessary for the purpose of exchange, holds that it is beyond its competence to take a decision in regard to the case of this ecclesiastic in view of the fact that he is a Metropolitan"³.

The verdict of the Mixed Commission was evasive. It would neither give,

1. *B.P.P.T.*, No 38, February 21, 1925, p. 7. *Times* (London), December 18, 1924.

2. *Times* (London), December 31, 1924. *O.M.*, February 15, 1925, p. 97.

3. League of Nations, *Official Journal*, April 1925, p. 483. Hereafter cited as *L.N.O.J.*

nor refuse to give, an exit passport to Constantine Araboğlu and at no time referred to him as Ecumenical Patriarch ¹.

A) THE EXPULSION OF CONSTANTINE VI

Greek public opinion was enraged when on January 30, 1925 the Turkish police abruptly removed Constantine VI from Turkish territory ². In the Greek Parliament, the Prime Minister, Mr. A. Michalakopoulos, declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch would greatly obstruct the Government's desire to re-establish normal relations with Turkey. Most members of Parliament felt that the act was a grave insult to the Greek people and the civilized world ³. On February 1, the Greek protest against the expulsion of the Patriarch was conveyed to the Turkish Government along with a notice that Greece intended to appeal her case to the League of Nations as the Turkish action was a clear violation of the Treaty of Lausanne and threatened the peace. The Greek member of the Mixed Commission, G. A. Exindaris, tendered his resignation over what he characterized as the Turkish Government's treatment of the Patriarch as worse than that accorded the *hammals* (porters) of Constantinople; the Patriarch was expelled without time to pack his personal belongings. He warned Turkey that her action would hurt her, as it would arouse the anger not only of the Greeks, but of all Christendom. He claimed that since the Mixed Commission did not issue Constantine VI a passport and did not ask him to leave the country, the Turks had no legal right to expell him. He argued that the exchange of population was not an internal affair, as the Turks seemed to think, but an international matter in which only the Mixed Commission had the authority to decide who was to be exchanged ⁴.

The Turkish press responded with naive surprise at the indignation of the Greeks over the removal of Constantine VI from Turkey. It enthusiastically supported the expulsion and declared that the Turkish Government would regard any foreign *démarch* on behalf of the *Phanar* as an intrusion in the internal affairs of the country. Several newspapers, including Yunus

1. *Times* (London), January 30, 1925. 'Ελεύθερον Βήμα, (Athens) February 3, 1925. Hereafter cited as *E. V.* Department of State, *Monthly Political Report*. Serial 23, No 7, February 1925, pp. 12 - 14.

2. *Le Messenger d'Athènes*, January 31, 1925. Hereafter cited as *M. A.* Large demonstrations were held all over Greece in protest over the exulsion of the Patriarch. The refugees groups were especially active in these demonstrations.

3. Πρακτικά τῶν Συνεδριάσεων τῆς Βουλῆς, (Proceedings of the Greek Parliament) January 30, 1925, pp. 86 - 87. *Times* (London), January 31, 1925.

4. *E. V.*, February 3, 1925.

Nadi's *Cumhuriyet* advocated the exchange of all the Greeks of Constantinople for the Turks of Western Thrace "as it would *ipso facto* abolish the *raison d'être* of the *Phanar*, *Vatan* reported that Papa Efthim would establish a new Patriarchate, and most of the newspapers declared that Turkey would not be intimidated by Greece. "Even though Greece is prepared for war, she is too busy in the Balkans to be a threat to Turkey". *Istiklâl* stated that as the Caliphate was abolished so must Turkey expell the Patriarchate: "we cannot allow the Greeks to have a foreign organ in our country"¹. *Tanin*, however, cautioned the Government not to impose its view on the question of the Patriarchate and criticized Ankara for reawakening an anti-Europe fanaticism among the people at a time when conciliation with Europe was necessary. The Mosul question and internal problems, it insisted, were far more important than any advantage resulting from the expulsion of the Ecumenical Patriarchate².

