GREEKS AND BARBARIANS

The Genesis of Hellenic International Thought*

Paris Arnopoulos*

RÉSUMÉ

L'univers hellénique antique constituait un microcosme du système socioculturel au sein de l'environnement géopolitique de la Mediterranée. On pourrait dire la même chose de la société européenne dans son contexte mondial actuel. Il est utile alors de savoir comment les Grecs se percevaient face à d'autres nations. Une telle perception révèle les origines de la pensée internationale classique. L'hypothèse qui suivra se base sur la dichotomie primordiale entre les Grecs et les barbares. Cette dichotomie aurait fourni la base même de l'idéologie internationale hellène. De plus, nous croyons que de telles distinctions affectent le raisonnement de l'homme depuis toujours, et par conséquent, encore aujourd'hui. Même s'il ne faut pas aller trop loin dans l'analogie, il existe pourtant des parallèles bien définis entre le monde classique et le monde contemporain que le lecteur saura reconnaître et apprécier. Afin de vous mettre au parfum de l'époque, cet article puise dans les évènements critiques jusq'au Ve siècle avant Jésus-Christ ainsi que dans leur impact sur les philosophes qui suivront. Ainsi, les idéaux humanistes et cosmopolites de ces mêmes philosophes ont influencé la pensée internationale à travers les siècles.

ABSTRACT

The ancient Hellenic world was a microcosm of a sociocultural system existing within the Mediterranean geopolitical environment, much the same as the European society now exists within its global context. It is then instructive to know how the Greeks saw themselves in relation to other nations. Such perspective gives an idea of the origins of classical international thought. It is our thesis here that the primordial dichotomy between Greeks and barbarians served as the foundation of hellenic international ideology. Morcover, we contend that such distinctions always color human reason and still persist in modern times. Although the analogy should not be carried too far, there are definite parallels between the classical and present worlds which the reader will recognize and appreciate. In order to give the flavor of the times, this article is based on the world shaking events up to the Fifth century BC, and the impact they had upon the great philosophers who came later. Their humanistic and cosmopolitan ideals therefore influenced international thinking through the ages.

Initial International Contacts

Hellenic political thought was determined not only by the existence of a plethora of sovereign city-states in Greece itself, but also by the knowledge of other peoples abroad. These foreign nations formed the environment in which the Greek political system operated and interacted. The Greeks not only con-

* The author wishes to thank the Research Center for Greek Philosophy at the Academy of Athens for its help in preparing this article.

* Department of Political Science, Concordia University

templated the relation of each polis among the others, but also the position of them all in the world at large.

Quite early in their history the Greeks learned to separate interstate from international affairs. The development of a national consciousness was directly related to this separation between the Greek system and its encompassing Mediterranean environment. It is therefore necessary to investigate how the Greeks envisaged their place within the ecoumene.

At the beginning of their history the Greeks had very little contact with the surrounding nations of Europe, Africa and Asia. The sparsely populated Mediterranean littoral ensured that even spreading colonization did not involve international contacts. By the end of the seventh century however when most available lands had been settled, contacts and hence friction increased between the Greeks and other nations.

The sixth century ushered in a new era of intercontinental conflicts among the expanding Greek states and the outlying oriental empires. The first major encounters between Greeks and foreigners took place in Asia Minor, when expanding eastern empires attacked and conquered the Ionian colonies of Greece.[1]

These initial events had momentous repercussions for the international relations of the next two centuries.[2] The subjugation of the Ionian Greeks, first by the Lydians and then by the Persians, set off a chain reaction between the continental Greeks who were trying to liberate their compatriots and the Persians who sought to keep their possessions.[3] The idea of a Greek expedition was first proposed around 500, when Aristagoras of Miletos asked the Spartans to invade Asia Minor to help the Ionians revolt.

Afterwards, although Athenian propaganda depicted the Persians as effeminate, it also raised the spectre of a barbarian peril which only a panhellenic union could repulse. Intermittently from then on, Greco-Persian relations centered around this bone of contention, following a vicious circle of insurrections by the Ionians, interventions by the Greeks, and suppressions by the Persians, repeated many times until Alexander finally put an end to it.

From these adverse events the Greeks first began to form their opinions of other nations. In the previous Helladic era, the Greeks had no knowledge and made no distinction of other peoples. In their semi-isolated condition, they took it for granted that all nations were similar to themselves. Different ways of life could not be imagined, so ignorance served as an indiscriminate equalizer.

With the first contacts however, this naive humanism began to change. The initial hostility of these conflicts engendered fear and distrust between the Greeks and their Asiatic invaders. The few facts about the strangers at the gates were augmented by many rumours and exaggerations which opened a chasm

that evolved into the infamous dichotomy of mankind.

Greek Civilization

The origin of the term *barbaros* is unknown. Homer did not use it at all, and it is not until the fifth century that it was firmly established in literature, as distinctive and mutually exclusive term against that of *Hellene*.[4] Its original meaning of a non-Greek-speaking person was gradually broadened to include many connotations, all of them derogatory. Not being able to understand foreign languages, the Greeks could not sympathize with other cultures. So, as a defense mechanism, they fell into undue exaggeration and overestimation of their own way of life.