On February 2, the Turkish Legation in Athens announced that the Patriarch was found exchangeable because he was born in Anatolia and came to Constantinople after October 30, 1918. Turkey does not wish to destroy the Patriarchate; the Greeks must merely elect a non-exchangeable person to that institution according to Turkish law. Turkey, it continued, desires peace and friendship with Greece but cannot tolerate meddling into her internal affairs³.

On February 4, the Turkish Prime Minister, Fethi Bey, delivered a speech in the Turkish Grand National Assembly in response to the Greek note on the expulsion of the Patriarch. He warned Greece that Turkey refused to be intimidated and that the Greek note was considered unfriendly by the Turkish Government as the Patriarchate was a purely domestic institution. He accused the Greeks of efforts to incite Christendom against them and of entertaining hostile intentions against Turkey. He argued,

"as you know from the debates at Lausanne, the Turkish delegation asked that the Patriarch be removed from Constantinople and even wanted to exchange the Greeks of Constantinople. After the Great Powers and Greece assured us that the Patriarchate would not meddle in politics, the leader of our delegation, Ismet Pasha, announced his consent to retain the Patriarchate in Turkey. These declarations were inserted in the verbatim proceedings—one does not find them in any article of the Treaty. It could

1. *B.P.P.T.*, No 39, April 21, 1925, p. 3.

2. *E. V.*, February 5, 1925.

3. *Ibid.*

not be otherwise since Turkey would not accept a document or an international engagement relative to a question of a purely domestic nature”¹. On the same day, Cevat Bey, the Turkish Ambassador to Paris, reported to the press that Greece should keep out of Turkish affairs and that Turkey would not accept any decision of the League of Nations or the Hague Court on this matter. If there is a threat to the peace as the Greeks claim, it is they who have instigated this threat². Tevfik Rüştü Bey (Aras), in Rome, declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch was in order and that the only thing left to be done was to elect a new Patriarch who was not exchangeable³.

The Turks felt that the Holy Synod, knowing the position of Constantine VI and being, in addition, notified of his ineligible status, deliberately elected him Patriarch to hinder the normal resumption of Turkish-Greek relations. They considered it a political move contrary to the decisions which affected the retention of the Patriarchate in Turkey. Their case was simply that the expulsion of Constantine VI was merely putting into effect the decision of the Mixed Commission which found the person of Constantine Araboğlu exchangeable under the terms of the Exchange Convention. Fethi Bey made it clear that the expulsion of Constantine Araboğlu did not mean that the Turkish Government would not honor its pledge given at Lausanne to retain the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople. However, he insisted that the voting members of the Holy Synod and the elected Patriarch had to be Turkish subjects as defined by article 2 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations. The Greek view for the retention of Metropolitans in Turkey on the basis of “position” was unacceptable⁴.

The Greeks insisted that Constantine VI was not exchangeable because his “establishment” at Constantinople dated from the year 1902, the date when he was appointed a Metropolitan and thus gaining permanent residence in that city, all Metropolitans being members of the monastery of the *Phanar* at Constantinople. They also claimed that the Patriarch was protected from deportation by Ismet Pasha’s promise that the Patriarchate would be allowed to remain in Turkey as a purely religious institution,

1. *B.P.P.T.*, No 39, April 21, 1925, p. 3.

2. *E. V.*, January 31, and February 3, 1925. *Times* (London), February 2, 1925. *Ἐκκλησία* (Official Organ of the Church of Greece), No 8, February 21, 1925, p. 61.

3. *B.P.P.T.*, No 39, April 21, 1925, pp. 3 - 4. *E. V.*, February 1, 2 and 3, 1925. *Times* (London), February 2, 1925.

4. *Tanin*, February 5, 1925 (*O. M.*, February 15, 1925, p. 97).

the Patriarch is the most essential component of the Patriarchate¹. The Turkish action, they argued, was contrary to the Exchange Convention which stipulated that only the Mixed Commission had the right to issue passports to decide who was to be exchanged. The real issue for them was that on the basis of the Turkish approach all but three of the Metropolitans who comprised the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, having arrived at Constantinople after October 1918, were exchangeable subjects. If Turkey had her way over the expulsion of Constantine VI, what would prevent her from deporting the remaining "exchangeable" prelates? Such an admission would be tantamount to the abolishment of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey as canon law required that the Patriarch be elected by a Holy Synod of twelve Metropolitans².

B) THE GREEK APPEAL TO THE LEAGUE

On February 11, 1925, the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. A. Michalakopoulos, requested under the provisions of par. 2, article 11 of the League Covenant that the world organization consider the question of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. He declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch was hostile act which threatened the peace, and telegraphed to the League the following message:

"The Greek Government states that the measure taken against the Patriarch by the Turkish authorities constitutes a serious infringement of the Lausanne agreements regarding the Patriarchate, an infringement of Article 12 of the Convention for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, and of the Mixed Commission's decision of January 28, 1925, and, further, that it is contrary to the understanding given on October 31, 1924 at Brussels by Turkey loyally to carry out all decisions that might be adopted by the majority of the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Populations"³.

In response, the Turkish Government sent the following telegram dated March 1 to the League in support of its position⁴.

"The Patriarchate is a Turkish domestic institution, the constitution and administration of which are governed by Turkish laws and regulations, and there are no provisions whatever in any Treaty in which a contrary

1. *Times* (London), February 2, 1925.

2. *M. A.*, February 1, 1925. *Times* (London), February 3, 1925. *Ἐκκλησία* (Athens), No 10, March 7, 1925, pp. 73 - 74; and No 11, March 14, 1925, p. 85.

3. *L.N.O.J.*, (April 1925), p. 578.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 580 - 581.

view could be based; there is, moreover, no clause giving one or several foreign powers the right to intervene in the constitution and the administration of this institution: furthermore, notwithstanding the assertions contained in the Greek Government telegram neither the Treaty of Lausanne nor the agreements, conventions, declarations, protocols and letters signed at that place contain the slightest allusion to the Patriarchate...It is obvious that the Greek Government wishes to take advantage of this opportunity to endeavor to make the Patriarchate into an international institution and so interfere in Turkish domestic affairs, whereas, as we have already stated, no international treaty or convention contains any provisions regarding that institution...".

The Turks refused to send a representative before the League to plead their case; Turkey was not a member of the League, and denied that the League had jurisdiction in this matter.

At the Council meeting of March 14, 1925 the Greek representative, Mr. D. Caclamanos, assured the League that Greece did not want to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey, but that "the maintenance of the Patriarchate of Constantinople had been one of the provisions of international agreements"¹. On the same day, the Council adopted the following resolution for a decision by the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague:

"Do the objections of the competence of the Council raised by the Turkish Government in its letter of March 1 which is communicated to the Court, preclude the Council from being competent in the matter brought before it by the Greek Government by its telegram to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations dated February 11, 1925?"

It also adopted a resolution directing Greece and Turkey to privately settle the dispute and suggested that they might use the good offices of the neutral members of the Mixed Commission².

1. *Ibid.*, p. 482.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 488. At the discussions before the Court as to the meaning of the word *établis*, the Greek Government sought a decision of the Court exempting from exchange high ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Orthodox Church. In the Court opinion given on February 21, 1925 the Court declined to consider the question, as its opinion on ecclesiastical matters had not been asked for by the League. See "Documents Relating to Advisory Opinion No 10, Series C. (Lausanne Convention VI, January 30, 1923 Article 2) "PCIJ, No 7-1, Sixth Extraordinary Session, Leyden: AW Sijthoff's Publishing Co., 1925, 261 pp. and *Publications of the Permanent Court of Int'l Justice*, Series B. No 10 February 21, 1925, Collection of Advisory Opinions, "Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations (Lausanne Convention) VI, January 30, 1923, Article 2" (Leyden 1925), 28 pp. *Times* (London), February 25, 1925.