The fact that they had a single term to designate so many different nations, indicates the self-absorption of the Greeks and the little interest they had in other cultures. In contrast to the modern anthropological view that in order to understand ourselves we need to know others; the Greeks believed in understanding primarily themselves; others were largely irrelevant. This *gnothe s'auton* principle was very congenial to Greek ethnocentrism, if not xenophobia, and contributed to their substantial disinterest and disdain of other people.[5]

The extant writers of the sixth century have not left any record of interexchange of ideas between Greeks and foreigners; so it is hard to estimate the impact and cross-fertilization that any intercultural relations may have had on either side. In spite of the deep concern the Greeks had for man, they had very little for mankind. Until the Hellenic period, no Greek work deals with the concept of humanity as a whole. In their way of life the Greeks emphasized the differences that separate people and underplayed the similarities uniting them. Thus hostility towards foreigners became one of the most marked features of Greek thought.[6]

Being weaker and poorer materially, compared to the powerful and wealthy empires of Asia, the Greeks realized their precarious position and hence clung to their way of life with great tenacity. The envy of the poor for the rich, accentuated Greek pride for their mental acumen and cultural nobility that surpassed all other people. To make up for their lack of material possessions, the Greeks had to emphasize their spiritual and intellectual values in contrast to the luxurious decadence of their adversaries.[7]

Seeing the wealth and magnificence of the contemporary Asiatic empires, the Greeks had to admit that their states were much inferior. Their claim for superiority was that: on the one hand, they were not over-refined to the point of debility, like the Asiatics; and on the other hand, they were civilized, unlike the savagery of northern European tribes. Since both extremes typified barbarism, the Greeks considered themselves as the "golden mean" reflected in their civilization. Their motto "nothing in excess", made a virtue of necessity and kept them

from the "barbarian vice" or lack of proportion which swamped the individual and smothered his personality.

In addition to these general cultural differences, Greece's single most significant distinction was political. The idea that the Greek-barbarian antithesis was primarily political, was propagated by all Greek thinkers as the core of their arguments. The Greek thought of himself as the only "political animal" in the world; on the contrary, barbarians were either isolated *idiotes* or enslaved masses. Their urbanity made Greeks the only truly civilized people on earth and hence strengthened their sense of superiority over both tribal and imperial societies.

A corollary to political life was the idea of freedom: *eleutheria*. Unlike the barbarian who was a subject, the Greek was a citizen: *polites*. The difference between the two was that of liberty and slavery. No matter how rich and powerful a Persian was, he was still the humble servant of his king; while even the meanest of the Greeks was a free member of an independent community. That is why no Greek could exchange his position, however low, with that of the highest barbarian. In comparison to the political way of life, powerful empires were nothing but massive and oppressive leviathans.

Greek freedom was supposed to be obedience to law, not licence to do as one pleased. That law, moreover, was not the arbitrary command of a master, but the result of human reason. Thus the Greek obeyed consciously his own convictions, whereas the barbarian followed blindly someone else's orders. The laws of Greece were based on persuasion by dialogue, whereas those of the barbarians upon the fear of a superior's personal wishes enforced by sanctions.[8]

These attitudes developed gradually among educated Greeks as the pressure from Persia was increasing. By the end of the sixth century the Greeks saw their world as an oasis of order and civilization in the expanding desert of chaos and barbarism. As such they felt themselves as the defenders of the highest values of occidental liberalism from the threat of oriental despotism. So, as the trustees of light against the forces of darkness, the Greeks became the champions of Western civilization and the enemies of Eastern imperialism.[9]

Yet, towards the Greeks, the Persians had none of the race hatred that makes international conflict inexplicable. Although they had no less pride than the Greeks, they managed to combine it with respect for the customs of others, something of a unique synthesis for that time.[10] The main source of their incompatibility with the Greeks was their opposing systems of government. Hellenism was suspect because it undermined the loyalty of their subjects and subverted the *status quo*. Greco-Persian hostility was thus a combination of power politics and political ideology.[11]

World War

The Persians were not the only barbarians who threatened Greece. Along with their Persian encounters, the Greeks met and clashed with another great power: Carthage. As the Ionian Greeks were fighting for their freedom in the East, the Sicilian Greeks were similarly engaged in the West. By the end of the sixth century the lines had been drawn for the decisive battles that were to determine the fate of Hellenism for a century.

Although their enemies were closing in from both sides, the Greeks were confident of the final victory of their cause. Believing that they belonged to a community of gods who sponsored their freedom, they were prepared to fight against any odds to resist foreign subjugation.[12]

Unlike their antagonist however, the Greeks were not united, therefore they could not agree on a single defense or foreign policy.[13] The problem of how to coordinate a united front against the barbarians thus plagued the city-states throughout their history. The same causes that prevented them from political integration also hindered a defense organization, thus increasing their handicap in facing external pressures.