The earlier negotiations between Mr. G. A. Exindaris and Tevfik Rüstü Bey for the settlement of the Patriarchal problem were deadlocked. Turkey wanted Greece to withdraw her application for the settlement of the question from the League, and the open direct negotiations between the two Governments for a satisfactory solution of the problem. On February 23, 1925 the *Vali* (Governor) of Constantinople, Suleiman Sami Bey, took a conciliatory step by informing the Holy Synod, which was then in session, that he would try to arrange a non-exchangeable status for its members and for which, in return, he expected the Holy Synod to obtain the abdication of Constantine VI and to proceed with the election of a non-exchangeable Patriarch.

The Greeks seemed to feel that the Turkish promises were too vague and refused to withdraw their application from the League¹. By bringing the case to the League, they hoped, once and for all, to establish the international character of the Ecumenical Patriarchate so as to prevent the complete subjection of that institution to the whim of the Turkish Government, and to avoid, in the future, conflicts with Turkey arising out of the unsettled status of the Patriarchate.

C) THE SUCCESS OF DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS

For several weeks following the expulsion of the Patriarch, the press of both countries denounced and berated each other, and rumors of Turkish and Greek troop movements along their common Thracian border were rife. But towards the end of March, the readiness of the Turkish Government to come to an understanding with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the sudden improvement of Greek-Turkish relations in general, eased the tense situation. The refugees settlement problem, constitutional issues and the political isolation of Greece, and in Turkey, the elimination of political opposition, the Kurdish revolts, the problem of internal reform and the general feeling that the Western world and the League were hostile to Turkish interests, especially, in the regions of Mosul and Alexandretta (Iskenderun), were factors which contributed to the resumption of negotiations between the two states.

Tanin declared on February 12 that it was afraid the Government would impose its point of view on the question of the Patriarchate and that in attempting to serve its prestige it might give in on Mosul thereby losing a lot more than it would gain by expelling the Patriarchate. This is why,

1. *Times* (London), March 2, 1925.

it explained, that the British attitude on the expulsion of the Patriarchate is very reserved and almost neutral.

By April, it was apparent that both Turkey and Greece wished to settle all the outstanding issues between them. The trip of John Politis, the newly appointed Greek representative, to Ankara was viewed favorably by the Turkish press, and the newspapers of both countries reported that agreements on the exchange of population question, which had marred Greek-Turkish relations since 1923, were soon to be concluded¹. In this friendly atmosphere, and in exchange for a Turkish promise to extend non-exchangeable status to the members of the Holy Synod, excepting Constantine VI, the Greek Government resumed direct negotiations with Turkey for the settlement of the issue concerning the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It urged Constantine VI to abdicate and asked the 58 Metropolitans whose diocese belonged to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, although they had been located in Greece since 1912, to accept the abdication as it would help better relations with Turkey and improve the lot of the Greek minority in Constantinople². On May 19, Constantine VI informed the Greek Government that he was forwarding his abdication to the Holy Synod of Constantinople. The Greek press expressed the hope that his personal sacrifice would reopen the way for more cordial relations between the two countries and that agreements on the population exchange question, which it felt would shortly be signed in Ankara, would lead to a Greek-Turkish rapprochement³.

The abdication of the Patriarch was accepted on May 26, and three days later in Ankara, G. A. Exindaris reported that the Turkish Government had assured him the election of the new Patriarch would be orderly and proper. The Constantinople authorities were directed to prevent Papa Efthim or anyone else from making trouble at the Phanar⁴. On

1. *E. V.*, April 9 and 15, 1925.

2. *E. V.*, May 3, 1925, D. Gatopoulos, 'Ανδρέας Μιχαλάκοπουλος, 1875 - 1938 (Andreas Michalakopoulos, 1875 - 1938) (Athens, 1947), p. 228. The diocese areas annexed to Greece after 1912 still come under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and their Metropolitans are members of the Holy Synod at Constantinople. However, according to Turkish law only Turkish subjects can vote for a new Patriarch. In order to comply with the canon law and the Turkish law an arrangement has been worked out whereby the Metropolitans of Turkey vote for certain issues and the non-Turkish Metropolitans of the Holy Synod almost automatically approve their decisions.

3. *Times* (London), May 21, 1925.

4. *E. V.*, May 30, 1925. *Interview with Constantine Rendis*, (Athens), April 9, 1958, Mr. Rendis was the Greek Foreign Minister in 1925 and a close friend of

June 8, the Greek Government informed the League in a letter dated June 1, that the negotiations between Greece and Turkey on the subject of the Ecumenical Patriarchate had been successfully concluded¹.

"...the Turkish representative of the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish populations in a letter to the Greek member of the Mixed Commission has declared that he withdraws definitely the dossiers relating to the exchangeability of the members of the Holy Synod. The question having therefore been settled, and the Greek Patriarch having abdicated, the Holy Synod will proceed with the election of a new Patriarch. The Greek Government, therefore, withdraws its request of February 11, 1925 to the League Council and begs it to inform the Permanent Court of International Justice of the solution of the question".

On July 13, notwithstanding the renewed proposals of Papa Efthim and his followers that the Turkish Government should participate in the elections, the Holy Synod, in a quiet atmosphere, freely and canonically elected Basil Georgiades, Metropolitan of Nicaea, as the Ecumenical Patriarch, Basil III².

THE GREEK-TURKISH RAPPROCHEMENT OF 1930

The desire to improve relations between Greece and Turkey was realized by the Angora Accord of June 21, 1925, and by the establishment of normal diplomatic channels the following month. Although the Angora Accord and the Athens Accord of December 1, 1926, which replaced it, were not executed, and although it was not until 1930 that Greece and Turkey finally agreed upon a settlement of their major differences, there were no longer any serious disturbances at the *Phanar*.

Perhaps, the most serious obstacle to the establishment of normal relations between Greece and Turkey—the *sine qua non* for the well-being of the Ecumenical Patriarchate—arose from the fact that the coming of a strong and stable government to Greece was at least five years behind the comparable movement in Turkey. The years 1923 to 1928 were marked by frequent shifts in Greek politics, with accumulating discredit to the

Teufik Rüstü Bey who became Turkish Foreign Minister the same year. The Greek Government, he said, recognized from the beginning that the Patriarch should be *persona grata* to the Turkish Government.

1. *L.N.O.J.* (July 1925) p. 895.

2. *B.P.P.T.*, No 40, June 18, 1925, p. 11. *M. A.*, July 12 and 15, 1925.

State. It was not until 1928, when the return of Venizelos to power ushered in a period of firm government with deliberate policies, that Greece was able to deal with Atatürk's Turkey on a co-existential basis of *quid pro quo*. From January, 1923 to July, 1928, there were in Greece ten different Prime Ministers in fifteen Governments, including the dictatorship of General Theodore Pangalos. In contrast, Mustafa Kemal Pasha (Atatürk) was President of Turkey from the proclamation of the Turkish Republic in October, 1923, to his death in November 1938; and during the same period, with the exception of two very brief interruptions, his lieutenant, Ismet Pasha (Inönü), was President of the Council of Ministers.

The improved relations between Greece and Turkey, and the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Turkey were illustrated by an incident which occurred during the first visit of Venizelos to Turkey. In October 1930, Venizelos was invited to Turkey to sign a treaty of friendship with the Ankara Government and to discuss measures for establishing better relations between the two countries. He declined to go to Ankara via the railway center at Haidar Pasha, an Anatolian suburb of metropolitan Constantinople, explaining that if he visited Constantinople, he would be obliged to visit the Ecumenical Patriarch, and that this might strain relations with the Turks, whereas, if he journeyed through Haidar Pasha without visiting the *Phanar*, the Greeks would be offended. The Turkish Government, however, assured him that a visit to the *Phanar* would be in order. Consequently, he passed through Haidar Pasha to Ankara, and upon his return visited the Patriarchate where he was enthusiastically received by Turks and Greeks alike.