This exaggerated spirit of independence kept Greeks divided, since no one preferred subordination to a central authority over servitude under the barbarians. If anything, the opposite might easily be said, because many of them chose security under the Persians rather than sympolity with other Greeks.[14]

It is perhaps significant that the only extant opinions of the father of philosophy on the subject of politics, deal precisely with Hellenic unity. Thales, the sage of Miletus, thought that the only way for Greeks to keep their freedom was to confederate their defense and foreign policies under a single government. The same principle was reiterated by the historian Hecateus, who told the Ionians that without adequate preparation and coordination, any resistance to Persia was doomed to failure.[15]

The only alternative the Greeks had to federation was emigration. Bios of Priene must have realized the impossibility of union among the Greeks, when he advised them to sail west to Sardinia and there re-establish themselves in a single colony. The good advice of these thinkers, however, went unheeded and so their predictions came true. One colony after another fell to the Persians, until all were subjugated in turn. Theognes of Attica provided the eulogy for these fallen colonies and lamented that Greek disunity would ultimately lead to their slavery (Frags. 756-82).

After the loss of their overseas colonies, which they hardly did anything to prevent,[16] the mainland Greeks waited until the eleventh hour before deciding for the first and last time to unite temporarily to meet their common foe.[17] The

battles of Salamis in Greece proper and Himera in Sicily proved what the Greeks could do all together. Their victory in this two-front war against both Persians and Carthagenians was no mean achievement. It stabilized the balance of power in the Mediterranean and provided the Greeks in the middle sufficient space and time to develop their civilization.

Herodotus, the great historian of these wars, depicted the momentous impact that struggle had for the Greeks. As one of them, he saw the war as a clash of opposites: *hubris* and *sophrosune*, slavery and freedom, tyranny and democracy.[18] He, like the other Greeks, was convinced that their victory was proof positive that their gods chose them as the highest embodiment of human culture. The Hellenic way of life was not only their exclusive prerogative, but also the gift of Greece to the world.[19]

Greek literature abounds with allusions to these ideas. Pindar of Thebes, the last of the great lyric poets, in his *Odes,* glorified the heroic deeds that proved the superiority of Hellenic culture over all others. Aeschylus, the first of the dramaturges, praised the men who defended Greece against the unworthy barbarians, as the most honored of men.[20] His version of the *Persae* represents the first expression of orientalism in European literature, wherein the asiatics are depicted as effeminate and corrupt, in contrast to the brave Greeks whose pride for their achievements knew no bounds and colored their thinking for a long time afterwards.

As a result, the fear and awe which the sixth century Greeks had for the formidable and mysterious barbarians turned into contempt and ridicule by their fifth century epigones. Having come into contact with them in the battlefield and utterly defeating them, the Greeks judged the barbarians on military merits and found them wanting. From that single instance, they generalized and confirmed their earlier suspicions of barbarian inferiority and Greek superiority in all respects.

Greek thinkers tried to explain and rationalize the apparently miraculous salvation of Greece and the cultural renaissance that followed it in terms of natural principles. Heraclitus, the obscure philosopher of Ephesus, was first to generalize on the nature of conflict. Perhaps elated by the outcome of the Persian Wars, he formulated the hypothesis that conflict was the ultimate test of human qualities. War, he said, "is common to all things, the father and king of them all." International conflict is therefore the highest court of justice which decides between superior and inferior, free and slave, its verdict is the life or death of entire states and empires.[21]

This theory of conflict was not one of chaotic violence. The Hereclitian *eris* was tied with the general theory of *logos* through the concept of *nomos*. This cosmic triad of conflict-reason-law, became the core of his philosophy. It implied that even violence should be carried out according to logical and

defined rules. In the external relations of states, these principles helped formulate natural reason, upon which what later became international law was based.

The ideas of Heraclitus were especially influential in the development of a Hellenic code of the law of war. His initial attempts to rationalize and limit violence opened up new fields of speculation among the thinkers of the fifth century. One might even say that Greek thought on international affairs really begins with him.

Supplementing the Heraclitian theory of polemology, another thinker developed a theory of ethnology to explain the differences between Greeks and barbarians. Hippocrates, the father of medicine, proposed that the natural environment determines national character. In a treatise on *Airs, Waters, Lands*, he expounded the physiological theory of climatic and environmental determinism. Asiatics and Africans are stupefied and debilitated because their torrid climate makes them so, whereas Europeans are hardy and rough because of their cold and harsh climate. On the basis of their physis, their nomoi are different, thus compounding the distinctions of nature with nurture.

This Hippocratian doctrine was, of course, a corollary of the Greek principle of the Golden Mean. Both were very appealing to Greeks because they placed them in an enviable position where they had the best of both worlds. By rooting cultural differences on nature, the Greeks came to regard their superiority as permanent and fundamental. Thus, ecological environmentalism became the standard theory of classical anthropology.[22]

The last great thinker who completed the Hellenic concepts on international affairs was Herodotus of Halicamassus. Not only was he a historian but also an anthropologist. His astute powers of observation made him a great student of social customs and ways of life. Living in Ionia, the crossroads of many civilizations, he could compare many different traditions and thus recognize the cultural relativity of human beliefs and actions.[23]

Being a Persian subject of a cosmopolitan city in Asia Minor, Herodotus developed his unusual interests by extensive travels in the course of which he came in contact with many cultures. His wide experience taught him to respect and even admire many exotic traits. In his writings he showed an extraordinary understanding for what other Greeks considered outrageous and outlandish.[24]

The comparative studies of Herodotus, more than anything else, opened the eyes of Greeks to the outside world. Through his writings, the cultural enlightentment of Ionia spread to the Greek mainland. His many anecdotes of different customs made his readers realize that their own traditions were by no means natural. When Herodotus echoed Pindar's famous epigram: "Naturally, custom rules everywhere" (III,3 8); he implied that what is obvious and unquestionable in one culture may be unheard of and outrageous in another.

By the middle of the fifth century, all these new ideas began to change the simplistic black and white picture that the older Greeks had of foreigners. The widespread ignorance of the past gave way to an insatiable curiosity for the customs of far-away cultures. Following Herodotus, other Greeks gathered and disseminated information about foreign societies, thus dispelling old prejudices and revising hoary stereotypes. The return to peace and the normalization of international relations after the Persian Wars improved the socio-economic conditions of Greece and thus prepared the ultimate flowering of its civilization. The critical outlook that resulted from cultural relativism thus helped set the pattern for later and more sophisticated theories.[25]

One of the most lasting effects of the new ethnographie information was in the development of ethical relativism. By questioning what everyone had taken for granted so far, the educated Greeks of the fifth century started a major philosophical argument which came to be known as the *nomos-physis* controversy.[26]

Natural Principles & Political Laws

Since the Helladic ages the relationship between nature and culture was that the latter represented the explicit order -*taxis* - of humanity, whereas the former reflected an implicit order of the *cosmos*. On that basis, man-made law was coeval with society and existed only within the polis. Outside it, physical nature was chaotic and unpredictable. The *nomos* of the polis reflected human reason and civilized existence in the midst of the wilderness of *physis*.

This idea prevailed when states and nations were isolated and thus thought of themselves as representative of humanity. But with the increase of international relations and the spread of information, state laws came to be seen for what they were: the products of particular cultures and circumstances. It was at this point that the nomos-physis controversy sought to find a new way to explain the authority of law and guide the relations between states.

One of the strongest justifications for any culture was to claim that it was natural; based on universal absolute and necessary principles, rather than human idiosyncracy or local peculiarity. The central purpose of the Greek debate was to find if such absolute principles could be found, in view of the relativity of human laws and customs. The considerable thought given to this problem ultimately reversed the traditional opinions which the Greeks had concerning nature and culture.

By the latter half of the fifth century, the partisans of natural law had largely succeeded in discrediting traditional law as a rational principle. The most advanced thinkers of the time discarded common law as artificial and parochial and in its place they elevated natural law as the superior criterion of ethics. Nature now became the entire process of growth and universal order, while cul-

ture was merely custom and convention. The world thus followed only a single physis within which existed a myriad of nomoi.

This new interpretation coupled with the other novel theories already covered, revolutionized international thought. The fifth century naturalists accepted the Heraclitian doctrine of *logos-eris-nomos* as a view according to which the order of nature was maintained by the resolution of human differences through conflict. This interpretation developed into a sort of natural selection theory of the survival of the fittest which identified might with right and power with justice.

In world affairs, this ethical relativism meant that every state could determine for itself right and wrong, as long as it was able to uphold and enforce its will upon others. The criterion of state conduct became capability. As long as a state could get others to accept its point of view by any means, that view was right. In the final analysis, ethical was whatever could be accepted by public opinion: *koine doxa*.[27]

The classical illustration of this theory is associated with Callicles and Thrasymachos.[28] For them the law of nature applies to two dissimilar realms: the animal kingdom and international affairs. It is because nations, like animals, exist in a state of unmitigated conflict, that self-interest is the only criterion of ethics. This morality allows the strong to attack and subjugate the weak. "A state may do whatever it can" becomes the general principle of action in world affairs.[29]

In a famous example regarding the operation of natural law, Callicles pointed out Greco-Persian relations. The only rule that the kings of Persia recognized was that might makes right. How else could the invasion of Xerxes against Greece or that of Darios against Scythia be justified but by the natural right of the strong over the weak. It was the ultimate success or failure of these enterprises of power politics, and not any moral principles, that decided who was right and who was wrong.

Callicles and Thrasymachus, who were responsible for the development and the propagation of these ideas were early adherents of the notorious school of Sophism, whose first and foremost representative was Protagoras of Abdera. His terse dictum: "Man is the measure of all things," best exemplifies their ethical relativism which characterized sophisticated thinking throughout the centuries.[30]

Basing his argument on his ethical dictum, Protagoras in the *Thetenos (172a)* concluded that no state could claim for its policies a higher right than any other. Only in matters of national interests could one state claim better judgement than the next. In the absence of a higher authority, each state was to judge its own case and set its own standards.