In May 1931, Kemal Pasha reassured Venizelos that he would keep Papa Efthim out of the affairs of the Patriarchate¹. Although Papa Efthim

1. *Interview with Leon Maccas*, (Athens), April 3, 1958. Mr. Maccas was a close associate of Venizelos and was for many years associated with the Press Section of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs. He was also a deputy of the Liberal Party in the Greek Parliament. He received the assurances mentioned above on behalf of the Greek Government during an interview with Kemal Pasha. *Interview with V. P. Papadakis*, (Athens), April 12, 1958. Mr. Papadakis was a long time member of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs and served as political advisor to the Metaxas regime. In 1930, the Turkish Government asked Venizelos to restrain or expell certain Muslim religious leaders who were seeking to restore the Caliphate and to prejudice the Turkish minority in Greece against the Turkish Government. Mr. Papadakis suggested to Venizelos that in return for the Turkish request Greece ought to insist on a Turkish guarantee which would keep Papa Efthim out of the affairs of the *Phanar*.

was important to the Turkish Nationalists, who emphasized the ties of blood between the Turkic peoples, psychologically, the majority of the Muslim Turkish people were not prepared to accept non-Muslims as brothers. We must look elsewhere to explain the connection between Papa Efthim and the Turkish Government. It seems certain that he was merely another pawn in the hands of the Turkish diplomats at Lausanne and after. As soon as the major differences between Greece and Turkey were resolved, the project for a Turkish Orthodox Church sank into oblivion and Papa Efthim was no longer posed as a threat to the *Phanar*.

The activities of the Ecumenical Patriarchate were not completely hindered by the conflict over its status which raged unabated throughout the 1920's. Indeed, although its secular power was discarded, the Patriarchate became more "Ecumenical" in the original geographic meaning of the word. It expanded its jurisdictional influence to many areas of the world as a result of the movement of many Orthodox Christians into non-Orthodox countries. Between 1922 and 1931, the Ecumenical Patriarchate appointed representatives to newly created posts in western and central Europe, the Americas, and Australasia. It became the religious center of those churches formerly under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Moscow who wished to avoid Bolshevik control in the affairs of the Church of Russia. It recognized and, at the requests of the churches concerned, allowed to come under its jurisdiction the Orthodox Churches of Finland, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and the Church of the Russian emigre in western Europe and elsewhere. (Since World War II most of these Churches were returned to Russian jurisdiction). It also established close and friendly relations with the Orthodox Churches in the Balkans and the Near East, and provided moral support to the Church of Russia which was being savagely persecuted by the Bolsheviks. Notwithstanding its own difficulties, the Church of Constantinople continued to assume its responsibilities as *primus inter pares* among the Orthodox Churches throughout the world¹.

The execution of the Greek-Turkish agreement concerning the population exchange, and related matters, on June 10, 1930, and the Greek-Turkish Treaty of Friendship on October 31, 1930, provided a healthier atmosphere for the activities and progress of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The long struggle, partially due to the erroneous assumption on the part

1. Harry J. Psomiades, "Soviet Russia and the Orthodox Church in the Middle East", *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4, (Autumn, 1957), pp. 371 - 381.

of Papa Efthim, Patriarch Meletios and others that the Patriarchate was pre-eminently a culturo-political institution, ended in a reaffirmation of the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate as laid down by the Lausanne settlement. The right of the Patriarchate to remain in Constantinople was recognized, and the Turkish demand that the Patriarch be *persona grata* to the Turkish Government and that he refrain from political activity inimical to Turkish interests was confirmed. Although the old suspicions toward the Patriarchate remained, it was allowed to function rather freely provided that relations between Athens and Ankara were cordial.

Columbia University

HARRY J. PSOMIADES