By reiterating the Pindarian epigram, the sophists identified popular morality with conventions and thereby contributed to the development of the classical theory of social contract.[31] Morality, they said, like legality, was a creation of the social contract of each state, hence it did not exist in nature. Since the principles of morality could not be applied to international affairs, true friendship could not exist between Greeks and barbarians. [32]

In spite of their relativism, the sophists admitted the advantage of having some common rules in international relations. Even if morality was only an intrastate phenomenon, the self-interest of each one required orderly intercourse between them. A procedural international law was thus necessary as well as sufficient for interstate order. As Empedocles of Akragas thought: whatever was lawful encompassed the world; and as Hippias of Elis believed: all nations partook in the same international law.[33]

Thus, out of the sophistic arguments grew the idea that Greeks and barbarians, their different customs not withstanding, came under a common international law. From this first step towards world law came the idea of a common humanity, embracing within it all nations.

Sophistic Humanism

The atmosphere of critical and skeptical inquiry developed in Greece after the Persian Wars included the demand for more popular education. The fulfilment of this demand was supplied by the sophists: the itinerant traveling teachers, social researchers and writers. They not only taught practical subjects but also originated many iconoclastic ideas, including ethical relativism and humanism.

Since the sophists were the world travelers of their day, roaming from poleis to ethnoi, they cross-fertilized many cultures with foreign news and notions. Often, they participated officially in international diplomacy by acting as messengers, negotiators and mediators between states. They could thus be seen as the diplomatic corps of the ancient world as well as its foreign correspondents.

Hippias of Elis was perhaps the embodiment of sophism. Among many other things, he was also a politician and a diplomat. In his latter capacity he conducted a good deal of top-level interstate negotiations. As an expert in the art of diplomacy, he only undertook the most difficult or delicate commissions, usually heading large missions to international conferences.

For his many talents, Hippias was extraordinary even among the Sophists. He was familiar with both Greek and barbarian customs, languages, and ideas. Among his works was *The Nomenclature of Peoples*, a comparative anthropological study in which he expressed himself very favorably towards the barbarians.

In his studies, Hippias reasoned that although men differed in their customs and laws, they were of similar nature. All men, he thought, were held together by common bonds due to their common humanity which was stronger than their superficial differences. From that, he concluded, different nationalities could live together in the same community, so heterogeneous states were quite possible.

Here we have then the idea that the polis was not the only way of civilized life, larger political units could be planned on the basis of human equality. In many surviving fragments of sophistic works, one can discern a continuous and pronounced tolerant and humanitarian outlook that is lacking in other Greek writers. In spite of their somewhat negative reputation then, the sophists widened Greek horizons and taught their compartiotes to understand and even appreciate foreigners.[34]

As peacetime contacts with other nations increased through travel and trade, Greek exclusiveness weakened and something of an internationalist movement began to form. The most advanced liberals of the day saw no reason why mankind should end in the frontiers of Greece. The sophistic idea of a common humanity transcending the distinctions of race and culture must have some appeal to the educated public of the fifth century, since we meet it time and again in many quarters.

Unlike the unveiled contempt towards the barbarians that one finds in many philosophical works of the fourth century, most popular writers of the fifth were egalitarians. Callecles thought that slavery went contrary to natural law, Alcidamas claimed that "God made everyone free, nature made none a slave" Archelaus of Miletos, like Hippias, carried out comparative ethnological observations with similar conclusions.

Antiphon of Athens, in his *Truth* denied any differences between Greeks and barbarians altogether, arguing that everybody was alike -*homoios* - by nature. Being a sophisticated anthropologist, he ridiculed many traditional beliefs including the axiom of Greek superiority. Anaxagoras, the friend of Pericles, considered the whole world as his country[35] and Democritus, the great atomist, transcended the limits of his nation by stating that to the wise man every land is open and the whole earth is his home.[36]

Thucydides carried on the work of Herodotos and Hippocrates by combining environmental and evolutionary factors of human development. His theory was that originally by nature all men were similar, living around the same region and under the same conditions. The differences arose as migrations separated them in various environments and thus changed their rates of development.

It was after living in the Mediterranean climate for many generations that the people who settled there evolved into Greeks, whereas the barbarians who

stayed behind remained in their primitive state. "Ancient Greeks lived like modern barbarians," said Thucydides (I, 6, 5); but by an evolutionary process, they perfected themselves. On the other hand some Greeks who lived under the same conditions as the barbarians soon became like barbarians. It is thus the accidents of geography and climate and not any inherent superiority that makes Greeks different from other nations.

The Athenian playwrights, as well, echoed other intellectuals in their cosmopolitanism. Sophocles in the *Antigone* championed a wider view of human rights and duties and in *Ajax* protested against unwarranted prejudice towards the barbarians. Euripides in the *Media,* pointed out that barbarians could also be good and Greeks bad, and in many of his other plays he often depicted some barbarians as being superior to Greeks in many respects. Finally however, the tragedians for all their efforts, failed to instill in their fellow Greeks any other view of humanity than the traditional binary "we-they" taxonomy: i.e. free-slave, citizen-alien, Greek-barbarian.[37]

By the end of the century then Greek concepts on world affairs had come a long way from the naive opinions based on ignorance to the sophisticated theories based on substantial knowledge. From these humanistic and international ideas of the fifth century ultimately grew the cosmopolitan ideas of world unity of the third century. Intermediately, however, during the fourth century, although this tradition was carried on by a few radical thinkers like the cynics, the two main philosophical schools of Plato and Aristotle remained true to the traditional dichotomy.[38]

Although the sophistic ideas ultimately contributed to Alexandrian transnationalism, Hellenistic stoicism and ultimately the *Pax Romana*; their immediate effect was to unsettle venerable traditions, question social values and upset moral principles. Before the new concepts could be transformed into a positive ethic of humanity, they left an ideological vacuum in which naked power devolved as the central criterion. Thus by undermining the foundations of the traditional political system, these laudable ideas contributed to the decay of Hellenic society and helped unleash a century of violence and deprivation.

NOTES

1. The Trojan War was only later characterized as the first encounter when it was used as an excuse by the Persians for their invasion of Greece. (Plato, **Laws,** 685c-e).

2. According to Herodotos (I, 6 & 14) Greek-barbarian relations began in the reign of Croesus (c. 550 BC). The Lydian king had established diplomatic relations with the mainland Greeks and was a great admirer of their culture. He treated his Greek subjects well and left them complete autonomy. Before

Croesos, however, the Persian king Gyges (c. 650 BC), was the first barbarian to consult the Delphic oracle. Yet politically the Persians did not come into contact with the Greeks until after they defeated the Lydians in between.

3. The Persians were hard taskmasters. They abolished the autonomy of the Ionian colonies and incorporated them into their satrapies.(Herodotus, 5, 49)

4. The common disjunctive phrase the Greeks used to indicate the Greek-barbarian antithesis was: *e ellenes, e barbaroi.* (Strabo, XIV,9).

5. Tolerance was never a quality highly esteemed by the Greeks. (Cf. Randal, 2; Toynbee, xxv; Sinclair, 180; Diller, 18).

6. The only negative feelings the Greeks were spared were violent nationalism and racism. (Cf. Zimmem, 372; Baldry,1-4; Oliver, 142).

7. Etymologically, "barbarian" is an onomatopaea, meaning "one who speaks gibberish". Thus the barbarians were without *logos*, i.e. speechless and irrational. (Cf. Arendt, 23, 214; Sabine, 18; Haarhoff, 62; Thompson, 60)

8. Theirs was not to reason why, but only follow orders. This justified them being slaves to the Greeks and subjects to their masters. (Jouguet, 68; Sinclair, 74; Ashley, 15).

9. As early as the seventh century, Anaximander had divided the world into *Europe* and *Asia.* (Livinston, 327; Thompson, 136; Pohlenz,16; Hero. 1,4).

10. The Persians treated foreigners as they did their own subjects; and apart from the Persian Wars, their relations with Greeks were continuous and often amicable. For a time, Susa was the meeting place of many Greek expatriates. (Jarde, 267-268).

11. The East-West conflict is illustrated in the famous Darius Vase. On it is depicted the Euro-Asian antithesis as a struggle between western culture and eastern barbarism. (Oliver,120; Thompson,84; Zimmem,268).

12. *Zeus Eleutherios* was worshiped as the Liberator of the Greeks from the barbarians, and along with *Zeus Soter* protected the Hellenic world in international affairs. (Pindar, 305; Oliver, 137).

13. It was said that Persia and Carthage, via Phoenicia, had synchronized their attacks on Greece. The trade competition by the Greeks was beginning to drive them out the Mediterranean, so they had to pool their resources in a concerted action. (Hero.II,39; III,139; IV,103: Pindar, **Pyth**, 175ff; Knorringa, iv).

14. The failure of the Greeks to conceive of representative democracy, hindered them from creating large viable states of extended citizenship. (Pohlenz, 18; Thuc. III,10.3).

15. Thales made his proposal at the Pan-Ionic Congress of 540. The sage is also credited with the discovery of an important principle of international affairs,

when he advised the Greeks to ally with their distant enemies the Persians in order to fight their immediate threat the Lydians. (Anderson, 138; Hero.I,170; Freeman,14; Caldwell, 58).

16. First by diplomatic protests and then by a weak expeditionary force, Greek intervention in Asia Minor did not do anything but arouse the hostility of the Persians who claimed retribution by invading Greece later on.

17. The *Synedrion* of *Probuloi*, or Representative Assembly which met in the Isthmus, 480 BC, was the only pan-hellenic political decision-making body to take such momentous actions as the battle of Salamis, thus ending once and for all the Persian threat to Greece. It should be noted that the Assembly did not represent all Greek states. Many poleis remained neutral and a few even joined the Persians. (Ehrenberg,107; Jarde,279).

18. Some modern scholars agree with the Greeks, that they were indeed fighting for Western civilization. (Sinclair, 39; Thompson, 10).

19. This conviction of the Greeks, seems to have passed on to the Europeans of modern times. (Sabine, 65; Bowra,12).

20. Aeschylos painted stirring pictures of war in Homeric proportions. Having participated in the wars himself, he regarded his deeds as the most worthy of his life in his **Suppliants**. Yet he pitied the tragedy of Xerxes in the **Persae**, whose dream to harness Europe and Asia to his chariot had failed so miserably. (Atossa's Dream, 181-7).

21. "Justice is strife", said Heraclitos, "and all things come through strife and necessity." (Diels, Frs. 53-4; 2; 24; 80; 121; Caldwell, 79; Sinclair, 30; Baldry, 22-23).

22. Hippocrates: **Aeres**, 16; Also Kohn, 114; Diller, 15.

23. Ionia was the birthplace of scientific thought, because, as Aristotle noted, it was the first society to attain leisure. (Toulmin).

24. Herodotos always shows a lively admiration for non-Greeks. (Myres, 121-168; Wells, 95-111; Baldry, 21; Randall, 2; Agard, 155).

25. The Greeks began to learn of the outside world from the writings of Xenophanes in the late sixth century. Anaximander of Miletos at the same time drew up the first atlas of the world. Hecateus of Miletos, early in the fifth century, wrote a **Description of the World** based on the latest information. In it were included references to the political systems of Assyria, Media, and Persia among others. (Anderson,181; Baldry,17,24; Sabine 22).

26. In spite of the disbelief Herodotos created in many quarters and the questioned veracity of his sources, enough people took him seriously to debate the implications of his findings. (Randall,3).

27. On the nomos-physis controversy cf: Barker, 29; Sinclair, 48, 53;

Untersteiner, 304-310; Webster, 56.

28. Our knowledge of these men comes from Plato. Both appear in many dialogues, but the particular example of Callicles is from **Gorgias**, 482e-483d.

29. Thucydides later expressed much the same views (IV,61.5; V,105.2). (Webster, 61).

30. The famous epigram was in Protagoras' book **Peri Politeias**, the first of many other works of the same title including Plato's **Republic**. (Livingstone, 111).

31. Archelaos, the naturalist, thought that right and wrong existed only by convention and not by nature; and Alcidamas concurred with Herodotus in placing custom at the base of morality. Finally Xenophon identified justice only with legality.(Barker,36; Sinclair,51,170).

32. Euripides, **Hecuba**, 1199-1201; Livy, xxxi, 29; Jarde, 246.

33. Fragment 135. Herodotos even castigated the Spartans for breaking international law when they killed the Persian envoys who had been sent to demand their submission.(VII,136; VI48). It was statements like these that earned him the epithet of barbarophile. (See also Note 24). (Baldry 28; Caldwell,47).

34. Although many of the things the sophists said were quite controversial to say the least, they did not always merit the bad reputation they had, nor were they as ruthless as they are often presented to be. Cf. Thucidides V, 86-111. For Plato's opinion see **Hippias Major**, 281a-b; **Timaeus**, 19e; **Protagoras** 337d. Also Anderson, 172; Arendt, 51; Barker, 33; Baldry, 42; Caldwell, 48; Ebenstein, 47; Jaeger, II, 73; Konuitz, 27; Levinson, 215; Pohlenz, 32; Roberts, 256; Webster, 56.

35. Like Herodotos, Anaxagoras was also accused for medism. In his case the Athenian Assembly forced him into exile. (Anderson,155; Baldry,29).

36. Democritos of Abdera, was the only Greek philosopher to praise democracy without reservation. His doctrine of *omonoia* was the harmony of interests that bonded a community and its absence was the reason of wars among them (Fr.250). (Sinclair, 65; Freeman, 124; Baldry, 58).

37. Euripides anticipated later cosmopolitanism by saying that the noble spirit has the world as his country (Fr.1047). Nonetheless, in **Iphigenia in Aulis**, 1400-1, he stated that the Greeks had the right to rule over the barbarians. (Baldry,32-3, 36, 45-50; 52; Morrow, 127; Roberts, 30; Webster, 63).

38. On this subject, see two articles by this author: "Platonic Ideas on International Affairs" **Hellenic Review of International Relations**. Vol. 2, No. 1 (1981); "Aristotelian Thought on World Affairs." **Skepsis**, Athens, 1994.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARNOPOULOS, P.J. **Polis-Ethnos-Cosmos**. (Monograph to be published in 1996).

AGARD, W.R. **What Democracy Meant to the Greeks**. Wisconsin U. Madison, 1960.

ANDERSON, W. **Man's Quest for Political Knowledge**. Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1964.

ARENDT, H. **Between Past and Present**. The Viking Press, N. Y, 1961.

ASHLEY, W. **The Theory of Natural Slavery**. Author, Notre Dame, 1941.

CALDWELL, W.E. **Hellenic Conceptions of Peace**. (No Publisher), N.Y, 1919.

DILLER, A. **Race Mixture Among the Greeks**. Illinois University, Urbana, 1937.

EBENSTEIN, W. **Modern Political Thought**. Rinehart, New York, 1947.

EHRENBERG, V. **The Greek State**. Blackwell, Oxford, 1960.

FREEMAN, K. **God, Man, and the State**. Macdonald Co., London, 1952.

HAARHOFF, T.J. **The Stranger at the Gate**. Beacon Press, Boston, 1951.

JAEGER, W. **Paideia**. Oxford University Press, New York, 1945.

JARDÉ, A. **The Formation of the Greek People**. A. Knopf, New York, 1926.

JOUGUET, P. **Macedonian Imperialism**. Kegan Paul, London, 1928.

KNORRINGA, H. **Emporos**. H.J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1926.

KOHN, H. **World Order in Historical Perspective**. Harvard, Cambridge, 1942.

KONUITZ, M.R. *et al.* **Essays in Political Theory**. Cornell U., Ithaca, 1948.

LEVINSON, R.B. **In Defence of Plato**. Harvard, Cambridge, 1953.

LIVINGSTONE, R.W. **The Greek Genius and its Meaning**. Oxford, London, 1915.

MORROW, G.R. **Plato's Cretan City**. Princeton University, 1960.

MYRES, J.L. **Anthropology and the Classics**. Oxford at the Clarendon, 1908.

OLIVER, J.H. **Democratia, the Gods, & the Free World**. John Hopkins, Baltimore, 1960.

POHLENZ, M. **Freedom in Greek Life and Thought**. Humanities Press, N. Y, 1966.

RANDALL, J.H. **Aristotle**. Columbia University, New York, 1960.

ROBERTS, J.T. **Athens on Trial**. Princeton UP, N.J., 1994.

SABINE, G. **A History of Political Theory**. Henry Holt, New York, 1950.

SINCLAIR, T.A. **A History of Greek Political Thought**. Routledge, London, 1951.

THOMPSON, J.A.K. **Greeks and Barbarians**. Allen and Unwin, London, 1921.

TOYNBEE, A.J. **Greek Historical Thought**. Dent Sons, London, 1950.

TOULMIN, S. **Night Sky at Rhodes**. Methuen, London, 1964.

UNTERSTEINER, M. **The Sophists**. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1954.

WEBSTER, T.B.L. **Political Interpretations in Greek Literature**. Manchester U., 1948.

WELLS, J. **Studies in Herodotus**. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1923.

ZIMMERN, A. **The Greek Commonwealth**. Oxford University, London, 1931.

DOCUMENT

RESOLUTION 939 (1994)

Adopted by the Security Council et its 3412th meeting, on 29 July 1994

The Security Council,

Recalling its relevant resolutions on Cyprus,

Welcoming the report of the Secretary-General of 30 May 1994 (S/1994/629) and his letter of 28 June 1994 (S/1994/785), concerning his mission of good offices,

Reaffirming, in this context, that the confidence-building measures, while not an end in themselves, nor a substitute for the wider political process, would offer significant benefits to both communities and would facilitate the political process towards an overall settlement,

Recalling the acceptance in principle by both parties of the confidence-building measures, and **welcoming** the acceptance by the leader of the Greek Cypriot Community of the 21 March 1994 "Draft ideas for implementing the package of confidence-building measures" (S/1994/785, annex), and **welcoming also** the considerable progress towards agreement made by the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, as described in the Secretary-General's letter of 28 June 1994,

Noting that there is now a substantial measure of agreement on the substance of the confidence-building measures and the modalities for their implementation, but also **noting with concern** that neither leader is yet prepared to proceed to their implementation on the basis outlined in the Secretary-General's letter of 28 June 1994,

Having studied the options and ideas for future action set out in paragraphs 57 to 62 of the Secretary-General's report of 30 May 1994,

1. **Reiterates** that the maintenance of the status quo is unacceptable;

2. **Reaffirms** its position that a Cyprus settlement must be based on a state of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship, with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded, and comprising two politically equal communities as described in the relevant Security Council resolutions, in a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation, and that such a settlement must exclude union in whole or in part with any other country or any form of partition or secession;

3. **Requests** the Secretary-General to begin consultations with members of the Council, with the Guarantor Powers, and with the two leaders in Cyprus with a view to undertaking a fundamental and far-reaching reflection on ways of approaching the Cyprus problem in a manner that will yield results, and reiterates its call to the parties to demonstrate their commitment by cooperating fully to this end;

4. **Urges,** in this context, the parties to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General and his Special Representative to achieve agreement on the modalities for implementing the confidence-building measures at the earliest possible time;

5. **Also requests** the Secretary-General to submit a report by the end of October 1994 including a program for achieving an overall solution to the issues involved in the Cyprus problem following his consultations referred to in paragraph 3 above and on progress made towards the implementation of the confidence-building measures;

6. **Decides** to remain actively seized of the matter;